U.S. Congress

Appendix

The Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I believe the best method of determining if an expenditure of public funds is justified is to analyze the benefits to be derived and to measure them against the total expenditure involved. In the case of the Colorado River storage project, the benefits far exceed the total cost. In a 50-year period following the last power installation, irrigation revenues from the irrigation projects, plus net power revenues from the power facilities to be authorized by H. R. 3383 will have repaid the investment in construction cost plus interest on the power features even during construction and leave a surplus of about $86 million. In addition, after the project has paid for itself, net power revenues amounting to from $15 million to $20 million annually will continue to flow into the Treasury. That, to me, means that the Colorado storage project is a sound investment for the people of the United States and that it is financially feasible from every standpoint.

However, there have been a number of unfair attacks on the project, and I would like to put the record straight on one of these distorted criticisms. The attack to which I have reference originated with Leslie A. Miller, and I feel it necessary to answer it not only because of its inaccuracies, but because Mr. Miller is a resident of my State. I do not want people to think that Mr. Miller speaks for the rest of the citizens of Wyoming. He most emphatically does not.

Like other opponents of this project, Mr. Miller ignores this fundamental fact: The project is self-liquidating. Documents show that the cost will be repaid to the Government, much of it with interest, by the people of the area to benefit directly from the project.

Mr. Miller errs when he says the project will not provide the needed water and power for industrial uses. The project specifically provides for full use of the water and the power for industries and cities. A specific assignment for these purposes was made after careful and comprehensive surveys of the potential needs. If cities need even more water in the future, they have the right to it under western water law. So this is not a matter of shutting the municipal and industrial users out of the picture. It is the only way to provide them with a guaranty of adequate water. A study of the project will show that this is a major purpose, and the cities and industries of the West are well aware of it.

Also, Mr. Miller gives an erroneous impression when he lists the portion of the cost the water users will pay and states, "The balance will be subsidized by the Federal Government." Actually, the balance—that which is not paid for by the water user—will be paid for by the power user. Power is a natural byproduct of the project.

Mr. Miller implies that the use of sprinkling systems for irrigating farmland is a substitute for the project. We are not arguing the merits of various ways of putting the water to use; our problem is to get the water in the first place.

Mr. Miller writes only about those items he hopes will justify his conclusion, refusing to examine the project as the package that it is. He makes as a prime example of the weaknesses of the overall project the La Plata unit in New Mexico. This particular unit is not included as an authorized project in the bill that passed the Senate in April, nor is it listed as a project subject to future approval, nor is it included in the bill now before the House in any form.

To be able to decide whether the project is strong or weak, one must look at all aspects. The bill which was approved by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in June 1955 authorizes 3 major dams and 11 participating units at a total cost of $760 million, and of this total, 61 percent will pay full interest.

The project will pay for itself within 50 years. This is no theory. It has been documented and detailed by engineers, scientists, and economists, and a study of hearings before the Senate Interior Committee this year will bear this out.

This same plan has worked time and time again in the United States, and the taxpayers and the people of the nation are the ultimate beneficiaries.

Where Mr. Miller and his friends fail to do the project justice is in their attack on isolated units, or the use of arithmetic trickery, to justify a predetermined opinion. They are too busy looking at the trees to see the forest.

Attacks on reclamation and the Colorado River storage project overlook these factors:

First. In addition to repaying its total cost, the project will eventually return a profit to the treasury of several millions annually, from the sale of power produced by the project.

Second. All power and municipal features of the project pay full 2½ percent interest.

Third. Tax revenues and other benefits will far exceed the total cost and the cost of interest-free money.

Fourth. The project greatly benefits industries and cities, and not just users of irrigation water.

Fifth. Water resources development creates wealth and income.

Sixth. The total wealth and income created are vastly greater than either the real costs or the money costs, and tax revenues on the wealth and income created eventually more than offset the money costs.

Seventh. The Colorado River region, as a major resource of the Nation, must fully be developed for reasons of maximum resource utilization and for long range national defense purposes.

Eighth. The western States are great contributors to the United States treasury and to the reclamation fund itself by royalties from oil and minerals found in these States.

In regard to the latter point, income from these minerals is divided 37½ percent to the State where the mineral is produced, 10 percent to the Treasury of the United States, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund for the benefit of the Western States.

My State of Wyoming alone has paid more than $200 million to the Treasury in this manner. By the time the bill comes due for the Colorado River storage project, my State alone will have paid into the Treasury enough to assume the entire cost of the project. Yet, we are criticized by advocating developments that put this money to use.

The United States is the landlord in my State and in other States concerned directly with the Colorado River project. The Government owns more than 51 percent of the area of my State. It owns the oil and other minerals under 44 million of Wyoming's 62 million acres. This actually deprives our State of needed tax revenue sources and of income. That is one reason we feel justified in encouraging the Federal Government to participate in a project that will be a sound investment from a tax standpoint.

The history of water resources development is a history of accomplishment, of wealth creation. In the reclamation phase of such development, expenditures since 1902 of less than $3 billion has provided irrigation water and facilities to more than 7 million acres of land. This has been the basis for the transformation of relatively valueless land into highly productive valuable farms. The land has produced almost $10 billion in crop values. Net revenues from power generation on the projects total approximately one-fourth of $1 billion. Municipalities have been provided water supplies, and vast areas have been protected from the ravages of floods.

When Mr. Miller discusses the irrigation costs of the Colorado project his

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

basic figures are as much in error as his basic premises.

He arbitrarily uses an estimated irrigation construction cost of $1,000 per acre. This is way out of line with the actual facts of the matter. The average cost per acre served is $545—not $1,000.

Admittedly, this is more than the land would sell for today without the water. But it is a feasible and practical figure when its long-term use and repayment is considered. Repayment over a 60-year period makes the annual water cost about $8, which in terms of added wealth provided, is a great bargain.

Also, it should be kept in mind that the Federal Government is not being asked to shoulder this cost. It is an expense that will be borne by the water user and those who will benefit from the Colorado project.

Mr. Miller condemns the project because the land to be irrigated lies at high elevations. But he completely ignores the point that water will produce more calories of food per unit of water consumed at these elevations than at low elevations such as Imperial Valley, Calif.

Mr. Miller opposes reclamation of more land to provide food for the Nation's booming population. He says present farm acreage can handle the extra demand by 1975 through paying proper attention to new techniques and fertilizers and more efficient machinery.

This view is in direct contradiction to 3 Government studies which set the 1975 population of the United States at from 190 to 210 million. These three studies are: First, report by Byron Shaw, Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, 1953; second, the President's Water Policy Commission, 1952; and third, policy study of material resources, 1953.

To provide food at present diet standards will require 30 million new acres in addition to all the increases in production that can be obtained through scientific improvements.

The items now in surplus generally are not those that will be produced in the upper Colorado River Basin. Also, it will take perhaps a quarter of a century before the land is put to full use—and by then we will be facing a food shortage rather than a food surplus.

Is it any wonder there is no worry about having too much food a quarter of a century from now?

Of course, irrigation of farmland is only one benefit to come from the project.

One of the most important uses of water is for industrial development. In 1954, the Bureau of Mines listed 42 metals and minerals of strategic and economic importance found in substantial quantity in the upper Colorado River Basin. Considering proven reserves, their their value as raw material was estimated at $1,123 million. The Colorado Plateau accounts for nearly all of the Nation's current production of uranium, and one-third of the Nation's copper.

But water and power must be available in dependable quantities and at reasonable cost on a permanently assured basis. Water and power are essential ingredients for the mining, smelting, refining, and processing of these vital natural resources which are not readily available elsewhere. Right now, there is a shortage of uranium-processing mills, largely because of a lack of water to supply these mills.

The project will provide the water and power for mining and industrial development, and in so doing will add wealth to the Nation at the same time will bolster our national defense. Uranium royalties alone return millions of dollars every year to the United States Treasury.

This summer, many communities are rationing water for domestic uses. Denver has such a rationing program in effect, and so do other cities. This project will provide the water needed in these communities, and the cities, of course, will pay for it—and with full interest.

The project pays for itself in many, many ways. It is a great investment for the Nation from every standpoint and should, I believe, be authorized now, with construction to begin immediately. The Nation will benefit and so will the taxpayer. I urge my colleagues to give this project, as outlined in H. R. 3383, their full support.

The Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, never has any reclamation project been subjected to as much vilification and misrepresentation as has the upper Colorado River storage project. At the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars, opponents of this project have deluged our offices with propaganda alleging—among other things—that the project will be a burden on the residents of other States in the Nation. This is false. The cost of the upper Colorado River project will be repaid by the residents of the four States directly benefitting from its construction—New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming. Each unit of the project will be repaid within a 50-year period after full development. The power and municipal water features of the project will be repaid with interest.

It is because this project is repayable within the limits set by the reclamation law that it has the full support of President Eisenhower. Those opposing the project would have the people believe that the President of the United States was advocating something that would increase their taxes by $4 billion. This is not so. The money is repaid to the Treasury and repaid by the people in Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. The rest of the Nation shares in the additional wealth produced as water is saved from waste and put to domestic, industrial, and agricultural use.

Each Member of Congress should ask himself why this project—more than any in history—has been subjected to such a distorted national campaign of opposition. What is there about this project that makes it the target of calumny?

The answer is readily available. The source of the propaganda and opposition wealth is southern California.

Southern California's interest in the project is economic. As long as our water wastes into the sea, industry in southern California benefits from the purchase of firm power at dump power rates of 1.47 mill per kilowatt-hour. Depending upon the flow of the river, this power generated by upper basin water, is worth between $2 million and $4 million per year. The contracts for this power all have a clause cancelling them when the upper basin starts to use its water. To protect these contracts and, in protecting them, to steal our water is the sole purpose of southern California's opposition.

Statements that this project would add to the tax burden of residents in other States of the Nation are as false and fantastic as the accusation that we in the West want to grow bananas on Pike's Peak. We want our water in order that we can continue to grow. This priceless resource should not be wasted to furnish subsidized power to a few favored industries in southern California and to grow cotton in Mexico.

The Business of Wiretapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Collier's of August 5, 1955:

THE BUSINESS OF WIRETAPPING

As the British discovered as early as 1775, privacy has always been a touchy subject with Americans. A man's home was his castle, and if you entered without knocking you did so at your own peril. You didn't ask your neighbor about his quarrels with his wife, or how much money he had in the bank, or which way he voted in the election. In fact, in some rural mountain areas where traditions of personal dignity are still highly valued, it was considered customary and proper to shoot a man who asked an indelicate question. It emphasized a healthy national contempt for snoopers and eavesdroppers, for Peeping Toms and sneaks—and sometimes that included the police. As soon as they could get around to it, the Founding Fathers set matters straight in article IV of the Bill of Rights, which guaranteed all citizens the right to be "secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures." Whenever those rights were threatened, folks from Boston to Texas to California were apt to reach for the squirrel gun over the mantel.

Why do you suppose we invented window shades, mister?

Well, maybe it's about time we primed old Betsy again. For more than 30 years, in the absence of any real Federal or State controls, eavesdropping by telephone wiretaps or newer electronic listening devices has become a furtive big business. Federal Government agencies admittedly use wiretaps. So do State and local police throughout the country. Private investigators intent on snaring straying husbands or suspected employees are setting up unlicensed listening devices with all too common ease and impunity.

The legal confusion surrounding wiretaps is shown by the fact that Federal agencies continue the practice despite a Supreme Court decision in 1937 which forbade wiretapping by Federal officers and denied the admission of such evidence in Federal prosecutions. As a result of this paradox, the Department of Justice admittedly is loath to prosecute other wiretappers when its own wiretaps are legally so dubious. State laws are almost equally muddled. In April of last year, United States Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., informed the Senate Judiciary Committee that 10 States permit authorized tapping of wires, yet an additional 23 States, although limiting in some forms the tapping of wires, "do not prohibit the admission in evidence of information obtained in violation of their laws."

That eavesdropping has become a clear and present danger is indicated in the testimony of various congressional investigations and by the revelations in the recent Collier's articles by wiretap expert Bernard B. Spindel and staff writer Bill Davidson. Since the development of electronics, the eavesdropper is no longer dependent on crude wiretaps. With apparatus far more ingenious than any known defense against it, the up-to-date snooper may aim a parabolic microphone, much as one might sight a gun, and record a conversation 300 yards away. An even more insidious device utilizes inaudible high-frequency sound waves to penetrate thick walls and when further perfected may be able to record supposedly private conferences in rooms half a mile away—and this without "bugs" or wires of any kind. According to Mr. Spindel, not even the White House and the private talks of the President may be considered wholly secure against modern eavesdroppers.

The growing list of wiretap abuses is as frightening as the possibilities of the new listening apparatus. In Pennsylvania and Rhode Island wiretapping has been used by State officials as a means of political espionage against their opponents. In Brooklyn, an investigation into the police blackmail of bookmaker Harry Gross revealed that some officers were making unauthorized wiretaps not to apprehend criminals, but to shake them down. In New York, it has been testified, wiretap authorizations were readily obtained from some local judges who hardly glanced at the applications before signing them. In Washington, a high-ranking Cabinet officer dared not use his office telephone to confer with his advisers because he had reason to fear it had been tapped by his political foes.

Despite its concern over the growing evils of wiretapping, as of this writing Congress has failed to act. Eleven times in past years either the House or the Senate has conducted investigations, then backed away from the problem without any decisive legislation. During the 1955 session of Congress, a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee headed by Representative EMANUEL CELLER aggressively pressed its inquiry into wiretapping, but the fate of any proposed legislation will not be known until Congress reconvenes.

The hesitation of Congress stems from the very great difficulties involved. Despite the fact that the Federal Government quite probably holds jurisdiction over telephone and air communications as essentially interstate in nature, the basic division of Federal and State authority over wiretapping has not yet been clearly determined. But beyond this difficulty, many Congressmen are haunted by a dilemma. They are uneasily aware that wiretapping is a powerful political weapon, that it has been used in the building of police states, that without the strictest safeguards it can become an instrument of blackmail and oppression. Yet they are equally aware that wiretapping may well be essential in protecting the national security against espionage and treason. It is a highly effective police tool in murder and kidnap cases as well as bookmaking, prostitution, and narcotics peddling, which depend heavily on telephone communications. The problem—and Congress has not yet resolved it—has been summed up by Representative CELLER: "We have to weigh two basic principles—the national defense and security versus constitutional privacy. One must not, need not, yield to the other."

Clearly, whatever the difficulties, it is time to act, to make some hard decisions. It is time that Congress strictly defined those crimes against national security, and perhaps individual life, for whose prevention or solution wiretapping authority must be permitted. It must decide whether wiretapping authority should be vested in the Attorney General, with its hazards of political exploitation, or in the Federal courts where, we believe, such controls traditionally and properly belong. It must carefully define the safeguards, such as the strict surveillance and licensing both of equipment and operators, against indiscriminate use. It must set up protective measures against the kind of vocal forgery which experts have shown to be possible. Congress then should make all other wiretap activities a Federal felony punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Confronted with the heavy burdens of enforcing the laws, there are police officers who oppose any stringent regulation of wiretapping. Some already have stated that it would cripple their campaign against criminals. But in the long run we believe it is far better to handicap the police than to run the risk of a police state, far better that some crime go undetected than to commit a greater crime against all citizens. As Justice Holmes remarked: "Wiretapping is a dirty business." However much the method affronts our national character, there are times and occasions when wiretapping is a necessary protection for the country's safety. But if we do not shortly limit its use to the most essential requirements of the national security, we may see a cherished constitutional right disappear by default.

North American Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the most significant developments in industry are accompanied by a great deal of turbulence. This has been the case in civil aviation, where each new innovation has been the subject of considerable debate and argument. However, in the free-enterprise system there seems to be a selective process and generally, despite monopolistic restrictions, regulations, and all kinds of hobbles, the outfit with the new ideas manages to survive. This, of course, is the basis of the miracle of the American economic system.

However, if too many restrictions are arbitrarily set down the new enterprise is driven out of business and the entire economic system and the general public suffer.

I should like to point out that this is what is taking place in the field of civil aviation, where one of the most creative and valuable enterprises, North American Airlines, is having its operating authority revoked by the Civil Aeronautics Board for technical, and what appear to be entirely petty reasons.

This remarkable company, which pioneered air coach and which has introduced hundreds of thousands of citizens to traveling by air, can continue to perform a valuable public service, providing it is not regulated to death. The story of this unusual company was recently recounted in Time magazine, February 28, 1955, and I should like to read the brief article about North American.

The article follows:

DOWN WITH THE SWOOSE

To establish United States airlines, North American Airlines is neither swan nor goose but an unloved and awkward swoose. Technically a nonscheduled operator under CAB rules calling for irregular and infrequent flights, it has nevertheless grown into a $9,000,000 outfit operating one of the biggest transcontinental air-coach services. Last week, with North American's 1954 sales topping $11 million, the CAB decided to clip the big hybrid's wings. A CAB examiner recommended that North American be grounded for operating a scheduled airline in violation of CAB regulations.

BATTLES AND COACHES

The trouble was nothing new for North American's four Los Angeles co-owners—Stanley Weiss, 43, James Fischgrund, 39, Ross R. Hart, 40, and Jack B. Lewin, 42. Separately, and together, they have been fighting CAB for years. Returning from the war Fischgrund, a Navy lieutenant commander,, and Weiss, an ex-Air Corps transport pilot, bought two war-surplus Douglas C–47 transports for $15,000 down, and formed Standard Airlines, Hart and Lewin, two Douglas Aircraft employees, formed their own Viking Airlines with the money raised from 29 coworkers. The two lines pioneered cut-rate air-coach flights. By 1948 they had 80 percent of the transcontinental aircoach business sewed up between them.

This was too successful both for CAB and the big scheduled airlines. Charging that the lines flew too regularly and too often, CAB put them out of business. The four-man team of flyers promptly organized North American as a series of interlocking companies to get around the rules. First they formed Republic Air Coach System to handle the financial end, then bought up four small nonscheduled lines with valid CAB letters of registration—Twentieth Century Air Lines, Trans National Airlines, Trans American Airways, Hemisphere Air Transport—to supply planes and pilots.

North American itself, though its name is on all planes, acted merely as a ticket agency. With that setup, Fischgrund, Weiss & Co., started maneuvering their four "flying companies" to operate what amounted to a regular scheduled airline. Though no one company ever flew at the same time each day, the four combined could put together a solid, round-the-clock schedule by jockeying their flights back and forth.

PERFECT SAFETY

The CAB took out after North American almost as soon as it started. But by one legal dodge after another, the line has managed to keep going. And it has turned into a whopping success. It started the first $99 fare coast to coast, expanded its air-coach business so fast that it forced the scheduled lines to start air-coach flights (today 34 percent of all airline travel is by air coach). North American made enough money to buy 2 Douglas GC-6Bs for nonstop transcontinental flights, has 3 more on order, and has been able to chop its coast-to-coast fare to $75 one way. The line can also boast proudly in its ads that it has flown "1 billion passenger-miles without an accident—a perfect safety record."

North American which will keep on flying while it files an appeal before the full Board, makes no bones about its determination to force its way into the exclusive circle of scheduled airlines. The line argues that CAB doctrine since the Board was first set up in 1938 has been to limit the number of trunk airlines to the 16 "grandfather" lines (American, Eastern, United, TWA, etc.) operating at that time. Since then, 3 have dropped out, but no new names have been added to the roster, though 27 small feeder services have been authorized. Instead of expanding existing airlines to fill all United States needs, North American wants the CAB to let it provide new service and competition.

The Most Important Idea of Our New Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the boldness of President Eisenhower's proposal at Geneva—a proposal that all the players in this tense and terrible game of power politics lay all cards on the table, face up—is as breathtaking as it is sound. By this single step—if it could be accomplished, the basic need for armaments could be removed, and the mortal peril of annihilation which hangs over the world could be dispelled. Emerson, contemplating some battleships, once said, "By an idea they were created; by an idea, they will vanish away." The President has put into words the idea that could cause them to vanish away. Let us prayerfully hope mankind will grasp it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Friday, July 22 issue of the Democrat and Chronicle, of Rochester, N. Y., bearing on this subject:

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL MOST IMPORTANT AS NECESSARY STEP IN NUCLEAR AGE

President Eisenhower has again proved his right to the five stars which he won as a career military man. He has achieved tactical surprise in the field of diplomacy as effectively as any man ever did in a war.

It has become a reiterated maxim in the atom age that if man is to survive, he must begin to think in new channels. The Eisenhower leadership has brought the most startling new proposal seriously advanced by any national leader.

If the Russians are not sincere in their professions of desire for peace, they have a most difficult decision to make. They must now stand before the world as they are. On their answer to the proposal they will be judged as men who realize that war is insane and who will do their utmost to prevent it, or their desire for a mere breathing spell before future aggression becomes plain to all.

The idea of putting both the United States and Russia in a goldfish bowl can be regarded on at least two levels. Considered as diplomatic strategy, as a move to force the Communists into the open, it is superb generalship.

But as a serious proposal to advance toward conditions that will eventually make war nearly impossible, the President's challenge is the most important idea of our new age. Nor can we doubt for a moment that he is completely sincere. He has to be sincere, for if he were not, the Russians could make a boomerang of the proposal by accepting it. Obviously, the President means to go ahead with it if the Reds do agree.

It should be noted that the President warned that Americans will not be pushed out of Europe. We shall maintain and, if necessary, increase our armed strength in Europe for as long a period as is necessary to safeguard peace and maintain our security, he promised. He is not making any idealistic but impractical proposal that the United States strip itself of its strength.

He merely proposes that surprise in war be made impossible of achievement. To do this he would push aside the old, inefficient system of spies and set up corps of military reporters. They would have access to any place in the United States and Russia. Pearl Harbors would become impossible under his plan.

Even the byproducts of this system are startling to consider. Russia would have no further use for its American Communist spy apparatus. Americans could quit looking at each other with suspicion and an atmosphere of full freedom might return in this country. Badges, fingerprints, loyalty investigations would lose much of their point.

All this we can have and lasting peace, too, if the Russians agree. Their decision may be slow in coming. It took them several years to agree with the President's first big international proposal. Not until the beginning of this meeting in Geneva did Premier Bulganin commit Russia to joining the atomc-energy pool. But the Reds have now promised to join.

So if the immediate answer by the startled Kremlinites is the nearly automatic "Nyet," it may not be the final answer. We hope, however, it is "Da," a seldom-heard Russian word meaning "Yes."

Postal Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Henry Haserot, of Shaker Heights, Ohio, has organized a group of people known as the Postal Voters.

The Postal Voters have an extremely worthwhile program which is explained by a recent brochure distributed by Mr. Haserot:

[From the Postal Voters, a nonprofit, nonpartisan plan for informing your Congressmen]

I. Most people enjoy the stimulating sport of criticizing Federal activities. Sometimes they even threaten to do something.

II. In the meantime, heavily endowed national organizations, assisted by hard-working professionals, are constantly and effectively urging their views upon our congressional representatives. Sometimes these views are detrimental to the best interests of the Nation. Sometimes, they are downwright treacherous.

III. When improper legislation is effected—or needed legislation shelved—we wail and moan, howl and gnash our teeth. Usually we do little else.

Holding these conditions to be satisfactory but corrigible: Therefore be it resolved that henceforth we shall make it our business to communicate frequently with our Congressmen and, moreover, we shall urge our thinking friends to do likewise—via use of the postal vote.

The postal vote is simply a preaddressed and stamped postal card having a blank side for the sender's message, name, and address.

The Postal Voters agree to maintain a supply of these cards—for personal distribution to all who indicate a desire for proper government.

"Too many people don't care what happens, so long as it doesn't happen to them."

Carlos P. Garcia, No. 2 Man in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I received from Mr. P. W. Reeves, an American in Manila who previously had served many years in the House Office Building as a congressional secretary. Because I am sure we are all interested in the Philippines and have read considerable about their President, Ramon Magsaysay, I believe the following information about the No. 2 man, Carlos P. Garcia, will be of much interest:

It is not my desire to minimize the popularity of President Ramon Magsaysay because it is known by all that he is a very popular man. However, during the 1953 campaign in the Philippines, Ramon Magsaysay needed help. No man gave candidate Magsaysay more support than Carlos P. Garcia—and the purpose of this article, therefore, is to tell my American friends a few facts about this man Garcia.

The 52 Provinces composing the Philippines are divided into 3 groups, viz: The northern or Luzon group, the central or Visayan group, and the southern or Mindanao group. The particular group to which I wish to direct my attention is the central group—or the Visayas.

Carlos P. Garcia was born November 4, 1896, in the town of Talibon, Province of Bohol. The Province of Bohol is 1 of the 13 Provinces which constitute the Visayan group. The other 12 Provinces are Antique, Cebu, Capiz, Iloilo, Leyte, Marinduque, Masbate, Negros Oriental, Negros Occidental, Romblon, Samar, and Palawan.

Using a pet phrase of that great American Alfred E. Smith of New York, let us look at the record. In the November 1953, election the ticket of Magsaysay and Garcia received in the Philippines a total vote of 2,912,992 as compared to 1,313,991 received by

the ticket of Quirino and Yulo. Magsaysay and Garcia were candidates of the Nacionalista ticket; Quirino and Yulo were candidates of the Liberal ticket.

In the Visayas where Carlos P. Garcia was born and where he campaigned vigorously for the ticket of the Nacionalista, the Marsaysay-Garcia ticket received a majority of 394,339 votes. When you take into consideration that the Visayas consists of only 13 provinces—and there are a total of 52 provinces throughout the Philippines—you must admit that a difference of 394,339 votes greatly helped in the election of Ramon Magsaysay as President.

Before members of the Philippine Senate were elected, at large (by all of the provinces), the provinces of Agusan, Surigao, Misamis Occidental, and Misamis Oriental, with his home province of Bohol, were in the same senatorial district which was represented by Senator Garcia. Senator Garcia carried the campaign into those five provinces in his efforts to elect Ramon Magsaysay as President. The vote which the Nacionalista ticket received in Senator Garcia's old senatorial district reflects the standing of Senator Garcia in the area. In the 1953 election the province of Agusan cast 20,273 votes for the Nacionalista ticket and 7,153 for the Liberal ticket. Province of Surigao cast 37,638 votes for Nacionalista ticket and 18,653 for Liberal ticket. Province of Misamis Occidental cast 23,600 votes for Nacionalista ticket and 9,612 for Liberal ticket. Province of Misamis Oriental cast 34,297 votes for Nacionalista ticket and 9,171 for Liberal ticket. Bohal voted 68,879 for Nacionalista and 37,849 for Liberals.

Thus in that original area of Agusan, Bohol, Misamis Occidental and Misamis Oriental, the Nacionalista ticket received in 1953 a total of 147,049 votes, as compared to a total of 63,785 votes cast for the Liberal ticket—a clear majority of 83,264 for the Magsaysay-Garcia ticket in the 5 provinces of Garcia's former senatorial district, 4 of which are Mindanao Provinces. The record is there. Facts are facts. The high officials appointed to office by the Magsaysay government should be everlastingly grateful to Carlos P. Garcia for the unrelenting campaign which he made in what was supposed to be Quirino-Yulo strongholds. Carlos Garcia was elected Vice President by the people. Carlos Garcia is a very important part of the Magsaysay government. No one can dispute the fact that Carlos Garcia is just as popular today throughout the entire Philippines—and holds the affection of the masses just as strongly—as in November 1953.

The vote which the candidate for Vice President (Garcia) received over the candidate for Vice President on the Liberal ticket (Yulo) was fabulous in some of the chartered cities of the Philippines. For example, in the city of Manila, Garcia received 162,856 as compared to the vote of 58,825 for Yulo. In the city of Davao, Garcia received 25,318 as compared to 5,745 for Yulo. In Cagayan de Oro, Garcia received 7,709 as compared to 1,326 for Yulo. In the city of Cebu, Garcia received 30,200 as compared to 9,042 for Yulo. In Ozamis City, Garcia received 6,419 as compared to 1,615 for Yulo. In Lipa City, Garcia received 10,508 as compared to 1,575 for Yulo.

Because of the knowledge throughout the Philippines of the terrific support given to Ramon Magsaysay in the 1953 election, I could not resist the urge to make known to the American readers the true stature of this man Garcia. When I was in America in 1953 several friends wrote to me about the campaign. They advised me that the greatest help to Magsaysay was being given by his runningmate, Carlos P. Garcia. Garcia's speeches were eloquent and impressive. Garcia's crusade for clean government was effective—particularly in the Visayan region where Magsaysay and his advisers had expected much greater strength to develop for Quirino and Yulo. One very outstanding man in the Philippines advised me that if Magsaysay could break even in the Visayas, he would win. Magsaysay not only broke even and held his own in the 13 provinces which make up the Visayas and the old senatorial district represented by Garcia, Magsaysay's ticket received a majority of almost 477,603 votes because of the fight which was carried to the enemy stronghold by Garcia. Quirino had carried that same region by a huge majority in the 1949 election. It was expected that Quirino would run even better in the 1953 election in the Visayas. Also, Jose Yulo being a man from the Visayas on the ticket with Quirino in 1953 was expected to give Quirino even a larger vote in the Visayas in 1953 than he received in 1949.

To enumerate the positions held and services rendered to his country by Vice President Garcia would require an article of great length. He served 6 years as Congressman (3 terms), 9 years as Governor (3 terms) and 12 years as Senator (2 terms). In 1945 he was sent to Washington in connection with Philippine rehabilitation and war damage claims. In 1945 he was sent to San Francisco as a delegate to the World Conference; and he helped to draft the charter of the United Nations. He was a delegate to Dublin, Ireland, in 1950 to attend the Interparliamentary Union Conference. In 1950 he was a delegate to the Baguio Conference (SEATO). In 1954 he was chairman of the Philippine delegation to Geneva Conference for Korean Unification. He served as president of the SEATO conference in Manila in 1954, and this resulted in the Manila Treaty and Pacific Charter. He went to Thailand in 1955 as chairman of the Philippine delegation at the Bangkok Conference. And with all these multitudinous duties for his people, he has served as Secretary for Foreign Affairs with credit and distinction.

The vice president is well fortified at all times with documentary proof to back up any statement he might make. His facts and figures are never challenged. When he speaks he has the complete attention of his audience and he has often addressed audiences of 25,000 and more. No other speaker throughout the Philippines can hold the attention of the Filipino people as does this former Congressman, former Governor, and former Senator from Bohol.

Many caustic and poisoned darts are thrust in the direction of the vice president from the Senate Chamber and oftentimes scurrilous attacks on this No. 2 man of the Philippines appear in the newspapers. Because of many years of sound-thinking and self-discipline, a highly developed sense of restraint, a proper perspective, the vice president will not permit himself to be drawn into a controversy, and he will not indulge in any form of reply or retaliation.

Notwithstanding the unwarranted attacks and unfair criticism which has been hurled at Garcia, he has stood four-square like a mighty oak. In the face of harassment and humiliation, the Vice President of the Philippines has held his head high, and has stood his ground with his banner of truth and honest service unfurled above the unmitigated attacks of his political enemies.

I have witnessed the popularity of certain Filipino politicians rise and fall. The friends who loyally supported Carlos P. Garcia in 1953 are his steadfast friends today after 18 months of the Magsaysay-Garcia administration. Moreover, by his candor, honesty, straight thinking, and straight talking the Vice President has won thousands of new friends to his banner.

Carlos Garcia is God-fearing, and he worships God. He loves his country, and I know the Filipino people love him. He is a man of great learning and high ideals. He has a warm heart and sympathetic personality. He has used his wisdom, experience, influence, and energy to help his country gain its place in the society of nations of the free world. He has many qualities, but the most outstanding, in my opinion, is his sublime humility. He has the courage of his convictions, and no power or combination of forces can swerve him from the position which he thinks is proper and best for his country's welfare.

Carlos Garcia's philosophy has taught him that triumph always comes to the side of truth. He believes that one will reap that which he sows. He is frank and straightforward in all of his decisions and dealings with his fellowman. He is a firm believer in the Golden Rule. He answers any question without the slightest equivocation. He does not resort to subterfuge, camouflage, or deception. There is no part of his makeup which even approaches demagoguery.

Some men are not dismayed by defeat or disappointment. Some men do not surrender their convictions when the will of a higher authority is laid down as the order of the day. Such a man is Carlos P. Garcia.

Leaders seldom spring into great power with one broad jump. Leadership is that rare and elusive quality by which some men are destined to lead. If a leader is fortified with truth he can lead his people to limitless horizons of happiness, prosperity, culture, and morality. Carlos G. Garcia is endowed with this type of leadership.

Political enemies differ with the Vice President but never question his integrity and honesty of purpose. No man in the Philippines is more highly respected than the even-tempered, soft-spoken Vice President. Yes, indeed, the name Carlos P. Garcia adds luster, dignity, and prestige to any activity or movement. There is something all-compelling about this man Garcia. His voice is such as Homer ascribed to Nestor—"a stream of eloquence sweeter than honey."

Yes, I unhesitatingly go on record in stating that Carlos P. Garcia is one of the truly great men of the Philippines. He is not a glory seeker. He stands for progressive ideas in government, economics, and in world affairs when they truly mean progress. He is a man of culture, a scholar, a gentleman, and a statesman of the highest order. His courage, foresight, strength of will, and unwavering conviction on all matters and his sterling integrity stand out like the Rock of Gibraltar. Fortified with this armor, he can with absolute ease weather the storms of opposition.

His thorough knowledge of world conditions, as well as his knowledge of what is best for the Filipino people, ideally equips the Vice President for the many services he is now rendering. My prediction is that he will continue to serve his people—yes, in a higher capacity.

Something Else for Our Russian Visitors To See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the visit of the Russian farmers and farm experts has been confined so largely to the Midwest—eye-popping as their peregrinations out there are proving to be.

Agricultural New York could also show them some things they never saw in Russia; for example, a typical farm auction in a typical rural community of the Northeast called—whether the Russians believe it or not—Freeville.

A. B. Genung described it in the July 16 issue of the Times-Union of Rochester, N. Y., and under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD:

HOW IT LOOKS IN FREEVILLE: DRAMA UNDER AN ELM—THE LAND OF PROMISE

(By A. B. Genung)

This week I went to one of the most interesting farm auctions I ever saw. And if you missed the typical country auction, you have something to see.

This was and is one of the noted farms in our part of the country, known as the Hart Fitts farm, near Freeville. It was settled in 1818 by an ancestor of Professor Van Hart, of Cornell, who is widely known about the State, the farm having been in the one family ever since.

It is a noble homestead, 500 acres of excellent land, 400 tillable, lying up on a flat table-land overlooking the beautiful Dryden Valley. Three big houses on it, good barns, big fields, just about everything a farmer's heart could desire.

For weeks men had talked about the auction and several ambitious younger farmers had sought finances for it in advance. Cornell experts had appraised it beforehand for certain prospective buyers. Guessing what it would bring had become one of the favorite local games. The guesses ranged from $40,000 to $70,000 for the farm with its growing crops of potatoes, beans, and so forth.

Auction day dawned bright and fair. Some 400 people streamed into the place and the sale began.

At noon hour after lunch came the sale of the farm itself. The crowd gathered under a big elm tree in the dooryard, the auctioneer mounted his box and the bidding began at $20,000.

Among those interested in the place were two brothers, Bob and Len Wright, both energetic young men of this county, excellent dairymen who have prospered on farms of their own. I talked with Bob before the sale began. He was quietly but very earnestly in the market.

You could see that that farm loomed for him and his brother like a dream of golden opportunity which might just happen to come true.

The bidding rolled rapidly up to $40,000 and there the Wrights came into it. But there were half a dozen other bidders, all hardworking, successful farmers, who also wanted the place. It wasn't a millionaire crowd. It was the grassroots men who know what it means to shoulder a debt and pay it off out of farm earnings. Each had his own idea of what the farm could be made to yield and each had a ceiling above which he felt unable to go.

After $43,000 the bidding went up $100 at a time, very slowly. Several times the canny auctioneer put his watch in the hands of a boy and told him when it had ticked off 2 minutes to call out "sold!" But each time as the seconds ticked away in tense silence, somebody would raise the bid at the last instant. This happened half a dozen times.

Finally it narrowed down to two bidders. Over an hour had been consumed in this drama, yet the crowd was now more than ever on edge, for now it could sense the climax coming.

I heard a flat bid of $50,000. I could not see who made it. But you could feel in the tense expectancy of the crowd that this would probably be it!

Again the auctioneer put his watch in the hands of the boy and gave all concerned his final warning for the 20th or 30th time. Only this time it meant something. One minute. One and a half. Two minutes—sold! Bob Wright was the buyer.

So, in that brief little scene there under the elm, the fine old Fits farm had passed to a new family after almost a century and a half. The Bob and Len Wright families this weekend are moving to new home and new land. For them it is indeed the land of promise. That's America.

Technical Assistance to Foreign Nations—Address by Hon. Hugh L. Keenleyside, Director General of the Technical Assistance Administration, United Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to be the guest of a luncheon meeting of the National Press Club, which was addressed by the Honorable Hugh L. Keenleyside, Director General of the Technical Assistance Administration of the United Nations.

I believe the address is one which should be read by Members of the Senate, because on numerous occasions we have to pass upon appropriations and other matters relating to this vital organization which has done such significant work throughout the world. I therefore ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 13, 1955, BY HON. HUGH L. KEENLEYSIDE, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION OF U. N.

We are now just a few days away from the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. During the next few weeks there will be many reviews of the political achievements and failures of the world organization. It seems to me that it is most appropriate that we should also consider the progress of the United Nations constructive activities in the economic and social field.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should begin by making it clear that in appearing before you I am doing so, first of all, as a representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. But, in addition, because the United Nations programs of technical assistance are a cooperative activity, I think that I can also claim to speak for the other participating organizations. These are seven of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, namely, the Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, World Meteorological Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, International Telecommunications Union.

In addition to these active partners, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund act as observers in the Technical Assistance Board which is our coordinating unit.

May I say just a word about the nature of the program? In spite of the publicity that has been given to technical assistance in recent years there are still people—including, I regret to say, even certain Members of the Congress of the United States and of other national legislatures—who refer to it as a giveaway program. It has been described as a starry-eyed, impractical scheme to give two shirts to every Asian or a bottle of milk to every African.

Now I have no objection to people being starry-eyed—what great idealist or humanitarian from Christ Himself down to Dr. Schweitzer wasn't so described? Nor certainly have I any objection to giving clothes and food to people who need them, whether they are Asians or Africans, or Americans, or Canadians.

But relief programs are not technical assistance.

What we are trying to do is to help governments to strengthen their national economies so that they can meet their own needs. We try to give them, on request the kind of advice and guidance that will result in justified self-reliance. We don't supply goods; we supply knowledge.

Nor do we in the United Nations and the specialized agencies have resources of capital for investment purposes. In this, of course, we differ from the point 4 program of the United States and the Colombo plan for aid in south and southeast Asia, both of which have strong capital backing. In our case we can refer the governments we are helping to the International Bank, or to the Export-Import Bank, or to sources of private investment, and we can assist them to mobilize their domestic capital resources. But we ourselves have no money to grant or to lend.

I have mentioned the point 4 program, now administered by the Foreign Operations Administration, and the Colombo plan. We are often asked about the relationship between these bilateral and our multilateral activities. Don't we overlap? Isn't there conflict? Don't we get in each other's way?

In response perhaps the first thing to say is that there is no competition between the United Nations activities and the national programs, except insofar as each tries to do its job with the utmost efficiency. Everyone who is engaged in any of these programs realizes that with over two-thirds of the people of the world suffering—for the most part unnecessarily—from ignorance, poverty, and disease, there is far more to be done than we can possibly achieve by our united efforts with our present resources. Thus, instead of competition, there is a well-established willingness to cooperate and to supplement each other's activities.

There is no organic connection between the United Nations programs and those of the various national governments. There is, however, a close and useful contact maintained between them. This is true as between the headquarters of the various programs and it is even more true of the representatives who are working in the field. I could quote many examples of how American, Colombo plan, and United Nations personnel have worked cordially and helpfully together, and of how the various programs have complemented and strengthened each other. I could quote instances in which we have given advice and the United States and British agencies have followed up with money to enable the Government to translate the advice into action.

I know of no field in which national and international organizations work more effectively and more cordially together.

And at this point I would like to pay a very warm tribute to the cooperative attitude of the successive administrators of the United States program, the late Dr. Bennett (who was killed in the course of duty), Mr. Stanley Andrews, and the Honorable Harold Stassen.

II

* * * * *

When the statesmen of the world met in San Francisco in April 1945 they faced a series of problems unprecedented in his-

tory. Humanity had survived two world wars but the scars of conflict were everywhere apparent. Within a single generation war and its attendant ills had brought death to tens of millions of human beings. Devastation had visited many of the oldest, largest, and proudest cities of the world. Invention had become the mother of desolation.

In this new world of scientific miracles—so potent for good or evil, so scarred by physical and moral dangers—the statesmen at San Francisco found themselves confronted not only by the traditional problems of the traditional peace conference, not only by the vivid contrast between humanity's technical progress and its moral lethargy, and not only by the issues created by the universality of modern war.

Another, new factor in human, and particularly in international, relations was the rising tide of determined discontent among the underprivileged persons and nations that was threatening with disintegration many of the oldest and apparently most stable of political institutions. For the first time an almost universal rebellion against their conditions of life was sweeping over that great part of the human race that had always suffered and was still suffering from hunger, ignorance, disease and the manifold forms of injustice.

The men of San Francisco were forced to recognize that the world of the present generation was, above all else, a world of shocking paradox.

There were, on the one hand, those to whom good health was customary and for whom adequate facilities existed to provide attendance in disease; who could expect a life span of 65 or 70 years; who had opportunity for education and for attaining the magic power that goes with knowledge of the written word; who were economically well established and to whom hunger was seldom known; who enjoyed political liberty and reasonable hope of justice under law.

There was, on the other hand, that much larger element of the human race whose members suffered chronically from disease and who could seldom expect to live beyond 30 years or 35; who were illiterate and denied the other tools and values of education; to whom hunger, inadequate housing and other economic and social ills were the commonplaces of life, and who, in many cases, were deprived of national independence and often of individual liberty and consistent justice. Of over half the people in the world it could be said, to adapt the words of Thomas Hobbes, that their lives would almost inevitably be "poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

It is true that conditions of this kind were not new. What was new was that now, for the first time, the majority of the people of the world had become convinced that the continuation of such condition was not inevitable. They no longer believed that it was a rule of nature or a law of God that they should be born in misery and hasten to an early grave. They were no longer prepared to accept the hope of felicity in heaven as a substitute for happiness on earth. With growing unanimity they were determined that something must be done. (That some things have been done becomes apparent when we remember that 600 million people—one-quarter of the population of the world—has gained its political independence in the last 10 years. But, of course, political independence, like patriotism, is not enough.)

The first and most urgent of the problems faced at San Francisco was that of designing measures to insure, if possible, international peace. It was for this reason that in the creation of the United Nations Organization major emphasis was placed upon the work and responsibilities of the Security Council.

It was at the same time recognized, however, that peace could never be secure so long as grotesque inequality and injustice continued among men and between nations.

It was therefore decided that in addition to the contrivance of machinery created specifically for the prevention of war the United Nations should be provided with instruments and policies designed to improve the social and material conditions of life wherever misery unnecessarily prevailed. The most important of these instruments was the Economic and Social Council; the most significant statement of policy was that embodied in the undertaking in articles 55 and 56 of the charter by which all members pledged themselves to work for economic and social progress in all countries.

One of the first steps to be taken in the execution of this promise was the beginning of a small program of technical assistance.

III

Technical assistance is not, of course, new. It is as old as the history of peaceful intercourse between organized communities.

* * * * *

IV

In 1946 for the first time the budget estimates of the United Nations included an item permitting the Secretariat to provide technical, scientific or administrative assistance to any member goverment that should ask for aid of this kind.

Four years later, stimulated by the initiative of President Truman and by the early successes of the point 4 program, the United Nations respondent to American leadership and organized what was called its expanded program of technical assistance.

In this expanded program the specialized agencies as well as the United Nations have from the first been participants. The particular value of this cooperative approach has been repeatedly emphasized by both recipient and contributing governments, and it has been clearly and vigorously asserted in their annual meetings by the Secretary-General and the heads of the other participating agencies. Any fragmentation of the program would inevitably destroy a large part of its practical effect, and would certainly dissipate much of the enthusiasm of the governments that are its strongest supporters.

Funds for the new program have been obtained from voluntary contributions made at annual pledging conferences by all governments willing to cooperate.

At first it was hoped and indeed intended that the expanded program would start with a budget of $25 or $30 million and grow rapidly to something of the order of $100 million a year. It was quite clear to its founders that obvious and immediate needs would justify an expenditure on that level.

What actually happened was that in the first year contributions amounted only to some $20 million, and that even this was not entirely spent.

Without going into too great detail perhaps it will suffice to note four reasons for this slow start.

In the first place it was necessary for the participating agencies to get themselves organized to do the job efficiently. New machinery had to be designed, competent personnel recruited, and effective techniques improvised.

Secondly, the problem of obtaining suitable experts in sufficient numbers proved to be much more difficult than had originally been anticipated. This is still, of course, one of our major problems because in selecting experts it is necessary to find men and women who are not only technically competent, but who have qualities of character and personality that make them suitable for the very responsible duties and very sensitive relationships they must face.

The third difficulty was that which arose from the inability of some governments to convince themselves that there were no political or economic strings attached to this offer of help from the United Nations. Some people in some governments at first believed that the technical-assistance program was just a new form of disguised colonialism or of dollar diplomacy.

And a final reason for the slow start was the fact that many governments—and particularly those most in need of help—either did not know what to ask for, or did not know how to formulate and present their requests. Thus it sometimes took us months of hard negotiation and discussion to reach agreement as to the real needs of a government, and then to work out with it an accurate and convincing justification for its request. One of the most characteristic difficulties of inexperienced governments is their failure to recognize their own most pressing needs.

As a result of these complications the program began slowly and it was not until 1953 that its early problems could be said to have been largely overcome.

Since that year our basic difficulties have been almost entirely financial. In the last 3 years there has been a very significant increase in the number of contributors. In 1955 we expect that something like 80 governments will share the financial burden. These include, of course, many governments that are not members of the United Nations, such as Switzerland, Japan, Italy, and Ireland. They include also the Holy See which for the last 3 years has used this method to emphasize approval and interest. But in spite of the increased number of participants the total amount of money contributed annually has grown only to something like $27 or $28 million a year—an increase of less than 50 percent.

During this same period, however, there has been an enormous increase in the number of requests for help. Early suspicions of the program have disappeared. During the last 5 years over 100 countries and territories have asked for and have received aid. Over the last year and a half we in the Technical Assistance Administration estimate that we have discouraged or actually refused at least three sound and sensible requests for every one that we have been able to meet.

In this whole period the United States has made the largest single contribution, at first about 60 percent. That percentage has gradually declined so that today the contribution of the United States is approximately half of the total.

I should perhaps add that although the United States makes the largest contribution it does not now provide as much proportionately as Denmark, Norway, Canada, and certain other countries.

Based on the original estimate of world needs and on the extensive plans that were made to meet them, the technical assistance program has accomplished little. In fact, it might almost be described as a token activity or a pilot project for a program. If it is continued at its present level, it cannot be expected to bring about the kind of changes that are so obviously needed and so urgently requested by the governments of the less developed areas of the world.

In addition to the serious limitations resulting from the meager amount of money available there is the added handicap th' arises from the fact that under the present system of pledging and payment we who are trying to administer the program have no accurate idea, at the beginning of a year, of how much money we are going to have during the succeeding 12 months. Governments are asked to make their pledges in November for the following year but we have to start the planning for that year at least 6 months earlier. Moreover, many governments do not make their pledges at the time of the November conference and others make them in a conditional form. Because we handle our funds in accordance with strict accounting

procedures, we cannot make firm commitments until the money is in hand, and very often governments leave large sums unpaid even into the last quarter of the year. As a result of these timing difficulties, we have found it necessary to reprogram our activities as many as 3 or 4 times in the course of a year.

Fortunately some governments have undertaken to make commitments—subject, of course to legislative approval—for 2 or 3 years in advance. In the past we have not been sure of the amount of the United States contribution until Congress has passed the appropriation in June or July of the year concerned. President Eisenhower has now proposed, however, that an appropriation be passed by the present Congress to cover not only the last half of 1955, but the whole of 1956. If this action is taken our position will be greatly eased.

* * * * *

Another complicating factor in our financial picture is the arrangement by which governments can make their contributions in their own currencies—and many of these currencies are not convertible. Thus we have to do a great deal of adjusting and accommodating of our program to the particular kinds of money that may be available.

You will, I think, be interested in a word about the cost of administration of the program. Governments very naturally and properly scrutinize our overhead costs with the greatest care. Having myself been trained under the rigorous procedures of the Canadian Treasury Board, I think that I can claim some solid basis for judgment in such matters. In my opinion the annual examination of our administrative expenses in the United Nations is notably severe. Any slackness or waste would be quickly exposed. In 1954 the central administrative costs of the technical-assistance administration amounted to only 5.9 percent of the total program expenditure. I doubt that any other similar organization can show a lower ratio.

Before leaving this aspect of the subject may I emphasize most strongly that the Secretary-General and all my colleagues on the Secretariat of the United Nations are very conscious of the fact that we are using money that comes through governments but originates in the taxes paid by the people of this and other countries. It is, therefore, a matter of great concern to us that our administration should be marked by the most meticulous efficiency.

* * * * *

VI

It is, I think, important to note that this is not a one-way program; that it is not simply a case of a few highly developed countries like the United States, Great Britain, France, and Canada sending out technicians to assist the less advanced governments. While it is true that the United Nations has aided over 100 countries and territories it is also true that help has been given by between 70 and 80 countries. Countries like India, Egypt, and Israel, for example, have sent out experts and have received students as well as having obtained aid themselves.

This brings me to a consideration of one of the great advantages of the United Nations program as compared, for example, with the national programs of the United States, the British Commonwealth and other countries. This is the fact that we in the United Nations can draw upon the resources of the whole world whereas expenditure under the national programs is normally confined to national personnel and facilities.

It is also significant to note that many countries find it much easier to accept aid from an international organization of which they are themselves a part, than it is to take help from a single government. This is particularly true of countries that require help in such sensitive areas as public administration or national financial policy. In this connection it is perhaps worth noting that we in the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration have at the present time top ranking economic and financial advisers occupying the most significant advisory posts in 18 different capitals. At the same time we have senior administrative personnel assisting governments at the very highest level in seven countries.

This willingness to accept United Nations aid in the most significant and sensitive activities of government is perhaps the most hopeful aspect of our work.

VII

It is not, I think, necessary, in speaking to informed Americans, to engage in any prolonged justification of technical assistance. It is an international activity that has been examined with the greatest care and with the most critical interest by governments, organizaions, and competent individuals all over the world. In the United States it has been strongly supported by both Republican and Democratic administrations and by every board or commission (the names of Bell and Rockefeller and Grey come readily to mind) of which I have any knowledge.

In Canada it has had the unanimous support of both the House of Commons and the Senate.

* * * * *

VIII

But in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think it must be said that technical assistance, and all that is encompassed in that term, is fundamentally a moral issue. The program was started and is being carried on not only because it strengthens the cause of peace, and not only because it holds out the promise of immense commercial profits. Its real motivation is found in the fact that it is the right thing to do. You in the United States and we in Canada have been born and have grown up in an atmosphere or freedom and democracy; we have been nurtured in the principles of Christianity. It is simply not possible for human beings with such a tradition, in America or in other fortunate lands, to rest in comfort and indifference when we know that by a concerted and determined effort we can put an end, within a relatively short time, to a measurable part of the unnecessary ignorance, disease, and hunger that affects so many human beings—men, women, and little children with needs and fears and hopes like our own—in other parts of the world we share.

Whatever our individual religious convictions I believe that all Americans and Canadians can agree with the good people of the Society of Friends when they say:

"Let us join together to grow more food, to heal and prevent disease, to conserve and develop the resources of the good earth to the glory of God and the comforting of man's distress. These are the tasks to which, in humility for our share in the world's shame, and in faith in the power of love, we call our own society and all men and nations everywhere."

Two thousand years ago Christ, speaking of those of his day who really practiced their religion, said:

"I was an hungered and ye gave me meat,
I was thirsty and ye gave me drink,
I was a stranger and ye took me in,

"Naked and ye clothed me,
I was sick and ye visited me,
I was in prison and ye came unto me."

Today in modern America, and elsewhere throughout the world, it is only to the extent that we translate the spirit behind these words into the realities of current practice within and between nations, that humanity can move toward that distant but imperative goal of peace and decency and justice and hope fulfilled for all men everywhere on earth.

Tribute to Herbert Hoover by Raymond Moley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the article entitled "See Thou Character," written by Raymond Moley, and published in the July 18, 1955, issue of Newsweek. The article is a tribute to an outstanding American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEE THOU CHARACTER

(By Raymond Moley)

You might well pause in your work or play, ladies and gentlemen, and consider for a few moments what it takes to make a great American. It would fit the mood of such a moment of reflection to contemplate, as a vivid example, Herbert Hoover as he completes his latest public service.

There have been 41 years of such service since in 1914 the first rumblings of a generation of war and strife called him, at the age of 40, from a distinguished professional and business career to a broader service of mankind.

Two of his successors as President have regarded him as the man of all men in public life to survey the vast burden of Government which, unless it is lightened, may well engulf us all.

Consider the Hoover equipment for this task. He came from the grassroots of America and knew as a child and youth the ideals and habits of its people. As a young man in foreign fields he acquired the capacity not only to deal with large affairs but to see from abroad the ultimate place which his own Nation must take in a restless world. As an engineer and manager he learned the secrets of an industrial civilization. In Europe he saw the dire tragedy of Western nations intent upon their own destruction.

Hoover, the Quaker and humanitarian, comprehended long before politicians prattled about welfare, the need that organized government provide a minimum of subsistence while cherishing the initiative indispensable to a full life. Then there followed 12 years in the Cabinet and the Presidency. Where else in this generation or in our history has there been such personal equipment for a broad look at the way we are governed?

The statistical descriptions of the labors of the Commission are impressive, indeed, but they convey none of the essential feeling of the labors imposed upon the Chairman. The field of Government operations was divided into 19 sections, each with a task force to do the spadework and to make preliminary recommendations. Some of those task forces in turn subdivided their work with committees for each part. Hundreds and hundreds of meetings were held all over the United States. The personnel of the task force included scores of men who, with the compelling example of Hoover before them, gave weeks and months to public service.

Let us see what this job meant in terms of the labors of the chairman. Hoover toiled from 10 to 15 hours a day, mostly in weeks 7 days long. He divided his week between New York and Washington, usually using the weekend for the Nation's Capital when, as he said, he could "get the most work out of his congressional members." The task-force reports were often intoler-

ably long and badly written. Some were excessively dry. But Hoover read them all, and with his own hand and pencil rewrote most of them as commission reports. On one report alone, which in its raw state ran to 1,783 printed pages, Hoover labored every day for a month to make it shorter and more intelligible.

The staff of the Commission itself and its various task forces was large and needed at all times the supervisory attention of the chairman. There were also the innumerable appointments which he had with people in the departments surveyed, as well as with individual members of the task forces. Then there was the Commission itself to guide and moderate. This required many meetings, sometimes for days at a time. With the patience of Job, the chairman dealt with the quibbling of some of the members and when he could not persuade, he encouraged minority reports. Finally, he had to endure the political sniping from the agencies which it was necessary to criticize and from political opportunists in Congress who still hope to win votes by abusing Hoover.

Only a man with character chiseled out of granite and blessed with an extraordinary physical equipment could survive such a service. Altogether, Herbert Hoover has created a reputation and has established a record that will become a great American story long after the storms of controversy that have swept across his career have lost meaning and content.

Need for an Adequate Highway Program—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the need for an adequate highway program in the United States is recognized by everyone. The highway problem is particularly acute in areas of concentrated population and in corridor States such as New Jersey. While New Jersey ranks eighth in population and eighth in motor vehicle registration, it ranks first in density of traffic. In fact, the density of traffic is 7½ times the national average. This places a tremendous burden on the State to provide adequate highway facilities.

Therefore, it seems appropriate to me that because of the vast magnitude of traffic coming from outside the State—200 million motor vehicles cross the State borders annually—a substantial contribution to the State's highway needs should come from the Federal Government.

In line with this thought, I sent a statement to some of the leading people in my district on the highway question. Under unanimous consent, I include my statement and some of the answers I received for the information of my colleagues in considering the highway bill which has just been reported.

The statement and letters follow:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., DEMOCRAT, NEW JERSEY

While New Jersey ranks 45th in size in the Nation, eighth in population and eighth in motor vehicle registration, it ranks first in density of traffic. The New Jersey problem is multiplied in Union County, which is a corridor in a corridor State. The density of traffic in Union County is over 7½ times the national average.

The facilities for handling this traffic, particularly on U. S. 1 and U. S. 22, are inadequate today—constituting not only a source of constant frustration and delay, but even more important, an extreme safety hazard. This problem will get worse rather than better, since it is clear that the number of automobiles on the highways will vastly expand in the future. The tremenodus output of the automobile industry this year, breaking all previous records, is but one indication of the scope and magnitude which this problem will assume in the near future.

For some time a subcommittee of the governors' conference has been studying this problem. In addition, a presidential commission headed by General Clay has also looked into ways and means of meeting this problem. Their reports have now been published. The Clay report outlines a 10-year program of Federal assistance to the States in modernizing and expanding our highway facilities. The recommendations of this report, as contained in legislation sponsored by the administration, emphasize the need of an interlocking system of national highways to carry the burden of city-to-city traffic, which is the major problem we face today and will face in the future, in terms of traffic density.

The plan proposed by the administration has one serious drawback, which is its financing provision. Financing of the program would be handled by a Federal highway corporation which would be established to sell bonds. This feature has two drawbacks: first, it hides the indebtedness of the National Government from the budget; and, second, it would involve a good deal of interest payment over the long pull.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the President's program—which I hope will be improved upon with regard to its financing provisions—offers the best hope for solving the highway problem, particularly in areas of concentrated density such as Union County. In all probability, under this plan very substantial assistance would be available to improve upon or build alternate superhighways for routes U. S. 1 and 22.

Under the Clay program, New Jersey's share of Federal funds each year for a 10-year period would be $141,900,000, with the State contributing $11,200,000, making a total expenditure per year for the State of New Jersey of $153,100,000, exclusive of other funds not contained in the Federal aid system. Of this total, 60 percent would be required for the modernization of three Federal interstate routes, including U. S. 1 and 22.

In addition, there is a proposal being advanced by Senator GORE and others in the Senate for a 5-year plan which has serious drawbacks in terms of the needs of New Jersey. First of all, it falls far short of the goal of providing adequate highways; and, secondly, it does not emphasize to nearly the same extent as the President's program the development of adequate and safe interstate highways. Under the Gore plan, New Jersey would receive $54 million of Federal funds each year for 5 years, as against $141,900,000 each year for 10 years under the President's recommendations. New Jersey's contribution under the Clay plan would be $11,200,000 per year, and $8,100,000 a year under the Gore proposal. I am informed by the State Highway Commissioner that New Jersey would be unable to meet the requirements of the Gore plan and at the same time provide for reconstruction, maintenance and relocation of routes not under the Federal aid system but still vital to the needs of the State.

Therefore, it seems clear to me that given the tremendous needs for highway development now and in the future, we in New Jersey particularly would be better served should a plan close to the President's proposal be adopted. I have already publicly mentioned my support of this proposal, with the reservation that I would like to see the financing provision improved.

It seems apparent to me that New Jersey should justifiably receive substantial Federal aid in maintaining a highway system which carries such a large proportion of traffic from other States. Taxpayers from other States who use the New Jersey highways to such a great degree should contribute to the maintenance of these highways through the means of Federal assistance.

MOORE CHEVROLET CO.,
Elizabeth, N. J., May 27, 1955.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Recently you expressed your desire to hear my viewpoint regarding the present national problem of highway construction.

In reading over your statement as to the solution of this problem, I cannot but help agree with you wholeheartedly.

Union County, small as it is, has a serious problem with its own internal traffic due to its large population and industrial concentration; but when the flow of traffic from U. S. Highways No. 1 and No. 22 is added, the problem becomes unduly severe.

It must be remembered these two highways are two of the main arteries into New York City, yet Union County suffers the weight of this out-of-State traffic. In addition, Elizabeth has already been penalized by the New Jersey Turnpike, which bisects its eastern region. This area is already showing signs of rapid deterioration due to this bisection.

I certainly hope you will use your utmost powers to further the highway construction program and with particular emphasis on Union County receiving its share of this financial assistance.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN J. MOORE,
President.

ELIZABETH MOTORS, INC.,
Elizabeth, N. J., May 27, 1955.

The Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.

DEAR SIR: Having carefully read your statement on the highway question, we desire to go on record as being in full accord with your position. Definite steps must be taken soon to relieve present highway conditions, and Federal assistance seems to be the solution.

I am glad to see your interest in the program which, in my opinion, is of vital importance and should not be delayed any longer. There is, in my opinion, sufficient tax money derived from automobiles and gasoline, etc., to take care of this problem adequately.

I shall be glad to render any assistance if called upon to do so.

Respectfully yours,

ELIZABETH MOTORS, INC.,
B. W. SCHONINGER.

SUMMIT AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Summit, N. J., June 10, 1955.

The Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS: I have given your letter dated May 23, with which you enclosed a statement regarding the problem of highway traffic, considerable thought.

Chambers of commerce have, as a rule, opposed any increase in Government control over projects normally operated by the individual States.

I realize that New Jersey's problem is somewhat different since it is a corridor State and has, accordingly, a greater density

of traffic. Because of these unusual conditions, perhaps we should accept some help from the Federal Government and, should this be done, the administration's plan seems the more practical, rather than that proposed by Senator GORE.

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to express my views on such a controversial subject.

Sincerely yours,

WM. RAE CRANE,
Executive Secretary.

PLAINFIELD LODGE, No. 835,
BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE
ORDER OF ELKS,
Plainfield, N. J.

The Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is with great interest to me that you are supporting the President's highway bill with reservations as to the financing.

With the growing demand for new highways and reconditioning of the older ones it is very necessary to get quick action for the bill passage.

Your suggestion as to financing is in complete accord with my opinion.

Here's to success in this problem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. REILLY, P. E. R.

Need for an Adequate Highway Program—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the highway legislation which is presently pending before the Congress has attracted widespread comment in the newspapers and elsewhere.

The need for an adequate highway program in New Jersey—not only now but in the future—is approaching staggering proportions.

I would like to call to the attention of the Congress the views of two leading New Jersey newspapers on the highway problem, as expressed in their editorial columns in May.

The editorials follow:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of May 29, 1955]

THE MOST FOR OUR MONEY

The Democratic United States Senate has shelved the administration's highway program for one of its own, but the day may yet be saved by the House of Representatives. We hope so, for the administration plan is much, much better for New Jersey than the Democratic substitute.

A last-ditch fight will be needed in the House to win support for the administration program, developed by Gen. Lucius Clay. We trust that every one of New Jersey's congressional bloc, Democrat and Republican alike, will be lined up on the side that offers our State the most for its money.

The Democrats should not find the Eisenhower side too uncomfortable. Governor Meyner, a Democrat, has already endorsed the administration plan, because he recognizes how much better it is for the State than the Democratic program.

Here are the facts:

Administration plan: New Jersey would get $141,900,000 per year for 10 years. We will contribute $11,200,000 a year in addition, making a grand total of $153,100,000 a year for 10 years.

Democratic plan: New Jersey would get only $54 million a year, and for only 5 years. Our share would be $8,100,000 a year.

The Clay plan is obviously a much better deal for New Jersey. We would pay 3 times as much, but get more than 5 times as much in Federal aid.

These figures are stratospheric, of course, and it's a little hard to visualize just what all this means to us. You may get a better perspective on the terrible need for road construction and modernization in New Jersey when you realize that we are the first in traffic density in the entire Nation. It's no honor. It's a nuisance.

Our State is the carpet between that big city across the river and the rest of the United States of America.

Our traffic problem, as a result, is in reality the Nation's traffic problem. It is unfair and unrealistic to think that we should, or could, solve the Nation's problem by ourselves.

The Clay plan recognizes this reality. It offers New Jersey a substantial share of the Federal road-building program. It offers us enough money to make a significant and worthwhile contribution to solving our immense traffic headache.

The Democratic plan will not solve the problem. It will only ameliorate it. And that is not enough. Niggardliness in road-building usually ends up costing more money in the long run.

The future well-being of northern New Jersey rests largely on the success we have in eliminating the traffic problem. The New Jersey contingent in Congress should take the lead in persuading the House of Representatives to pass the administration's highway bill, and then in persuading the Senate to change its mind.

[From the Newark Evening News]

NEW JERSEY LEFT OUT

In a new and strange preoccupation with economy and the public debt, Senate Democrats, aided by a dozen Republicans, have defeated President Eisenhower's road-building program.

As a substitute the Senate offers the Gore bill. It doesn't come close to meeting national-defense needs for an interstate highway system and, comparatively, makes New Jersey a Federal orphan.

The Gore bill reduces the President's 10-year plan to 5, and Federal-State expenditures from $39,100,000,000 to $17,941,000,000. Reduction doesn't stop there.

Nearly $1½ billion had been earmarked for New Jersey under the administration bill at a matching cost to the State of approximately $112 million. By the terms of the Gore bill this grant becomes $260 million. And to qualify for this cut-rate aid, our State would have to contribute up to an estimated $100 million.

Under the President's proposal, New Jersey and other road-conscious States were to have been reimbursed for the millions spent on toll facilities such as Garden State Parkway and the State turnpike. There is every justification for such credits because parkway and turnpike form part of the interlocking system of transcontinental highways which the Eisenhower program is designed to create.

Governor Meyner 3 weeks ago refused to accept Democratic policy as promulgated by the Senate, and came out strongly for the President's plan. He appealed to the State's congressional delegation to do likewise, and has been joined publicly by a fellow Democrat, Representative WILLIAMS of the Sixth (Union County) District. Republican Senators CASE and SMITH both supported the shelved administration bill.

It may be said that New Jersey's stand is inspired by State interest. Frankly, it is; but in this case State interest coincides with the national interest that would have been served by the broader administration project.

This is more than can be said of the politics and sectional interest, such as the plea for farm-to-market roads, that went into the Senate's support of the Gore bill, with its emphasis on intrastate rather than interstate facilities. Moreover, as a corridor State, New Jersey bears a far greater burden of national traffic than the much-advertised bridge States of the West.

This State is not, of course, the only victim of the Gore bill. It discriminates as well against Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and other progressive States which have invested heavily in toll facilities to form a national road network. This fact doubtless will not escape representatives of the affected States when the Senate's poor substitute for a good road bill reaches the House.

Need for an Adequate Highway Program—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the highway problem is a matter of vital and continuing concern in the State of New Jersey. In the light of the highway bill which has now been approved by the Public Works Committee of the House, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues two editorials from New Jersey newspapers which summarize much of the opinion on this subject which has been publicly expressed regularly during the past several weeks. It is particularly gratifying to note the job the Public Works Committee has done in working out an adequate highway program to meet the Nation's needs and at the same time provide a method of financing for consideration by the Congress which would not impose a staggering interest payment on the taxpayers of this country, as the plan proposed by the administration would do.

The editorials follow:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of July 13, 1955]

SPECIAL INTERESTS

There is hope on the horizon again that we in New Jersey will get the Federal help we need to straighten out our highway problems.

The Senate scuttled President Eisenhower's road program, which would have given us enough money—$153 million a year for 10 years—to really do the job right. There were political considerations in killing the bill, of course, but there also were objections in principle to the way it was to be financed. The idea was to float bonds, thus keeping highway expenditures out of the budget. This was attacked as illegal. There was also the reasonable objection that too much money would have gone for interest on bonds instead of for building better roads.

The House is now considering a new financing plan, and it promises to revive the Eisenhower plan which New Jersey needs so much. The money would be raised by direct tax increases. The gasoline tax would go up a penny and there would be special levies on diesel fuel, trucks, and truck tires and tubes.

The special interests involved have already registered their protests. They are genuinely worried that these boosts may drive some firms out of business.

There is something to be said, however, for taxing those who are most directly benefited by the projects involved. Clearly, the people who use gasoline and tires and tubes and trucks gain more from better roads than the people who do not drive at all.

A compromise here might turn out to be the most effective solution. The public at large should also share the cost of road improvements, since the economy as a whole is so dependent on good transportation. Instead of raising all of the funds by direct road taxes, it might be more reasonable to raise half that way and take the rest out of the general tax fund.

[From the Newark Evening News of July 12, 1955]

REALISM ON ROADS

Former Governor Driscoll was at least being consistent when he reproved Republican State Chairman Bodine for praising Governor Meyner and New Jersey's Democratic delegation in the House of Representatives for supporting President Eisenhower's highway program.

Mr. Driscoll has long advocated the repeal of the Federal gasoline tax and the return of the whole roadbuilding job to the States. He argues that not only could they do it cheaper, but that many States, including New Jersey, pay more in gasoline taxes than they get back in Federal grants-in-aid.

Mr. Driscoll is not alone. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, is among many others who share his views. Theirs is a logical argument, but it has no chance of acceptance. Some States get back more than they contribute, and there are enough of these to prevent the abandonment of the Federal highway program. Governor Meyner agrees with Mr. Driscoll in theory, but looks at the facts realistically.

"Sure," he says, "I'd like to see the Federal gasoline tax abolished and returned to the States. But when there's no chance of this happening, let's jump in and get all we can."

Mr. Meyner favors the Eisenhower plan because, despite a proposed 1-cent increase in the Federal gasoline tax, New Jersey would, for once, get back more than it paid. In contrast, the Democratic alternative, embodied in the Gore bill, would greatly reduce the amount New Jersey would receive, while requiring it to put up far more in matching funds than it could afford.

Mr. Meyner is working for a compromise that would come closer to the Eisenhower program than either the Gore bill or a new plan just presented by the House Public Works Committee.

With a highway problem of staggering proportions, New Jersey cannot afford divided counsel or the pursuit of impracticable principle, either here or at Washington. Its representatives should agree on the most advantageous program that can win congressional approval and then back it with every bipartisan resource.

Need for an Adequate Highway Program—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a number of communications I have received from constituents with regard to the so-called Fallon highway bill. Although they mention H. R. 7072, it is clear from the tenor of these comments that they support the revised version of the measure, which is now numbered H. R. 7474.

The letters follow:

ELIZABETH, N. J., *July 20, 1955.*

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am indeed interested in bill H. R. 7072 which covers the method of financing a huge Federal highway construction program requiring the expenditure of approximately $3 billion a year for some years to come. As you undoubtedly know the purpose of the bill is to allocate on a fair basis among the users of the new highways, and consequently the bill provides for size-and-weight limitations on large vehicles as well as for certain taxes, primarily on large tires.

It is my considered opinion that the individual automobile owner (I am in this category) using the car primarily for a little pleasure and recreation should not be burdened with an excessive proportion of taxes, while heavy commercial vehicles might well continue to evade their proper assessments. I believe highways costs should be calibrated in ratio to use, and surely the heavy vehicles result in considerably more wear and tear.

Your full support of H. R. 7072 will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

ALBERT L. POSTLETHWAITE.

ELIZABETH, N. J., *July 21, 1955.*

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Trust you will kindly give favorable consideration to the passage of Bill H. R. 7072, which deals with the method of financing the huge Federal highway construction program.

In my opinion this bill contains legislation that will result in a fair distribution of the costs, and therefore would deeply appreciate your vote in favor of its passage.

Thanking you for your past considerations, beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

(Miss) MARY KIERNAN.

ROSELLE, N. J., *July 21, 1955.*

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Will you kindly give your most favorable consideration to the passage of bill H. R. 7072, with reference to financing the huge Federal highway-construction program.

As this bill contains legislation that will result in a fair distribution of the costs, would therefore greatly appreciate your vote in favor of its passage.

Thanking you for your past considerations, I remain,

Very truly yours,

MRS. VERONICA AZZARA.

WESTFIELD, N. J., *July 19, 1955.*

The Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: As one of your constituents, and as a taxpayer vitally interested in seeing that the cost of our huge Federal highway program is distributed equitably among the several highway users—trucks, buses, and private automobiles—I urge you to support to the fullest extent H. R. 7072, which imposes taxes proportionate to highway use.

Sincerely,

NATHAN W. JAMES.

SUMMIT, N. J., *July 22, 1955.*

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an ordinary motorist, I am interested in the highway-improvement legislation currently being considered by the Congress. Also, as such I am quite willing to pay my just proportion of the cost of these much-needed improvements on a pay-as-you-go basis to avoid further increase in the already too large public debt. I think that all other highway users should also pay their just proportion of these costs.

In my opinion the trucks and buses, which contribute so greatly to the congestion on our highways are not and have never shared the cost of maintenance of present or construction of additional highway commensurate with their use of those facilities. I, therefore, strongly urge your support of H. R. 7072. The provisions of this bill, while falling short of equalizing the cost of highway maintenance and construction as between the private automobile and the trucks and buses, is at least a step in the right direction.

Yours truly,

P. V. WEBB.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., *July 20, 1955.*

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
Representative, Sixth District of New Jersey, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: I am very much in favor of passage of bill H. R. 7072, which deals with the method of financing the proposed Federal highway-construction program.

Being an individual automobile owner, I feel very deeply that costs of this huge program should be apportioned equitably.

Urge you to vote for passage of this bill.

Yours truly,

S. KURITSKY.

JULY 21, 1955.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS: We strongly urge you to support bill H. R. 7072, which provides for financing Federal highway construction by levying costs directly to those who will use such roads.

When we, as motorists, use these highways in the course of our travels, we would be happy to pay our way, but we do not favor being taxed indirectly through increased gasoline taxes or similar methods which might be proposed.

Yours very truly,

G. C. Wilms, Union, N. J.; Ward D. Ferguson, Union, N. J.; Fred H. Boehm, Roselle, N. J.; R. W. Baker, Cranford, N. J.; J. P. Anderson, Roselle, N. J.; Henry Schlaupitz, Roselle, N. J.; J. M. Palochak, Elizabeth, N. J.; Philip Cheetz, Elizabeth, N. J.; E. O. Dickinson, Elizabeth, N. J.; H. E. Whitener, Union, N. J.; A. J. Trusheim, Cranford, N. J.; G. A. Vogel, Scotch Plains, N. J.

ELIZABETH, N. J., *July 22, 1955.*

Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that the bill known as H. R. 7072, which deals with the method of financing a Federal highway-construction program calling for the expenditure of some $3 billion a year, has recently been reported out of committee for consideration on the floor of the House.

I wish you would throw the full weight of your support behind this bill which pro-

vides, I believe, for the apportionment of the costs in ratio to the use, wear, and tear on the highways.

Yours truly,

C. S. STRANG.

FANWOOD, N. J., *July 22, 1955.*

Hon. H. A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I believe that highway costs should be apportioned in ratio to use, wear, and tear.

When H. R. 7072 is up for action please consider my comments.

Yours truly,

S. L. PACH.

ELIZABETH, N. J., *July 22, 1955.*

Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.,

DEAR SIR: I wish you would give your full support to the bill known as H. R. 7072 which, I believe, deals with the method of financing a Federal highway construction program calling for the expenditure of some $3 billion a year.

I believe that the provisions of this bill which call for size and weight limitations on large vehicles, as well as for certain taxes, are just and equitable.

Yours truly,

J. J. DUFFY.

JERSEY CENTRAL LINES,
New York, N. Y., July 22, 1955.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS: I will very much appreciate your support for H. R. 7072, the bill which deals with the method of financing a huge Federal highway construction program.

In my humble opinion this bill equitably and democratically distributes the financial responsibility in ratio to use.

Sincerely yours,

R. E. ROWLAND,
Industrial Agent.

WESTFIELD, N. J., *July 21, 1955.*

Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Urge that you vote for bill H. R. 7072.

Respectfully,

FRANK V. MARTIN,

UNION, N. J., *July 20, 1955.*

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
United States Congress,
Sixth District, New Jersey.

DEAR SIR: This is to let you know that as a private automobile owner, I am interested in seeing to it that private automobile owners are not compelled to pay more than their fair share of highway maintenance cost.

Bill H. R. 7072, in my opinion, should prevent an undue proportion of taxes being saddled on private automobile owners, and therefore hope that you can give full measure of support to this bill.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE H. MASSY,

The Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial comment by various newspapers, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE END OF DIXON-YATES: EDITORIAL VIEWS

THE NEW YORK TIMES

We have never shared the opinion of the more ardent critics of the Dixon-Yates contract that this long-disputed project constituted "a national scandal," something akin to Teapot Dome. No giveaway of public property was involved.

It seemed to us from the start that the question of how to provide for the additional power needed was a matter in which the initiative should have been taken by TVA itself and not—as events transpired—by the Atomic Energy Commission, which was the customer requiring the additional power. In the second place, it has become increasingly evident that the whole record of the discussions that preceded the decision was not originally made public, as it should have been. And, finally, there is ground for believing that at least in some quarters the Dixon-Yates contract was intended to be a first step in dismantling TVA. Such a transformation would run counter to the long-established policy of Congress.

For these reasons we welcome the action of the President in canceling the contract.

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

The Democrats are hailing the cancellation as a famous victory for their side, and will try to keep the issue alive as long as possible. The President sees it as a vindication of his original determination to restrain the expansion of Federal power within limits. It can hardly be said to be a victory of any kind for private enterprise, the representatives of which, despite honorable efforts at cooperation, find themselves holding a canceled and null agreement.

Even the cancellation of the contract has not, in the Democrats' eyes, foreclosed what they hope to make a major domestic issue in 1956. Their strategy has been abetted by shortcomings on the part of Mr. Eisenhower's aids. The full story, which he ordered released, did not include the role of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell and the First Boston Corp., a fact of which the opposition makes much. At his press conferences he has been pushed to enter into the discussion of details with which his staff had not made him fully familiar.

AMERICA

There are signs that the GOP politicians are not yet "out from under." With the appearance of Adolphe H. Wenzell on the stand, the Kefauver subcommittee appeared to have struck something resembling paydirt.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract does little to settle the long-range question of added power for the area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority. How it will affect national policy on power—particularly President Eisenhower's concept of a public-private, local-Federal "partnership"—is problematical. For simple power questions have been submerged by politics.

Senator KEFAUVER is grossly exaggerating when he compares anything disclosed in this case with the Teapot Dome scandal. But the Democrats, working hard to build up domestic issues for next year's campaign, will undoubtedly try to make much of Dixon-Yates. They may be hampered somewhat by two facts: One, this contract was more favorable to the Government than two made under the Truman regime by AEC. Two, the last previous Democratic Congress refused to give TVA money for another steamplant.

THE LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL

The Eisenhower administration is doing its smiling best to bury that Dixon-Yates contract with as little show of pain as possible. None should speak ill of the dead, it seems.

None, that is, except those who are concerned with the glaring truths of the record. They point out that Mr. Eisenhower was aware that Memphis official spokesmen said last December 20 the city would have none of Dixon-Yates power, but preferred to build its own plant. The President continued to defend the contract as a good deal.

Now it all comes clear with the determined Tennessee contingent, Senators KEFAUVER and GORE and Governor Clement, dragging out the missing pieces. All the evidence of evasion, haste, subterfuge, and secrecy, all the highhanded disregard of ordinary safeguards, all the misrepresentations and the shrewd "policy reports" aimed at dismantling TVA power—all come out.

The President is quite affable with the mayor of Memphis. But the broadest of smiles and the utmost of geniality are not going to obscure the Wenzell testimony and shadow of conspiracies.

THE WASHINGTON POST

The spectacle of President Eisenhower and Mayor Tobey, of Memphis, rejoicing over the decision of Memphis to build its own power-plant and the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract is a happy outcome.

It should not be supposed, however, that this solution of an immediate problem has disposed of the issue underlying the Dixon-Yates contract. One partial solution may lie in giving TVA the authority it seeks to issue bonds of its own to finance its projects. If this were accompanied by a requirement that the TVA pay a full equivalent of Federal and local taxes, the special advantages which it confers upon residents of the Tennessee Valley in cheap power would be in large measure eliminated.

The administration and Congress ought now to proceed to work out a power policy in an orderly fashion.

DECATUR (ILL.) HERALD

Politically, the contract was becoming as dangerous as a high tension wire.

Fortunately for the President and the Republican party, there was a relatively easy out.

The Dixon-Yates contract was not in the public interest. But the whole episode represents only a skirmish in the high-voltage fight between private and public power advocates.

MADISON CAPITAL TIMES

The President has seized, almost frantically, on the decision of the city of Memphis to build its own generating plant rather than buy power from the Dixon-Yate combine as an excuse for the cancellation.

Few thoughtful people will be fooled by the President's pat alibi. The history of the affair is too clear. There is no record that he ever invited Memphis to build its own plant or consulted with its officials about such action.

It is now clear that the Dixon-Yates deal was meant to be the first major thrust in the drive to dismantle TVA and turn this vast public development over to private interests. It was a part of a proposed raid on the public domain staggering in its scope and brazenness.

President Eisenhower has indicated on frequent occasions that he wants to be known in history as a President who was above partisan politics. He owes it to his own place in history to disregard partisan considerations and cooperate in exposing the full truth about Dixon-Yates and to bring to the bar of justice any who are guilty of wrongdoing.

TRENTON EVENING TIMES

The Dixon-Yates contract, which President Eisenhower has ordered terminated,

has proved to be a costly mistake—costly to the Government and costly to the Administration.

It is unfortunate from every viewpoint that the President, who seems unwittingly to have played into the hands of financial interests, did not at a much earlier date face the facts of life on the Dixon-Yates contract. These facts have been quite apparent from the beginning.

THE DES MOINES REGISTER

The Administration took a deserved licking on the Dixon-Yates contract.

The licking was deserved because the Administration, in its zeal to find an alternative to TVA expansion, resorted to subterfuge and evasion in working out the Dixon-Yates plan. Neither the manner of working out the contract nor all the financial arrangements provided in it have stood up well when subjected to close congressional scrutiny.

President Eisenhower was slow to recognize that serious mistakes were made. But he finally did so and ordered cancellation of contract.

THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

President Eisenhower is "happy" over his decision to cancel the Dixon-Yates power contract. If he finally understands the whole mess, he ought to be overjoyed. He has been toying with the makings of a first-class scandal.

Dixon-Yates was wrong from its inception. The President forced the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority to accept it after their best judgment said "No." This unwarranted interference with the operations of independent agencies gave the President himself top responsibility.

There was endless secrecy. The contract itself was kept in complete darkness, until an enterprising St. Louis Post-Dispatch reporter obtained a copy.

Almost incomprehensible in the whole story has been the stubbornness of the Administration which likes to call itself brainy and businesslike and to be thought of as "clean as a hound's tooth." It compounded error on error to the door of scandal.

Anyone who read a good daily paper in the last year could see the folly and political dynamite of Dixon-Yates. Unfortunately, the President apparently doesn't read newspapers. That's dangerous for a man whose subordinates mislead him.

THE MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

Now that a definite decision has been reached in Washington, we hope the fires of regional controversy will be pulled.

It is our hope that the West Memphis plant will be built. Arkansas needs reasonably priced power as an indispensable factor in its development.

Elimination of the AEC-DI-ON-Yates contract from the scene might well be a signal for simultaneous elimination of intemperance in words and behavior on the part of all concerned. As President Eisenhower and his administration have agreed, Memphis has the right to build its own power facilities to protect its own interests. It also has an obligation so to do in the absence of assurance from TVA of a favorable, long-term contract.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

The tumult about the Dixon-Yates plan was ended by the President's cancellation of the contract, but the shouting is far from over; the Democrats quite plainly look on it as an issue in the 1956 elections.

Senator KEFAUVER says the purpose of the plan was to restrict the TVA to flood control and like activities. That these—and not expansion into a giant public power project by construction of steam plants—were the original purposes of TVA has been forgotten as it grew into a tax-supported Government power empire.

What will be remembered by the Democrats until the next election is that the Dixon-Yates proposal angered most of the people in Tennessee who profited by TVA. And it is not at all unlikely that the Republicans remembered that in 1952 Mr. Eisenhower carried Tennesse by less than 3,000 votes out of nearly 900,000 ballots.

The implications of the controversy are more than political, however. The fight over Dixon-Yates was philosophical also. It was from start to finish a continuing battle between advocates of tax-paid public power and those who believe in free enterprise's private power.

No longer will taxpayers from all over the Nation pay to supply Memphis with cheaper electricity. And that was a defeat for those who support TVA's unwarranted expansion, no matter how long the shouting about Dixon-Yates continues.

BUSINESS WEEK

The Dixon-Yates power project will be canceled if the city of Memphis proves up on its plant to build its own powerplant. With the Memphis load off TVA, the Government's big power system can meet atomic needs. On the political side, the handling has been inept from the start. GOP politicians would like to get out from under the contract. The Democrats are using it outside the valley area to work up voters on the public power issue.

Problems of Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago from Elkhorn, Wis., I received a message from a man who works continually with the farmers.

He commented, as a great many other Wisconsinites have, on the very difficult problems faced by Wisconsin dairymen these days.

He pointed out that farm prices—farm milk checks—are low, while farm costs are high. He wrote:

The cost of items necessary to carry on a farm operation, namely, labor, machinery, and supplies are at an all time high. The price of milk to the farmer is approximately 7 cents per quart. The consumer is paying up to 26 cents per quart, delivered. There is too much price spread.

This is the very grim situation which I pointed out in an address which I delivered by transcription last night over station WGN, Chicago, and which I have described here in the Senate time and time again, in requesting corrective action.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN DAIRYING—1955; A CONSTRUCTIVE 10-POINT PROGRAM

I would like to report to you on a great industry affecting every single American.

Yes, through the courtesy of station WGN, I would like to comment in detail on the problems of this industry—which affects you and me and 165 million other Americans. The industry I am referring to is the dairy industry of America.

Now, some city folks might not realize how crucially the dairy industry affects them.

But if they stop to think it over for a moment, even city folks who are listening to me tonight will realize that dairying—meaning the sale of milk, butter, cheese, nonfat dry milk solids, ice cream—is indispensable, in many ways, to this great Nation of ours.

And so I am going to answer some questions about our dairy industry—its past, present, and future.

DAIRYING—GREATEST SINGLE SOURCE OF CASH FARM INCOME

Question. First off, Senator WILEY, just how widespread is America's dairy industry in Wisconsin, Illinois, and elsewhere?

Answer. Well, a few facts will provide the answer. Last year the dairy farms of our country produced almost 124 billion pounds of milk. That means around 56 billion quarts.

To produce this vast supply of healthful milk, the dairy farms of America keep almost 25 million cows. Each of these cows turns out an average of 2,500 quarts of milk—a new record.

Question. How does dairying compare with other parts of American farming?

Answer. Dairying is the largest agricultural enterprise in America. It is the greatest single source of cash farm income. In other words, the health of the great farming segment of America depends on dairying.

Nearly $1 out of every $5 of all farm income comes from the sale of milk, and of dairy animals as beef.

TWO AND ONE-HALF MILLION UNITED STATES DAIRY FARMERS

There are dairymen in every State of the Union—about 2.5 million of them in all. They produce the milk which goes through more than 35,000 dairy plants and which comes out in bottles or as butter, cheese, ice cream, and other dairy foods.

There are around 10 million people employed—10 million people—in the dairy industry. And there are other millions building the machines and trucks and factories and other equipment needed to keep that river of milk flowing from the farms to the Nation's consumers.

WISCONSIN, AMERICA'S DAIRYLAND: NO. 1 IN THE NATION

Question. Senator WILEY, since you are the Senior Senator of the greatest single dairy State in the Nation—Wisconsin—naturally, your people have a special interest in the well-being of dairying.

Answer. That is absolutely right.

Wisconsin is America's Dairyland. Our 16½ billion pounds of milk production each year—our Wisconsin production of more than half of all of the cheese in the Nation—our top-quality dairy standards—our pioneering in dairy research—all this has rightly focused the attention of the entire country on Wisconsin dairying.

BADGER FARMERS CONCERNED ABOUT POOR RETURN

Question. Well, Senator WILEY, since Wisconsin farmers are the Nation's leading dairy farmers, what is their reaction to the present dairy situation?

Answer. I am sorry to report that Wisconsin, like other dairymen, are deeply concerned about the present dairy situation. They simply are not getting enough return for their labor.

Remember, dairying is no simple 40-hour-a-week proposition. A dairy farmer has to work—and work hard—at his occupation—with his wife and youngsters and hired hand—if he is lucky enough to have one—7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, around the clock.

Moreover, the dairyman has to have a heavy investment in machinery, in buildings, in equipment. And yet, he simply is not getting enough return on his labor and his investment.

WISCONSIN FARMERS GET ONLY 7 CENTS PER QUART

I know this personally. For over 30 years, I have been intimately acquainted with the dairy farmer's problems on the farm in Barron County, Wis., which my father before me owned and operated, and which I in turn took over.

I know that the dairy farmer has been getting, in my area, only around 7 cents per quart of milk. Just think of that, 7 cents only. And yet, the consumer buying that same milk in the city has been paying around triple that sum.

Question. Then one of the problems is, Senator, that the dairyman is not getting enough of the retail price?

Answer. That is right, Government statistics show that the dairy farmer gets only 46 percent of the retail price of fluid milk, and only 47 percent of the retail price of American cheese. Distribution costs all along the line are responsible for the difference.

And remember, these are national averages. The 7-cent-per-quart figure which I have quoted to you earlier shows that Wisconsin dairymen are getting even less of the consumer's price than the national average, in many instances.

Question. Well, lowering high-distribution costs is then, one answer to the dairyman's dilemma; is it not?

A DECENT LIVING FOR FARMERS ESSENTIAL

Answer. That is right. But the biggest single factor is, of course, to make sure that the farmer gets back his cost of production, plus a reasonable profit. If we keep that clear objective in mind, we won't become confused and confounded about details of the so-called parity debate.

After all, all the farmer wants is a decent living for himself and his loved ones.

The farmer has been caught in a price squeeze for far too long. The farmer is the only man who sells cheaply at wholesale, but buys expensively at retail.

You know, no other producer in America is so much at the mercy of competitive forces as is the farmer.

The farmer is also often at the mercy of other forces, as well as the elements. He faces the problem of fighting livestock diseases. He fights adverse weather conditions. He suffers from a terrific shortage of farm labor. And then, if he overcomes these and all other obstacles, when he sends his milk to market, he may find that his milk check is so low as to give him little or no profit for all his labor.

UNITED STATES DAIRY CONSUMPTION FAR TOO LOW

Question. How about American consumption; are we eating and drinking enough dairy products?

Answer. The answer to that question is, Definitely not. We Americans simply do not consume enough dairy items. If we did consume more—if we did consume as much as some European countries do—then much of this so-called dairy problem would be eliminated.

Question. What do the statistics show, Senator, on dairy consumption?

Answer. Well, believe it or not, although ours is the greatest Nation, with the highest standard of living in the world, we rank eleventh—yes, a low eleventh—in cheese consumption. We only eat around 7.1 pounds per person per year. Ten other nations consume more cheese on the average than we do.

In butter, we are even worse. We are in 13th rank, and only eat 8.6 pounds of butter. In fluid milk, we rank eighth. We drink around 350 pounds of milk per person per year. But in Sweden, people drink around 513 pounds, and in Norway, New Zealand, Switzerland, Canada, Denmark, and Ireland people drink more milk than we do.

Yet, if Americans realize what a wonderful buy milk is, if they realize how essential it is for building of sound bones and healthy skin and tissues, they would drink more milk.

Question. Are there any other statistics which point up this problem?

Answer. Yes, a study showed that 84 percent of American adults drink coffee, and only 43 percent drink milk. In other words, many of our adults have gotten out of the habit of drinking milk, even though it is essential to adult health, just as it is essential for the health of youngsters.

A 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR UNITED STATES DAIRYING

Question. Well, now, Senator WILEY, you have described a great many of the problems of the dairy industry. Would you tell us what you feel to be some of the solutions? I know, for example, that you have sponsored a great deal of constructive farm legislation on Capitol Hill to cope with this problem. Would you tell us about some of these bills which you have offered as partial remedies for the dairy problem?

Answer. Yes. I am going to run through a series of 10 major points in my dairy program. I am not going to try to hit every aspect of the situation, but I am going to cover many of the most important features.

Question. What is the principal point, Senator?

PUT DAIRY ITEMS AT SAME PARITY AS BASIC FARM GOODS

Answer. First, my first point is, of course, that the dairyman must absolutely get his cost of production, plus a reasonable profit. To do this, I feel that dairy parity should be established at the same level as the other six so-called "basic commodities."

There is no other agricultural commodity more basic than milk.

So, there is no reason why the dairyman should be discriminated against in relation to other agricultural products, like cotton or tobacco.

Question. What other points in your dairy program?

EDUCATE AMERICANS AND RAISE DAIRY CONSUMPTION

Answer. Second, well second, the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies, should strengthen its program to increase dairy consumption.

That means better educating the American people, particularly the American housewife, to use more dairy foods at every mealtime—to use milk, and butter and cheese, in more wholesome, healthful, recipes.

WIDEN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Third, we must increase consumption among the Nation's school children. For that purpose, I have cosponsored with Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, a bill to expand the special school milk program, which already has resulted in vastly increased drinking of milk by the Nation's youngsters.

Question. I know, Senator, that another of the major points on your program relates to research.

Answer. Very definitely.

PASS WILEY BILL FOR DAIRY RESEARCH LAB

Fourth, so I have offered a bill, S. 788, to establish a dairy research laboratory in Madison, the capital of my State.

This laboratory would help to coordinate all of the dairy research in the country. That means research into new byproducts for milk. It means finding new uses for milk, just as we have found new uses for the peanut and for cottonseed and for corn cobs, and other agricultural items.

But I want research also into dairy packaging, dairy processing, dairy distribution. Such research is recognized as essential by just about everyone. Endorsements for the Wiley bill for the United States Dairy Research Laboratory have come in from all over the country.

Question. How about other points on your dairy program?

MORE MILK-VENDING MACHINES ESSENTIAL

Answer. Fifth, my next major point is to increase the availability of milk-vending machines. I am referring to automatic machines which dispense milk by cup or in the carton. Right now, there are more than 20,000 of these milk-vending machines all over our country. They have resulted in tremendous increases in sales. Car owners, for example, can drive up to a gasoline station, drop some nickels in the slot, and take home quart ice-cold cartons of milk, which they might not otherwise buy, particularly if it is late in the evening and most stores have closed. So, there ought to be many more milk-vending machines in the Nation's factories, in schools, Armed Forces facilities, and other public places.

Question. How about other points on your dairy program?

INCREASE ANTIDISEASE RESEARCH

Answer. Sixth, well, next, we ought to step up scientific research in the combating of livestock and crop diseases.

Take two instances—brucellosis (that is, Bang's Disease) and bovine tuberculosis—which have cost American farmers heavily. Fortunately, these scourges are on their way to elimination. But money spent for research in battling these and other diseases pays off tremendously for the American people as a whole. It helps to produce more income for the dairyman and more wealth for America.

Question. How about some other points in your dairy program?

PREVENT OLEO MISREPRESENTATION

Answer. Seventh, we must enforce the Nation's laws so as to prevent misrepresentation of artificial products which try to masquerade as natural dairy products—as whole milk or butter or ice cream. In other words, we want fair play in advertising and labeling, fair play not fraud and deception.

PERMIT WISCONSIN MILK IN EASTERN MILKSHEDS

Eighth, then, there ought to be a study of the restrictions which prevent milk from moving freely across State borders.

For example, Wisconsin milk can't move into many eastern markets, because of wholly artificial restrictions which have been built up against it. This whole subject ought to be studied, and progress ought to be made so that there is freer movement of milk throughout our country.

Ninth, the problem of harmful foreign dairy imports requires constant reexamination. Very often foreign farm products pour into this country and they don't nearly meet the high health standards which our American dairy products meet. It isn't fair to penalize the American dairyman who must spend a great deal to bring his products up to high health standards, while at the same time, foreign products with far lower standards and produced at much lower labor cost, can pour in.

STRENGTHEN FARMERS' CO-OPS

Question. That represents nine points, Senator WILEY. How about the 10th?

Answer. The 10th point is to strengthen the farmers' organizations, not weaken them. That means strengthening the Nation's farm cooperative system, strengthening its rural-electric co-ops, its phone co-ops. It means strengthening soil-conservation committees. These and other groups are, after all, helping the farmer to help himself.

SENATOR WILEY'S FIGHT FOR FARMERS' SOCIAL SECURITY

Question. That is certainly a significant 10-point program.

Incidentally, I know, Senator WILEY, that many other objectives for which you have fought for the farmer have now been realized, or are on their way to realization. For example, you have fought to help assure old-age pensions for farm operators—legislation which was enacted, and which now helps to eliminate fear of insecurity in the farmer's later years.

You have fought for improved rural health for our farmers, for better hospital and medical service for them, for more schools in the rural areas of America, for improved highways to bring the farmer's products to market. You have fought to help the farmer lower the accident rate on farms, and fought to secure amendments to the tax laws to assure the farmer a fair break.

REFUND FARMERS' GASOLINE TAX

Answer. Yes. For example, right now, I am trying to get refunds for the gasoline tax which the farmers pay. After all, that gas tax penalizes the farmer when he buys gasoline for his tractor and other farm machines. The Federal gasoline tax was intended as a highway tax. So, it isn't fair to soak the farmer with this tax when he is using the gasoline, not on the highways, but basically within the confines of his own farm.

CONCLUSION—HELPING DAIRYING HELPS ALL AMERICA

Question. Well, I know, Senator, that our listeners have been interested in your presentation of the dairy farmer's problems.

I know, too, that they will understand that in speaking for the dairyman, you are speaking for the American people as a whole, because, if the dairyman goes out of business—if he finds it necessary, for example, to auction off his farm—then it is not simply the dairyman who is hurt, but America generally.

Answer. That is absolutely right. I am, indeed, speaking for the health of America—health which is dependent on this great segment of farming. I am not asking, and the dairy farmer is not asking, for favoritism or privilege.

Any man who has ever worked on a busy dairy farm knows that if there is anyone in our population who really works his own way, who really relies upon himself, is willing to take his chances, it is the dairyman.

He is not asking for anything special—just for fair, decent treatment from his Government. And he asks for understanding from the American people generally.

I hope that in the comments which I have made, my listeners will find greater insight into the problems of this great industry of America.

Thanks very much for your kind attention. This is Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEC WILEY, signing off.

Address by Thomas K. Finletter, Former Secretary of the Air Force

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Thomas K. Finletter, one of the most able minds in the United States, has devoted intensive study to two propositions which at first seem mutually inconsistent, but, in actual fact, are very consistent indeed. The first is that the United States should have armed superiority. As Secretary of the Air Force, and in many special missions, he has worked tirelessly for the kind of Air force we need to assure the security of our Nation. He is probably the country's leading proponent of a strong air arm.

The second proposition to which Mr. Finletter has given great study is the proposition that this planet cannot survive another war, and that the only way to prevent another war is to achieve total and enforceable disarmament of all countries, enforced by the United Nations.

Finletter, an experienced international lawyer and a hard-headed executive, does not want to rely on paper promises. He does not expect an era of good will to dawn. He wants the kind of enforceable arrangement that will work even though evil men and evil-intentioned rulers exist in the world.

A week ago Secretary Finletter delivered a provocative address at Colgate University, in which he criticized the disarmament proposals now being considered. I consider his criticism so vitally important that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THOMAS K. FINLETTER, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AT COLGATE UNIVERSITY, JULY 12, 1955

* * * * *

We are entering, I think, a phase in which disarmament will be an increasingly active subject of discussion among governments. The reason is the growing realization that hydrogen war simply must be prevented, and that it will not be prevented unless governments get more busy than they have been in working for disarmament.

Now the United States will enter these discussions with a well-defined program on disarmament. It is this program that I shall talk about today. For I believe that United States policy on disarmament is based on a premise which should not and will not be accepted by the people of the country. This premise is that it would be safe for the United States to destroy its atom bombs under an unenforceable system of disarmament—one which, since it would be unenforceable, would put faith in Russian and Chinese Communist promises.

I do not think it necessary to choose between trusting the Communists and having no policy for disarmament and peace. The policy of enforced disarmament which was the policy of the United States until supplanted recently by this unenforced policy would achieve all the results of the new unenforced idea and at the same time would not put us in the position of relying for our safety on Russian or Red Chinese good faith.

I shall now try to make clear the difference between an unenforced system of disarmament such as is now the policy of the United States Government and a system which would be enforced.

This unenforced policy was revealed in a release of documents at London in May of this year. You will remember that the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament was meeting this spring in London in sessions which were supposed to be secret. The Russians, though, made a flamboyant public release, through their Tass Agency, describing the policy they had been advocating in the secret sessions and pointing out to the world that they had now accepted practically all the proposals which the United States and the other Western countries had been making for the reduction and control of arms. And indeed, they had accepted most of the West's program. Only on the inspection service was there any substantial difference. And even on inspection the Russians had gone far, agreeing to international inspectors permanently stationed on Russian soil at control posts in the big ports, railway junctions, motor roads and airdromes, and agreeing also to allow international officials unhindered access to materials pertaining to national budget appropriations for military needs, and to be allowed to inspect all objects of control, whatever that means.

If the two sides want to reach agreement this Russian attitude and the as yet not fully defined Western position on inspection can be brought together. There, however, is the big question. Are we right in assuming that the Russians do want to make an agreement? And then there is the question, too, whether we ourselves are decided on the kind of agreement we would be willing to make.

The West also released its side of the case at London. The significant fact which came out of this release was that the United States had abandoned its old principle of insisting on a foolproof enforcement before it gave up any of its arms, and now was ready to disarm even of its atom power, in reliance on an unenforced arrangement, in reliance that is on Russian and Chinese Communist good faith. The West said at London that it would give up all its atom bombs in exchange for a promise from the Russians to give up all of theirs, provided that both sides would first reduce their conventional forces to certain levels, namely 1 to 1.5 million men each for Russia, Communist China, and the United States, 650,000 men each for the United Kingdom and France, and lower figures for the other countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

A preliminary point about these London proposals of the West is that even if we could assume that the Russians and Communist Chinese would live up to the letter of the agreement, the London plan would be a bad arrangement for the United States and the other Western countries. For under the London policy the West would give up all of its best weapon, its atomic power, and would allow the Russians and the Chinese to keep enough of their conventional forces to assure them military supremacy in Europe and Asia.

The Western proposals at London recognized that United States public opinion would not put up with the United States giving up its main weapon, its air-atomic power, in reliance on Soviet and Chinese Communist good faith. So they announced a new theory, or rather put new faith in an old theory, which is supposed to protect us against a breach of faith by the Russians or the Chinese. This is the so-called fire alarm principle based on an elaborate inspection system.

The fire alarm theory is this. If there are enough inspectors permanently on the soil of all countries, and if these inspectors have the right of access to all factories, installations, and other necessary places, they will be able to learn if any country violates the disarmament terms. If there is a violation the fire alarm will ring. Then the matter may be referred to the United Nations which may try to persuade the law-abiding states to go to war to compel the offending country to stop its violations, or if the UN fails to rise to the occasion, the law-abiding nations may go to war on their own initiative against

the offender. Or if they do not want to do that, they can start rearming. As a high State Department official put it recently, "any significant breach of the agreement would be reported immediately by the enforcement agency and remedial action could be taken by that agency, the Security Council, the General Assembly, or the other participating states, relying on collective action by national armed forces as a last resort."

Unfortunately this fire-alarm theory will not protect us. If we could get it without giving up our armaments, and above all without giving up our air-atomic power, it would be good to have it. It would be to our advantage to have an international inspection service. But it would be too high a price to pay for it to give up our air-atomic power.

Possibly if the fire alarm were perfect, and would report every fire, we might think of paying a high price for it. But even then I do not think we should give up our good right arm, our air atomic power and much of the rest of our military establishment for an inspection service which could be stopped at any moment at the will of the Communists.

But this is academic. No inspection service can assure us that we shall know what the Russians and the Chinese are doing, especially in the atomic field. The Russians now have a lot of fissionable material and the other ingredients that go into A- and H-bombs. If they want to they can hide large quantities of this material and even the bombs they now have in the vast spaces of Russia and China which would be beyond any finding under any inspection system.

The current western proposals for disarmament in short would have us destroy our A- and H-bombs and would leave the Russians and the Chinese with a great amount of atomic explosive and of completed atomic weapons, together with the means of delivering these weapons against the United States and the rest of the free world. This, plus the 3 million men allowed to the Russo-Chinese partnership and the additional forces which their satellites would have under the London proposals, would give world dominion to communism.

* * * * *

These then are my conclusions about the present disarmament policy of the United States and its Allies. I shall now add two prophesies about this policy.

No tinkering with it, no minor changes, in fact no changes less than scrapping the whole concept of giving up our arms under an unenforced arrangement, can make any disarmament safe for the United States and its friends.

And second, if we persist in the proposals we made at London, or any other disarmament plan based on the unenforceable principle, it will be rejected by public opinion in this country and by the Representatives of that opinion in the Congress.

The reason that no tinkering with the London proposals will do any good is that they are based on a premise which is inconsistent with the safety of the United States. That premise is that we can rely on Russian and Chinese promises in matters of the military security of our country. This is the inherent and fatal weakness of any system of unenforced disarming. I do not think that American opinion will agree to disarm under a system of that kind.

* * * * *

Let us now look at the policy of enforced disarmament. What is it? Why is it so objectionable that we dare not even try to realize it? And if we did, would it work—surely, probably, or not at all?

Briefly and oversimplified, the following is the essence of an enforced system. It starts with some negative propositions.

1. The guiding principle of an enforced system is that we will not give up our decisive weapon, our atomic-air, or the smallest part of it, except at the end of the last step in the development of an enforcement system which, when this last step is completed, will be able, practically and legally, to stop any lawbreaking state (and here we are thinking especially of Russia and Red China) from starting to rearm or from using any weapons which it may have successfully concealed.

Inherent in this proposition is the principle that until we do get such an enforced system into actual being we will build and keep an overwhelmingly strong United States atomic-air, and will not give it up in reliance on promises by the Russians, the Communist Chinese, or, indeed, anyone else.

At the same time it is realized that armed strength of itself cannot assure the peace; that we need something more than armed strength if we are to be assured that there will not be a hydrogen war; that with the fantastic increase in the destructiveness of weapons which has taken place in the last 10 years we must make it the top priority policy of the United States to prevent a major war, if we can; and that when we come right down to it, only by eliminating the weapons with which war is made will we prevent a major—and that means a hydrogen—war from happening.

* * * * *

2. Collective security cannot enforce a disarmament treaty. Collective security—that is, the making of war by the law-abiding states to suppress a lawbreaking state—will not work against major countries such as Russia.

3. Inspection is not enforcement. Inspection is the intelligence system—the G–2—which gets the facts but goes no further. It is the fire alarm, not the fire department.

4. The two pillars of any enforced system must be—

First, to have a U. N. military force strong enough to compel any lawbreaking state, including the largest, to stop any violation of the terms of the disarmament treaty.

And, second, since this U. N. force must be relatively small, the other pillar must be to have all countries disarm down to the level needed for domestic policing.

5. Finally, an enforced system will need effective international control, which will probably connote international operation, of all civilian aircraft over a certain size. The wide spread of fissionable material and fission and fusion bombs and the ability to conceal them have made civilian aircraft into potential military vehicles. And since they would carry hydrogen weapons they cannot be left uncontrolled.

Such a control of civilian aircraft would be practicable under an enforced system, although not under an unenforced system. * * *

This, in rough outline, is the kind of arrangement, the kind of invasion of our national privacy, we would have to put up with if we were to agree to an enforced system of disarmament. It would be a serious invasion. It would be acceptable to our American opinion only if the American people were convinced it was the only way, or the best way by which hydrogen war could be averted.

I believe that this is the fact, that only by an enforced system with all its disagreeable aspects can we prevent a major war with the new weapons. And I believe it is as plain as can be that anything less, any plan which relies on Russian or Chinese promises, or on an inspection system operating in the vast spaces of Russia and China, can never work.

Even an enforced system would have its time of travail in being born and in coming to maturity. But once accepted by the United States, it would, I believed, be accepted by our major allies. And once accepted by them it might be accepted by the Russians and their Chinese partners. If half of the current optimism about the desire of the Kremlin to cut down its armament expenses is true, it certainly will be accepted by the Soviets.

The real test is what the United States is willing to put up with in order to make a serious attack on the institution of war.

The two most serious hurdles in the enforced system are (1) the degree of disarmament—almost total, down to the forces needed for local policing and for U. N. contingents, and (2) the creation of a United Nations police force.

Curiously, the United States Government seems to have accepted the idea of almost total disarmament. As late as the London meeting this spring the United States Government announced that it hoped that the "armaments and armed forces of the powers will be further reduced to the levels strictly necessary for the maintenance of internal security and the fulfillment of the obligations of signatory states under the terms of the United Nations Charter." United States policy at London indeed went further. We said that we would immediately divest ourselves totally of our best weapon, our air-atomic force, while allowing the Russians and the Red Chinese to keep conventional forces, which is their best weapon, up to the impressive total of 3 million men, not including the satellites.

It is the U. N. police force, surprisingly, which bothers our officials. Ten years ago we agreed to help build a U. N. armed force, in article 43 of the U. N. Charter. We renewed this commitment in the uniting-for-peace resolution of November 1950. But earlier this year a high State Department official said that "in the present state of international affairs the creation of such an authority (a U. N. police force) does not appear to be feasible, certainly in the foreseeable future."

There is, though, one ray of encouragement in all this. If the United States Government is willing to swallow the bitter pill of total disarmament, and is objecting to an enforced system only because of the U. N. police force, it is possible that it will change its mind. For a U. N. police force would operate only against treaty breakers. Surely we have no reason to think that we would ever be in that class. * * *

However, the fact is that our national policy is now opposed to a U. N. police force and, therefore, to an enforced system of disarmament. * * *

I have said that I do not think that a first step of giving up our air-atomic power in exchange for a partial reduction in the conventional forces of the Russians and Chinese is a sensible step. * * *

We might make arrangements at Geneva, or later, for a continuing international committee at a high level to discuss disarmament. This is such a novel and vital subject that the United States representative on such a committee should be an official one step only below the President, that is, a Cabinet official; and Mr. Stassen has already been given this status by the President. * * *

This is not the first step I would prefer, but it would, I think, be helpful. The first step I would like to see would be more venturesome. It would be for the United States Government to abandon the idea that it knows for certain that the people of our country would not accept an enforced disarmament, including that objectionable U. N. police force and all the other disagreeable elements of such a system, and to put forward an enforceable plan in the normal disarmament discussions in the U. N. * * *

We cannot be sure what the response of the American people would be. Justice Brandeis said that "the irresistible is often only that which is not resisted." It may be that, in this matter of peace, the impossible is only that which we are too timid to try.

Arms Cuts and Curbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Arms Cuts and Curbs," written by Hanson W. Baldwin, and published in the New York Times of July 22, 1955. The article refers to the Geneva Conference.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMS CUTS AND CURBS—A CRITIQUE ON PROPOSAL BY PRESIDENT FOR UNITED STATES AND SOVIET MUTUAL INSPECTIONS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President's dramatic arms inspection suggestion to the Russians in Geneva yesterday dealt primary with the effects—not the cause—of international tensions.

The Big Four conference was discussing the limitations of armaments, after having failed to agree on solution of the political and other problems that caused those armaments. But, as the President said, if measures, such as he suggested, could be taken, the danger of surprise attack might be reduced, "thus lessening danger and relaxing tensions," and in turn, perhaps, creating an improved atmosphere for the solution of political problems.

In effect, the President's program represented a modification of one part of the United States plan advanced in 1946 by Bernard M. Baurch for the international control of nuclear armaments and atomic energy. The Baruch plan was envisaged as a United Nations program, and there were many facets to it besides the inspection program, which was the heart of the President's proposal yesterday.

SOVIET ACCEPTANCE DOUBTED

The Russians rejected the Baruch proposals, including the sweeping inspection and enforcement provisions the plan contained, and there is no indication they will accept—or, indeed, can accept—the President's program.

The President suggested: (1) that the United States and Soviet Union exchange complete blueprints of their military establishments from beginning to end; (2) that the United States and Soviet Union provide each other with ample facilities for aerial reconnaissance and photography to make all the pictures we choose; and (3) that these measures would merely initiate further discussions looking toward a comprehensive and effective system of inspection and disarmament.

The brief and somewhat ambiguous nature of the President's proposal, and indeed the entire proceedings at Geneva to date, show quite clearly that the program advanced was idealistic, in the full sense of the word, rather than pragmatic. The President suggested a general idea as a starting point for future discussion, rather than a specific program for immediate action. The spirit of his suggestion is far more important than the details of it. As part of a psychological peace offensive of great importance, it will be hard for the Russians to match.

MANY DETAILS LACKING

But that very spirit, unless tempered, could lead to unwarranted hopes. The President spoke, for instance, of disarmament. There is no practical possibility of such a goal. Complete disarmament never has been achieved in history, unless enforced by a conqueror upon a conquered. The program offered in Geneva must be read against the background of history.

The President addressed himself primarily to the great obstacle upon which nearly all prior attempts at arms limitation and reduction have stumbled—inspection and enforcement. His program was merely a suggested beginning to guard against surprise attack. Since it was not explicit and would have to be spelled out in great detail before its assets and liabilities could be judged, present criticisms can be purely tentative.

A mutual exchange of blueprints of their military establishments between the United States and the Soviet Union undoubtedly would benefit the United States in a strictly intelligence and factual sense. For Moscow unquestionably knows more about United States military establishments than Washington knows about the Soviet Union's; this is an inescapable part of our form of government.

The word "blueprint" needs, of course, to be defined, but if it were interpreted in as sweeping a sense as the President seemed to use it, such an exchange probably would give the Russians technical information of greater value that the United States would receive. For there is not much doubt that the United States still has a qualitative technical edge in nuclear developments, aircraft, naval vessels, and so forth.

Would the Russians, for instance, be permitted to inspect the submarine *Nautilus*? Could they visit atomic-energy facilities, the Strategic Air Command, and other vital areas? There is not much doubt that there would be very great opposition in this country, as in the Soviet Union, to such an exchange.

Furthermore, unless the exchange was strictly limited and hence of very limited utility, it would be difficult, indeed, to do other than include nearly everything in both nations under the heading of "military establishments." Missiles need no landing strips for launching, and biological agents can be produced in small and easily hidden laboratories. Are such installations part of the data about "military establishments" that it was suggested should be exchanged?

OTHER QUESTIONS POSED

The same general problems confront the President's second point—the suggestion for mutual aerial reconnaissance and photography of each other's "military establishment." This might well have to mean if it is to mean much of anything, complete freedom by each side to fly over any and all parts of the other's nation, and its outlying military establishments.

And would the Soviet Union open up its military secrets to the United States unless Britain, France, and other western allies followed suit? Would the United States be content to look at the Soviet "military establishment" without similar inspection of the Red Chinese and the East European satellites' facilities?

The effectiveness of any aerial inspection system is, in any case, open to question. Aerial photographs, magnified and carefully interpreted by experts, can reveal military information of great importance. During World War II, for instance, British photo-interpreters discovered the first visual evidence of the German V-2 rocket from aerial photos made of Peenemunde, the German rocket experiment center.

However, if all the military installations in a country as large as the Soviet Union were to be photographed the physical job involved would be tremendous, and in any case much vital information could be concealed from the camera's eye. Aerial photographs could not reveal underground storage depots for nuclear weapons and camouflage and concealment could hide effectively even fairly extensive surface installations. Even the most extensive and elaborate aerial inspection systems could not be expected to be foolproof.

The problem of establishing a foolproof inspection system, given the present immense variety and quantity of military equipment, has been studied and restudied repeatedly since World War II. Most expert opinion is that no such foolproof inspection system can be devised. Something must be left to trust.

The President's goal, therefore, seems both lesser and greater than the establishment of a foolproof inspection system. In fact, he stated that "we have not as yet been able to discover any scientific or other inspection method which would make certain of the elimination of nuclear weapons."

The President, therefore, is merely suggesting on the one hand, some exploration of the possibility of increasing our guard against surprise attack but on the other hand he is frankly postulating even this hope on some degree of mutual trust and confidence.

Despite the new atmosphere of sweetness and light in Geneva this mutual trust and confidence does not exist. Soviet tactics have changed since Stalin's death, but in the light of record, the United States would risk its future if it put its confidence in the present Soviet leaders.

There is an equally important hurdle confronting the President's proposal. Our own fears and lack of confidence in the Soviet leaders are more than matched by the Soviet fears and lack of confidence in us. There is, however, a very great question as to whether or not the Communist hierarchy could permit the type of sweeping examination and inspection proposed and still retain its grip upon the Soviet Union. Open frontiers could lead to open minds—always the enemy of dictators.

Effect of Reciprocal Trade Act on Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it will be recalled that when the bill extending the reciprocal trade agreements program was before the Senate Finance Committee an amendment was added authorizing the President to restrict imports in a situation where the national security was threatened. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, and subsequently accepted by the House of Representatives.

That was only a short time ago, but I am happy to say that the amendment is having the intended effect so far as imports of petroleum, that vitally important resource, are concerned.

A report from the Austin Bureau of the Dallas Morning News carries the information that Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, member of the Texas Railroad Commission and an internationally recognized authority on the oil industry, says the legislation already is having a wholesome effect on petroleum imports.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story published in the Dallas News be inserted in the Appendix of the REC-

ORD in order that all Senators may benefit from General Thompson's report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX.—Congress' act permitting the President to restrict imports when the national security is threatened already is having a wholesome effect on oil imports, a Texas official said Tuesday.

Ernest O. Thompson, railroad commissioner, noted that imports recently have shown a decline.

"The legislation has had a wholesome effect," said Thompson, just back from the World Petroleum Congress in Rome. "I think it will continue to have a wholesome effect."

While some domestic producers believe greater restrictions should be imposed, Thompson said he expects the threat of Presidential action will help to keep imports in check.

The commission next Tuesday will hold its first proration hearing in two months.

"There seems to be no great optimism nor any great gloom" for Texas producers at this point, said Thompson. He noted that "phenomenal sales" of gasoline have reduced stocks and that crude oil supplies are 2 percent lower than 1954, as of July 2.

"There's plenty of oil and gasoline, so the consumer should be happy," Thompson commented. "We're really in a period of surplus, yet drilling activity is high. We need to be careful (regulating production) in the last half of the year."

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it seems that every session of the Congress, either Republican or Democrat controlled, brings new additions to the so-called social-security law. The House of Representatives last week added some 2½ million more persons to the social-security rolls. If this House bill becomes law, all self-employed persons except doctors will be included.

Modern society recognizes the fact that we must properly and adequately take care of fellow citizens in need of help and assistance. I know full well the day of the poorhouse under the hill has gone and properly so.

Certainly the aims of social security are admirable, but too many still do not realize how the costs are to be paid. It is not self-supporting or sustaining. There is at least a deficit of 11 to 12 billion at present. Who will eventually have to pay for all this so-called security? The answer is simple: Oncoming generations.

Most people know that they should look carefully for the fine print on an insurance policy, but too many citizens do not look for the fine print in this so-called social-security law. It is mostly "social" and has very little guaranteed security.

It is well to remember that the Government does not create wealth; it only takes away. I believe there are still millions of Americans who prefer to handle their own personal budget and buy their own insurance rather than to be managed by bureaucrats. Whenever a Government undertakes to redistribute wealth, the benefits generally go down rather than up. In a Republic of free men, so-called free riders are not conducive to greater incentive efforts. "Social security" has a siren voice, but no one ever proclaims that it helps to increase productivity.

This Government was designed, set up, and paid for by our ancestors' blood, sweat, and tears. They set out to provide justice, domestic tranquillity, common defense—of American shores—the general welfare—not welfare of individuals—and to secure liberty. This new social-security law places by compulsion, involuntary tax slavery upon all self-employed persons whose net earnings total more than $400 a year, including lawyers, dentists, architects, engineers, accountants, funeral directors, osteopaths, chiropractors, veterinarians, optometrists, ministers, and farmers. This is nothing more nor less than involuntary tax slavery through a device called compulsory social security.

When we buy private insurance, either life, accident, health, hospitalization, or retirement, the price tag is clearly on the package. We just know how many dollars it will cost. But in this compulsory Government social security, the true cost is hidden—and will have to be paid by future generations—and the benefits paid in highly inflated dollars. The price we have to pay can lead to a lower standard of living, regimentation, and loss of more of our freedom.

This compulsory social security program is a most distasteful program because there are still millions of Americans who want to take a calculated risk—who refuse to barter incentive for a dole. Who prefer the risks of freedom to a guaranteed existence with a chain around their neck and above all they will not trade self-respecting initiative for a doubtful handout.

In our reading of history several facts always stand out in bold relief. This is particularly true when we get into the area of "social reforms" or a new approach to social progress. Many of the best international social reforms have become mere instruments of oppression to the whole of society. And in the end the individual sought to be helped becomes the mere tool of some all-powerful minority.

Just remember that European socialism was transformed into an autocratic, despotic, nationalistic socialism of Hitler and Mussolini, and that the idealistic communism from the intellectual teachings of Karl Marx, Lenin, and Trotsky finally took the form of present Soviet totalitarianism. All resulted in the enslavement of the individual and his government became his complete master.

Last week there was published an editorial in one of New York's newspapers. This editorial was inspiring because we often think that the large city papers do not see the picture quite as clearly as the less congested areas. This article lauds Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT who had the courage to vote against this new social security law.

Representative WAINWRIGHT—who is opposed to social security as such—was honest in his vote, not because he does not believe in helping those who need it but because he knew it was fraudulent and deceitful in approach. It was not in the best interests of those who deserve better treatment from their Government.

I commend this editorial:

[From Newsday of July 21, 1955]

A VOTE AGAINST MOTHER

Voting against an extension of social security coverage is like voting against mother. It isn't done.

Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT did it, though, for which he rates an awe-inspired gaze and a vote of thanks. Only 30 Congressmen joined him while 372 opposed him, but WAINWRIGHT was still right.

The bill would lower the retirement age for women from 65 to 62, jack up the present contribution from 4 to 4½ percent, and give benefits to disabled persons at the age of 50.

Like WAINWRIGHT, we are all for social security, but this bill did not deserve passage. It would cost $2.5 billion, yet no hearings were held by congressional committees. Only 40 minutes of debate were allowed.

In addition, as WAINWRIGHT said, women are given a special and unwarranted advantage. They retire only a few months earlier than men, not the 3 years the bill presumes. They live, on the average, 5 years longer than men so that, if anything, men's retirement age should be reduced rather than women's.

The bill passed the House so easily because it is not expected to reach the Senate this session. Congressmen could vote for women without risking a dime. We're glad WAINWRIGHT had the courage to say no.

Real Help for the Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1955, President Eisenhower signed into law the so-called public works appropriation bill. Included in this bill is $906,000 for the city of Atlantic City, $67,000 for Ocean City, and $60,000 for Cape May. This money is now being made available for the work actually done by these three cities in protective work against beach erosion, and will undoubtedly be followed by further appropriations as the work progresses.

It is also encouraging to remember that other seashore cities similarly affected may, by undertaking cooperative studies, eventually share in this same program.

The much larger amount which goes to Atlantic City is, of course, explained by the fact that their project is much the larger, and further by the fact that the entire beach at Atlantic City is publicly owned, which is not so either in Ocean City or Cape May.

The final successful conclusion resulting in these substantial benefits is the

culmination of a 10-year fight on my part to get the Federal Government to recognize its responsibility to our coastal areas as it has so long done in other areas of the country.

The authorization legislation for this purpose was passed last year, and on July 30, 1954, I made a statement to the House in which I said:

We have plowed the long furrow and we seem to be reaching the end of it. This is of the utmost significance to the entire State, because the seashore resorts of our area, entertaining millions from all over the world, are literally a billion-dollar industry in our New Jersey economy.

In my successful efforts to get funds actually appropriated, I testified before my own Committee on Appropriations this year and said in part as follows:

These high ratios are partly because of the values to be protected. The assessed value of real estate in Atlantic City is close to $90 million; in Ocean City it is more than $20 million; and in Cape May in excess of $6 million. The true values will at least double these assessed values. The permanent population of Atlantic City is 65,000, but it is estimated that it entertains 10 million visitors during the course of a year, from every State in the Union.

The protection afforded therefore is not local. Congress has recognized the value of these resort areas to the national health and welfare, and what we are protecting are recreational areas of great national value, and not localities.

One further word in closing. We appropropriate money, and quite properly, for navigation; for the benefit of shipping interests, which in some areas is the lifeblood of the community. We likewise protect farmlands from flooding, because agriculture is the lifeblood of that community. Recreation in New Jersey is a significant part of the lifeblood, not only of our communities, but of the State. Despite the fact that New Jersey is the sixth most important manufacturing State in the Union and a great agricultural State, its resort and recreational industry is its greatest producer of gross revenues, and is valued at well over a billion dollars a year. All of this would be lost without adequate and properly protected beaches.

Mr. Chairman, New Jersey pays a very high share of the total Federal revenues and seldom is found before this committee for any appropriation to it. I am sure that you will agree that this comparatively small amount of Federal aid, recognized by the 79th Congress, duly authorized by the 83d Congress, and now before you with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, is amply justified.

I am very happy to have been instrumental in obtaining such a substantial amount of money for our seashore areas which, in the long run, will help to protect our beaches and will substantially relieve the local tax burden in doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I am appending an editorial appearing recently in the Ocean City Sentinel-Ledger, Ocean City, N. J., and for their kind words, I am very grateful.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESSMAN HAND WINS ANOTHER ROUND

As the gory pugilist was supposed to have said, "It was a tough fight, Mom, but I won." That's about the way it seemed when word came from Congressman T. MILLET HAND late last week that the House Committee on Appropriations has approved funds totaling more than $1 million for South Jersey beach protection work, including $67,000 for Ocean City.

The business of persuading Congressmen that Uncle Sam has some financial responsibilities in keeping the seashore a fit place for millions of bathing vacationists has been in progress for at least 15 years, ever since the ocean began making noticeably serious inroads on bathing beaches here and in neighboring resorts.

Action by the House committee is seen here as the culmination of a long wait for some Federal participation.

The wheels sometimes grind very slowly down in Washington. After what seemed an eternity, the 79th Congress conceded that seashore cities were entitled to some Federal aid, but that was as as it went. Conceding a point and providing money to back it up turned out to be two different things. It wasn't until 1954 that the 83d Congress moved ahead to the point where it prescribed the conditions under which it would grant such aid. Again, without an appropriation.

Now, according to Representative HAND, the money is definitely set up in an omnibus bill coverying a myriad of public works projects, and it is believed to have excellent chance of passage, at least in the House. Which brings up another question of whether the Senate will concur.

At any rate, the outlook for genuine Federal beach erosion assistance is brighter than it ever has been before. And Ocean City owes some words of thanks to a diligent Congressman HAND, who has been fighting for just such recognition for his district a good many years.

H. R. 9 and H. R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee by Hon. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Burger, it seems to me, has expressed a position which may conceivably hold at least, a partial solution to the perplexing problems faced by independent self-employed people in providing a measure of retirement security for themselves while keeping alive the system of business opportunity which characterizes this Nation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, JUNE 28, 1955, SUBJECT: H. R. 9 AND H. R. 10

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

It must be understood by members of the committee that no officer or group of officers is permitted to speak for the federation as to its position on any legislative or economic problems unless so directed by a nationwide poll of our members. The entire membership is polled and the results of these polls give the executive officers the authority to act in behalf of the members.

For the information of the committee, we have in the field approximately 200 or more sales representatives who are in personal daily contact with small business nationwide. Through this we are able to get the factual information from the grassroots.

The membership of the federation, all individual voting members, comprises independent business and professional men. Of course this includes doctors, lawyers, accountants, civil engineers, etc., and all as mentioned above are classed as self-employed. I myself have been self-employed for over a quarter of a century and there is no way that I, like many thousands of others, could build up a reserve for retirement purposes, except through private investment.

I think that the proposals in the bills being considered here today are fair and just, that they present a commonsense approach to the problem, and that if such legislation was approved it might for the time being result in a slight loss of revenue to the Government, but on the other hand, it could produce savings in many ways both to the Nation and to the individual States.

Professional men and self-employed persons having the privilige under the law to postpone paying taxes on a limited amount of money deducted from their taxable income each year and put into a retirement fund, would be subject to the tax when the pension benefit was received.

I agree with the statement of Congressman KEOGH where it is reported in the press that he maintains: "That the losses would be moderate and only temporary, because the money would be taxable when received as pensions."

I do know in my travels throughout the Nation and in discussion of matters of this kind, pension and retirement funds, the self-employed often remark: "Well, if I was working for a corporation for the years I have spent in my own business, I would find myself at the retirement age not alone receiving the benefits through social security, but I would in most cases receive retirement benefits from my employment over the years."

The trend of the times it seems is to make provisions for faithful and conscientious employment, which is typified in some degree through the actions of organized labor insisting on contract arrangements for the people they represent, through a guaranteed annual wage and other provisions.

You will hear the present-day youth, when they go into the commercial world remark, "Why should I open up my own business when I can get a job with some corporation and build up over the years a retirement fund." Surely many of the States and the Nation itself provide for retirement funds after years of service.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am making on the overall legislation are my personal views, but they may be found to be shared by many in the federation membership which would come under the category benefited by the legislation proposed in H. R. 9 and H. R. 10.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the sponsors of this legislation, namely Congressmen JENKINS and KEOGH, are to be complimented on taking a very forward step, and more important, that the action is bipartisan, which should carry tremendous importance with the full Committee on Ways and Means, and the Congress of the United States.

We intend to poll our nationwide membership on these two bills through our official publication, the Mandate, with which Members of Congress are well acquainted, and I would request the privilege of having the results of that poll made a part of the record of the hearings on these bills.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing in personal support of the legislation.

Submarine "Seawolf"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1955, at the yard of the Electric Boat division of General Dynamics Corp., a pioneer in Marine construction was launched, the submarine *Seawolf*, the second nuclear-powered vessel in our Nation's history. I include as extension of my remarks the speeches made on that occasion, and data concerning the *Seawolf* and the christening ceremony:

ADDRESS BY JOHN JAY HOPKINS, CHAIRMAN AND PRESIDENT, GENERAL DYNAMICS CORP.

Mrs. Cole, Secretary Thomas, Commissioner Strauss, Mr. McCune, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are delighted to welcome you to the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., and to the launching of the United States Navy's second nuclear-powered vessel, the submarine *Seawolf*.

It is our pleasure, on this happy occasion, to greet many of you not only as honored guests in your own right, but as honorable representatives of the Government of the United States, and of our friendly allies, the peoples of Canada, Colombia, France, Italy, Peru, and Japan.

It is our privilege to extend greetings of still deeper feeling to those of you who in your capacity of leadership represent here today the United States Navy, the United States Atomic Energy Commission, the General Electric Co., and all those hundreds of other American organizations whose people have poured their minds and hearts and hopes into this great and revolutionary ship.

The atomic *Seawolf*, as you may know, will not be the first submarine to bear that name. It will be the third. I take particular pleasure, therefore, in saluting our very special guests: Capt. Henry M. Jensen, commanding officer of the first *Seawolf*, commissioned 42 years ago; Capt. R. B. Lynch and Rear Adm. Royce L. Gross, two of the commanding officers of the second *Seawolf* during World War II; and Comdr. Richard Laning, the prospective commanding officer of the third, the atomic, *Seawolf*.

Thus, the *Seawolf* of today is bound to her predecessors by invisible filaments of Navy tradition and achievement. But, like her sister ship, the famous atomic-powered *Nautilus*, the first vessel in world history to be propelled by the energy of atoms, she documents anew, not on paper, but in steel, that passionate belief in progress and improvement which is the wellspring of our national strength.

I am confident that vessels of tomorrow, the products of the minds and hands of scientists and engineers and craftsmen yet unborn and powered perhaps by engines utilizing processes of controlled atomic fusion, will have awesome attributes of strength and speed and dimension to dwarf even this historic ship.

Surely the turning propellers that drive the *Seawolf* deep under the sea and far, must bring home again to all the world astounding proof that cosmic forces can be domesticated to man's common needs.

Yet, in the elation of this moment, I recall the memorable phrase of the Spanish philosopher Unamuno that true science teaches us above all "to doubt and to be ignorant."

We must beware then in all science and industry, as in shipbuilding, of terminal thinking—of a happy contentment, whether through apathy or timidity or guile, with limited attainments.

In the struggle against even the possibility of an atomic status quo as insurance against the stultifying influence of terminal thinking and as evidence of our intent to extend the frontiers of scientific knowledge under the sea, in the air, and in space beyond—we will dedicate before the year's end what we believe to be the first privately financed laboratory in the world, devoted primarily to basic nuclear research. In the struggle for a massive technological breakthrough on all nuclear fronts, we have recently enlisted many of the world's great scientific minds among them Dr. Hans Bethe, Dr. Charles Critchfield, Dr. Frederic De Hoffmann, Dr. Joseph Kennedy, Dr. Frederick Seitz, Dr. Edward Teller, and Dr. John Wheeler.

The dedication of nuclear energy to constructive, creative purposes—now shortly to be demonstrated to the world for a second time in the *Seawolf*—must benefit all men, everywhere, on every continent, and in every economic and moral clime.

Indeed, the power embodied here—so sinister to felons, so happily ominous to friends—serves doubly in the interest of humanity. For the *Seawolf* epitomizes the dual destiny of the atom: To deter all men and all nations from the folly of atomic destruction, and to unite all men and all nations in the wisdom of atomic creation.

To me, the *Seawolf* is "atoms for peace."

HARNESSING A DREAM

(By Francis K. McCune, vice president and general manager, atomic products division, General Electric Co.)

The atomic age began on July 16, 1945, at 5:30 a. m., mountain war time. There, on a stretch of desert about 50 miles from Alamogordo, N. Mex., the energy locked within the atom was released in a burst of flame such as the world had never seen.

We have come a long way since then. Here, at Groton, Conn., only 10 short years after that history-making event, we are witnessing a practical, useful, and highly significant application of that awesome energy.

Today, we launch the second of two great undersea boats to be driven by the energy of the atom. This is phase two in the Navy's well-planned and far-sighted nuclear submarine program * * * and a real victory in the development of the atomic Navy of the future.

Atomic submarines, I am told, are the answer to a submariner's prayer. For—because of their nuclear engines—they can travel faster and farther under water than any other type of submarine in operation today, anywhere in the world.

The reactor going into the *Seawolf* operates on an entirely different concept from its predecessor. It is a second step in the rapid development and improvement of nuclear engines for naval propulsion. The next reactor—on which we are already working—will be superior to this one. This is progress.

To General Electric, the *Seawolf* signifies another in a long list of contributions to the science of ship propulsion. Almost 45 years ago, W. L. R. Emmet, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy who later joined General Electric, produced the Navy's first turbine-electric drive for the collier *Jupiter*. This was so successful that 5 years later the same principle was applied in a capital ship, the *New Mexico*—a ship that, in its day, was as modern in concept as our *Seawolf* is today. It is interesting to note that the *Jupiter*—with its same turbine-electric drive—later became the *Langley*, the Navy's first aircraft carrier.

Moving rapidly across the years, between 1933 and 1937, major technological contributions were made in the field of naval propulsion—advances that Charles Edison, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, characterized as the greatest single contribution in a generation.

I would like to emphasize one thing at this point. Our long association with the Navy bears out the importance of teamwork in the creation and application of new ideas. No one organization can do the whole job. Rather, progress depends upon a cooperative effort with all elements aiming at a common objective or goal. And, certainly the *Seawolf* is no exception. Together, working with one aim in mind, a team—consisting of the Navy, the AEC, General Dynamics, and General Electric—produced this strikingly advanced nuclear submarine.

God willing, we will never have to measure the impact of military atomic propulsion in action. But one thing is certain: The mighty atomic Navy of the future will be the bulwark of our defense * * * a sturdy pillar of our freedom.

And to those who have worked so hard and so long to make this atomic dream a reality, and believed when others refused to believe, this is a dramatic victory: The beginning of significant practical application of the energy of the atom. But let me hastily add that, as these men well know, the most startling thing in the atomic field has been the tremendous speed with which the dream of yesterday becomes the commonplace fact of today * * * and the ancient history of tomorrow.

Already, these men, the many hands who have made the *Seawolf* possible, are turning their efforts to even greater accomplishments, aware, now, that it is possible to create progress. For, they have done it.

REMARKS BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

It is a privilege to be here today on this history-making occasion.

The launching of the *Seawolf* marks another important achievement in the development of atomic power. It signifies—as did her proud predecessor, the *Nautilus*—the leadership and determination of American democracy and free enterprise to advance the day when atomic power will greatly enrich our lives and the lives of peoples everywhere.

Work on the powerplants for the *Seawolf* and *Nautilus* was started at about the same time as parallel and competitive efforts, using reactor designs of marked difference. The *Nautilus* uses a reactor operation with low velocity neutrons, and the heat is removed by water under high pressure. On the other hand, the *Seawolf* reactor operates with neutrons of higher velocities, and liquid metal is the medium of heat transfer.

In the beginning no one could be certain of the success of either attempt, since atomic power was then still unproven; it was a great and very bold adventure.

I need not tell you how handsomely the *Nautilus* performed at sea under all conditions.

Today, I am happy to be able to announce that the land-based prototype of the atomic powerplant which will be used in this great new submarine also has operated most impressively.

Beginning on June 6, that prototype, located at West Milton, N. Y., operated, at full power, long enough to have propelled the *Seawolf* on a 2,250-mile, nonstop trip, fully submerged. That represents the equivalent of an underwater voyage from St. Johns, Newfoundland, to Dover, England. This, I am told, compares to 4 hours at full power as the qualifying time for new, diesel-powered submarines.

This prototype of the *Seawolf* powerplant has achieved further renown. On Monday

of this week at West Milton, I had the privilege of throwing the switch which sent thousands of kilowatts of power surging into transmission lines to serve homes, farms, and industries of upper New York State.

Who can fail to be enthused at these accomplishments and the visions they unfold for the future?

In a little more than 5 years, we have established the success of two different types of atomic energy reactors as propulsion systems for submarines, and this achievement was due neither to accident nor good luck. It is the result of hard work on the part of many skilled, devoted, and courageous people.

Outstanding among those entitled to take deep personal pride in todays event is my friend and colleague, Adm. H. G. Rickover.

The Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp. and the General Electric Co. merit particular commendation and we in the Commission are continuously grateful for the splendid cooperation we have received in this, as well as many other enterprises, from our great Navy, and especially its distinguished Secretary, the Honorable Charles S. Thomas.

We build submarines and other weapons of defense because we have no other prudent alternative. Our security and our freedom depend upon them.

Nevertheless, such military weapons as the *Nautilus* and the *Seawolf* return to us very large, nonmilitary dividends — dividends which may in fact exceed the cost.

For the atomic powerplant so developed provides us with valuable new knowledge with which to advance the peaceful applications of atomic energy, especially in the field of power.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the men who have developed the *Seawolf* do not regard her only as a weapon. She is one of the significant milestones on the way to a great goal—the goal of progress, plenty, and of lasting peace.

INVOCATION, LT. COMDR. PAUL F. BRADLEY, (CHC.), UNITED STATES NAVY

Almighty God, it would be a foolish thing for us to be other than simple and brief in the epochal circumstances under which we are here assembled. We wish simply to ask Thy blessing on forces which we do not yet fully comprehend. It is an hour for prayer not rhetoric, for humility not hauteur.

We have seen the power of Thy creation in our own days, O God. We have felt the earth shrug and have seen whole cities shudder and slip into rubble. We have seen lightning leap from angry skies to incinerate man and his works. We have seen bacteria, so minute as to challenge the most discerning lens, snowball into pain and plague and death. We have heard the volcano rumble and seen it spew out destruction. We have seen the forces of nature caught in test tubes and have seen her metals hammered into blades and barrels and bombs in man's own plan and pattern of pain.

Today, O God, we ask you to look down on us with patience and compassion. This craft—this *Seawolf*, this capsule contrived of steel and secret structure, holds within its bulkheads the most awful culmination that man has yet derived from the potentials that your creative hand pressed into the bins and closets of nature.

We are awed and chastened, O God—but we are not frightened, for is it not true that none of Thy handiworks is as great as Thee? We are not frightened so long as we dedicate this craft and the fearful forces that propel it to Thy glory, to the protections of man's rights—to peace for all men.

And so again with the simplicity that this occasion elicits, we acknowledge that all Thy gifts are good—and only by man's will, can be bent to man's sorrow. Even the water and the air and earth and fire can be distorted and disastrous. * * * The nightshade and the lovely poppy can bless or blight, the mind can love or hate.

Therefore, reverently we ask Thee, O God, of both the atom's laws and man's reason, to bless and guide them to life more abundant. * * * To peace—because the awful alternative is the end of all life. Amen.

A REPORT OF NAVAL PROGRESS IN NUCLEAR PROPULSION

(Address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy)

Mrs. Cole, President Hopkins, Governor Ribicoff, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, only 10 years have passed since the power of the atom was first unlocked. Today, you are witnessing the launching of the second known nuclear propulsion plant in the entire world.

This launching follows by only 6 months the commissioning of the first nuclear-powered ship, the *Nautilus*. Few people can appreciate the magnitude of these twin miracles of design and production. History can ciate no similar achievement in so short a period of time as the development and construction of the submarines *Seawolf* and the *Nautilus*.

The launching of this ship has not been a naval enterprise alone. It had been a combined Atomic Energy Commission and Navy enterprise, encouraged by the enthusiasm and approval of the Joint Congressional Committee for Atomic Energy. The Atomic Energy Commissioners, under the outstanding inspirational leadership of Chairman Strauss, are to be commended for their unstinting support of this and other naval projects. Tribute is also due to the Navy's Bureau of Ships and particularly to Admiral Rickover of that Bureau whose vision, tenacity, and zeal contributed so much to this accomplishment. And great credit must go to the General Electric Co. who constructed the nuclear plant, as well as to the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., who built the *Seawolf*.

If, 10 years ago, one would have predicted that the end of the next decade would see operating nuclear power plants, he would have been thought unrealistic, to say the least. Great progress has been made in an incredibly short time. In spite of the fact that nuclear propulsion is only in its infancy. Americans can take pride that three nuclear powerplants are operational in the United States today. And of course, we are extremely proud that all three of these are for naval use.

As we look at the *Seawolf*, let us briefly examine the present status of the Navy's nuclear propulsion program. As you know, the *Nautilus* if now operating and its performance has exceeded our expectations. Today, the *Seawolf* is launched. In addition, Congress authorized the building last year of two additional nuclear submarines.

The production of nuclear-powered vessels by the Navy has come of age. This year, Congress has approved the Navy's plans to build four more nuclear powered submarines. This means that this fiscal year the Navy will have eight nuclear-powered submarines in being or under construction and, in rapid succession thereafter, many others. Of course, our future plans include nuclear-powered vessels of other types. Development of nuclear propulsion for larger naval vessels is well advanced, and the Atomic Energy Commission will soon start construction of a land-based prototype at its National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho.

To insure the earliest and maximum exploitation of nuclear power for surface ships and naval aircraft, I have recently appointed with Admiral Strauss' concurrence, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, Mr. James H. Smith, Jr., and Rear Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, the incoming Chief of Naval Operations, to work with the Atomic Energy Commission in the accelerated adoption of nuclear power.

To show you the Navy's avid interest in nuclear propulsion, the Navy has seven different nuclear reactor projects. The nuclear plants of the *Nautilus* and the *Seawolf* were purposely made competitive, partly to determine which is the better power plant and partly to exploit the rapidly advancing technology of nuclear propulsion. The objective of these seven projects is to develop a family of reactors which will be applicable not only to submarines but to surface ships. They will lead to savings in costs, refinements in construction, saving in the expenditures of fissionable material, and incidentally, the faster realization of nuclear power for American farms, homes and factories.

The Navy is also giving special attention to the nuclear propulsion of naval aircraft. This field has unique application to the Navy's mission. In particular, careful attention is being given to nuclear powered seaplanes. Promise in this field is great indeed. Much of the way in this field has been paved by the efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission and the United States Air Force. Their years of research and effort had made possible the Navy's effort in recent months to increase its contribution to the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. Our naval program is being fully coordinated with the Air Force and is designed to complement that effort.

To keep pace with this accelerated progrom of nuclear propulsion, both construction and research, increasing emphasis has been given to broadening and expanding the educational and experience levels of the Navy's personnel, naval and civilian. A letter of instruction emphasizing and profound impact of nuclear power on the Navy and the need to attract and train our best officers and men to participate in this accelerated program was sent by me to every ship and station in the fleet in April. A stepped-up program of training selected officers in nuclear engineering was comenced last year. The training of production and maintenance personnel in naval and private shipyards has also been accelerated. The point has been reached where it is desirable to further expand the base for constructing nuclear powered ships. This has been done and this year two naval shipyards will build nuclear powered submarines for the first time.

Thus, the *Seawolf* is symbolic of the accelerating importance of nuclear power in the American Navy. We have crossed the threshold of a period of change which promises to alter the fact of the Navy even more than did the changes of sail to steam and of wood to steel combined. Submarines with nuclear power are a new and modern weapon. They have a submerged endurance and versatility heretofore unknown. In addition to the traditional role of destroying enemy ships, the nuclear powered submarine may lay mines, may furnish early warning of threats to our homeland or to ships of our task forces, and may track and kill the enemy's submarines. Nuclear submarines may be used for the supply and replenishment of the new jet seaplanes, perhaps nuclear powered ones, that I mentioned. Even more imortant, the nuclear submarine has a very promising role as a component of a missile launching system. Equipped with missiles, the submarine can silently emerge from the depths of the ocean and send missiles of great destruction great distances with deadly accuracy as the newest weapons system in our retaliatory arsenal.

The Navy is very proud of its pioneering in the nuclear propulsion field. We are glad

that a requirement for a naval ship such as the *Seawolf* motivated the generation of a new body of technical knowledge which will have extensive peaceful applications.

The President's farsighted program to demonstrate what the peaceful use of atomic energy can do in the benefit of mankind is an inspiration to all of us. The Navy is proud that its contribution goes beyond military purposes and aids in the achievement of our national goal of peace. What has already been learned and what will be learned from the operation of the *Nautilus'* and *Seawolf's* powerplants has already been most helpful for atomic power in American industry and commerce. The successful development of nuclear propulsion systems for naval ships has solved numerous problems which industry and commerce can adopt: new metals, new controls, new materials, new safety devices, new processes, new pumps and new instruments.

These facts, I think, indicate that the Navy has been pressing forward in the field of atomic energy in a bold and aggressive manner. We shall continue to push ahead as rapidly as is consistent with industry's ability to support our program, as the availability of trained manpower, building facilities, and technical know-how grows, and with prudent concern for the taxpayer's funds and the rapidly developing state of nuclear science.

This launching is also symbolic of the new American Navy of which the *Seawolf* is a small but important segment. Throughout our fleets, accent is being given to the rapid adoption of nuclear propulsion to submarines, surface ships, and aircraft. Fresh emphasis is being given to the concept of using ships as mobile bases—moving airbases, missile launching bases—bases upon which our national power can be projected wherever necessary. Jet seaplanes are being developed that can range the oceans of the world. Guided missle ships are replacing conventional ships, and missiles are replacing guns themselves. A stable of atomic weapons, air to air, air to ground, and surface to surface, is being fully assimilated.

It is, I can assure you, a new Navy which the *Seawolf* joins.

"SEAWOLF" LAUNCHING HIGHLIGHTS

Mrs. W. Sterling Cole, who will christen the new atomic submarine *Seawolf* today, July 21, will be making her second appearance on the sponsor's platform at Electric Boat. On August 8, 1943, she launched the submarine U. S. S. *Bluegill*. That submarine was commanded by her brother-in-law, Lt. Comdr. Eric L. Barr, Jr., United States Navy. Now a retired captain, Barr is security director at the Electric Boat division.

Mrs. Cole has two sons serving in the Navy. Lt. (jg) W. S. Cole, Jr., United States Navy, is attached to the New London-based submarine U. S. S. *Sea Robin*. Ens. Thomas Cole is a gunnery officer serving in the heavy cruiser U. S. S. *Newport News*. Mrs. Cole's third son, David, a recent high school graduate, will begin an agricultural career at Cornell University in the fall.

Mrs. Cole's husband, Representative W. STERLING COLE, Republican, New York, is a member of the Joint Congressional committee on Atomic Energy and a former committee chairman. He played an important part in the development of the Navy's atomic submarine program. He will ride the *Seawolf* down the ways.

The U. S. S. *Seawolf* SS197, for which the Navy's newest atomic submarine is named, was one of the first American submarines to seek out the enemy in World War II. Its record of 18 vessels sunk for a total of 71,609 tons during 15 patrols was one of the best established by a United States submarine. She won two Navy unit citations.

Two former shipmates on the World War II *Seawolf*, Royce L. Gross and Lucien T. Rajotte, have been working on the new *Seawolf* since its keel was laid. Gross is inspection manager at Electric Boat and Rajotte is a first class pipefitter.

The new *Seawolf*, is the third submarine in the United States Navy to be named *Seawolf*. The first *Seawolf* was authorized on March 3, 1909, but her name was changed to the *H–1* before she was commissioned on December 1, 1913. The second *Seawolf*, SS197, was commissioned on December 1, 1939.

The *Seawolf* will be able to steam submerged at speeds in excess of 20 knots. Because it is powered with a nuclear reactor, independent of the earth's atmosphere, the *Seawolf* will be able to cruise underwater almost indefinitely.

The crew of the *Seawolf* will number approximately 100 officers and men.

The cost of the *Seawolf*, SSN575, is estimated at $32,700,000 exclusive of the Atomic Energy Commission's construction costs for the nuclear powerplant.

The powerplant of the *Seawolf* will be of a different design from that of the *Nautilus*. The *Nautilus'* powerplant, called the submarine thermal reactor, is cooled by high pressure water. Another type reactor, labeled the submarine intermediate reactor, will be installed in the *Seawolf*. It is cooled by liquid sodium and is being built for the Atomic Energy Commission by the General Electric Co.

Habitability is a key word in the *Seawolf*. New color schemes in the living and working spaces have been designed to increase efficiency and morale. Operating machinery and instruments have been "human engineered" to reduce fatigue and extend the period of top efficiency for crew members.

A reunion of old shipmates who served in *Seawolf* during World War II was held July 20 at the Mohican Hotel in New London. More than 50 men were to be on hand for the get-together. Among those planning to attend were old "seawolves" from Aztec, N. Mex.; Durango, Colo.; and one from Mount Vernon, Ind., who arrived on motorcycle.

Mrs. Nancy Brindupke Cole, matron of honor at the *Seawolf* launching today, is steeped in submarine tradition. Her late father, Comdr. C. F. Brindupke, United States Navy, was in command of the submarine *Tullibee* when it was lost in the Pacific in 1944. Her stepfather, Capt. John Davidson, United States Navy, had command of two submarines in world war II, the *Mackerel* and the *Blackfish*. Her husband, Lt. (jg.) W. S. Cole, United States Navy, is now serving in the submarine *Sea Robin*.

The *Seawolf* is the 229th submarine built by Electric Boat for the United States Navy. Electric Boat is the only civilian builder of submarines in the United States.

If all the blueprints used in the construction of the *Seawolf* were laid end to end they would make a path 30 inches wide from Groton to Washington, D. C. They would cover an area of more than 100 acres.

On the building ways adjacent to the *Seawolf* is the partially completed *Darter*, a conventional diesel-powered submarine of the *Tang* attack class.

Comdr. Richard B. Laning, United States Navy, the prospective commanding officer of the new *Seawolf*, comes from a Navy family. His father is Rear Adm. Richard H. Laning, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; he has 2 brothers, Robert and George, who are naval officers, and 1 brother, Edward, who is a Marine flier. Commander Laning's sister, who served in the WAVES in World War II, is married to a submarine officer in the Reserves.

Capt. Robert L. Moore, Jr., United States Navy, supervisor of shipbuilding and naval inspector of ordnance at Groton, has the immediate Navy responsibility for the construction of the *Seawolf*. Captain Moore is well qualified for his position. He took a course in advanced nuclear engineering at MIT and served in the Bureau of Ships as head of the engineering and research group of the nuclear power division, assisting in the design and development of nuclear propulsion plants for naval vessels. He is also a qualified submariner.

Electric Boat, shipbuilders, installed 205,920 feet of electrical cable in the *Seawolf*, or enough cable to reach from bow to stern almost 700 times. There are also 89,760 feet of piping and tubing in the Navy's newest nuclear submarine.

The agency of the Navy which is responsible for the design and construction of the *Seawolf*, is the Bureau of Ships. It is the duty of BuShips to develop, design, and construct or have constructed all Navy ships.

The keel of the *Seawolf* SSN575 was laid on September 15, 1953 by Robert B. Anderson, then Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Anderson's initials are welded on the keel plate and are a permanent part of the *Seawolf*. Mr. Anderson, now Deputy Secretary of Defense, will attend the launching.

After the *Seawolf* has slipped down the launching ways into the Thames River, she will be towed to an Electric Boat wet dock where work on the nuclear-powered vessel will continue.

The sponsor of the *Seawolf* of World War II fame, Mrs. Edward C. Kalbfus, is one of the distinguished guests at the launching. Mrs. Kalbfus, widow of the late Rear Adm. Edward C. Kalbfus, United States Navy, retired, christened the *Seawolf* SS197 at Portsmouth, N. H., on August 15, 1939.

As the *Seawolf* experiences her first dip in the Thames River, United States Navy planes from the naval air station at Quonset Point, R. I., will fly over in salute to the Navy's newest atomic-powered submarine.

Three former *Seawolf* captains will witness the christening of the new *Seawolf*. On hand for the launching are Capt. Henry Martin Jensen, United States Navy, retired, first commanding officer of the first *Seawolf*, Rear Adm. Royce L. Gross, United States Navy, retired, and Capt. R. B. Lynch, United States Navy, both of whom commanded the second *Seawolf* on patrols in World War II.

Until launched, the *Seawolf* will be held on the ways by a steel trigger sticking up from underneath. At a signal from the sponsor's party, a lever is tripped and the trigger is turned down so that the ship and its supporting cradle is free to slide. Should she stick, hydraulic rams mounted at the head of the ways will give her a shove to start her moving.

FACT SHEET ON COMMANDER RICHARD B. LANING, UNITED STATES NAVY, PROSPECTIVE COMMANDING OFFICER OF "SEAWOLF" (SSN575)

Commander Laning has served on 5 submarines and 2 aircraft carriers since graduating from the United States Naval Academy in the class of 1940. He is the son of Rear Adm. and Mrs. Richard Henry Laning, Medical Corps, United States Navy (retired), of Amherst, Va.

He has two brothers, Robert and George, who are naval officers, and a third brother, Eward, who is a Marine flyer. He also has a sister who served in the WAVE's during World War II.

Prior to attending the submarine school at New London, Conn., Commander Laning served on board the carriers *Yorktown* and *Hornet*. He was then assigned to the submarine, U. S. S. *Salmon* which was badly damaged in action. The entire *Salmon* crew was then transferred to another submarine, the U. S. S. *Stickleback*.

Since World War II he has commanded three submarines, the U. S. S. *Pilotfish*, U. S. S. *Trutta*, and the U. S. S. *Harder*.

The *Seawolf* is the second electric boat-built submarine which Commander Laning has commissioned. The *Harder*, a Tang-class boat, was commissioned in August 1952 with Laning as the skipper.

The prospective *Seawolf* commanding officer has had considerable schooling in preparation for his new command. He took a postgraduate course at the Naval Academy in 1947 and spent 2 years at the University of California at Berkeley where he was awarded a master of science degree in biophysics.

In addition he has taken specialized training in nuclear physics at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Albuquerque, N. Mex. In 1954 he reported to the Schenectary, N. Y., area office of the Atomic Energy Commission where the *Seawolf* reactor is being built by General Electric Co.

Commander Laning was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with combat "V" and the Silver Star Medal. In addition he wears the Presidential Unit Citation ribbon and the Navy Commendation ribbon.

He is married to the formed Ruth Richmond and they have 2 daughters, Christine, age 9; and Lucille, age 5.

ELECTRIC BOAT BACKGROUND

Electric Boat is 1 of 5 divisions of General Dynamics Corp. Other divisions include Convair, Stromberg-Carlson, Electro-Dynamics, and General Atomic. Canadair, Ltd., General Dynamics subsidiary, is located in Montreal, Canada.

In addition to submarines, General Dynamics is a leading producer of military and commercial aircraft, guided missiles, telephone and electronics equipment, and specialized types of electric motors.

For more than a half century, Electric Boat has been building submersibles. Today's launching of the *Seawolf* makes 229 submarines which Electric Boat has built for the United States. Another 100 have been built for allied nations.

Work at the division now includes completion of the *Seawolf* and construction on the conventional-powered submarine *Darter* on the south yard building ways. Electric Boat has been designated by the Navy for construction of a third nuclear-powered submarine as yet unnamed.

Principal General Dynamics officials at the Electric Boat division are:

Carleton Shugg, a General Dynamics' vice president and general manager of Electric Boat; joined Electric Boat in 1951 after holding top executive positions with the Atomic Energy Commission and the shipbuilding industry.

Rear Adm. Andrew I. McKee, United States Navy, retired, a corporation vice president and director of research and design at Electric Boat. Extensive submarine construction experience in Navy and regarded as leading submarine designer.

VITAL STATISTICS ON THE SUBMARINE "SEAWOLF" (SSN575)

Builder: Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp.
Length: About 330 feet.
Breadth (at widest point): About 27 feet.
Keel laid: September 15, 1953, by Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense.
Christening: July 21, 1955, by Mrs. W. Sterling Cole.
Delivery: 1956.
Number of crew: About 100.
Speed: Over 20 knots.
Displacement (surface): About 3,000 tons.
Main propulsion: Reactor-fired steam turbine (sodium cooled reactor).
Auxiliary propulsion: Storage battery and diesel electric drive.
Miles of electric cable: 39.
Miles of pipe and tubing: 17.
Miles of blueprint issued: 400.
Number of drawings made: 2,200.
Number of propellers: 2.
Number of items included in ship: More than 1 million.
Daily capacity of water distilling plant: 5,000 gallons.
Cost (exclusive of reactor): $32,700,000.

Respecting the Wishes of Professional People in Social-Security Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I realize how anxious most Members are to complete our labors and adjourn this session of the Congress. Veteran observers, with significantly few exceptions, have noted in terms of highest praise the volume of important and constructive legislation thus far enacted. If we can complete those matters remaining unattended and adjourn at an early date, it will add further credit to this session's record of businesslike accomplishment.

Surely there is one obligation, however, which must transcend our quite natural desire to create a new record in legislative volume performance, and that is the obligation to accord thorough deliberation to each measure which arises and to protect the processes which assure to the membership the opportunity to work its will.

It seems to me that there is a very grave danger involved when we become too much in a hurry. An excellent case in point was the motion last Monday which brought before the membership a compendium of social-security revisions hermetically sealed in a single package, limited discussion to 40 minutes, and denied Members the privilege of a separate vote on any of the varied issues at stake.

This closed rule placed many Members in an extremely embarrassing position. It forced some even to break promises where they had indicated approval for certain of the revisions embodied in that single motion and opposition to others. Other Members were confronted with the uncomfortable choice of either breaking a promise or violating a conviction.

Certain features of the bill seemed unanimously agreed to be necessary and desirable, such as that strengthening the actuarial soundness of the program, and that permitting women to retire at the age of 62.

Other provisions, such as that extending compulsory coverage under the program to the members of 7 professions, seemed highly questionable and at the very least worthy of more extended discussion.

In matters of this kind, involving such groups of self-employed professional men and the Government's role if any in the planning of their future security, it seems to me highly proper that the desires of the people directly affected by such legislation should be an overriding consideration.

Not believing myself sufficiently wise to act in their behalf without knowing their feelings in the matter, I conducted a poll by mail of the members of these professions in my district. In all, some 400 responded.

The results of this poll intensified my delemma in trying to cast an intelligent vote with all the provisions wrapped inseparably together under this "closed rule."

My poll indicated, for instance, that a majority of the lawyers in my district want such coverage, while clearly tending to show that most dentists do not.

It seems to me that an effort should be made to respect the desires of such people when considering an extension which affects none but themselves. Surely this would be preferable to compelling them against their will.

It is encouraging to note that open hearings have been scheduled in the Senate, and it is hoped that separate votes on these varied matters may be permitted in that body.

Why could we not consider a plan of voluntary, rather than compulsory, coverage for those self-employed professional groups whose members desire it?

It has been argued that too many would wait until retirement time nears, then qualify for benefits by participating for only a short period, thus increasing the costs of administering the program.

Yet it seems to me that this particular possibility could be rather easily overcome by some permissive program setting a deadline for beginning participation—say at the age of 35—with those already beyond that age to have 18 months from the effective date of the law in which to decide.

The Members of the House of Representatives have successfully maintained a voluntary retirement system by setting a deadline for declaring oneself in or out. With sufficient imagination and thorough study, it seems not at all impossible that such a permissive plan could be devised for other professional groups of our citizenry.

I do not say that this is the answer. Yet it may possibly provide a means of accomplishing the objective within the framework of individual choice without involving the distasteful means of compulsion. I hope the Senate will carefully consult the wishes of the people directly concerned and will look fully into this possibility.

Direct Loans Under Servicemen's Readjustment Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to add my wholehearted support to this proposed legislation. I trust every Member of this House will likewise give it his enthusiastic approval.

The Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a free press has become one of the strongest foundations of our democratic form of government, and one without which our system could not survive. The first amendment of the Constitution says, "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." The fight to maintain and protect that freedom has been continuous since our first days as a Republic.

It is natural enough for any person or group of persons to believe that his opinions are right, and others' are wrong. But one of the main responsibilities of Congress, and of the courts, is to protect the right of the press to express its editorial opinions free from intimidation by any individual, organization or governmental power. However much we may disagree at times with the press, it is our duty to safeguard that freedom accorded it by the Constitution. We must keep a most watchful eye on any commission or bureau of the Government which may attempt to control the dissemination of news.

Of course the governmental agency which most obviously touches on the communications media of our Nation is the Federal Communications Commission. The advent of radio and television broadcasting, and the regulation entrusted by Congress to the FCC, have resulted in ever-increasing contacts between the press and the Government. Every caution that these contacts do not result in intimidation or quasi-censorship must be exercised.

The FCC must act as arbitrator in determining which parties should be given television permits; and this authority increases the duty of the FCC to tread carefully in consideration of our freedoms. A recent examiner's report on an application for a television franchise spent a considerable portion of the report criticizing the editorial policy of a certain newspaper, the principal owner of which was also the principal stockholder in one of the companies which sought the TV permit. No one would deny that the FCC has the right to consider the possible effects of a communications monopoly which might be created by granting a TV permit to the owners of radio or newspaper interests.

However, the Commission must not attempt to evaluate the content of an applicant's newspaper editorials. And certainly such considerations should play no part in deciding which applicant gets the TV permit. Such a precedent could lead to terrible abuses, such as closing the airwaves to applicants who have shown an editorial policy contrary to the political opinion of the FCC. It might go beyond considerations of party, and act against applicants who expressed certain views on public power or tariff legislation or on any economic, social, or political opinion. Such a precedent could well be the beginning of a governmental step toward thought control. We must ever be on guard against the infringement of free expression of opinions in our Republic.

There is no evidence that the Commission has adopted the philosophy indicated in this examiner's report. There is now pending in Congress a bill stating that "In no event, however, shall the Commission in any proceeding give any significance to the editorial policy of a newspaper." The legislative action on the subject seems warranted, and I believe the bills now pending which deal with this subject deserve consideration by this Congress.

Time Magazine Shows What Water Can Do in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent article in the current issue of Time magazine, in which the impact of water on our arid West is dramatically disclosed. This article and its beautiful photographs by the famed photographer, Joern Gerdts, show full well that water can make the desert blossom as the rose. It shows that what the Nation can derive from its reclamation projects far exceeds the investment. This situation is true in the proposed Colorado River storage project. It is a wise investment for the Nation, not only because of what it will do for the West but because it repays its entire costs.

Mr. W. A. Dexheimer, a distinguished engineer and now Commissioner of Reclamation, acknowledged this fine article in a letter to Time magazine. Mr. Dexheimer makes some excellent points in his letter. As an extension of my remarks, I wish to introduce this letter into the RECORD:

EDITOR, TIME MAGAZINE,
Time and Life Building,
New York, N. Y.

SIR: Congratulations on your excellent spread of pictures and story on the Pacific Southwest, entitled "The American Desert, 1955."

Never was a truer word written than your assertion that "Water has always been the limiting factor to the desert's growth." The author could have well added that, but for men of daring and vision, the water supply which has made the growth of this area possible would still be flowing unused down the Colorado River.

When Federal Western reclamation was authorized in 1902, some critics labeled it unnecessary, impractical, and visionary. The Salt River and Yuma irrigation projects, the keystone to Arizona's prosperity, were constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1906–1907. The Salt River water users will make final payment to the Federal Government on those early works in November 1955, and the Yuma water users are also virtually paid up.

I heard the same cries of "visionary" and "impractical" when I was on the Bureau of Reclamation survey party which fixed the location of Hoover Dam in 1929. The growth and prosperity of the Imperial, Yuma, and Coachella Valleys and metropolitan southern California, would not have been possible without this dam (completed in 1936) and other river control structures, low-cost hydroelectric power and irrigation canals built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Now, history is repeating itself. The need for water in all of the arid West and elsewhere in the Nation grows more critical. The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to alleviate some of those shortages. We are again being indiscriminately criticized with the same old adjectives—unnecessary and visionary.

I hope this country can learn from experience the lessons your article so clearly demontrates. Water is the key to prosperity.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

Rural Electrification Administration Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Listen to Mr. Nelsen," referring to Anchor Nelsen, Director of the REA. The editorial was published in the Denver Post on July 17.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTEN TO MR. NELSEN

Ancher Nelsen, Chief of the REA under the Eisenhower administration, wasted no time in condemning the Hoover Commission Report on Lending Agencies (which include the REA). Mr. Nelsen said simply that the Commission's plan, if put into effect, would raise interest rates on Federal funds advanced for rural electric and telephone systems to prohibitive levels. And he is opposed to that.

Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, has pointed out that the Chairman of the Commission's task force which reviewed REA lending policies was Paul Grady, a partner in Price, Waterhouse & Co. Mr. Ellis observed that that is the firm which audits the

National Association of Electric Companies, which is the lobbying organization of the private utilities.

But Price, Waterhouse & Co. also audited the Bonneville Administration when Paul J. Raver was its head, and upon the insistance of Dr. Raver.

The point is that the basic thinking behind a policy of imposing crippling or restrictive interest rates for REA's is more important than who propounds it. Once again, as in the case of the Dixon-Yates deal for the TVA, the issue is what is good public policy and what is not.

The principle of lending Federal funds, at minimum rates of interest, to spread the benefits of electrification and telephone service in areas that could not be feasibly served by investor companies is a sound and proven one. Problems of competition for new loads and added business, in areas where private companies and cooperatives overlap, are multiplying. But there is still great, legitimate demand for REA loans—to heavy-up existing lines and to expand generating and transmission system. And there is no reason why that program should be handicapped or terminated by the imposition of unnecessarily high interest rates.

The Congress would do well to listen to Mr. Nelsen. He is winning the confidence and respect of REA by forthright action on a course midway between the extremes of private and public power. Mr. Nelsen knows better than members of the Hoover Commission task force or the Commission itself the intensity of loyalty that most REA members feel to their co-ops. Devotion to the REA is not a party matter.

Washington Police Boys' Clubs

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, no issue presently before the people of the United States is more explosive or more fraught with danger, not only to our social system, our customs, our mores, our institutions, and also to the very form of government which we enjoy than the racial issue which has been made a political football for the last decade or longer. This issue portends to destroy our very system of government as well as our social institutions.

Already the political implications involved in the racial issue have caused members of the judicial branch of our Government to set aside their judicial consciences, to disregard their oaths to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States of America, and to invade the legislative field by usurping the prerogatives which, under our Constitution, belong exclusively to the legislative branch.

It is a very serious thing when we permit an emotional issue to become involved in politics; and when for the sake of political expediency we permit our institutions to be destroyed. It is a sad commentary on our present political system when a court, sworn to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, can become the vehicle by which that Constitution can eventually be destroyed.

Under the guise of seeking to help minority groups, who allegedly have been made second-class citizens by our present social system, many, many fine institutions in this country are being destroyed.

Those who profess to be tolerant are, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] said the other day, perhaps the most intolerant people in our country. While they would like us to be tolerant of the other fellow's racial background, at the same time they are very intolerant in seeking to force laws upon us which are directly in conflict with our best interests and which would result in great damage to our people.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] on Tuesday of this week made a very pertinent speech to the House in which he pointed out a specific example whereby racial politics carried on by our intolerant-"tolerating" friends, was about to destroy one of the finest institutions that has ever come to this Nation's Capital. I refer, of course, to the Police Boys' Club of the District of Columbia.

The police boys' clubs have been a prime deterrent to crime and juvenile delinquency over the years. I think it is significant to note that last year, 1954, when the membership in the boys' clubs reached its peak of 22,000 members—14,000 colored and 8,000 white—juvenile crime was at its lowest in many years.

To give you the figures, in 1949 a total of 2,856 felonies were committed by juveniles in the District of Columbia. By 1953 that had fallen off to 2,166, and last year it was 2,015. The dropping off of this juvenile crime rate has been more or less in proportion to the increase in membership in these Washington Police Boys' Clubs.

Judging from my conversations with people in the District who know what they are talking about, these police boys' clubs have been the finest deterrent to juvenile delinquency of any institution in Washington with the possible exception of the churches. Today, as a result of orders from the executive department and as a result of these newfangled social theories which seem to have swept the political leaders of the District of Columbia, orders have been issued to deny the use of public facilities in the District to boys' clubs which operate on a segregated basis.

The result has been that three of the Washington Police Boys' Clubs have been closed and their facilities denied to members of either race.

When we let our passions and our emotions proceed beyond the point of practicality, to the point where we actually injure the chances for a law-abiding and productive future for our young men, whether they be white or colored, I think we have reached a pretty sad state.

I do not exempt the President of the United States from criticism when I say that from the White House over to the Supreme Court and right on down into the Halls of Congress to the Commissioners' offices in the District of Columbia cheap, petty politics have been played with this issue, with little or no regard for the consequences. It is jeopardizing the future of the youth of the District of Columbia as a result, so much that I understand the Police Department of the District is considering the possibility of withdrawing its sponsorship of the Washington Police Boys' Club.

The reason for that is very simple. It is, of course, to be found in the fact that the Washington Boys' Clubs are supported by the contributions of the white citizens of the District of Columbia. Over 95 percent of the contributions made to the operations of the boys' clubs in the District of Columbia are made by the white citizens of the District of Columbia.

I understand that in the last drive to raise funds for the operations of the boys' clubs it was very, very difficult for these policemen to approach white sponsors and tell them that they were going to have to finance integrated boys' clubs. Contributions for integrated clubs are difficult, if not impossible, to get. Ask any District policeman, and he will verify that. We are going to see the boys' clubs destroyed, sacrificed to petty political scheming; and when they are destroyed, we are going to see the crime rate in the District of Columbia increase. The very fine influence of these boys' clubs will be lost to the youth of the District.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to compliment the gentleman on his remarks on this very important question. As the gentleman has intimated in his remarks, I think the decision of the Supreme Court upon which a lot of this integration activity is based amounts to nothing more or less than a fraudulent use of power and a fraudulent usurpation of legislative functions which that Court does not possess.

With reference to the gentleman's remarks regarding the police boys' club, he has given us some very interesting information about it and I concur in his statement that it will be a very sad day when this worthwhile organization is destroyed, as 3 of these clubs already have been by 1 church and 2 public agencies where they have been meeting in property under the control and jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

I would point out also to the gentleman—I am sure he knows it—that almost twice as many Negro boys have benefited from the police boys' club as white boys. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago that in 1954 the organization reached its peak in membership of 22,000 members; 14,000 of these were colored and only 8,000 were white.

As the gentleman has pointed out, the contributions made to support the activities of these clubs have been 95 to 97 percent from white people.

In 1954 the budget was $350,000. Right thinking people, people who believe in bringing our youth under good influences contributed $350,000 for that purpose. As I said, 95 to 97 percent of it was contributed by white people although almost twice as many colored boys benefited by it as white boys. It had the fine result, which the gentleman has told us about, of decreasing juvenile delinquency. It took the boys in off the streets. It tended to decrease the influences which lead to gangsterism and hoodlumism and crime. It had a wholesome effect and influence upon all of the boys. As the gentleman has pointed out, three of these clubs have been ordered to be closed. For what reason? Simply because the would-be liberals are so interested in mixing the races that they are not willing to provide places for these boys to meet and to come under these good influences unless they can come there in an interracial group. I am so glad that the gentleman from Mississippi is thinking on this subject, and I appreciate very much the facts that he has called to our attention.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on his fine appraisal of the situation and telling us about these glorified hypocrites who are trying to carry out this new fandangled concoction of mingling the races.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman knows that there is no other issue in public life today that has as much hypocrisy wrapped around it as this issue.

Mr. RIVERS. Some people in this District of Columbia would do more to be a Commissioner than a lot of people would give for a one-way ticket to heaven. I would like to pay my respects to this outfit known as the Commissioners, and with particular emphasis to one Samuel Spencer. I would not know him from Adam's house cat, and the chances are I would select the house cat. But I would like to say this about that individual: He is the so-called Commissioner who sent this action up here to take over Wolfson's enterprise. I understand that it has about as much legality and constitutionality as the man in the moon. But he is so interested now in carrying out the beck and call of the NAACP that he does not care anything about the existence of these boys' clubs. He has already destroyed the usefulness and the morale of the fire department. He would destroy them just to get a writeup in the NAACP magazine—what ever that is. About this other outfit known as the Supreme Court and the school integration case, they wrote a decision when there was not one iota of testimony in the transcript of the lower court. That is what you call legerdemain. My word is as good as theirs. I say here and now they have bypassed the Congress in order to write legislation. They have left the making of the laws to the administrative department and God knows what is going to happen to this country when that crew finishes wrecking the decisions that have existed since this country began. They are in a headlong flight to take care of the political expediency of this day and to destroy the traditions of this country and of the several States. God help us if something does not happen to stop that crew from legislating and otherwise stealing the birthrights of future generations. As far as this crew in the District of Columbia, these Commissioners, are concerned, they are going to have about as much influence in the Congress as the man in the moon as far as I am concerned. They could be abolished tomorrow and the District would be much better off.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. As he well knows, the current trend in our present Supreme Court is to interpret the law, not as the law is written but to interpret the law as they think it should have been written. When we reach the point when the courts interpret the law in that fashion, we shall have no such thing as law.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. FLYNT. I want to join the gentleman from Mississippi and my colleague from Georgia for bringing this very important subject to the attention of the House. I have had some little experience with the work of these boys' clubs. They have meant a great deal to the underprivileged, not only of this city but throughout the length and breadth of this land. There are those who, under the guise of doing good and with the cloak of hypocrisy wrapped around every ounce of their bodies, are doing everything they can to inculcate and bring race mixing into this good work that has been done by these boys' clubs their own ideas. They will either rule it or ruin it with their hypocritical ideas. They care not for the youth of this land, they care not for the youth of this city, but if they cannot mix the races against the will of those who do not want to be mixed, they are going to ruin and destroy everything they touch.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, we hear our self-styled liberal friends speak of the brotherhood of man. They speak in glowing platitudes about the equality of human beings. They speak in terms of ideals. They speak of second-class citizenship for certain people of our country, yet they disregard the very vital fact that in order to achieve first-class citizenship an indiivdual must discharge the responsibilities of first-class citizenship. They speak in glowing terms of the brotherhood of man, yet they disregard completely the practical aspects, which must be taken into consideration before the principles they enunciate can be realized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman know of any better way to create first-class citizens than to start to train them in their youth in the principles of industry, integrity, honesty and truth, as these boys' clubs do?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course not.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Those race mixers to which the gentleman has just referred consider it a matter of secondary importance that the youth of this country should be trained in the principle of good citizenship. Their goal is to mix the races, regardless of the cost or consequences. As a result of that policy of "rule or ruin," to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] has just referred, they have already caused the doors of three of these clubs to be closed, and destroyed the good influence for every one of these boys who formerly had the benefit of those clubs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is not my purpose here to try to advance theories of racial superiority of one race over another, but there are differences between the whites and the colored which, for many generations to come, will prevent their living together in an integrated society. We must recognize this as true as a practical matter. We must be realistic. We must also recognize that if we are ever to abolish second-class citizenship in these United States, if such exists, that those who now are considered second-class citizens will never attain first-class citizenship until they are ready to assume the responsibilities that go along with the privileges and emoluments of first-class citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very serious thing, the abolition of the Washington Police Boys' Clubs. Those who are responsible for insisting that those clubs be integrated, and thereby destroy those clubs, must assume the responsibility—in the hereafter at least—for the future crimes committed by boys who otherwise could have been taught the advantages of law-abiding citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Immigration and Naturalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the national council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Whereas there has been going on in the United States a vigorous campaign to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act which became a law of the United States on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act is the result of almost 4 years of study of the im-

migration system and is well suited to the present conditions and situations in our country; and

Whereas the act was passed by an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives, and when it was vetoed by the then President of the United States it was enacted into law over President Truman's veto: Therefore be it

Resolved by the national council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc., in session assembled in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, this, the 22d day of June 1955, That we call upon Members of Congress to keep the McCarran-Walter Act on the statute books of this Nation in order to ward off attempts to weaken or modify the act, and to continue to screen carefully all aliens who apply for admission; and to keep the present immigration quotas. This is by far the best immigration act that the United States has ever passed; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the National Council send a copy of this resolution to the State secretary of every State council for presentation at their State councils and the enactment of a similar resolution to be forwarded to the President of the United States, Members of Congress, and especially members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees.

Mr. George Y. Harvey

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with reluctance to note the retirement of the Clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. George Y. Harvey, who has been with the committee for many years.

He was appointed to the committee staff by Chairman Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado, October 29, 1937, and is the only member of the present staff who had the privilege of serving under Chairman Taylor. He has served under both Democratic and Republican administrations—under my own chairmanship and during the 80th and 83d Congresses under Chairman TABER—under the administrations of Speaker RAYBURN and Speaker MARTIN.

He is retiring permanently at the age of 48, the youngest retirement in the history of the staff, on the imperative insistence of his physician.

His retirement is a great loss to the committee and is accepted only because there is no alternative. He is one of the ablest of the short line of particularly able men, Stevens, Courts, Sheild, and Pugh, who have occupied that position since the establishment of the Committee on Appropriations in 1865.

During his incumbency the work of the committee expanded until the amounts appropriated by the committee reached a total in excess of the entire expenditures of the Government from the administration of President Washington down to the world wars. The duties and responsibilities of the committee and the staff more than kept pace with the growth in volume of expenditures and accompanying studies and investigations. Under the pressure of war conditions he worked unceasingly, and with such indefatigable energy and devotion to duty as to contribute unquestionably to the condition which today forces him to relinquish at the prime of life one of the key positions in the Government.

It has been a brilliant service while it lasted. It would be impossible to estimate the total savings made in the budgets with which the staff dealt under his study and direction but it aggregates stupendous sums.

His record and his attainments have had wide recognition. I had the privilege of attending the exercises when Northeastern University conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of laws and, at my request, the president of the university favored me with a copy of the citation with which he was presented to the faculty and board of trustees on that occasion. It reads:

PRESENTATION OF CANDIDATE FOR HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS

Mr. President, fellow members of the board of trustees, and faculty, I have the very great honor and pleasure of presenting this candidate for the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

This candidate was born October 28, 1907, in Chillicothe, Mo. He attended grammar school and graduated from high school in Norborne, Mo. He came to Washington, D. C., December 1, 1927, * * * and since that time has held positions in the following organizations: The Department of Justice, the Federal Security Agency (now Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

He, at present, is the fifth person to hold the position of clerk and staff director to the Committee on Appropriations, United States House of Representatives. As you know, this is one of the key committees of Congress, particularly where the operations of the Federal Government are concerned.

His broad understanding of financial management in all of its aspects gained from firsthand experience in the executive branch of the Government makes him particularly qualified to assist the Congress in bringing about legislative changes that are beneficial to the Congress from the standpoint of being able to realistically evaluate the various Government agencies' requests for operating funds and maintain adequate control thereof, to the Federal Government from an operating standpoint, and to you and me as taxpayers, in that we receive more efficient governmental operations for our tax dollars.

He attended this university and graduated in June, 1938, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Laws.

He is a member of the following organizations: Society for the Advancement of Management, American Political Science Association, and the Methodist Church.

Over the years this gentleman has given freely of his time and talents to the service of the United States Government. He has always made himself available to extend a helping hand to any agency, organization or person to improve financial management in the executive branch of the Federal Government in balanced relationship to the fuller development of the exercise of the constitutional function of the Congress in control of the public purse. There are few people who have the keen practical perception of the interrelated workings of executive and legislative fiscal procedures and how they can be blended together to secure maximum results from tax dollars expended.

He has never looked for or expected any personal glory for himself; in fact, he has always chosen to work in the background with only the end result (a more efficient operation of the Federal Government) as his goal. The many sacrifices of his personal time are little known except to some of us in the Government who have benefited from the time he has given us during and after office hours. Looking back over the many hours he has devoted to this cause, it would be surprising to many of us if his family got to see him except on rare occasions.

It is said that Diogenes spent his life going around with a lighted lantern looking for an honest man. He had the wrong approach. The honesty, the character, the devotion to duty, the service to the United States Government of this candidate shine like a beacon in the dark. He is a living example of what all career Government employees should try to be. This university needed no lantern to find this candidate, even though he has always tried to stay in the background. His deeds shine for him.

In recognition of his outstanding service to the United States Government, I present to you George Y. Harvey, Clerk and Staff Director, Committee on Appropriations, United States House of Representatives, a gentleman, scholar, outstanding career employee of the United States and recommend that he receive the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

His capacity and faculty for cooperation also won the highest approval and collaboration in the Federal agencies with which he was associated. I am just in receipt of the following letter, typical of others, which I also include:

UNITED STATES GENERAL
ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
July 19, 1955.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have just learned that George Harvey is leaving his post with the committee. Knowing the hazard to his family and himself that continued service would bring, his decision is an understandable one, regrettable as it may be.

It has been my rare privilege over the years to observe firsthand the tremendous contribution that this one man has made to better and more economical government by his efforts. The far-reaching financial improvements with which he is identified include basic simplifications in central fiscal and accounting processes followed in making funds available, the strengthening of the Antideficiency Act, and control over foreign credits, simplification of agency appropriation structures, and improved accounting support for budget presentations—to name only a few.

From its inception in 1947 he provided the Governmentwide joint accounting improvement program with understanding support and able counsel. This has contributed immeasurably to the progress which has been made under that program, particularly from the standpoint of keeping the improvements made tied in directly with the development of more effective congressional control.

In mutually seeking the most advantageous course of action, we did not always readily agree as to method, but there was never any doubt as to his sincerity of purpose or his loyalty to the Congress. Many times the course he chose to follow was not the one which would win him popular acclaim, but time has proven the wisdom of the reforms for which he labored.

Others will, no doubt, express much better than I the significance of the part George played in Governmentwide improvements in financial management in the past decade. However, I will ever be grateful for the helpful guidance and assistance he rendered to me and I felt impelled to convey to you my deep feeling of appreciation. I joint his

many, many friends in wishing him the good things he so richly deserves.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. FREESE,
Director, Accounting System Division.

I am certain I reflect the sentiment of the members of the Committee on Appropriations, on both sides of the table, in expressing the regret at his retirement and in wishing for him health, happiness, and contentment and length of days.

Mr. Harvey will be succeeded by Kennet Sprankle as of this date. Mr. Sprankle will have associated with him, in the expanded administration of the committee, Corhal Orescan with supervision over the Military Establishment and Paul Wilson, in charge of the nonmilitary establishment.

The Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Change in Parley Course," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times of July 22, 1955. The article deals with the proposal of the President for a United States-Soviet arms-inspection program.

So many of us are apt to oversimplify the program stated by the President, and I believe it would be well for every one of us to read this very thoughtful article by Mr. Reston, dealing with that subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGE IN PARLEY COURSE—A SUMMARY OF EVENTS THAT ARE ALTERING ORIGINAL CHARACTER OF THE CONFERENCE

(By James Reston)

GENEVA, July 21.—The Big Four conference is declining fast. What was advertised for weeks as a realistic private discussion of conflicting national interests, and started this week as a determined demonstration of international chumminess, developed today into a propaganda battle between United States and the Soviet Union.

There is nothing new about this so far as the Russians are concerned. They have been making propaganda since Monday. The new thing is that President Eisenhower joined the propaganda parade today with a vengeance. He suggested that the United States and the Soviet Union let each other know everything about each other's defense establishments. He proposed, further, that they, the Russians, fly all over the United States photographing our military establishments, and that they let us do the same in the Soviet Union.

PLAN CALLED UNREALISTIC

This was the surprise of the conference for a variety of reasons; in the first place it was generally regarded as unrealistic. As President Eisenhower himself said yesterday, the Soviet Union already knows almost everything it needs to know about United States defense arrangements. The Soviet leaders do not need to hand over their defense blueprints and let United States aviators photograph their country to find out what the United States is doing.

Second, it is illegal under United States laws. Nobody, for example, is allowed to fly over the atomic energy projects in Savannah River, S. C.; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; or Los Alamos, N. Mex.

Third, in light of these facts it seemed to other Western delegates to be a proposal line the Soviet proposal for the destruction of all atomic bombs and the dismantling of Allied air bases, which the other side knew in advance had no chance of being accepted.

Fourth—and this was the greatest surprise of all—the idea of exchanging defense blueprints and aerial photographs with Moscow, forbidden under United States law, apparently was not explored in any detail, if at all, with congressional leaders, who make the laws, or decided upon as a carefully calculated policy in Washington.

Everybody in the United States delegation here knew the President was going to make an important disarmament speech. Photographers were alerted ahead of time for the briefing. Plans were made to reproduce and publicize his remarks.

The idea of exchanging "defense blueprints" with the Soviet Union and taking aerial photographs of the United States and Soviet defense establishments had been discussed casually here in private meetings, but it apparently was not in the draft of the speech President Eisenhower took with him to the Palace of Nations this afternoon.

When Marshal Nikolai A. Bulganin, Soviet Premier, started talking about the Soviet ideas of disarmament, however, President Eisenhower apparently decided to spring his "blueprint" and aerial photograph ideas.

This, of course, he had every right to do. He is the President of the United States, its Chief Executive, and Commander in Chief of its Armed Forces. But his proposal was not in keeping with the principles or the tactics he has recommended ever since he arrived at the summit.

EARLY ATTITUDE RECOUNTED

The President's contention all week has been that this was a conference not for orations but for discussions, not for controversial details but for general principles, not for emphasizing the things that divide "the four," but for emphasizing the things that unite them.

The United States delegation at the summit has been politely annoyed by the tendency of the British and French to propose specific plans that had little chance of careful discussion, let alone negotiations, in Geneva.

The United States delegates have been pointing to the President's own tactics here this week as a model of how to act at a short conference of this kind. He has been full of good will toward everybody. He has been courting the Russians one by one, so much so that they have been saying privately here for the last 2 days that they are convinced there will never be a war as long as he is President.

This was the traditional Eisenhower operating on his own, applying to international politics the personal habits that elevated him to the top in the Army and finally to the summit of United States political life.

Yesterday, however, a new flock of advisers arrived at the summit from Washington—Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Harold E. Stassen, disarmament assistant, and Nelson A. Rockefeller, White House propaganda chief. The President has been in conference with them ever since.

Whether they persuaded him to change his tactics or whether one or another of them merely threw out ideas he accepted was still a matter of speculation here tonight.

The fact is, however, that he changed his line. He is still saying that a new spirit of good faith may dissolve the contradictory East-West policies on German unity and European security but today's barrage of Soviet propaganda followed by President Eisenhower's improvisations have not improved the outlook.

Attitude and Procedures of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from the Credit Union League, at Jamestown, N. Dak., dated July 21, 1955, signed by John P. Hillerson managing director, as well as an article entitled "Federal Bureau Hikes Audit Cost for Credit Unions," which was published in the Flint Weekly Review of July 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA CREDIT UNION LEAGUE,
Jamestown, N. Dak., July 21, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Enclosed is a copy of an editorial and news article from the Flint Weekly Review of Thursday, July 14, 1955, dealing with the changes in the attitude and procedures of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and its attack upon the credit-union movement of Michigan.

The copy of the news item and the editorial was sent to me by Mr. A. W. Marble, managing director of the Michigan Credit Union League. As you perhaps know during the past year there has been some question of the tactics and methods used by the bureau of Federal credit unions in the State of Michigan against the Federal credit charter unions there. Mr. Marble felt that you should have this information and that by my sending it to you, you may become more interested in the trouble there and also in the credit-union movement as a whole. It is our feeling that you would be a valuable ally to the credit-union movement as you have been to the REA cooperatives in the past. We feel that credit unions are a vital part of democracy and are a physical expression of free people in doing something for themselves. If this right to organize and run credit unions freely is taken away from the people then democracy ceases to function.

If there are any further questions or any help that we can give you on this matter, please feel free at any time to write to us.

Sincerely yours,

NORTH DAKOTA CREDIT UNION LEAGUE,
JOHN P. HILLERSON, *Managing Director.*

[From the Flint Weekly Review of July 14, 1955]

FEDERAL BUREAU HIKES AUDIT COST FOR CREDIT UNIONS

The millions of workers in industry who are members of Federal chartered credit unions need be alarmed at the current administration's attitude toward their democratically operated organizations, say Michigan leaders. Latest move from the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education designed to stymie credit union operations is

a healthy boost in the cost of the annual audit conducted by the Bureau.

This new boost in costs could very well impair the efficiency of fast growing credit unions in their attempt to give service to their members. Last audit for Flint Buick Employees Federal Credit Union cost $1,169 with no increase in assets. The same audit next year would cost $1,246.68. Since the Buick credit union is one of the fastest growing in the Nation the handicap imposed with the new high cost of auditing will make it far more difficult for the credit union to continue its program based on service rather than profit.

HIGHER THAN STATE

That the Federal Bureau of Credit Unions audit costs are ridiculously high is evident when such costs are compared with a similar service performed at the State level where an audit for the Buick credit union last year would have cost $778.40. State chartered credit unions have a great deal more flexibility in operation than do those chartered by the Federal Government. They may make low-cost real-estate loans where Federal credit unions are restricted to what are designated as provident loans. Loan limits are lower for Federal credit unions too. However, groups wishing to organize credit unions frequently find that Michigan law provides for a far narrower base of organization than does the Federal law. For that reason they seek Federal charters.

Michigan credit-union leaders see in the newly established audit costs just one more attempt at the Federal level to bring them into disrepute or force them out of business. They cite the wholly false accusations made against the Ford Rouge Credit Union as one example of banker pressure in Washington to eliminate a rival suddenly grown big enough to constitute a threat to the lending industry. They point to the recent attempt of Federal examiners to find something wrong, no matter what, at the Buick Federal Credit Union as evidence that the Federal boys have been given orders to make things really tough. (The Review carried a story about the Buick CU probe).

M'NAMARA WANTS EXPLANATION

Michigan Senator PAT MCNAMARA has asked for an explanation as to why the Federal Bureau has suddenly gotten so tough. Over in the House of Representatives Wayne County's CHARLES DIGGS has posed the same question.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Credit Unions has, under the law, sole responsibility for fixing the fees charged credit unions for audits. This bureaucratic setup has never been used to harass credit-union activities until Bureau came under the direction of an Eisenhower appointee, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby.

Michigan credit-union leaders are aware of the terrific banker influence in the President's Cabinet and wonder if the chill is on for credit unions.

AS I SEE IT

Michigan workers have taken to the credit-union idea with the same enthusiasm with which they welcomed labor unions back in the 1937 days. In labor unions workers unite to get their fair share of the goods they produce along with fair treatment on the job.

Workers join credit unions to avoid paying fantastically high interest rates when they need an emergency loan and find that such savings as they may be able to lay aside draw a fair rate of interest along with life-insurance protection.

Labor unions are currently under attack in a number of States where legislatures are bending to the will of employers and passing laws which restrict union activity and outlaw the union shop.

The UAW-CIO is under attack at the Federal level. Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey was recently hailed before a grand jury probing union expenditures for political action.

The press, radio, and television moguls, always faithful to their big advertisers, have found it easy to depict union leaders as ruthless goons who go about beating reluctant workers over the head until they join up.

It is not so easy to pick out a weapon with which to beat the brains out of credit unions. Credit unions have always had the cautious approval of big business having been good customers for the banks.

The trouble is credit unions are becoming too successful. Too late the bankers realized that this viper which they had clutched to their bosoms is now getting big enough to bite. At both the State and Federal level bankers have been insisting that certain curbs be put on the activities of these organizations which are run for service and not for profit.

In Washington Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby's Department of Not Too Much Education, Health, and Welfare has not been devoting all of its time to lousing up the Salk vaccine program. Part of the time Mrs. Hobby's Department has used dreaming up methods of killing credit unions without leaving any evidence of the crime. Auditors from the Federal Bureau of Credit Unions, part of the Hobby staff have been instructed to get tough. And they have. The Ford Rouge tempest in a shallow teapot was one example.

For days Detroit's three dailies kept the fact that the Federal Bureau had illegally seized the Ford credit union in big black headlines. All of the phony charges against the Rouge CU fizzled and the Bureau turned its attention to Flint.

After an audit that cost the Buick Credit Union $1,169 the examiners couldn't find even a wrongly placed decimal point. Still they called the board of directors together and put them through a rude and rigorous cross examination.

But the bankers demanded more than that so the Federal Bureau has hiked its fee for such audits. The Federal Bureau of Credit Unions once enjoyed a Federal subsidy. This has been withdrawn. Costs have been hiked and the eagle-eyed auditors are alert for any slight error big enough to hang a headline on.

There are 10,000,000 credit-union members in North America. Mrs. Hobby is making Democrats out of most of them.

The House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the national council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas, the members of the national council of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, and the individual councils throughout the United States, feel that the House Un-American Activities Committee of the Congress has performed an outstanding job in the field of anticommunism, and that it should be encouraged and supported in its future work along this line: Therefore be it

Resolved by the national council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc., in session assembled in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, this, the 22d day of June 1955, That we urge that the powers, functions, and duties of the House Un-American Activities Committee be not curtailed but encouraged by sufficient appropriations to carry on; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The Ghost Trick Works, But Is It Really Honest?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in television and radio suggestion bulletin issued last week the Democratic National Committee proposes its answer to the Republican National Committee's program of ghost writing and composite television.

The Democratic program, fortunately, does not go as far as the Republican one in simulating interviews, but rather provides for an introduction followed by the appearance of a Democratic spokesman.

This whole practice of ghost writing, including tele-prompters, composite pictures, and television programs, has serious implications for democracy.

The following article raises questions needing the attention of Congress and the American people:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

THE GHOST TRICK WORKS, BUT IS IT REALLY HONEST?

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Where, oh where, is the political orator of yesterday?

Where is the barrel-chested shouter with his learned political references, his four-square stand for God, motherhood, dogs, children, country, and honesty (in that order)?

The old-style political orator survives in the Hall of the Congress and in semiprivate banquet halls. But he is rarely heard on radio. He is never, but never, seen on television.

Television has made the old-style politico's pitch as outdated as the Pony Express. New techniques—borrowed from New York's sellers of soap and Hollywood's merchants of dreams, have taken a high place in campaigning.

The film-laboratory technician threatens to replace the ghost writer. A makeup artist, euphemistically called a "cosmotologist," has taken on new political importance. The typewritten speech is being replaced by carefully concealed prompting devices called "idiot cards."

Whole personalities are being created to be shown only to the lenses of film and television cameras.

The practices may be deceptive and vaguely dishonest. But their effectiveness is not to be questioned.

Robert C. Albright, of this newspaper, has already called attention to the "ghostly" interview. It works like this:

You start with a script. It contains written questions and written answers.

A Cabinet member or any high ranking public official goes before a film camera and reads the answers. Develop the film and print it. In multiple.

Days or weeks later, any Congressman walks into the same studio and faces the same camera. He asks the questions, but he gets no answers. That comes later.

A laboratory technician takes the two pieces of film and neatly splices them together. Presto. The Congressman asks questions. The big wheel answers. Process and print it. In multiple.

Next step is to ship this chummy little interview to the politician's home territory. It is telecast—at no charge and as a public service feature. The interview is informative, to be sure. It is also likely to establish the Congressman as a big—indeed—dealer who can call Cabinet officials to heel and make them answer for his constituents.

Who knows? The film may convert a few voters. It can't possibly do any harm. Question: Is it honest?

There are variations on this laboratory technician's trick. With tape recordings, the job is a simple one. Radio stations may even marvel at voice quality.

But again we must face the question: Honest or deceptive?

The "scripted" interview need not be ghostly, need not be limited to film or tape recording. It can be done live and the viewer and listener is none the wiser. This practice has worked so well between politicos, that they've recently tried to force it on newspaper reporters.

A former Cabinet official, Oveta Culp Hobby, had a recent date with Reporters' Roundup. Shortly before the program a press agent arrived and delivered an ultimatum: "Work with a script or no show."

He got a quick answer: "No show." Mrs. Hobby changed her mind, went on the air and answered questions, unscripted questions.

(The very same week, Russia's V. M. Molotov tried this same trick on Face the Nation. His appearance on the show was canceled.)

Perhaps we should stop and consider the whole question. A man seeks office on his own merit. He offers himself to voters as informed, intelligent, honest, and articulate. You must consider him—if elected—as the spokesman for a great group of citizens.

The voters see this candidate on television, a media which threatens to sweep the slap on the back and the hearty handshake into the dustbins of history. It threatens to make face-to-face vote-getting a thing of the past.

The candidate is seen and he is heard. But whose words does he speak? Whose thoughts does he voice? Whose face does he show—his or a cosmetician's?

Makeup can grow hair on bald heads; give a boyish shave to a man with constant 5 o'clock shadow; remove bags from beneath the eyes of an old soak; magically wipe the wrinkles of decades from the face of an octogenarian.

("Stand still, Mr. Lincoln. Let me paint out that mole. Let's remove those wringles. This hair piece will take care of that high forehead and we simply must do something to shorten that nose.")

Honest? Well, we must remember to appeal to women. Their votes are vital in an election.

Then, too, the mechanical aids. TelePrompTers are fine for Milton Berle or Arthur Godfrey or any other entertainer. However, office seekers are not selling candy bars: they are selling themselves and, in effect, good government.

Candidate Jones reads his speech. He reads it openly and thus creates a small barrier between him and his audience. ("Look, Aunt Susie, he's reading.")

Candidate Smith looks his audience in the eye. ("Look, Aunt Susie, he's talking directly to us.") Candidate Smith, however, is reading. His script is in huge type, concealed directly above or below the lens of the TV camera.

Is the voter being cheated? The answer would appear to be in this fact: After election, the candidate must stand someday on the floor of Congress and speak for his district or State.

At last report, TelePrompTers have not yet been installed in the House or Senate.

Free Television or Scrambled Phony-Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, there are 36 million television sets in the United States today and their number is increasing rapidly. They cost the families that own them $13.5 billion and constitute the principal form of entertainment for many of these families, welding them together once again as no other influence has for many years. I think you will agree, therefore, that the fate of television is a matter of special and great public interest, and I as your representative in Congress certainly consider it as such.

That is why I am alarmed by a current effort on the part of certain promoters to arrest television's progress at the expense of the viewing public, all to satisfy their own greed and selfishness. The nerve of these promoters is almost fantastic. They are preparing a bitter, worthless pill for us to swallow and are actually arguing that it is good for us. Most of the writing into Washington today is, strangely enough, in favor of the idea, but that is only a reflection of the huge profits to be made by the promoters, and the lack of information on the part of the public. It is my hope that this column will supply some of that information.

Pay television, as the promoters call it, would mean that television stations which are now broadcasting free programs would scramble the image on the picture tube and the sound into a sort of unassembled jigsaw puzzle. Such programs could be unscrambled only when a costly gadget, attached to your set at your expense, was fed a coin, or slug, a key or a card for which you the viewer would pay, either in cash or as part of your phone bill.

It is no answer that you would not have to watch these pay programs if you did not want to. Since a station cannot televise two programs at once, any station broadcasting a scrambled pay-television program would necessarily have to eliminate its free program during that time period. Pay television would black out the best of free television. The plan is a sort of booby trap. It would render the television owner blind, and then rent him a seeing-eye dog at so much a program, to partially restore the sight he had previously enjoyed free as a natural right.

Worst of all, this scheme would divide television audiences along economic lines. Some of the promoters, with amazing gall, announce they would be satisfied if they got, say, $100 a year from the average family. Others say $3 to $5 a week on your phone bill. In a recent interview, the president of a baseball club, with understandable enthusiasm, announced he was in favor of it. After all, with only 11 million watching a ball game at say the price of a 50-cent bleacher seat, he would realize an additional half million dollars per game. Would this eliminate commercials? "Oh, no," he says. "After all, don't you have to look at billboard advertising at the ball park even though you pay to get in?"

It is hard to think of a single argument in favor of this scheme other than profit to the promoters. They argue that we would get better programs. But television is not suffering from lack of money today, not when million-dollar contracts are being signed by advertisers for a single program. The trouble is lack of talent—authors, performers, and so forth, to meet the tremendous demand for novelty and variety in our TV performances. Television is in its infancy, and already it has brought into the American home great box-office attractions, including opera, ballet, concerts, the legitimate theater, omnibus shows, sports events, children's and educational programs, current and patriotic events. All it needs is time to grow. Let us not be impatient. Permitting promoters to take in as much as $8 million for a single 30-minute program will not improve the program. If television is suffering from an illness, then the cure the promoters offer is worse than the illness, except for them.

About three-quarters of the people who own TV sets have an average annual income of $5,000 or less. Many bought them on the installment plan, and all were bought with the idea that once paid for they could enjoy free entertainment from then on, except for maintenance and repair.

As you can see from the above, I still think that is the right idea. If you can find the time, let me know how you feel about.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Joseph Coar

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most refreshing experiences for a Congressman is the efficient and courteous manner in which Mr. Robert Joseph Coar and his wife, Helen Badgley Coar, operate the radio and television room.

On this 20th anniversary of the day when Mr. and Mrs. Coar took over the leadership and direction of this most im-

portant Congressional auxiliary, I want to express my personal thanks for the kindly cooperation which I have received at the hands of Mr. and Mrs. Coar and their staff.

The Silent Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an article from Commonweal, July 22, 1955, written by Francois Houtart, secretary to Cardinal Van Roey, of Malines, Belgium:

THE SILENT REVOLUTION

(By Francois Houtart)

Political upheavals are familiar enough in Guatemala, Cuba, Paraguay, Bolivia, Nicaragua, and the other Latin American countries. Yet these are but a relatively minor aspect of the major revolution which convulses the Latin American continent today. This major revolution involves the social order, and it is advancing rapidly in every Latin American country, carrying everything before it. Economic factors are the basis for its transformation of this continent, just as they were the foundation for the transforming of Europe at the beginning of the industrial revolution.

Latin America remains chiefly a supplier of farm commodities and raw materials. In the last 15 years production has materially increased. Since 1939 Mexico and Peru have improved their production by 61 and 73 percent respectively. Mining too has increased, having doubled since before the war. This is due both to the discovery of new products and a large rise in the production of old ones.

Industrialization also is making great headway—especially in Brazil and Argentina, not to mention Mexico and Chile. New factories and industrial communities have sprung up where but a few years ago there were only the waving grasses of the pampas or the vegetation of virgin forests. Europe and North America have invested capital, built factories, organized production there. Since 1939 industrial production has doubled in such countries as Mexico, Chile, and Brazil. Where Argentina had 48,245 factories in 1937, there were 80,436 11 years later. In Uruguay the figures rose from 10,549 to 24,296. All this has led to a great rise in Latin American exports.

In recent decades the airplane has been effecting a complete changeover in transportation and communications on this continent. A country like Colombia, which had been cut off from the rest of the world due to its mountainous terrain and the virtual impossibility of building highways and railroads, is now linked to all points of the continent by airways, which have become the principal means of transportation in Latin America. Wherever you travel it is still common to see the natives, Indian or Negro, in their traditional dress, carrying their baskets or sacks just as their ancestors did three or four centuries ago, but now taking their places in a DC-6 or a Convair in the most natural fashion imaginable.

At the same time, technical and sanitary progress has brought about a continuing diminution in infant mortality in Latin America. The rate remains very high in certain regions, but the figures are shrinking throughout the continent, and in Argentina and Uruguay high infant mortality is already a thing of the past. Accompanying this development is an increase in the normal human life span. It is still possible to find certain areas, especially in the forests of Brazil, where the average life expectancy is not even 20 years. But progress in hygiene, especially in the rural areas, is producing increasingly greater longevity.

These economic and technical constituents of the Latin American revolution, however, are only the bony framework. When people speak of progress the world over, or in Latin America particularly, they refer to such elements. But this attitude fails to take sufficient recognition of the fact that these material elements supply only a starting point, that true revolution and true progress are preeminently human, and consequently social, developments.

We might consider the fact that since 1920 the continent has almost doubled in population (the figure for 1952 is 172 million). There is no doubt that this continent can feed many more people than it now contains. Yet natural resources have not yet been sufficiently exploited—nor has agriculture been adequately developed and mechanized—to permit an extremely rapid population growth. There are figures to show that the pace of investments in Latin America does not keep up with the increase in population and that therefore the standard of living is not slated to rise in the years just ahead. One effect of the impact of techniques is therefore to accentuate the contrast in living standards between the wealthy few and the Latin American masses.

Another social consequence of the economic transformation of this continent is the shift from a rural to an urban society, for the Latin American economy, long predominantly agricultural, is becoming more and more industrial and urban. All the large cities have doubled in population in the last 10 or 15 years and some 17 million people now live in cities of at least a million inhabitants. Obviously, the effects of passing from one civilization to another almost without any period of transition are catastrophic for individuals, families, and socety as a whole.

Latin America's rural civilization is still made up in large part of Indians and peoples of mixed blood, living under conditions which have not changed for four or five centuries. It is not surprising that industrialization and the exploitation of oil and mineral resources have brought in their train a social revolution. All too often, however, the conditions accompanying this industrialization are inhuman. Here we find a capitalism often lacking in human or ethical restraints. In some places there is a shameful exploitation of native labor by American or European capitalists. In others there is instead an indigenous capitalism which resorts, unhappily, to quite the same methods.

Whether it be in the sugar refineries of Cuba, the plantation of Guatemala or Nicaragua, the oil fields of Venezuela, the mines of Bolivia, the farming districts of Chile or the factories of Sao Paulo, everywhere we encounter similar conditions. Haiti may not be representative, but at Port au Prince the Haitian American sugar company employs workers but 6 months of the year because this is a seasonal industry. An unskilled worker gets $1.06 a day, a semiskilled, $1.25. A foreman, after 20 years in the refinery, earns $3.25 daily. There is no social security except for free medical care when accidents occur on the job. The Haitian infant mortality rate is extreme, and housing indescribably bad. The cost of living is outrageously high, as the economy is based on that of the United States. A suit of ordinary quality costs about $30 and a pair of shoes $10. The rent for two rooms in a poorer district can run as much as $15 to $20 a month. Rice, the principal food staple, sells for 20 cents a pound. Even if one considers the facts of industrial life in Haiti as one extreme, they still give some idea of the dimensions of the problem.

Because there is tremendous unemployment (since the big companies buy extensive farmlands displacing the small cultivators, who then flock to the city), the sugar company need make no effort at all to get workers. Some workers have to walk 7 miles each way to and from their jobs. There is no organized transportation and the company takes no responsibility about providing it. When workers complain about their low wages, management tells them to go elsewhere if they are dissatisfied, that hundreds of workers are waiting to take their place. That is true. A group of workers once tried to organize a union. It was immediately suppressed by the company; some of the leaders were fired; other were bought off.

Bolivia, like Haiti, may not be the best example to choose. But there I saw a mining village of 6,000 Indians, perched on the side of a mountain. Special permission is required to visit there. The miners work 8 hours a day; the 3 shifts cover the full 24 hours. The men work deep down in the mines while a number of women labor near the surface. The family life of the village is completely disorganized by this work in shifts. There are no holidays the whole year round, not Sundays nor even Easter or Christmas. The company which owns the mines builds its workers' living quarters; I would not want to put cattle in many of these dwellings. Some are simply wooden barracks filled with straw. Certain of these straw-packed hovels are called hot beds because every 8 hours they welcome a new shift of sleeping men.

There are also new homes of concrete with sheet-iron roofs. These provide 1 room for each family although some families have as many as 10 children. A miner earns the equivalent of 15 cents a day; one of the engineers gets over $2,500 a month. The mining company has built a church for the Indians. With 6,000 inhabitants, perhaps 50 people can squeeze into the church. A needy missionary who tries to conduct his apostolate under these conditions has himself declared that it is only the "opium of the people."

These examples are enough to show that the very conditions of industrialization held to be progress in Latin America are far from embodying real progress when it comes to the living standards and social life of the inhabitants. It is therefore not surprising that the Marxist ideology has begun to spread. Of course, the great urban masses, and even more the peasants in the rural areas, are not yet very greatly influenced by Marxism. Ignorance, illiteracy, difficulties in communications, the lack of a basis for comparison with better living conditions, the apathy of the Indian masses and the climate are all elements which hold back the growth of Marxism among the people. Yet Marxism makes inroads through two very important channels: the universities and the new workers' organizations.

In the universities the Marxist student organizations are often the most active, if not the most powerful. Indeed, the young intellectuals, who are much more conscious than the masses of the economic situation of their country, see Marxism as the economic and social solution of their problems. Moreover, it also seems to supply an answer to their needs for an ideology and a vehicle for their youthful, and characteristically South American enthusiasm.

The lack of other coherent theories on the social and economic order leads many students—even those from fairly well-to-do homes—to view Marxism as the only solution.

The labor organizations are almost all of Marxist inspiration—especially the different workers' mutual aid or cooperative groups.

Often they are camouflaged as government organizations—as in Mexico or Bolivia. In Argentina, although the labor unions are Peronist, it is no secret that the Communists hold many of the key posts, although for the moment they pose as more Peronist than the Peronists. In Brazil there is a similar situation.

A final social consequence of the great transformation now taking place is the growing influence of Latin America in international politics. The Latin American bloc is coming to be a force to be reckoned with. Its role in international organizations is increasingly important. That is why the economic and social destiny of Latin America can no longer be a matter of indifference to anyone. The character of the ideology and social system which ultimately prevails there will greatly influence the direction taken by international organizations in world affairs.

The Sunset Parade of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of witnessing the sunset parade of the Marine Corps at the Marine Barracks in Washington, D. C. It was a most inspiring sight.

Commanding the Marine Barracks, of course, is Col. Robert H. Williams. His executive officer is Lt. Col. Roy J. Batterton, Jr. The date of the parade was July 15, 1955, and the reviewing officer was Lt. Col. Roy J. Batterton, Jr., while the parade commander was Lt. Col. John B. Sweeney. Colonel Sweeney, I understand, has subsequently been transferred to further duties elsewhere. This parade was his last parade at the Marine Barracks here in Washington. The order of activities was thrilling, and was an experience never to be forgotten. In particular, the Third Platoon, Barracks Detachment, with 1st Lt. Richord W. Coulter, platoon commander, in a silent drill, was a performance, in my opinion, of exceptional perfaction. The Third Platoon performed the silent drill without a mistake and in a fashion which brought cheers from the stands.

In addition to the parade, we enjoyed the United States Marine Band. This scarlet-coated band performs its historic musical functions in Washington since its debut here on New Year's Day in 1801 when President John Adams gave his first official reception.

The parade is something that everyone should see in Washington. Every Member of Congress owes it to himself to attend this parade and I urge that every Member of Congress avail himself of this thrilling privilege and bring with him those of his constituents who may be in town on Friday evening, at about 5 p. m. when the sunset parade is held.

And so as an evidence of my gratitude to the Marine Barracks in Washington, D. C., for a thrilling afternoon and for a practical lesson in Americanism I hereby spread these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a testimonial of my thanks to this gallant arm of our defense force.

In addition, I would like to thank Col. John B. Sweeney for the invitation to be present. Colonel Sweeney and his officers are men of warm hospitality, men of exceptional refinement and officers of intelligence and ability. It was a pleasure to have been their guest on this occasion.

What Price Too Much Food?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the July Reader's Digest by Gaynor Maddox which gives a very glaring picture of the millions the taxpayers are doling out for storage and maintenance of surplus foodstuffs. It is unbelievable that this body on May 5 voted for the return of rigid parity prices which in turn encourages the production of more food and the raising of more storage bins and the spending of more of the people's money in a wanton and needless manner. The truth is we did not even give flexible price supports a chance to work before attempting to revert to the old rigid price program.

I am pleased to say that the Connecticut Farm Bureau Association, Inc., representing thousands of farmers in my district and the State, has always opposed any kind of price supports as a folly which has lowered foreign and domestic consumption, created unfair competition and tampered with the natural balance of supply and demand. The article follows:

WHAT PRICE TOO MUCH FOOD?

(By Gaynor Maddox)

The United States Government is belly-deep in the food business. I've traveled thousands of miles to take a look. It's been an eyeful—$7 billion worth of surplus wheat, corn, rice, butter, cheese, and dry milk stored away safe from the open market.

Who pays for these surplus foods? You and I and every American taxpayer. Do we get to eat them? No. A huge and unprofitable Government organization called the Commodity Credit Corporation keeps these foodstuffs out of circulation to protect favored sections of our agriculture from price competition. CCC functions as our price-support bank.

My secretary recently complained about the high price of bread and breakfast cereals for her family. She thought we had been raising bumper crops of wheat. I asked her whether she knew about CCC. "No," she said, "but doesn't it have something to do with gambling on the stock exchange?"

The CCC is not concerned with gambling. On the contrary, it is trying to take the gambling out of much of American agriculture. The CCC offers an insatiable market for those crops covered by the farm price-support program, buying up all the surplus beyond what the free market can absorb at prices considered fair to farmers. It withholds these surpluses from sale to keep the price up, and may dispose of them only at times and in ways that won't depress the market. This guarantees farmers a fair return, but also encourages them to pile up ever more unmanageable surpluses.

Today this colossal food corporation has over $7 billion invested in surplus commodities or in commodity loans. It owns or has under loan 1.2 billion bushels of wheat—enough to take care of all our people and all our animals, plus what we need for export, for 2 full years. It owns enough butter to supply our total population for 2 months, enough cheese to feed us for 3 months. The next freight train you see may be loaded with surplus food routed safely away from your supermarket. Hungry people please look the other way.

In the Fulton Market Cold Storage Co. in Chicago, H. C. Burrus, plant superintendent, showed me 14 million pounds of Government butter stored in below-zero rooms. Packed in 60-pound cubes, it has been there for almost 2 years.

In the same building Burrus showed me nearly 2 million pounds of surplus cheddar cheese, in 75-pound cylindrical hoops. Some of the cheese has been there since 1953. This storage plant is only one of hundreds the CCC has filled in our great milk-producing areas.

Our Government is in the rice business too. Stashed away in warehouses in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana, CCC owns 10,500,000 100-pound bags of rice. In Crowley, western Louisiana, a town that calls itself the rice capital of the world, warehouses were bulging with rice no one wants to buy now that oriental markets have been shut off. But the farmers go right on planting. As a result, more warehouses are needed. Six new storage bins are being built on the edge of town.

I asked one of the best-informed men in the area why they keep planting rice in face of mounting surpluses. Why don't they turn their land to raising marketable cattle? "Because they've been rice planters all their lives and don't intend to change," he said.

A reluctance to adjust to consumer demands is typical of farmers all over our fertile land. For example, although we as a nation are using less tobacco, and although synthetic fabrics are crowding cotton, tobacco planters and cotton growers are among God's chillun when it comes to price supports. CCC has more than 2 million pounds of surplus tobacco on its hands and well over a billion dollar's worth of cotton.

But the investment alone is only part of the surplus story. Just to store these foods costs American citizens $700,000 every day in the year. By law, CCC must use commercial elevators and warehouses for surplus when space is available. The Norris Elevator in South Chicago is typical of the 15,000 commercial elevators that have signed a uniform grain-storage agreement with CCC. The main tower and its 58 great storage tanks rise near Lake Michigan. Cups on an endless belt lift grain from barges into bins, where it is weighed and then routed on conveyors into the storage tanks. Every day more barges come up the Illinois River from the cornfields. Superintendent J. T. Goetzinger told me his elevator held 700,000 bushels of corn belonging to CCC, but only 200,000 bushels privately owned.

One of the largest grain elevators on the Great Lakes is at Superior, Wis., operated by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. Its cluster of white concrete tanks holds 12,500,000 bushels—nearly 8 million of them belonging to CCC. At the FUGTA plants in Minneapolis 65 percent of the grain is owned by CCC. The St. Paul terminal is 60 percent filled with CCC grain.

Because there is not enough commercial space, CCC has to find other hideaways for its surplus. So the Government has gone into the storage business and erected bins in 28 States.

Throughout grain-producing areas CCC bins dominate the small towns. The new ones are made of corrugated steel, take up

to 40,000 bushels, and can hold grain off the market as long as 6 years. The little farm community of Peotone in northeastern Illinois has 40 of these steel bins set up in rows at the edge of town. At Fairmont in the rolling Minnesota countryside the traveler sees more of these bins near green fields of corn and soybeans.

This summer as you and your family drive through the lush grain country and gaze at these dome-shaped bins mushrooming near little towns, remember that the Federal Government has spent nearly $200 million to build 185,000 of them, and is spending $200,000 a day to keep them in operation.

But it takes more than commercial warehouses and CCC bins to hold our rising tide of surplus grain. We also have nearly 2 million tons stored in ships at a cost of $25,000 a day. CCC has wheat in 112 reserve fleet ships on the James River in Virginia, and in 130 ships at two Pacific coast points. At Jones Point on the Hudson River, 40 miles from New York, 450,000 tons of wheat lie in the holds of 70 ships left over from World War II.

David J. Ryan, grain supervisor for the Hudson River fleet, and I climbed aboard the ghostly *Lord Delaware* which, like its 69 sister grain ships, has been stripped of all navigating gear, lifeboats and lines. Down in the dark hold lay a lake of wheat. Five men crawled over the grain, inserting long thermometers and pulling up samples to check for insect infestation. They make this inspection at least once every 2 weeks. When necessary, the grain is fumigated.

During winter an electric-fan system circulates cold air through the holds, chilling the wheat so thoroughly it stays cool all summer. Ryan says that with constant vigilance his grain may remain in good condition for 4 to 5 years. I tried to figure how many loaves of bread could be made from the 40 million dollar's worth of wheat squirreled away in this Hudson River fleet.

The Government has made an effort to slow down the relentless wheat combines. It cut parity from 90 to 82½ percent this year under the flexible price-support program. That's a dip from $2.24 to $2.06 a bushel. But political pressure is massing against flexible supports.

Congress has also cut our 1955 national wheat-acreage allotment to 55 million acres. But scientific research now makes it possible to grow more wheat per acre than ever before. We don't need 55 million acres to produce our normal supply of wheat. With our present surplus, we need only 19 million.

So overproduction goes on. No one in Washington has enough public backing to dam the mounting flood. Many of our 4 million politically strong farmers seem to believe in free enterprise only for nonagricultural producers.

CCC tries desperately to get rid of some of the millions of tons of stored food. Between July 1 and December 31 of last year we donated to schools, charitable institutions, and needy persons 243 million pounds of food worth $83 million. During the same 6-month period we gave away nearly $66 million worth of food to the people of 41 nations overseas.

The United States is also selling food to Turkey, Yugoslavia, Japan, and other friendly countries at fire-sale rates. CCC is authorized to lose up to $700 million over 3 years on this venture and get its money back from the Treasury.

It would be cheaper to destroy all our surplus foods. Moral considerations block that thrifty course. The administration's philosophy is to get as much as possible of these foods into human stomachs—free, at bargain prices or by barter. But if surpluses are disposed of in this country, merchants are outraged; dumped abroad they depress foreign economies. Besides, shipment of any quantities abroad would be both costly and impractical. The law provides that 50 percent of these shipments must go in American bottoms. As CARE points out in its booklet, Feast and Famine, to move our surplus food overseas would require the dispatch of 10 freighters every day for a year; even to move the food to our port cities would require 100 freight trains a day for that period.

It is time we took a critical look at our agricultural policy. It's out of date. Today we live in the beefsteak era. Our consumption of wheat and other cereals has been dropping steadily. But we go right on spending billions to keep the agricultural clock turned back.

In a country that boasts of its free enterprise, our Federal Government operates one of the most unprofitable food corporations in the world. It is profligate in its efforts to shield farmers from the risks of free competition. By keeping food prices high, it works against the taxpayers who support it.

This Mad Hatter situation sits down at every man's dinner table. It touches the pocketbook of every taxpayer. Sooner or later we must ask ourselves, "What price too much food?"

Politics and Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hunterdon County Democrat:

POLITICS AND IMMIGRATION

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER of Easton, coauthor of the McCarran-Walter immigration law, says that too many persons are "playing politics" with the immigration laws. He includes "well meaning do-gooders" as well as persons who seek to curry favor with minority groups and their self-styled leaders.

The McCarran-Walter Act is a favorite target in areas with large alien populations. Simply because people cannot come to America on the free and easy basis that once prevailed, spokesmen for the racial groups are exerting pressures on Members of Congress and persons in executive authority for the purpose of lowering the bars. Congressman WALTER points out that most of the eligible countries did not last year use up all the preference quotas assigned them. The law gives preference to persons with special skills and to mothers and fathers of aliens already in the country. Because of shortages of housing in this country and impending unemployment in some centers, restrictions have been necessary. Furthermore, there have been plenty of evidences of a desire to push into this country persons of subversive leanings.

We hear more doubletalk on this question of immigration than on any other. Publicly the politicians will join the clamor for "liberalizing" the immigration laws. Privately, in congressional committee sessions and in discussions with American patriotic groups, they will take the opposite stand, agreeing that to lift the bars means complicating the housing situation, the relief problem, the problem of unemployment and social conditions in the urban centers which receive and hold most of the immigrants—especially those from eastern and southern Europe. Congressman WALTER has taken much abuse for serving as author and defender of the Immigration Act. When given an opportunity in public to defend the act and to pin down those who make blanket charges of its unfairness, he makes out a good case for the law. The measure has overall national support or it would have been amended long ago.

Mining Industry Supports Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado Plateau now is the second largest producer of uranium in the world. This same area is rich in many other strategic minerals, including vanadium, oil shale, copper, coal, iron, oil and other materials. Water and power are needed to assure full development of these vital resources. That necessary water and power will be provided for this purpose by the Colorado River storage project.

The mining industry of the Rocky Mountain States fully recognized this need. In a recent publication the mining industry of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming issued a statement outlining the reasons for their support of this project and pointing out that the project is beneficial to the entire Nation. Especially is this so because the project repays its costs to the Government, most of it with full interest.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement by the Rocky Mountain mining industry into the RECORD:

WATER AND POWER NEEDED FOR DEVELOPMENT OF NATION'S RICH TREASURE CHEST

In 1954 the Bureau of Mines listed 42 metals and minerals of strategic and economic importance found in substantial quantities in the upper Colorado River Basin. All of these are produced in substantial quantities in this Colorado River country. Their value as raw material was estimated at $1,123 million.

The Colorado plateau accounts for nearly all of the Nation's current production of that spectacular atomic-age power source material, uranium, and one-third of the Nation's copper (78 percent if you include Arizona). Important quantities of other metals and minerals including coal, iron, zinc, lead, copper, oil, and gas are produced here. In these States are some of the world's largest reserves of oil shale (of which the U. S. Navy has substantial holdings)—an assured source of large quantities of tomorrow's petroleum products for industry and defense. Many minerals of potential strategic value areas are yet undeveloped.

Our rapidly growing population and economy, our defense needs, and the related strategic advantages offered by a diversification and dispersion of the Nation's basic industries, especially those depending upon close-by sources of heavy raw materials for their economical operation, demand that these Rocky Mountain mineral resources be further developed and utilized.

This development means that water and power must be available in dependable quan-

tities and at reasonable cost on a permanently assured basis. Water and power—they are essential ingredients in any practical program for the mining, smelting, refining, and processing of these vital natural resources which are not readily available elsewhere or which must be obtained here to supplement diminishing supplies from other major producing areas.

Failure now to provide the water and power needed for any long-range mineral resource development program can hurt our entire national economy and our national defense program.

The mineral industry of the Rocky Mountain West therefore urges you to weigh these needs in your consideration of legislation now before Congress asking for authorization of the upper Colorado River storage project.

The Rumanian Legation at Bern, Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a message from a Rumanian friend giving some interesting and, to me, new sidelights on the attempted seizure of the Rumanian Legation at Bern, Switzerland, by a group of young Rumanian anti-Communist students.

While we all realize that modern, or nuclear, warfare is unthinkable and to be avoided at all costs, still our hearts and sympathies are with the enslaved satellites who languish behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot help applauding these blows that are still being struck in the cause of freedom.

The message follows:

On the night of February 14 of this year a group of young Rumanian anti-Communist patriots seized the Communist-occupied legation in Bern, Switzerland, a legation which represents the Soviet-controlled puppet government in their homeland.

This action produced an enormous impression on European public opinion. The moral drama of these patriots, their youthfulness, the eldest among them being 31 years of age, aroused the sympathies of Europe. They came from resistance groups behind the Iron Curtain, being thus a living proof that 10 years of Communist indoctrination and oppression had been unable to kill the spirit of freedom germinating in the younger generation.

They had information that the new political setup in the Kremlin was in the process of sending fresh instructions to their various organizations and agents in the free world, one of these being the MVD chauffeur of the Rumanian Legation. They thought an excursion in that Communist den would surely yield valuable clues in that direction.

In fact the raid against the Communist Legation uncovered the espionage activities of the Red diplomats. An entire arsenal was found in the legation: a short-wave radio transmitter, automatic guns, all kinds of projectiles, time bombs, rockets, and a large quantity of ammunition.

According to the Swiss press, the important documents found clearly proved that the Legation was a spy center. As an immediate result of the Bern affair, the authorities in Sweden, alerted by this incident, uncovered also an important spy ring centering around the Rumanian and Czechoslovak Legations in Stockholm, thus bringing an added positive proof of the results of the action in Bern.

During the time the young Rumanians held the Legation the tension and excitement were at their height in Bern. The morning after the coup, about 2,000 Swiss were gathered in front of the building and 200 police surrounding it. As the young patriots refused to surrender at first, the Swiss authorities, under heavy pressure from the Communists, organized a veritable siege against the lone anti-Communists, surrounding the premises with barbed wire and bringing up an infantry battalion and an armored tank.

These young men had made a vow to obtain the release from Communist jails of several persecuted leaders of the Rumanian resistance, among whom was the heroic Roman Catholic Bishop Suciu. In these men they were asking symbolically the liberation of their people from the curse of Soviet slavery.

Finally after 42½ hours this action, which had caused such an impact on public opinion came to an end. The young men, before deciding to surrender, asked for a Catholic priest who released them from their vow. Then, before entering the police car, in full view of the crowd, they nailed on the front wall of the legation the insignia of free Rumania.

These young Rumanians are now in a Swiss prison awaiting trial.

The success of the Bern commando as a cold-war operation can be measured by the vehemence of Soviet Communist reaction. Mr. Allen Dulles and the CIA were violently attacked, a hysterical Communist press campaign was waged in order to combat the tremendous impression produced by the incident, and in Rumania a motion picture was made, in which the Bern incident was coupled with anti-American presentation of Korea, Indochinese, and Guatemalan scenes.

In Europe it was considered that the trial which will take place in the late fall, will be the most outstanding opportunity in years to dramatize with wide publicity, the issues between the free world and the Soviet enslaved world. Prominent European lawyers are ready to participate in the defense.

The incident in Bern was received among the refugees in Europe with unanimous enthusiasm and considered, since the revolt in East Berlin, as the most powerful event for stirring public opinion for their cause and for themselves a source of encouragement by strengthening their severely strained morale. It would largely counteract the present Soviet propaganda aimed at the repatriation of the refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

Considering the above factors, it is my conviction that the Bern incident and the ensuing trial could be used with telling effect from the point of view of the American cold war strategy by having a spectacularly organized anti-Communist trial.

If the defense will have American moral support, there is no doubt that such support of the trial will focus the attention of both the refugees and the people behind the Iron Curtain and strengthen their resistance forces. It will be a moving story of heroism and self sacrifice, which will catch especially the imagination of patriotic youth in the captive countries. It will also prevent the Soviet luring into repatriation hundreds of refugees, who would then be used in their country of origin as effective anti-American propaganda agents. It will give fresh proof that America is on the side of the enslaved as well as underlining the major role America is playing in the cold war.

Legal Opinion Backs Stand of Upper Colorado River Basin States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, southern California long has opposed the Colorado River storage project on a multiplicity of grounds, although seldom mentioning its real reason for this opposition. I submit that the true reason is its intention to appropriate the upper basin's share of the Colorado River system as well as their own, by a program of deliberate delay of the Colorado River storage project, regardless of the means used in bringing about such delay.

We of the upper basin long have been aware of the lengths the southern California water lobby would go, but even we were astounder when the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, of California, asserted earlier this week that any project authorization should await a suit pending in the Supreme Court in which Arizona seeks to quiet title to certain shares of water in the Colorado River system. California is the defendant.

This is an amazing statement in view of the report this week by the special master assigned by the Supreme Court to study this matter and to make a recommendation to the court.

The special master, the Honorable George I. Haight, was appointed on June 1, 1954, and directed to find the facts, state his conclusions and submit a draft of the decree recommended by him, specifically on California's attempts to bring the upper basin States into the suit as full parties.

The special master recommended that the upper-basin States need not be drawn into the suit. He excepted, of course, Utah and New Mexico, and only so far as to allow them to protect interests they have because small parts of these States are within the lower basin and the special master specifically ordered that these States be included only in relation to their respective lower-basin waters.

This ruling of the special master defeats another southern California attempt to delay the Colorado River storage project.

Not only did the special master reject the California contention that upper-basin States should be made full parties of the suit, he also emphasized some other important points relative to the Colorado River system, the Colorado River compact, and the rights of the various basins in the overall matter.

The special master has this to say about the compact which California seems to want to ignore:

The Colorado River compact evidences far-seeing practical statesmanship. The division of the Colorado River system waters into upper and lower basins was and is one of its most important features. It left to each basin the solution of the problems of that basin and did not tie to either basin the intrabasin problems of the other.

Southern California has attempted to dictate how we of the upper basin shall put our water to use. The special master says this:

How beneficial consumptive use shall be measured in each basin is a question for each basin to determine so long as the Colorado River compact endures. The quantities of water for the upper basin and its obligations to deliver are fixed by the Colorado River compact; (2) what matter how the individual basins measure beneficial consumptive use so long as it is possible to interpolate the two methods; and (3) as long as the upper basin is not using its entire apportionment (here no party alleges that it is), how can it be said that they are interested in the system used in the lower basin.

If ever there was a question about further delay pending the special master's report, that question has been definitely erased. This recommendation by the distinguished special master, appointed by the Supreme Court, gives another green light to a project that will benefit the entire United States. I refer to the Colorado River storage project, which I urge you to support regardless of the water-hog attitude of the southern California water lobby.

So that the record may be complete, I am including as an extension of my remarks the conclusions and recommendations of the special master, dated July 11, 1955, at Chicago, Ill.:

CONCLUSIONS

I conclude as follows:

1. No original party to the cause and no intervener charges any wrongful acts of commission or omission against the upper basin States, or presents any prayer for relief against them.

2. The Colorado River Compact divided the Colorado River system into two separate and distinct basins.

3. By the Colorado River Compact, each basin was left to make its own intrabasin allocations of the use of its water.

4. In 1949 the upper basin States entered into a compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, which was approved by the Congress of the United States.

5. The upper basin States have since been and now are operating under that compact.

6. By that compact, they settled among themselves the interbasin rights to the use of its waters, and also settled among themselves several upper basin questions which in the lower basin and in respect to its waters are now in controversy in this cause.

7. There is presently no legal or equitable reason for this court to disturb the operation of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, which result might come by joining these upper basin States as parties to this cause.

8. The States of the upper basin do not wish to join as parties in the instant cause. They resist the motion to join them.

9. To join them would be a backward and retarding step with respect to the solution of problems relating to the Colorado River system.

10. To now join the upper basin States in this cause with respect to upper basin waters would not tend to avoid litigation but would presently promote it.

11. The upper basin States in their capacities as such presently have no legal or equitable interest in the instant cause.

12. As to the upper basin States as such, there is no existent justiciable controversy between them and the present parties to this cause.

13. The United States, as intervener, has not enlarged the scope of the instant cause.

14. The interest of the United States in this proceeding is confined to its rights relating to waters of the lower basin.

15. Whatever the possibility of future controversy may be, there exists in such possibility no sound equitable reason for now joining the upper basin States as such in the instant litigation.

16. A decree can be soundly entered in this cause that will not affect the upper basin States with respect to rights to water or the use of waters in the upper basin.

17. The motion filed herein on July 15, 1954, by the California defendants to join upper basin States as parties ought to be denied as to Colorado and Wyoming, and denied as to Utah and New Mexico in their capacities as upper basin States.

18. Utah and New Mexico each has interests in the lower basin. These interests are small in comparison to the interests in lower basin water of the lower basin States, particularly California and Arizona. However small, they are substantial and important to Utah and to New Mexico, and likely will be so considered by dwellers in the areas having use and need for Colorado River water.

19. In the equitable allocation of the waters of the lower basin, the decree should not overlook these relatively small, but nevertheless substantial, interests.

20. The respective interests of Utah and New Mexico in lower basin waters are adverse to the interests of California, Nevada, Arizona, and the United States in lower basin waters. A justiciable controversy presently exists respecting these lower basin waters which involves substantial interests of Utah and New Mexico therein. In order to make equitable allocations of the use of lower basin waters in this case, New Mexico and Utah are necessary and indispensable parties.

21. With respect to Utah and New Mexico in their capacities as lower basin States, and only to the extent of their respective interests in lower basin waters, the motion should be allowed, and allowed separately as to each of them.

Clear the Runway—Here Comes St. Pat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass., Thursday, July 21, 1955, by Miss Barbara Jencks, who won second prize in the feature-writing category at the recent Catholic Press Convention in Buffalo, N. Y. Her award-winning story was about the Trappistine nuns in Wrentham, and she is a staff writer for the Providence Visitor.

The article follows:

IRISH PLANES ARE NAMED AFTER SAINTS

(By Barbara Jencks)

The next time you're in Ireland, go flying with St. Patrick.

And if St. Pat is tied up, don't fret. St. Brigid, St. Finian, or St. Laurence O'Toole will be glad to take you where you want to go.

ALL NAMED FOR SAINTS

You see, the Aer Lingus (Gaelic for airlines) has all the planes in its fleet named after Irish saints.

That's why it isn't uncommon to be standing at either Shannon Airport or Collinstown Airport and hear this:

"St. Patrick arriving on runway five."

In addition to the planes already listed, the fleet also includes the following craft:

LINED UP AT ALTAR

St. Columncille, St. Malachy, St. Aiden, St. Albert, St. Colman, St. Brendan, St. Enda, St. Finbar, St. Ita, St. Senan, and St. Flannan.

Annually the entire fleet is blessed at solemn ceremonies, much in the same manner that the fishing fleet is blessed at Gloucester.

At this year's blessing, the planes were lined up behind a temporary altar.

Pilots, hostesses, mechanics, cleaners, and members of the office staffs at the airport in Dublin walked in the procession prior to the blessing.

Music was provided by the Irish Army's band. A staff choir made up of Aer Lingus employees sang during the ceremonies.

Many of the saints after whom the planes are named were intrepid travelers themselves. They brought the Christian message to all parts of Europe.

HOLDS WORLD SAFETY RECORD

The Aer Lingus was founded in 1936. From the start it was decided that each plane would bear the name of an Irish saint.

St. Patrick was designated the flagship of the fleet.

Is it any wonder, then, that Aer Lingus is one of the world's safest airlines with only one fatality in its 19-year history?

The business of the Government-owned Aer Lingus has increased annually, at times doubled.

As yet, the system has not obtained a trans-Atlantic air service. The planes fly daily to England, France, Holland, and Scotland.

New planes are purchased each year by the rapidly growing company.

However, regardles of type, all planes are named after saints.

And all are painted bright green.

Space Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, theater goers throughout the country are familiar with the outstanding achievements of Walt Disney. Few know that, in addition to his role in the entertainment world, his technical capabilities have been of great service to our Government. I offer for inclusion in the RECORD an article describing Disney's study of the possibility of a flight into space, which was written for the magazine Interavia by Scholer Bangs, of Los Angeles.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE FLIGHT IS POSSIBLE (BUT WHO'LL PAY FOR IT?)

(By Scholer Bangs)

Walt Disney may be America's secret weapon for the conquest of space.

Apparently, and quite by accident, he has discovered the trigger that may blast loose his country's financial resources and place the Stars and Stripes of the United States aboard the first inhabited earth satellite and the first space ship to encircle the

moon as a trial run for an era of interplanetary exploration.

Scientists concede that human space flight is theoretically possible. And, generally, it is assumed that Russia and the United States are the two nations best equipped with resources and competitive urge to prepare the undertaking.

No one, however, seems to have come up with any clear answer to the No. 1 question confronting space planners:

"Who'll pay for it?"

In terms of the capitalist nation, the figure of $10 billion appears recurrently as a nice, round sum for getting space travel off to a good start.

One might imagine the amount, or its Soviet equivalent, as being relatively incidental to the overall space flight program, considering the stature of the nations involved.

In fact, United States space proponents figured they had made it as the cold war between the two world powers showed signs of becoming a "military ice age." They gazed upon the military as a prime source of dollars without end, and hopefully suggested that the first nation in the sky with an observation post satellite would dominate the other. The more politically astute even added that such dominance could prevent a hot war, and even assure lasting world peace.

The only thing wrong with this military approach is that it doesn't work.

It is true that under military pressure both the United States and Russia are spending some effort and money on space-flight research. But neither nation's armed forces may be expected to sponsor an all-out multi-billion-dollar do-it-now satellite project which might intrude heavily upon immediately available weapons.

In the case of the United States, the United States Air Force could hardly go to the Congress and say, "We do not yet have a production missile for intercontinental retaliation, but in the meantime how about letting us have an extra $10 billion to build a space ship?" And imagine the horrified reaction of a Congressman: "What would my constituents do to me at the next election if I were to vote for a comic-strip space patrol?"

Into this atmosphere has come Walt Disney, Hollywood's past master of the motion-picture documentary film, creator of countless wartime training films—Seal Island, Beaver Valley, The Living Desert, The Reluctant Dragon—to bathe the United States space horizon with a dazzling prospect. He has now produced a motion picture which he has titled "Man in Space."

It has never had "top secret" branded upon it to suggest awesome military importance because it is simply an entertainment film.

In Hollywood space fantasies are a dime a dozen for the television trade, and as preposterously improbable as they are numerous. But Disney has chosen to present merely a research-factual review of man's itch to explore the unknown, estimates of the flight equipment needed to probe the space wilderness, and a best guess of the problems and sensations which will be encountered by the first human to inhabit a space vehicle.

To do this he has brought together, for the first time in a motion picture, three internationally noted experts of space research: Willy Ley, the rocketry and space-flight historian; Dr. Wernher von Braun, the German rocket designer, now engaged in missiles projects a Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; and Dr. Heinz Haber, the space-medicine authority and associate physicist in the department of engineering at University of California, Los Angeles.

Ley brings up to date the advances man has made toward the barriers of space. Dr. von Braun presents his estimates for an immediately practical earth orbit space rocket, and offers in logical steps its construction, the training of its space crew, and the man's first blast-off into the void beyond earth's atmosphere. And Dr. Haber introduces an appealing, thoroughly Disneyesque cartoon personality, Homo Sapiens Extraterrestrialis, self-conscious, shyly serious, delighted and bewildered by his role of the first human to be subjected to a rocketing space flight. What happens to H. S. E. is exciting and alarming as he does everything wrong in the state of apparent weightlessness, and is subjected to a barrage of meteorites and cosmic rays. Of course, being the hero of the show, Mr. E survives it all quite handily, presumably ready for a go at Mars on the next trip out.

Disney's immediate achievement, with the aid of this triumvirate of space authorities, is the suggestion that space travel no longer is a wild dream; that it is so near that we can practically feel the earth tremble under the rocket base of Dr. von Braun's space ship.

Man in Space is believable, and Mr. Disney has close to one hundred million Americans believing. It was first shown on a network of 160 television stations in March and repeated on June 15. A third showing is to come on September 7, and if no production snags are encountered the Disney audience will be treated to a new space adventure, a rocket trip around the moon.

By then about half of the voting population of the United States of America probably will have reached two impressive conclusions: "It can be done!", and "Let's get on with it!".

United States space partisans are well aware of the potential of a nation of believers. The scientists who participated in the filming of the Disney show are certain that through public enthusiasm financial support of a space project will become readily available. Dr. Haber told me: "We are in agreement that the 'how soon' of space exploration is largely a political question, and that the hesitation of political agencies to assure funds for the project will disappear as popular support makes itself felt.

"However, one should not be misled into anticipating that if the Congress should vote unlimited funds tomorrow we could begin immediate construction of a space vehicle.

"We could reduce by years, perhaps, the target date for man's first space flight; but none of us have any illusions concerning the vast amount of preliminary work still to be done. We merely are more hopeful now, and convinced that we are on the right approach.

"I think it quite possible that I will live to see its achievement."

Dr. Haber believes that both Dr. von Braun and Willy Ley are in agreement with him that, before construction of a manned space vehicle can be attempted, exhaustive research data must be gleaned from tests of intercontinental ballistic missiles and, a step beyond, unmanned but highly instrumented earth satellites.

"Then," he said, "we will be ready to tackle the cross-country rocket plane which Dr. von Braun envisions."

"These are practical steps toward the realization of unlimited space travel, and they should not be too slow in their development. The manned station in space is quite another matter, however, and it is my strong belief that we have not yet reached the point of specific planning of the undertaking. We do not yet have answers to some of the major problems, both political and scientific. The mustering of scientific manpower for such a project presents, in itself, a major obstacle."

Such are the views of one who for many years has been in the foreground in United States discussions of space pioneering. In view of his careful, scientific recognition of many other stumbling blocks and barriers on the space highway it might appear strange that he should find himself involved in a television space show aimed solely at the entertainment of a mass audience principally concerned with meeting the monthly payments on their 1955 automobiles.

What persuaded him to join the Disney venture?

Dr. Haber relates the incident as follows:

"I was surprised when I received a call from the Disney studio in April of 1954. They explained that they were putting together a series of television films, and would like to have my participation as a consultant on a science-factual story about space travel. I was dubious because I knew from past experience that in Hollywood pictures and science don't mix.

"The studio had pinned upon the four walls of a large room otherwise occupied only by comfortable chairs with wheels on their legs a massive array of rough sketches depicting the plot and sequences of the space story. As we wheeled ourselves past this display, I was asked my reaction to every sketch.

"The story line was quite different than I had expected. Normally when a Hollywood studio does a space picture, scientific facts are badly twisted and distorted to fit a more or less silly plot of fiction. The projected Disney show had no plot—or rather, its plot was science and science's potential future. True, there were a number of sketches on the wall displaying material that was controversial, invalid, or scientifically doubtful. We scientists were put to work to weed out these flaws.

"It was very gratifying to find out that the science consultants to the Disney show were allowed to be true consultants. Their advice and suggestions were taken at face value. At one time Disney had told the artists 'If our scientists find it necessary to kill a good gag because it violates a law of nature—it is just too bad. Then we will have to find new gags that are consistent with scientific facts.'"

Dr. Haber feels that for himself and his consulting associates the making of the Disney film has brought about a new appreciation of the art of making pure science understandable to the unscientific lay mind.

"In putting together the space story the Disney artists became scientists, and we became Disney artists, inventing jokes and gags to convert pure science into pure entertainment and still present scientific facts which are important to an understanding of space problems.

"When we sought to personalize probable human experiences in space flight, the little cartoon character seen in the television show evolved. This droll little person did not come into being easily, however. The Disney artists drew more than a score of caricatures of the first man in space before the lucky fellow was selected. We chose to name him Homo Sapiens Extraterrestrialis not only to identify him with scientific clarity but, as well, to satisfy his obvious vanity at being selected for the important role.

"He became so real to us that very soon we found ourselves actually talking to him as a living actor: 'No, Homo, not that way; you're weightless; just floating in space. Show surprise when the Martini you're raising to your lips leaves the glass and keeps on going to splash against the cabin ceiling.' We constantly asked each other, 'How will Homo react?' when we placed him in one embarrassing predicament after another."

In the Disney show, Homo Sapiens is subjected alternately to the crushing forces of acceleration and the bewildering effects of weightlessness. He is machinegunned by bullets of cosmic rays; sucked by explosive decompression through a hole punched in the cabin by a wayward meteorite; seared on one side and frozen on the other when exposed, outside the space ship, to solar radiation; alternately delighted and terrified by the thrust effects of his small jet pistol as

he tries to regain the security of his space vehicle. Repeatedly, never quite able to grasp the consequences of his actions, he is subjected to the gross indignities of weightlessness in free fall through space.

Quite understandably Homo's misadventures in the weightless state command major prominence in the picture. It falls into the category of major problems of the space planners.

"Actually, while we have had and will have ample opportunity to test on the ground the structures, powerplants, and physical accessories of our space ships, there has been very little opportunity to learn from actual experience just how a human will react to the weightless state," Dr. Haber says.

"We can duplicate the effects of acceleration with the human centrifuge. Quite readily we can test human tolerances of heat and cold. We know what to expect of inanimate objects in the state of weightless suspension. But we know very, very little about human reactions in this field.

"As of today, our only tool for experimenting with human weightlessness is the fast-flying airplane, directed upward at high speed and then held as long as possible to the arc of a parabolic path. With equipment so far available, we have been able to maintain a crude approximation of the weightless state for as long as 35 seconds.

"I, for one, am not to happy with the results.

"Where Maj. Charles Yeager, the first man to fly faster than sound, experimented with weightlessness in a jet fighter, he reported that after 8 seconds in the parabola he became completely disoriented and had to break away from the curve. He said, 'I felt completely lost in space—as if I were sitting on a big ball and being rotated slowly.'

"Others who have attempted it have come down with quite contradictory reports of having experienced no disturbance.

"I cannot help but conclude that Chuck Yeager, an exceptionally good pilot, may have been the only one to maintain a steadily constant parabolic flight path, and it is wholly possible that we will get no really informative data on the physiology of weightlessness until we can so instrument a plane that it will maintain its parabola automatically."

However, Dr. Haber believes that the chief concern of zero gravity researchers will be that of discovering how to acclimatize space crews to their unusual situation. He says he believes that humans can adjust to the sense of weightlessness and through experience learn how to live with the phenomenon. He adds:

"Even should the transcontinental rocket plane develop before we have all the answers to weightlessness, we probably will not have too many worries. Assuming that the rocket plane reaches a speed of 3 miles per second in outer space, its passengers should not be exposed to weightlessness for a period greater than 6 minutes. Exposure of this length should not present any serious problems of human tolerance."

Small animals exposed to relatively lengthy periods of weightlessness in United States high altitude missile flights have shown no serious disturbance beyond disorientation, which evidently was modified when they were provided supports to which they could cling. At the point of rocket burnout, and start of the weightless state, test animals stopped breathing for the time of 5 or 6 exhalations but then resumed breathing normally.

While such experimental details are either absent or only lightly touched in the Disney picture, Dr. Haber and his fellow scientists appear to be convinced that the basic story of man's drive to learn what is beyond his earth's atmosphere has been well told, and effectively.

Walt Disney will probably expand the story in ensuing pictures. Those who know him are certain that he will not be swayed in the least by being considered America's "secret weapon" of space conquest.

The Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we have all been interested in the summit meeting at Geneva and its outcome.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the July 24 column of John O'Donnell, Capitol Stuff in Europe, which appears in the July 25, 1955, edition of the New York Daily News. Mr. O'Donnell was in Geneva during the conference, and I believe that his observations will be of interest to my colleagues.

The column follows:

CAPITOL STUFF IN EUROPE
(By John O'Donnell)

GENEVA, July 24.—We Americans should be mighty thankful today over the results of this Geneva Big Four conference. Most certainly the diplomatic plane supposedly headed for the port of universal peace, peaceful coexistence, and brotherly love made another crash landing.

But this time we were able to walk away from the wreck much more than we could after Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. True, we didn't win anything except a vague promise that we'd keep on talking with our opposite Commie numbers next month in New York and here in Geneva next October on the same cold war issues that the boys have been discussing all last week without getting anywhere.

But this time we didn't lose our national pants and shirts as Roosevelt and Truman lost them for us in 1945. There are no secret agreements at this meeting.

Eisenhower must be given credit for putting on an amazingly brilliant propaganda show, so expertly produced, both in formal sessions and informal hours of relaxation, that he astounded even his greatest admirers.

Ike didn't change the basic line of Russian Commie thinking. The Kremlin big shots moved out of Geneva last night and this morning still gushing sweetness and light and showing off their newly-acquired charm-school deportment. But they definitely refused to go along with Ike's argument for a united Germany and a German army in the NATO setup.

The Russians weren't as grim and nasty as they have been in the past on this matter. Instead of saying to hell with the idea of letting a unified Germany rearm with United States equipment, the boys from Moscow kissed it off with a broad smile. They just refused to answer or comment on that all-important question and called for the vodka and caviar celebration. The masterminds of global government then locked arms for an Auld Lang Syne, chorus by the banks of Lake Leman and headed homeward to Washington, Moscow, London, and Paris.

ADENAUER: A DISAPPOINTED OBSERVER

A hundred miles north of here, up in a German-speaking Swiss canton, the most powerful European this side of the Iron Curtain, Konrad Adenauer, the 80-year-old chancellor of West Germany is now reported to be definitely disturbed over the results of this Geneva conference.

Old Adenauer knows that the Russians are playing for time, for 6 months or a year, hoping that age will finally conquer their determined enemy. Adenauer is disappointed that Ike did not get a firm and definite commitment from the Russians at this meeting.

Furthermore, reports here from Germany say that newsreel shots showing Eisenhower and Marshal Zhukov posing happily together have aroused fury among German audiences who recall when Zhukov's soldiers staged the "big rape" in May, 1945.

Russian infantrymen stuck United States lend-lease tommyguns into the bellies of German fathers and made them witness the ravishing of their wives and daughters. This German reaction to Geneva may turn out to be important for us as a military question.

WHO IS MYSTERY MAN IN THE KREMLIN?

On the Russian side, the most interesting development, at least to Americans and our British cousins (the French just don't count in this setup), is the fact that the top Russian delegation here in Geneva was not able to make a final important decision without talking to somebody in the Kremlin.

What Americans would like to know is who now sits in the Kremlin so important that top guy Premier Bulganin (who has really charmed everyone here), rough-and-tough Commie political by Khrushchev, Ike's old pal Marshal Zhukov and iron-pants Foreign Minister Molotov have to call up before they get the go-ahead signal.

The Russians played it smartly on the most dramatic play of the conference, particularly in their own backyard behind the Iron Curtain. This quick-thinking move came when our own Eisenhower crossed the boys up with his surprise suggestion that we and our cold war enemies swap blueprints of our top-secret defense installations and exchange mutual invitations to come on over in your planes and take all the pictures you want.

Now this idea had been chewed over for many weeks in Washington. Naturally, it sent cold chills down the spines of every responsible professional military man. Ike himself was originally cold to the suggestion. But here in Geneva he realized that he was the one member of the Big Four who was riding high, wide and handsome on the international propaganda front. So he decided to shoot the works, making up his mind only eight hours before pulling the trigger.

IKE PROPOSAL IS TOLD TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE

This was an audacious move. The Russians might have taken us up on the diplomatic propaganda gamble. Thank the Lord they didn't.

The Russians, as the British report, smiled decisively at this suggestion by Eisenhower. But it's important to note that this highly important Eisenhower move, a definite win for the U. S., was honestly reported to the Russian people both in their controlled press and over their government radio.

So score one for our side on this play. And give credit to the boys who needled Ike into taking the chance. The two who did it were Harold Stassen and Ike's White House assistant, Nelson Rockefeller, a former F. D. R. global New Dealer.

The Late Frank Crowther

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved at the passing of my old

friend, Frank Crowther. He and I became great friends during his service in the Congress, and we have kept up a correspondence ever since he left. Frank was a very able man, a very useful and patriotic one. In his work in the committee rooms and on the floor of the House he was always listened to because he had meat in what he said. He really served his day and generation in the best fashion. To his wife and his other loved ones goes my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Appreciation of the GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a letter from a World War II veteran by the name of William G. Fogland, of Hornsby, New South Wales, Australia, whom I have never had the pleasure of meeting, and he is not a member of the district which I have the honor to represent. He writes in appreciation of the World War II GI bill of rights, Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress.

All of us know of the value of that legislation, but it is heartwarming to receive this type of letter from a young man who has made such excellent use of its provisions.

For that reason, I am asking permission to include his letter as a part of my remarks.

The letter referred to follows:

HORNSBY, N. S. W., AUSTRALIA,
June 8, 1955.

Mrs. EDITH N. ROGERS,
Member of Congress, Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Repesentatives, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C., United States of America.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: With the end of the last university term, my entitlement under United States Public Law 346, the GI bill, expired, and I am now finishing the last year of the medical course of the University of Sydney under personal resources.

To you, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and as the former member for Melrose, and to the other members of your committee, I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude for the opportunity provided by the far-seeing legislation enacted on behalf of veterans in 1944. It was a good substantial piece of constructive work at a time when the emphasis was on destruction, and without it, I, in common with so many others, should have been unable to retrain and to shift into a far more congenial and satisfying occupation. Since I have been in training for the past 5 years, I have felt very strongly that when my entitlement expired I must write to the Veterans' Affairs Committee to thank the members—both the present members and those who were members in 1944 if they be not members today—for providing the opportunity and the means for achieving the education which I should have been unable to obtain without this legislation.

Previously, I had a job; today I am on the threshold of a profession, and Albany Hospital, Albany, N. Y., has appointed me to an internship in surgery for next year.

Again, my many thanks to the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. FOGLAND.

A Bill To Relieve Aliens of an Unnecessary Trip To Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the case of Jane Edith Thomas has highlighted an inequity in our immigration laws that should be corrected. I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to obviate the senseless trip to Canada now required of aliens in the United States who are otherwise fully eligible to remain here.

Jane Edith Thomas is a 4-year-old girl born at the American hospital in Trieste in 1951. Her father, an American citizen, was a member of the Armed Forces stationed in Trieste. Jane's parents are now back in the United States, having brought Jane with them under a visa issued by the United States consul at Venice. Now it turns out that technically Jane is not yet a United States citizen and hence must be deported to Canada, although she can then, after cooling her heels in the land of our neighbors to the north, reenter this country under a valid visa and in due course gain her United States citizenship.

No earthly purpose is served by putting a 4-year-old girl to the trouble of a trip to Canada, and her parents to the expense and worry of such a trip.

Of all the needlessly harsh features of our immigration laws, none is more absurd than that which makes it necessary for an alien in the United States to make a special trip to Canada to secure an immigration visa in order to obtain permanent residence here. This makeshift procedure is resorted to by aliens in this country who desire to remain here, but have not been admitted for permanent residence, where they meet all the qualifications for admission as immigrants, and for whom a quota number is available if required. There is no explicit statutory provision which prescribes or authorizes this practice. It is an expedient devised by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to legalize the status of aliens who otherwise would have to leave the country or be subject to deportation.

To understand the situation, it is necessary to review the history of this method of adjusting the status of aliens, which is known as preexamination procedure. It was instituted by administrative regulation in 1935, after an agreement was reached with the Canadian Government whereby certain aliens would be granted entry into Canada temporarily for the purpose of applying to an American consular officer for an immigration visa to the United States. The United States authorities agreed to receive the alien back into this country if he was denied an immigration visa. In certain cases an alien who wished to have his status adjusted was examined by the immigration authorities in this country to determine his eligibility for admission. If found eligible and if a quota number was available for him, he was permitted to go to Canada, obtain an immigration visa from the American consular office there, and return to the United States.

Although originally intended as a temporary arrangement pending enactment of legislation by Congress, this "pre-examination procedure" was continued after Congress made provision in 1940 for suspension of deportation in specified hardship cases. To obviate the need for this cumbersome procedure, a provision—section 245—was inserted in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 authorizing certain aliens lawfully in the country as nonimmigrants to obtain an adjustment of status to that of persons admitted for permanent residence by petition to the Attorney General. Unfortunately, this provision does not go far enough. It applies only to a limited class of aliens—those who have entered as bona fide nonimmigrants and who continue to maintain that status, and for whom a quota or nonquota immigration visa is immediately available. If affords no relief if there has been any irregularity in the admission of the alien, even a technical error for which he is not responsible. A person admitted as a citizen cannot obtain an adjustment of status if it is found that his parents had lost his citizenship or could not transmit citizenship under the highly technical provisions of the Nationality Code. Nor is this procedure available to aliens who through misunderstanding of our laws, fear of persecution in their native country, or for other reasons overstay the period of their admission.

Because there are so many meritorious cases for which section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides no remedy, Congress has been flooded with private bills to adjust the status of individuals. To lighten this burden on Congress, and to avoid the necessity of deporting aliens who have proved themselves to be desirable residents, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization recently revived the preexamination procedure. While this is less harsh on a meritorious alien than deportation, to require him to go to Canada to pick up an immigration visa after he has been found admissible for permanent residence serves no useful purpose whatever. It imposes a wholly unnecessary financial burden on the individual. In many cases, especially with respect to elderly persons, it constitutes a physical hardship as well, one which may endanger their lives or health.

The bill I have today introduced would extend the present remedy for adjustment of status by the Attorney General to all cases where the alien is found admissible for permanent residence if a

quota number is immediately available to him or if he is admissible as a nonquota immigrant.

Such a provision would in no way weaken our control over aliens. It would be no obstacle to the deportation of undesirable aliens. Nor would it enable the alien who comes to the United States as a visitor to obtain a preference over persons in foreign countries who have applied for, and are waiting to receive, quota numbers. The Attorney General would be authorized to grant permanent residence to a quota immigrant only if he could obtain a quota number.

Furthermore, the adjustment could be made only where, after a thorough examination, the alien was found to fulfill all requirements for admission as an immigrant. The only substantial change I propose to make is to permit the adjustment to be made without a useless trip to Canada, after the Attorney General determines in accordance with the procedure prescribed by statute that the alien is entitled to the relief now obtained by this roundabout procedure. This change will be a benefit both to the alien and the Government. It will relieve the alien from the hardship resulting from leaving and reentering the United States. It will also greatly simplify the administration of the law.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter received from a constituent, Mr. Frank S. Lehmann, Hastings, Nebr.

Some weeks ago Mr. and Mrs. Lehmann were successful on the program Break the Bank. I sent a letter of congratulations to them and received this well written thoughtful letter in return. I feel that Mr. Lehmann's views on national and international subjects are deserving of this recognition.

The letter follows:

HASTINGS, NEBR., *July 9, 1955.*

Hon. PHIL WEAVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WEAVER: Kindly accept our heartiest thanks for your thoughtful letter of congratulation.

It was an unforgetable event for Mrs. Lehmann and myself when we proudly could proclaim to the untold millions listening in that we came from Hastings in the State of Nebraska.

We never would have believed what publicity really can do.

From the moment we left the theater, on the streets, in stores, depots, all over, hands were outstretched to greet and congratulate us. It is a grand and glorious feeling to live in such a great country among so many friendly people.

As a lifelong Republican, I was very happy to get in contact with my Congressman. May God bless you and your colleagues and may He help you in your great and strenuous work.

The world stands today at the crossroads of its most momentous decisions in the history of mankind.

Therefore the statement of fellow Nebraskan Mr. Brownell, that the President will be a candidate again in 1956 is timely, great, and welcome news to all patriotic Americans. His masterly and vigorous but still flexible judgment in guiding the affairs of his country and his comprehensive understanding of world affairs make it urgently imperative that he be the banner bearer again in 1956 and that we must do all in our power to convince our countrymen that President Eisenhower is absolutely the indispensable man of the day.

I have lived a long time in this world and I have studied its history over and over again to come to the conclusion that the power of the mind will prevail in the end.

Our great American democracy is the defender, godless communistic radicalism the attacker.

A great fiery and emotional propaganda campaign is in the offing.

Let's get ready for it.

With the approaching meeting of the heads of the four big powers in Geneva, and right thereafter the Communists will unloosen a flood of pernicious borings from within and bombastic and honest-to-goodness protestations of universal peace.

I watched them in Germany over 50 years ago when William Liebknecht and August Bebel fought Kautzky and Bernstein. In England when the Fabians, with the Sidneys and Bernard Shaw, gradually became the Kier Hardys and the McDonalds and ultimately the Atlees and the Bevins.

There is no "lesser evil."

They are all working for the same goal—the ultimate socializing of the world.

There might be coexistence for a while, but the positive end will be either free democracy or communistic socialism. There is still time. The freedom-loving people are still in the overwhelming majority. They are anxiously awaiting our message. Now is the time for action. We have to fight fire with fire. Let's get ready for it.

I could write volumes on this and related subjects, but I do not want to take up more of your valuable time, only please allow me to give a few sketchy remarks about myself and also my belief that God wants me to do my share in this great battle for justice and freedom.

I spent 20 years of my life in Germany and 5 in England. I have traveled all over Europe and studied its people and their political and economic conditions.

In general, the greatest part of my life I was in the mercantile field as a store owner, salesman, organizer, and public speaker.

For 12 years I was connected with an insurance company as agent, district manager, and traveling supervisor. My work consisted of opening new agencies, work as a high-pressure closer with the men, and go from office to office to make pep speeches. I helped to build the company from a small assessment society to 1 of the 10 largest sick and accident companies in the country.

I also was active in organizing industrial companies and fraternal societies. As an orator, I classify more as the emotional spellbinder type, very persuasive and successful.

In closing let me assure you that in writing this letter I am not guided by mercenary motives, nor do I have any political aspirations whatsoever.

My only desire is to lend a helping hand in this great and holy fight for liberty and freedom.

Sincerely,

FRANK S. LEHMANN.

HASTINGS, NEBR.

Elections in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include for the RECORD a story on elections in Israel as brought to my attention by the Embassy of Israel in Washington. I am sure the Members of this legislative body will be interested in reading of the similarities and differences between Israel's elections and form of government and ours. But the outstanding fact is Israel proclamation, which like our own system, assures and guarantees freedom of religion, speech, conscience, education, and culture for all.

ELECTIONS IN ISRAEL—ELECTION DAY—ITS SPECIAL MEANING

Election day in Israel brings to a climax a political campaign that, despite the differences of custom and language, bears striking resemblance to those of the United States and other western democratic nations.

In 1955, July 26—the 7th of Av, 5715, according to the Hebrew calendar—was selected as election day. On that day, Israelis will elect the 120 members of the Knesset, the Parliament of Israel.

Radio—sound trucks—advertisements in the newspapers—posters on the billboards—speeches in the parks and meeting halls—heated conversations over the dinner table and at restaurants and cafes—everywhere, the political campaign holds the attention and interest of the people of Israel.

Indeed, Americans visiting Israel during the campaign would find the speeches and oratory missing from only one accustomed medium of communicaiton. There is no political campaigning on television in Israel—only because Israel does not yet have television.

Free speech, and lots of it, dominated the scene during this 1955 election—the third in the history of the young Republic. The preelection discussions, the secret ballot, the excitement and the pride that are the mark of a free people, are found in Israel as they are throughout the democratic world when voters choose the candidate who will direct their sovereign government.

But election day in Israel has a special kind of drama.

Israel is one of the few countries in the Middle East that hold free elections or permit a broad enfranchisement of their citizens.

Israel, a small country (it has some 8,000 square miles, about the size of Massachusetts; and a population of about 1,750,000, not much more than the State of Oregon) offers the voting right to every citizen.

Many of its citizens are enjoying democratic rights for the first time in their lives, as a result of their immigration to Israel.

Never is that more obvious than on election day.

Ballots are cast by Israel citizens who just a few years ago were living an existence typical of the Middle Ages in the ghettos of Yemen or Morocco, or who had been reduced to second-rate citizenship in Iraq; by families who came to Israel to escape the persecution of Hitler's anti-Semitism; by men and women who managed to get out from countries behind the Iron Curtain before their governments put a halt to legal emigration to this little country on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean.

Whatever their background, these citizens of Israel now have the right to vote. They

use their right. Jew, Christian, Moslem; man or woman; rich or poor; native born, old settler, or newly arrived immigrant—all share the right to vote in secret for the party of their choice in Israel's quadrennial elections.

The people of Israel treasure that right to vote. It is embedded deeply into their democratic tradition, and specifically into the constitutional legislation of the state. It is valued the more because of the contrast—contrast so close at hand, so fresh in their memories—with lands where the franchise is sharply limited, if it exists at all; or with other areas where the ballot is scarcely secret and the political choice is limited to one all-powerful party.

So, as the people of Israel vote in the free elections of July 26—in the big cities, in the cooperative farms, in the remote settlements, of the Negev, or at their army posts—they will have the special pride of an enlightened citizenry which is building the future of their families and their nation, despite special conditions of adversity.

WHO CAN VOTE?

Every citizen of Israel, over the age of 18, without regard to race, color, creed, or previous nationality, has the right to vote. The Government does everything possible to make him aware of his right and encourages him to make use of it.

Every effort is made to see that every eligible citizen qualifies himself. Thus, in view of continuing immigration to the country, persons who obtained their citizenship between January 1 and March 1, 1955, were given the right to vote in the 1955 elections—under a law passed in 1954.

During a 6-week period in January and February, registration notice forms were sent by registered mail to all the people on the roster of eligible voters. A signature on that card becomes prima facie evidence on election day that the bearer is entitled to vote.

The same mailing system serves to warn those who don't get their registration cards that their names are not on the voting list, or that they're registered at a previous address. (That's particularly important in Israel, with its hundreds of thousands of new immigrants; as might be expected, they tend to move around before they finally settle down.) So, the failure to receive a registration card serves as a reminder to the individual to get himself registered for the election—at the right place, at the right time.

There's still another safeguard. At every polling station, a list of the qualified voters for the area must be posted 10 hours a day, for 10 days prior to April 15. People whose names are missing from the list can arrange for appeal of their status; and they may take the matter to the district courts, if necessary, for final redress.

Of course, Moslems and Christians, as well as Jews, have full voting rights, as they have all the rights of citizenship, in the State of Israel.

(In Israel, the Moslems constitute the largest non-Jewish religious group. A number of groups of people of the Christian faith also live there: Greek Catholics, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Maronites, Anglicans, and other Protestant sects.)

Israel citizens do make use of that right to vote. It is estimated that more than 85 percent of the country's adults (who number about 1.1 million), will vote on July 26—one of the highest proportions of voting participation in any democratic country in the world.

WHO CAN BE A CANDIDATE?

Every citizen of Israel who will be 21 years of age on the day the lists of candidates are submitted is eligible to run for office.

Judges of any court, however, are not permitted to run for office—a prohibition based on the belief that the judiciary at every level must be completely removed from partisan politics.

Civil servants and members of the armed forces, regardless or rank, are eligible to stand as candidates in the election. Civil servants (except for schoolteachers) and members of the regular army, must take a leave of absence from their government jobs from the day of nomination by their political party until Election Day—and, if they're elected to the Knesset, that leave of absence continues for the duration of their 4-year term.

This is required in order to insure that the machinery of government and the army are insulated from the heat of the political campaign.

HOW ARE THE ELECTIONS RUN?

Israel's elections, in the language of its basic law, are "universal, direct, equal, secret, and proportional."

They are "universal" in terms of a broadly enfranchised electorate.

They are "equal," in the sense that every citizen has one vote.

They are "direct," since the voters cast their ballots directly for the party of their choice.

They are "secret." Each voter, in the privacy of the voting booth, places his ballot into a sealed heavy envelope. The envelope, in the presence of official observers, is dropped into the ballot box. Nobody can see or find out how the individual citizen votes.

And Israel's elections are based on a "proportional" system—but one quite different from the system of "proportional representation" that is sometimes used in local elections in the United States.

The Israel voter does not vote for an individual candidate. He does vote for a party, a party philosophy, a specific party election platform. The voter cannot split his ticket among the various parties.

In the election for the Knesset, each party submits a list of candidates—up to a total of 120, the total membership of the Knesset. Most of the larger parties submit a full ticket of 120 candidates; many of the smaller ones submit a lesser number than the complete 120. Each list of party candidates is numbered in whatever order the party itself decides.

Here's how it works. If a party gets 50 percent of the votes, it gets 60—out of the 120 total—candidates elected. The first 60 people on that party's list thus take office. The law provides that any party receiving not less than 1 percent of the vote cast participates in the distribution of the Knesset seats.

One interesting byproduct of this election arrangement is that it saves the country the necessity of byelections to fill vacancies in the Knesset caused by death or resignation. When a vacancy occurs, the seat is filled by the next man or woman on the election candidate list of the party involved

WHO SUPERVISES THE ELECTIONS?

Supervision of Israel's quadrennial elections, and the handling of the technical arrangements for them, are in the hands of a 31-member central elections board, carefully established to give a voice to all political trends in the country.

The chairman of the board is a Supreme Court judge, elected for this specific task by his fellow judges. The members of the board are elected by the political parties in the outgoing Knesset, each party being roughly entitled to 1 seat on the board for each 4 seats it holds in the national parliament. In addition, the smaller parties represented by less than 4 deputies in the Knesset each get 1 seat on the central elections board.

The central elections board has five major tasks: (1) accepting the lists of candidates submitted by the parties; (2) setting up and supervising the regional election boards, which, in turn, name the local boards; (3) handling all the technical and administrative arrangements for the election; (4) "policing" the campaign to make sure the "ground rules" are obeyed; and (5) counting, certifying and publishing the election results.

The sound and the fury of Israel's election campaign come to a silent halt at 7 p. m. the night before election day. No public campaign meeting, no broadcasts, no sound trucks are permitted after that time. On election day itself, the polls stay open throughout the country from 6 a. m. until 11 p. m. Counting of the votes starts immediately afterwards—and since in most cases the election law permits no more than 800 voters to be registered at any one polling station, the count comes in quickly to the Central Elections Board.

Soldiers have their own polling stations, located at military establishments throughout the land. The election campaign at the military posts is severely regulated. Each party has the right to display one copy of its list of candidates, its election platform and notices of outside campaign meetings at the premises of each army unit. But no other policital campaigning is permitted at army posts.

CASTING THE BALLOT

Casting a ballot in the Israel elections is a simple task, since the vote is for a party rather than for individual candidates.

Throughout the campaign, each party features one Hebrew letter on all its printed and oral propaganda; that letter becomes the symbol of the party, in much the same way that political parties in the United States feature visual symbols which appear at the head of their column on the ballot or voting machine.

When the Israel voter enters the booth—a booth that by law must conceal the voter from the sight of any other person, he finds stacks of printed slips, bearing the letter-symbol of the various parties. He chooses the paper with the symbol of his favored party, places it in a heavy envelope and seals it. Emerging from the voting booth, he drops the envelope into the ballot box, in the presence of the election inspectors.

This voting system is simple, foolproof—and of special value in this land of heavy immigration, where considerable numbers of the electorate do not yet have full proficiency in the Hebrew language.

THE KNESSET—ISRAEL'S PARLIAMENT

The Knesset, for which the voters make their political selections, is the Parliament of Israel. It is the most important public body in the nation, as it is in most other parliamentary democracies.

The 120 members of the Knesset serve for 4 years.

The Knesset elects the President of Israel, who serves a 5-year term. The President's duties and powers are restricted. He entrusts a member of the Knesset with the task of forming a government; he appoints the country's foreign representatives and receives foreign diplomats; and he receives reports from the Prime Minister. Mr. Yitzhak Ben-Zvi is the second President; he succeeded the late Dr. Chaim Weizmann on November, 9, 1952.

The Prime Minister must be a member of the Knesset, and the members of his Cabinet are usually fellow deputies in the Parliament. The first Prime Minister was David Ben-Gurion; he resigned on December 7, 1953, and was succeeded by Moshe Sharett. Both are members of the Mapai Party.

The Knessett also elects the Speaker of the Knesset—whose functions somewhat resemble those of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the United States. The Speaker is Joseph Sprinzak.

The Knesset, unlike the American and British Parliaments, is a one-house legislature. There is no Senate, as in the United States of America, nor a House of Lords, as in the British Parliament.

Like its American counterpart, the Knesset has its own Congressional Record—called in Hebrew, Divrei HaKnesset—a transcript of all the debate. The Knesset also has its press galleries, and newspapers give it the same close attention that American papers pay to action and trends in the Congress.

The Knesset elected in July 1955 is the third in Israel's modern history; the first was elected in January 1949 and the second in July 1951. But the name "Knesset," as well as the figure of 120 members of which it is composed, derives from the ancient history of Israel. The Knesset Hagdola (the Great Synod) was the name of the central legislative body of Israel at the time of the Second Temple, over 2,000 years ago.

During the 7 years of Israel's existence as a modern Republic, the Knesset has been faced with the challenge of a heavy responsibility. It has had to establish a mass of modern legislation for a new state with unique and unexplored problems; and to adapt and modernize the legal system that applied under the British mandatory regime of Palestine and previous occupants of the land.

That means lots of legal problems. For instance, a typical hand-me-down from an older legal concept of the inferior status of women was a law of evidence that "in civil cases, evidence is only valid when given by 2 males, or by 1 male and 2 females." This discriminatory provision, like innumerable others, was abolished by the Knesset's passage of a women's equal rights law of 1951.

The wide scope of problems facing the State can be discerned in even a brief listing of the more important laws passed by the Knesset during 1953 and 1954. Over and above the normal parliamentary actions on appropriations, taxes, and governmental routine, the Knesset passed laws to establish an independent judiciary of high integrity; a modern social insurance system; a law and administrative ordinance to bring the general body of statutes up to date; and new laws covering marriage and divorce, education, and the abolition of capital punishment in murder cases—to name just a few.

Clearly, since the President's powers are limited and the Prime Minister is responsible to it, the Knesset is no rubber-stamp legislative body. It has been the scene of protracted and searching debate in the best traditions of parliamentary government throughout the world. Since no party has ever held a clear majority of the deputies, it is also an arena for the demonstration of political skill and sagacity. During these past 7 years, Israel's Cabinet—the executive government of the nation—has been a coalition of many parties.

ISRAEL'S POLITICAL PARTIES

Fourteen parties, reflecting every nuance of public opinion in Israel, are represented in the Second Knesset, which will be replaced by the new Parliament elected on July 26, 1955.

Here is the party composition of the Second Knesset at the time it went out of office:

Parties and seats in Knesset:	
Mapai (the predominant labor party in Israel)	47
General Zionists (the principal party of the liberal conservatives)	23
Hapoel Hamizrahi (a religious labor party)	8
Herut (a strongly nationalist conservative party)	8
Mapam (a left-Socialist, non-Communist workers' party)	7
The Israel Communist Party	7
The Progressives (a left-of-center liberal party)	4
Parties and seats in Knesset—Continued	
L'Ahdut Ha'Avoda—Poalei-Zion (a socialist party which seceded from Mapam)	4
Israel Arab Democrats	3
Arab Farmers and Development Party	1
The Arab Progress-and-Work Party	1
(The above 3 parties address themselves particularly to the Arabs of Israel. They are all alined with Mapai.)	
Agudat Israel (represents strongly orthodox religious circles)	3
Poalei Agudat Israel (a labor-oriented off-shoot of Agudat Israel)	2
Hamizrahi (a conservative religious party	2
Total	120

COALITION GOVERNMENT

During the second Knesset, the Government has been in the hands of a coalition of 5 parties: the Mapai Labor Party with 47 seats; the General Zionists, with 23; the Hapoel Hamizrahi, a religious party, with 8 seats; the Mizrahi Party, with 2 seats; and the Progressives with 4.

This grouping of 84 seats out of 120 in the Knesset has given the coalition a clear working majority; but, like all political coalitions, it has inhibited each of its constituent member parties from full expression and action on its own particular programs.

Despite the number of parties, the coalition form of government, and the immensity of the political, economic, and international problems which have faced Israel, the country has maintained a high degree of political stability.

The major political development since the 1951 elections has been a series of splits in the Mapam left-Socialist party. Two of its Knesset members switched affiliation to the Mapai Labor Party; two others, after a brief period as an Independent Party, joined the Communist Party; and four others seceded from Mapam to form the L'Ahdut Ha'avoda—Poalei-Zion.

Two small groups, the Sephardic Communities and the Yemenites, with a total of three seats, have adhered to the General Zionist Party.

Because of the large number of parties, many Israel political observers have suggested revisions in the present proportional system, under which any party that gets about 1 percent of the total vote is assured of a seat in the Knesset. These students of the Israel political system have voiced the hope that changes in the election system would tend to eliminate some or all of the smallest parties, and to concentrate power—and its accompanying responsibilities—to a greater degree in the larger parties.

But there is far from unanimous agreement on the desirability of changes—and any alteration of the election law will be dependent on the outcome of the 1955 elections and a consequent "great debate" both in the Knesset and among the voting public.

THE BASIS OF LIBERTY

Whatever the outcome of the elections or of the debate on the system of elections to the Knesset, one fact emerges from the history of Israel in the years of its modern independence—any future government will honor the words of Israel's Proclamation of Independence, which says:

"The State of Israel * * * will be based on Freedom, Justice and Peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel; it will ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants, irrespective of religion, race or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture; it will safeguard the Holy Places of all religions; and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

A Bill To Amend the Labor-Management Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1955, I introduced H. R. 5087, a bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to require that unfair labor practice cases be tried in Federal district courts, and for other purposes.

I am convinced that cases of this kind should be handled by the courts and that same would expedite settlement.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the July 25, 1955, edition of the New York Daily News which points out the delay of the National Labor Relations Board in following through and appealing the decision of the United States circuit court of appeals on the case involving the International Longshoremen's Association wherein fines were levied and jail sentences imposed by the lower court.

H. R. 5087 would, in my opinion, save us from situations of this kind.

The editorial follows:

WHAT'S HOLDING THE NLRB?

We imagine most of the readers remember the 29-day waterfront strike last year which tied up the port of New York almost as tight as a drum, cost millions of dollars, worked a lot of hardship on longshoremen, and so on and so forth.

Not too many, we imagine, remember the circumstances of that walkout. It was connected with the battle between the old International Longshoremen's Association, which had recently been booted out of the American Federation of Labor, and the new ILA which the AFL had set up in hope of taking over the old outfit's membership.

The strike was called for jurisdictional or secondary-boycott purposes. A longshoreman who had quit the old ILA and joined the new was employed at pier 32, North River. The old-ILA crowd there refused to work alongside this man, and struck. He was then fired.

Being a rather smart hombre, he set himself up as a one-man picket line. Since he now belonged to the AFL, the AFL truckers who served pier 32 refused to cross him—whereupon the old ILA refused to serve any trucks driven by AFL truckers, and the strike was on.

At that point, Charles T. Douds, regional director for the National Labor Relations Board, brought suit for an injunction to halt the strike. Federal Judge Edward J. Dimock issued the injunction. The old ILA thumbed its nose at the order, and the strike proceeded. Those who fomented this violation of a court's command were tried for contempt, and drew some rather stiff penalties.

The old ILA itself was fined $50,000; one of its locals $7,500, and seven other locals, $5,000 each. Three dock characters got jail sentences—Harold Bowers 6 months; William Ackalitis and Willie Lynch 3 months apiece.

What we've been working around to is that those fines have yet to be paid and those jail sentences served.

That is because the United States circuit court of appeals, in one of the most curiously reasoned decisions we've read in quite a while, reversed the rulings of the lower court. Also, it is because the National Labor Relations Board at Washington up to now

has shown a strange hesitancy about appealing the case to the United States Supreme Court.

How about the NLRB getting busy and bringing that appeal? After all, the case involves much law on secondary boycotts in the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act. It is most important that these questions be cleared up one way or the other. What's holding the NLRB?

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, with justified pride, I address myself on this occasion to the House of Representatives of the United States. Three years ago, on the 25th of July of 1952, the flag of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was raised for the first time, on the occasion of the inauguration of the new regime which had begun for the people of Puerto Rico. For the first time in their history, they were living under a constitution of their own adoption. Thus the people of Puerto Rico had organized themselves, as a free, self-governing body politic, with sovereign powers in all matters not reserved, under the terms of a solemn compact, to the Government of the United States.

The people of Puerto Rico became then citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but that did not alter the fact that they were and continued to be, loyal citizens of the United States.

The relationships between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Federal Government albeit parallel are not equal to those of a State of the Union vis-a-vis the Federal Government, but the significance for the people of Puerto Rico of the creation of the Commonwealth was the same as for the people of an incorporated Territory who attain the dignity of statehood.

The creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was the culmination of a series of events which evolved during the span of half a century and which began early in the century with the recognition of the existence of unincorporated Territories within the United States political system; areas and peoples who are subject to the sovereignty of the United States, but who, according to decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, "constitutionally are not an integral part of the United States."

A projection, parallel to that of incorporated Territories toward statehood, was then marked for the unincorporated areas. It has led the peoples of those areas into a status of association, by mutual consent, with full enjoyment of self-government and without loss of common citizenship, common defense, and common protection.

As history teaches us, seed of future events lies buried and unrecognized in past events. Looking now in the perspective of half a century, considering the geographical location of Puerto Rico, its demographic and cultural origin, the smallness of its georgraphical limits, the density of its population, the lack of natural resources, the high aspirations of its people, it is seen how, from the starting point of that Supreme Court decision, all these factors conspired and led, by gradual steps, inexorably, towards a formula which would give the people of Puerto Rico the dignity of freedom they craved, together with the security, which they needed if they were to exist, and could not have in isolation.

And so, after 50 years of what might be called the fermentation of thinking and the distillation of ideas, there evolved in the minds of the people of Puerto Rico the happy solution within which they could attain the status of political dignity to which they could aspire without the sacrifice of their security and prosperity.

Thus, with the overwhelming support of the people of Puerto Rico and with the cordial cooperation of the Government of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was born 3 years ago.

I shall eternally be thankful that it devolved upon me to bring the expression of the aspirations of the people of Puerto Rico before the consideration of Congress, when I introduced H. R. 7674, on March 13, 1950, which became Public Law 600 of the 81st Congress, establishing the compact and authorizing the creation of the Commonwealth.

I shall be thankful again that I had the honor to preside over the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico from September 1951 to February 1952, and that again I was privileged to introduce the joint resolution which became Public Law 447 of the 82d Congress, ratifying the Constitution of Puerto Rico.

I shall live eternally thankful to the Congress that both in 1950 and in 1952, almost unanimously adopted both pieces of legislation.

My legislative duties have not allowed me to be in Puerto Rico today, to participate with my people in the enjoyment they feel, mindful of the fact that on the very same date that we celebrate this anniversary, we also celebrate the anniversary of the landing of United States troops in Puerto Rico, an event which took place on the 25th of July of 1898, under the command of Gen. Nelson A. Miles. That was the beginning of the association of the people of Puerto Rico with their fellow citizens of the United States.

But the fact that I cannot be today in Puerto Rico, is amply compensated for by the fact that I can be here today with my colleagues of the House, to whom I am so deeply indebted for their spirit of generosity, fairness, and kindness toward the people of Puerto Rico.

I have had the honor of speaking, in the name of the United States, before the corresponding committees of the United Nations, when the status of Puerto Rico was there considered. As an alternate delegate of the United States, I presented there the reasons why the United States was justified in ceasing to report to the United Nations on Puerto Rico, as provided under the charter for dependent areas, since Puerto Rico had ceased to be a dependent area.

I found opposition there from such sources as naturally would be expected, but I found there the support, the understanding, and the applause for the United States and for Puerto Rico from the majority of the peoples there represented. The majority of the peoples of the New World, who speak the same language as the people of Puerto Rico and who have with the people of Puerto Rico a common origin and a common cultural heritage—especially did they express their deep satisfaction with the action taken by the United States.

Our good neighbors of the South American Continent, of the Caribbean islands, of Central America, with few exceptions, all heartily supported the United States in its decision. The praise I heard for the United States and for what the United States had done for Puerto Rico, made me proud to be a citizen of the United States, and proud that the United States received those expressions of applause and just recognition on the occasion of having done justice to Puerto Rico.

The association of the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States is based now on a compact, on legal documents, as it should be. But it has much more solid and much deeper basis. It is based on common relationships, on common history, on common devotion to common principles.

The blood of Puerto Rico's youth flowed in Korea for the same principle and under the same colors as the blood of the other youth from the 48 States which form this Nation. To the credit of Puerto Rico, by far a very large number of those young men who there bled and died, did not go there because they were called to duty under provisions of law, but because they volunteered of their own accord to do their duty.

Mr. Speaker, let me express my thought that the existence and development of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is a credit to the people of Puerto Rico and it is a credit to the people of the United States. Let me express my faith in the principles that have united us so firmly. Let me express my certainty that the association of the people of Puerto Rico to our mainland fellow citizens shall remain forever as firm as it is today.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Celebrates Third Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico today celebrates its third birthday. It is important that we make note of this most significant event as the United States has never before enjoyed such a tranquil political

and economic relationship as that which now exists with the people of Puerto Rico.

The establishment of a commonwealth has been a fortunate solution to the political problems of the Puerto Rican people and they now enjoy internal independence. We should be pleased that we authorized the organization of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, that we agreed to its constitution, and that the people of Puerto Rico have willingly assumed their responsibilities.

On May 28, 1952, in the 82d Congress, 2d session, I had the high honor to be appointed by Speaker RAYBURN as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union when the resolution—House Joint Resolution 430—approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was favorably considered by this House of Representatives. One of my treasured possessions is the gavel presented to me by Speaker RAYBURN and used at the time of passage of this historical legislation.

Since achieving Commonwealth status on July 25, 1952, the people of Puerto Rico have made remarkable progress and have forged ahead industrially, educationally, and agriculturally. They now have a sound economy and a stable government.

We must continue to help the people of Puerto Rico against segregation and discriminuation because of race, religion, or national origin. They are entitled to full equality of opportunity in education and employment. The fulfillment of such programs will prove that faith in freedom and self-determination has in every respect proved its worth.

I extend my felicitations and heartiest congratulations to the people of Puerto Rico on this historic day and commend my good friend the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, whose interest here in Washington has always been to maintain amicable association and understanding between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States.

Hurricane Emergency Warning Will Save Countless American Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include an editorial entitled "Greater Protection in Future Hurricanes," which appeared in the June 17, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, advising that we in New England must now, according to our weather experts, realize that we are in a hurricane area.

As a matter of record, we in central Massachusetts have already had the horrifying experience of a hurricane which struck unexpectedly and with great devastation on June 9, 1953, taking many lives and costing millions in property damage.

For that reason, I am intensely interested in the proposed appropriations for the erection of an emergency hurricane-warning system, which I hope will find unanimous favor with the Members of this House. If sufficient money is approved, many additional communities from coast to coast, with my home city of Worcester in central Massachusetts among them, will be included in the establishment of an expanded emergency warning system.

In my judgment, any reasonable amount of money expended to save American lives and homes and industrial property is the best economy that we can practice.

The editorial follows:

GREATER PROTECTION IN FUTURE HURRICANES

Weather experts say hurricanes in New England are here to stay for years to come. New upper-wind patterns will drive the great sea storms inland.

But New Englanders will be relieved to know that, because of improved warning measures and other Government action, damage will be minimized and many lives saved.

Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel last fall took 150 lives and caused property damage amounting to nearly a billion dollars. As a result, New England, for the first time, has now been linked to the special communications system known as the hurricane circuit. Last year Washington and New York were hooked into the circuit, which originally extended from Brownsville, Tex., along the Gulf coast to Tampa, across Florida to Miami and up the Atlantic coast to Jacksonville. Added now are New Haven, Bridgeport, Providence, Portland, and Boston.

These cities will henceforth receive prompt reports from storm warning centers at Washington, New Orleans, and Miami, which have inaugurated a 24-hour watch of the tropical waters where hurricanes breed.

In addition, President Eisenhower on Wednesday signed a bill authorizing a 3-year study of ways to minimize loss of life and property in hurricanes, tornadoes and other severe storms. Cost will be $3 million. And Congress is considering creation of an emergency hurricane warning system. The House Appropriations Committee has reached a compromise on a bill filed by Representative PATTERSON, of Connecticut, calling for a $5 million appropriation. The House compromise provides for $2,250,000 additional for salaries and expenses of the Weather Bureau to establish the emergency system. And the Senate is considering a similar bill introduced by Connecticut's Senator PURTELL.

These steps are logical. The need for advance warnings on hurricanes cannot be disregarded. And a few million dollars worth of foreknowledge may save billions over the years, to say nothing of lives.

The Transit Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the comments of Washington correspondent Joseph F. McCaffrey on the local transit situation. Mr. McCaffrey's remarks were made on his Sunday night television program. This Sunday report is rapidly becoming Washington's most popular news show because Mr. McCaffrey is bringing reporting to television, providing a fresh and vivid review of the news.

The comments follow:

I'd like to say something about the Capital Transit strike now. I first began this series of Sunday night news programs on July 3, 3 weeks ago.

There is nothing I can tell you tonight about that strike that I couldn't have told you 3 weeks ago tonight.

There is nothing new to report.

No strike in local history has produced so much talk and so little action.

Yet this strike has produced the greatest emergency situation this city, the Capital of the Nation, has ever faced. Downtown business is affected; the entire police department is disrupted.

I could recite for an hour a list of people and businesses who are adversely affected by this strike. But I'll just cite one instance which I uncovered this week.

There are thousands of men, women, and children who must have outpatient service at local hospitals and doctors' offices. They are unable to work, they have little or no income coming in; many are older people trying to live on inadequate pensions.

The shutdown of the public transportation system here has caused these men, women, and children hardship and suffering, both physical and financial.

That is only one group affected by this strike; there are many, many others.

It is time for less talk and more action.

And there is only one man who can act.

The President of the United States.

Now it may seem strange going from the summit to the transit system, but there is no one else who can do it.

Congress has failed.

The District Commissioners have failed.

The Public Utility Commission has failed.

In the District of Columbia there is no mayor to sit down with the parties involved and try to reach a settlement.

There is no governor to turn to.

In this emergency there is only one man living here who can bring the parties to the bargaining table and keep them there until the buses and the streetcars are running again.

No financier is too big to ignore the No. 1 man in America; nor is there any union leader who would feel that way.

If the public transportation system in this city—the Capital of the Nation and the world—is worth saving, then the only hope for saving it right now rests at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Urgency of New Highway Construction Is No Excuse To Abolish Fair Labor Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD. D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a brief editorial from the June 11, 1955, issue of the magazine America entitled "Victory for Low Wages," which explains how some skillful maneuvering by a few Senators

led to the elimination of the Davis-Bacon clause in the Senate road bill.

Let us earnestly hope that this grave economic error will be corrected by the House, and that in the final enactment of any highway-aid legislation our progressive fair-labor standards will be safeguarded.

The editorial follows:

VICTORY FOR LOW WAGES

Though a bipartisan Senate majority rejected the President's highway bill on May 25, Mr. Eisenhower is reported to be still hopeful that his plan will eventually prevail. Some Democrats in the House are said to see merits in the administration bill which completely escaped their colleagues in the Senate. Regardless of the final outcome of this controversy, it is by now regrettably clear that the Federal Government does not intend to safeguard fair labor standards on its future road-building projects. In passing the substitute Gore bill, the Senate knocked out a provision that would have applied the Davis-Bacon Act to all highway construction financed by the Federal Government. That law, which now governs labor contracts on all federally aided hospital and airport construction, requires contractors to pay prevailing wages. The managers of the Gore bill capitulated on the Davis-Bacon clause when southern Senators, led by the redoubtable GEORGE, of Georgia; BYRD, of Virginia; and HOLLAND, of Florida, threatened to vote against the bill unless it was deleted. Much to his amusement, and to the discomfiture of liberal Democrats, Minority Leader KNOWLAND allotted time during the debate to the supporters of the fair-labor standards clause. Senator JOHNSON, the majority leader, controlled the time for the opposition. The southern Democrats compounded their victory for low wages and poor labor standards by defeating all efforts to force a rollcall vote. Now the workers back home have no way of knowing how their Representatives voted on this important issue.

The Dixon-Yates Story: What Mayor Tobey Said

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, when the White House staged the famous scene announcing the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract and having President Eisenhower photographed cheerfully with Mayor Tobey, of Memphis, most people were not allowed to know precisely what Mayor Tobey's sentiments were. This defect can now be rectified.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch sent a reporter to Memphis to interview Mayor Tobey, just before the famous love scene intended to suggest that we were all good fellows together, and Mayor Tobey's comments on Dixon-Yates and the administration were vitriolic.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commenting on the interview:

MAYOR TOBEY'S HOT RETORT

Wholesome indignation characterizes the statement of Mayor Frank Tobey, of Memphis, in his interview in the Sunday Post-Dispatch.

From what Mayor Tobey said it is obvious that he and the national administration are of two different parties. It is also obvious that he does not mind hitting back hard. But when allowances are made, the substance of Mayor Tobey's statement adds up to a lot of common sense. Because it will not be as widely printed over the country for the information of the American people as it should be, we reprint Mayor Tobey's statement below.

Independent voters who do their own political thinking will see that the Memphis Mayor demolishes the patently distracting tactic of the White House in demanding "assurances" that Memphis will build its own powerplant rather than take a kilowatt of electricity from the Dixon-Yates utility promoters.

Here is what Mayor Tobey told the Post-Dispatch:

"In the first place there is no actual situation existing in which President Eisenhower on one hand gives an ultimatum of 90 days for Memphis to move toward building its own steam plant, and the city on the other hand races to meet the 90-day deadline.

"This is so much Republican hogwash to confuse the public.

"The true situation is that Memphis decided in its own democratic, fundamentally American manner to build a steam plant rather than accept power from Dixon-Yates.

"And by so doing, Memphis has taken the Eisenhower administration off the hook and opened the door through which the President can sidestep a political scandal of startling proportions.

"Consequently, it is our feeling that the administration should be thankful for our sincerity and honesty of purpose, rather than keep trying to insist that we come up with some special phrase-making that will help the Republicans in future campaign contests.

"Also, let's get the record straight. The Memphis City Commission on June 23 passed a resolution authorizing our light, gas and water division to commence the construction of a steam plant.

"We are not bluffing, and neither are we going to write campaign literature for an inept (Federal) administration when it bungles the public interest."

A straightforward answer to this from President Eisenhower, Attorney General Brownell, Budget Director Hughes and AEC Chairman Strauss would make interesting reading.

Conservationists and the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of those opposed to construction of Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. I voted against this proposed structure in committee, and would do so again if it were to come on the floor of the House.

However, this dam has been eliminated from the Colorado River storage project in H. R. 3383. Because of that elimination, I support the bill and hope that you will, too. I also hope that other conservationists will step forward now and give this bill their backing.

The conservationists opposed H. R. 3383 for one reason, Echo Park Dam. They won when the dam came out of the bill. But some of them have shifted their ground and now oppose the bill because of the possibility—actually it is an impossibility—that Echo Park will be put pack into the bill.

These people excuse their opposition on the grounds that proponents of Echo Park Dam will "sneak" it back into the project somehow. As a person interested in conservation, I assure you that I will ever be alert to any such procedure, although frankly it is impossible to add anything to the bill without approval of this esteemed body.

It would seem logical to me that conservationists now should support this project, conditioning that support with a statement reiterating their opposition to Echo Park Dam. That would be the honest and direct way to approach this problem and one that would draw support from all of us interested in conservation.

There seems to be some fear that Echo Park will be restored in conference committee. The Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, recently told the Rules Committee that he will let the entire project die in conference committee rather than have Echo Park inserted. The Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, chairman of the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation, backed up Mr. ENGLE on that point. Both will be members of the conference committee. How can anyone sincerely express fear that Echo will be reinserted with such assurances from these men?

The Washington Post and Times Herald described this project as it stands now as "a conservation measure in the largest sense of the word." That, I believe, is a correct analysis of the project as set forth in H. R. 3383.

I say to conservationists, put your fears to rest and support the revised Colorado River storage project.

Conference Views of United States Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, newspaper editorials throughout the Nation generally praised the Geneva Big Four meeting as a constructive step toward the possibility of ending the cold war. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from newspaper editorials around the country, as referred to in the July 25, 1955, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

The New York Times: "President Eisenhower, perhaps, won the moral victory at Geneva if there was such a victory. Nobody reading his words could doubt that he was full of good will toward all men and that therefore he honestly strove for peace. * * *

A third world war would be no solution. A modus vivendi to avoid that frightful tragedy is essential, and we now seem a little nearer to it."

Chicago Sun-Times: "Better world conditions and an easing of world tensions should result from the Geneva Conference. No final agreements were reached by the Big Four. But as the chiefs of state departed for home there seemed to be a better climate for peace on a firm agreement to continue the search for East-West understanding. * * * If the Geneva Conference did nothing but generate good will it was successful."

The Denver Post: "The President's proposal * * * would formalize a willingness, at least, to deal more openly in steps leading up to effective arms limitation and control. It would, moreover, provide a practical test of intentions and good faith of signatories to such an agreement, without exposing ourselves to any greater danger than presently confronts us."

The New York Herald Tribune: "The conclusion must be that the negotiations which will follow this conference have a better chance of getting somewhere than if the conference had not been held. * * * When all else has been said and done, the week will be remembered because the Big Four did meet * * * and did talk together candidly and calmly and left with the realization that further talk would not be wholly in vain."

Baltimore Morning Sun: "Without being overly optimistic, it is possible to discern in the tone of the last day at Geneva a trace of what President Eisenhower said more than a week ago was the first purpose of the meeting, to alter the spirit of acrimony in which East-West diplomats have been talking for the last decade. * * * Geneva was not a third act, but a prolog. As such it promises an interesting drama as the action unfolds."

New Haven (Conn.) Sunday Register: The President's proposal "gives emphatic definition to the United States desire for peace." (The plan) "is wildly unrealistic in terms of all our experience of the last 10 years with the Soviet Union, but the proposal is definitely not one to be regretted."

Atlanta Sunday Journal-Constitution: "Geneva was a beginning only, a slow and cautious start. From it, secretaries of state and foreign ministers may move on to other meetings, other conferences, where specific results may be achieved. * * * Negotiations are preferable to the imminence of war under which the world has lived for a decade."

Boston Globe: "Superb is the only word that can describe Mr. Eisenhower's achievement at Geneva * * * (His skill and sincerity) has all but eliminated the effectiveness of the charge this country is a 'warmonger'."

San Francisco Chronicle: "Some criticize the President for smiling a lot and avoiding the details of negotiating. This criticism overlooks the fact that Bulganin, Khrushchev, and Zhukov are, so to speak but recently prisoners of Stalin's Kremlin. They need to be exposed to the Western * * * personality; they need a chance to look us square in the eye."

Nashville Tennessean: "Thanks to President Eisenhower, the gathering of Big Four representatives cannot be put down as another dismal failure of world statesmanship. The man who once sought to bring peace to Europe in command of armies, has paved the way to better understanding by the impact of ideas * * *. The world waits for the decision that Bulganin and company are still called upon to make.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "The world can look back today on one of the most important weeks of the 20th century. * * * A fair summary of it is to say that although little was definitely settled, a great deal has been accomplished. * * * Certainly it is a great accomplishment for the Geneva conference to reawaken the spirit of diplomacy which now supplants the old condition of deadlock."

Cleveland News: "The big payoff is that cordial relations have been established * * * actually little was accomplished except to pass the issue on to another conference—if that can be arranged."

Cleveland Plain Dealer: "Not until the foreign ministers meet in Geneva in October will the world be able to put a proper assessment on the first meeting of the Big Four leaders in 10 years. Only when details of world problems are faced will it be possible to say whether the 6-day conference in the Swiss city wrote a postscript to the cold war and formed a prelude to an era of coexistence—* * *.

Chattanooga Times: "President Eisenhower's warm personality, his offer to trade defense blueprints with Russia, his refusal to treat any international problem as beyond solution made the Big Four meeting unique among such gatherings. * * * The Russians left Geneva knowing that the United States does not intend to attack them. They were never sure of that before."

New Orleans States: "As for any tangible results from the mutual scrutiny of military works, the Russians could start a discussion of the subject and keep it going for months, even years, which is probably what they will do."

St. Louis Globe-Democrat: "The summit conference, for which the world held great expectations in spite of itself, has ended without results of substance. * * * Geneva did not materially improve peace prospects. But neither did it worsen them or leave them unchanged. It did illuminate the road ahead—and suggest that if the world will be patient and forebearing, the way is not now quite so long."

Resolution Adopted at the 62d Annual Convention Banquet of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD. D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the resolution adopted at the 62d annual convention banquet of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation held on Friday, July 8, 1955, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., placing the organization on record in favor of House Resolution 183.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Armenian Revolutionary Federation meeting in 62d annual convention, in Washington, D. C., from July 2 to July 8 did consider the perilous days in which we live because of the aggressive threat of Russian imperial communism; and

Whereas the national independence of the United States of America and all other free and sovereign nations is threatened by the Communist conspiratorial plan for world conquest; and

Whereas the many non-Russian nations and peoples enslaved by the Red colonial policy of the Kremlin look to the United States for hope, inspiration, and enlightened leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Armenian Revolutionary Federation pledges itself to a continuation of unqualified support in the fight against Red colonialism and expresses its warm appreciation to Congress for the passage of House Resolution No. 149, which puts sage of House Resolution 149, which puts us clearly on record as against colonialism and for self-government and national independence.

That the Armenian Revolutionary Federation pledges itself to continue and to increase its efforts to better acquaint the American people with the true nature of communism, the subversive methods used by that conspiracy and the sufferings of the many nations and peoples now enslaved by that tyranny.

That the Armenian Revolutionary Federation puts itself on record as favoring House Resolution 183, a resolution which requests the United States delegation to the United Nations to submit a resolution to the General Assembly of the United Nations naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor, and urges the House Rules Committee to report that resolution to the floor of the House so that it may be put to the test of public debate and vote by Members of Congress.

The Dixon-Yates Story: A Policy of Coverup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the deeper we dig into the Dixon-Yates background the more clear it becomes that a deliberate plot was hatched against the Tennessee Valley Authority, that high members of the President's family were involved in that plot, and that they have tried—and are still trying—to cover up the facts, to hide, conceal from, even to misrepresent these facts to the Congress.

We have the Assistant President, Sherman Adams, declining to appear before a special subcommittee of the Senate, which earlier was forced to resort to a threat of contempt proceedings to get the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, J. Sinclair Armstrong, to confess that Sherman Adams had intervened in an SEC proceeding in the Dixon-Yates matter and requested delay—specifically mentioning the fact that a certain vote was then pending in the House on a Dixon-Yates appropriation item.

We have the question of Rowland Hughes, a direct subordinate of the President as head of the Budget Bureau, giving out a fake "chronology" of Dixon-Yates matters that carefully omitted the name of Adolphe H. Wenzell, the New York investment banking official who doubled in brass as inventor of Dixon-Yates and in conferences on financing with Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Strauss.

Bad faith has been revealed, Mr. Speaker, and something very close to breach of trust and breach of the honest and honorable relations that should exist between the Congress and high members of the executive department.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has been exceedingly alert to the developments arising from the dismal Dixon-Yates deal. I offer two editorials commenting

specifically on the refusal of Sherman Adams to appear before the Senate subcommittee and the record of Budget Director Hughes:

DARKER AND DARKER

Sherman Adams' refusal to testify to the Senate subcommittee investigating the Dixon-Yates power contract is a surprising and contradictory development. It would seem that the presidential assistant would want to do everything possible to clear up the imputations of questionable conduct that have been raised against him—that he would demand a hearing if he had not been invited.

It is all the more contradictory because Mr. Adams pleads immunity on account of his "official and confidential relationship to the President." President Eisenhower has given his word that the complete record of Dixon-Yates shall be spread out to the public view.

Could the complete record conceivably exclude the testimony of the one man who, as is becoming evident from the facts now being painfully extracted by the investigators, knows the most about it?

Fulfillment of the President's promise would plainly seem to call for Mr. Eisenhower to direct his first assistant to tell what he knows if Mr. Adams persists in his refusal to do so voluntarily.

The charges that have been raised against Mr. Adams are grave. He stands accused of having interfered in the affairs of an independent regulatory quasi-judicial commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission. That in itself would be a serious offense. But that is not the only imputation against him which it remains for Mr. Adams to explain.

Sherman Adams is further charged with having done the interfering for the purpose of keeping Congress in ignorance of facts pertinent to pending legislation until after the House of Representatives had voted on that legislation.

These charges are based on testimony given to the investigating committee by the Chairman of SEC, J. Sinclair Armstrong. As Mr. Armstrong continues his testimony before the Antimonopoly Subcommittee, headed by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, the atmosphere of duplicity and official secrecy which has surrounded this whole Dixon-Yates affair from its very inception becomes more and more odoriferous.

The SEC chairman seems to have acted as little more than an errand boy for Mr. Adams in this episode of an unprecedented 3-day recess in the hearings on Dixon-Yates financing. He withheld from his fellow commissioners salient information which might well have caused some of them to vote against the recess rather than, as they did, for it:

He did not tell them Mr. Adams had mentioned the pending legislation in the House. He did not tell them Mr. Adams had told him cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract was being considered and the whole matter might soon be academic.

Mr. Armstrong now says he cannot remember whether withholding this information from his colleagues was his own idea or Mr. Adams' suggestion. Yet the Commissioners could not have voted on the recess proposal intelligently and with their eyes open without knowing this information which their Chairman was withholding from them.

After the vote to recess was taken, the Commission issued a statement saying that "procedural problems were the reason for the unprecedented action. It now becomes apparent that this explanation was false. The Commission was guilty of practicing a deceit upon the public, yet Mr. Armstrong professes to see nothing wrong there. In fact, he maintains that it would not have been "proper or appropriate" to tell the public the truth.

These notions of propriety on Mr. Armstrong's part, and the actions that grew out of them, raise a strong question of his fitness to serve as Chairman of SEC or indeed as a public servant in any responsible capacity.

With all these questionable maneuverings by Mr. Armstrong, Presidential Assistant Adams is involved. How deeply is he involved? Does his involvement go so far as to raise doubts of his own fitness as a servant of the public as well as of Mr. Armstrong?

Only Mr. Adams' own testimony can settle these question one way or another. Until he testifies, frankly and fully, a cloud will hang over his role in this affair.

QUESTION ABOUT DIRECTOR HUGHES

Looking back on the Dixon-Yates fiasco, one of the most remarkable things about it was the role played by Budget Director Rowland Hughes.

Mr. Hughes was in the middle of all the negotiations between the Atomic Energy Commission, the Budget Bureau, Messrs. Dixon and Yates, and Adolphe Wenzell.

Yet Mr. Hughes, when called upon by President Eisenhower last August to give the the public full details on the contract, published a chronology which studiously omitted any reference to Mr. Wenzell.

Mr. Hughes knew that Mr. Wenzell had been brought into the Government in 1953 to make a study of TVA and plan alternatives to its expansion. He knew that Mr. Wenzell had been brought back into the Government in 1954 to help arrange the Dixon-Yates contract. Yet Mr. Hughes allowed President Eisenhower to make the public statement, at a news conference, that Mr. Wenzell "was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract." Only one inference is possible: that Mr. Hughes misinformed the President.

Budget Director Rowland Hughes, in short, appears to have been convicted of misleading both the public and the President about Mr. Wenzell's dual connection with the contract.

How much confidence can the President or the public henceforth place in Rowland Hughes as Budget Director?

A Rare Reformer Takes Over in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "A Rare Reformer Takes Over in Italy," which appeared in the July 22, 1955, issue of the Courier Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

A RARE REFORMER TAKES OVER IN ITALY

The new Premier of Italy and his cabinet got only a lukewarm reception in parliament when they first appeared. And in the first confidence vote on the new regime Premier Antonio Segni and his coalition government won by only 28 votes (293–265), with 12 deputies not voting.

But the situation in Italy, nevertheless, augers well for the West. The center parties have pledged to support him and the policies he advocates. These include faithful observance of treaties binding Italy to the West, "Western and Atlantic solidarity," the curbing of monopolies, war against unemployment, reduction of government spending, lower taxes for the poorer classes, development of exports, encouragement of capital investments, and extension of land reform throughout Italy.

The last-named goal may well account for the lack of enthusiasm with which the Segni government was confirmed. For the slim, sharp-faced new Premier, old-fashioned in courtesy and geniality but possessed of a pungent wit and capable of temperamental outbursts, is a veteran crusader for land reform. And land reform, promised Italy's hungry peasants by every premier since the war but not pushed too energetically by any, is not a popular program with all his supporters.

To Professor Segni, however, land reform is not only a necessity but one of the most effective ways to nullify the popular appeal of the Communists and of his neo-Fascist opposition. He is the Christian Democratic Party's leading expert on the subject. As Minister of Agriculture from 1946 to 1951, he pushed through some of his land-reform ideas then, saw gratified peasants by the thousands renounce the Communist Party, was eased into the Ministry of Public Instruction when his enthusiasm for more reform became too controversial.

Before Segni began his program, some 40,000 landowners held 22 million of Italy's arable acres, while 1,700,000 peasants owned only an acre each and another 2,500,000 had no land at all. A large landholder in his native Sardinia himself, Segni 5 years ago expropriated 250 acres of his own olive groves and vineyards as part of the government's campaign to break up great estates and redistribute the land on long-payment terms to those who work it. And this rare type of reformer defeated in parliament a transparent Communist attempt to save model farms such as his own from being split up.

First man from Italy's forgotten island of Sardinia to become the head of Italy's government, Premier Segni is now 64 and not in robust health. But he has a reputation for driving tenacity, and he may be able to transform the lipservice to land reform of other Italian politicians into the reality of its extension throughout the nation. On his side is the growing realization that, without it, the protracted economic misery of millions will add new strength to the Communists.

Farmers' Home Administration Makes Progress in Assisting Family-Type Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I took occasion to call your attention to an agency in the United States Department of Agriculture, the Farmers' Home Administration, where some remarkable improvements have been made under the Eisenhower administration. Today I would like to bring the account of that fine record up to date.

Last year I pointed out that during the first full year under the Eisenhower administration the Farmers' Home Ad-

ministration made or insured loans totaling more than $292 million. This was a 28-percent increase over the amount loaned in 1953, and more funds had been advanced in 1953 than in any previous year. During this current fiscal year the agency has continued to provide farmers of the Nation with credit at approximately the same volume.

The agency has continued to use most of its credit to help operators of family-type farms finance improvements in their operations, and purchase and improve farms. In this group are many young farmers who if it were not for the Farmers' Home Administration would not be able to obtain the credit they need to become firmly established in agriculture.

In addition, the agency has carried on a number of emergency loan programs which serve the credit needs of all farmers, including the small ones. These loans which include the special livestock loans and the economic emergency loans authorized by the 83d Congress have been lifesavers for thousands of drought-stricken ranchers and cattlemen.

I have said many times that in my opinion, the special emergency loans that the 83d Congress made available were a major factor in saving the livestock industry during the critical period in 1953. Altogether more than $53 million was advanced to cattlemen to help them carry on their operations until drought conditions eased and the market stabilized.

During the past 2 years the amount advanced for all types of emergency credit totals approximately $181 million.

Along with the emergency loans, in the drought-stricken areas, during the past year the county committees of the Farmers' Home Administration were assigned the responsibility for approving applications for emergency feed assistance. These committees with the help of the county office staffs handled this assignment in a commendable manner.

I want to pay special tribute to those committeemen. They receive only a nominal sum for their efforts and they give freely of their own time for the benefit of their community.

I pointed out last year that a number of steps have been taken under the Eisenhower administration to enable this agency to render a better service on a more efficient basis. Additional progress has been made along this line during the past year. For example, when the revised farm ownership loan regulations were placed into effect last January 31, sufficient streamlining had taken place to enable the number of pages in the regulations to be reduced from 75 to 18. The number of forms used in making these loans were cut one-third. The number of times a farmer had to sign his name in order to obtain a farm-ownership loan was reduced almost 50 percent. This, I believe, is indicative of the careful way that all of the operations of the agency have been reviewed and improved.

Last year I told you about a bill that had been passed that would enable the Farmers Home Administration to make more insured loans and thus enable it to serve the credit needs of a larger number of farmers. They have had almost a year's experience with this expanded insured loan program, and I want to tell you the record is impressive. The total amount of farm ownership loans insured so far this year—these are the loans that are made to improve, enlarge, and purchase family type farms—the total amount of these loans insured is $30,400,000, or three times the amount insured last year. This sets an all time record.

The largest amount of farm ownership loans ever insured before in any one year was back in 1951, when $17,500,000 worth of loans were made in this fashion. In addition, approximately $15 million of the new soil- and water-conservation loans have been insured since last fall.

These insured loans have two advantages: They enable the agency to serve the credit needs of more farmers. Also the insured loans reduce the amount that needs to be borrowed from the United States Treasury; for private lenders, banks, insurance companies, and other investors supply the funds from which the insured loans are made.

When the insured loan program was enlarged early last fall, Farmers Home Administration, with the advice and guidance of a representative group of private lenders, made a number of improvements in the administration of the program, cutting out red tape and making the loans generally more attractive as investments. Lenders in return have responded wholeheartedly, have committed more than $81 million, and appear willing to finance additional amounts in the months to come. This, I believe, is real progress.

I also mentioned last year the passage by the 83d Congress of a soil and water conservation loan program. This program has been in operation for about 9 months and it, too, has set an impressive record. What the 83d Congress did in respect to this program is this: First it extended the water facilities program which had been operating only on a direct loan basis and only in the Western States to the entire United States. In addition, it provided for insured as well as direct loans. This expansion made available throughout the country, credit for irrigation systems, farmstead water supplies—a type of credit that has become increasingly popular during the dry spells of recent years. In addition, the 83d Congress added to the water facilities loan, authority to loan funds both insured and direct, for soil conservation purposes. This authority likewise is available throughout the United States. The soil conservation loan enables farmers and ranchers to borrow funds to carry out soil conservation measures that are needed today for the protection of our Nation's soil resources. Without this credit available it is likely these measures would not be carried out for years to come. During that time the elements would further deteriorate, erode, blow, and wash away soil upon which our future and the future of our children depend. The loans will put a checkrein on that.

More than $18,800,000 was advanced for these loans this year. I expect the program to continue its expansion for months to come. R. B. McLeaish, Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, who incidentally has done a grand job placing that agency on a solid basis, tells me that the irrigation loans are now fairly well known throughout the country but that many farmers are not aware of the fact that they can borrow funds for soil conservation. I understand he is taking steps to make sure that this new type of credit is known throughout all farming areas in the country.

The collection record established by the Farmers' Home Administration is good despite the fact that the farm families who borrow are those who, at the time they applied for credit, were unable to obtain loans from banks or other reputable lenders.

A large proportion of the real estate loans, although made for 40 years, are being repaid well ahead of time. The bulk of the loans for farm operating expenses are also being paid on time. This speaks well for the understanding regarding repayments that the agency works out with the borrowers. It speaks well for the economic progress the borrower families are making through the wise use of Government credit. It speaks well for the attitude that American families hold in regard to repaying their debts.

The agency is also placing a great deal of emphasis on graduating borrowers to regularly established lending institutions as quickly as possible. The average operating loan borrower repays his loan in about 4 years. Each year from 20,000 to 25,000 farmers pay off their indebtedness to the Farmers' Home Administration. While some of these borrowers find it necessary to call upon the agency for assistance in future years, most of them continue to farm without further Government credit.

All in all, I would say that the prospects of the farmers receiving adequate service from this agency during the coming year are very good. There is no reason to believe that the fine record that has been established for the past 2 years will be in any way diminished; in fact it may be improved upon. Funds that have already been appropriated, plus the funds that are obtained from private lenders for insured loans will enable the agency to carry on its operations at about the same level. In fact there is every reason to believe that the insured loan business will continue the rapid expansion that was begun in the past year.

In addition, I understand that the Department of Agriculture is developing an expanded credit program for the Southern Great Plains States based upon the recommendations made at a meeting of the Great Plains Council in Denver early in June. This credit program will further expand the usefulness of this agency in the Great Plains area and will, of course, be of great service to the farmers and ranchers who need to reorganize their operations in order to make proper use of the land and develop the type of farming that is best suited for that area.

The way this program is being handled, and the service this agency is providing the farmers, is a fine example of the good government practiced by this administration, and an equally fine service to the farmers and ranchers who form the foundation stone upon which our Nation rests.

Mr. President, Here Is a Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Racine Journal Times of Racine, Wis., on July 18 carried an open letter to Bulganin and Khrushchev. It contained a pertinent suggestion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it at this point in the RECORD:

AN OPEN LETTER, WITH A SUGGESTION

To Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin, Commissar Nikita S. Khrushchev, and to Whomever Else It May Concern:

GENTLEMEN: During recent months the American people have noted what we believe to be a change in your attitude toward us and our Government. For 10 years the official tone of the Soviet Union toward the United States has been—and we understate deliberately—very unfriendly. Suddenly, that tone has become more friendly.

The American people are aware that what they are hearing from Moscow today is what could well be called "sweet talk" in our American way of saying things. But dozens of incidents lead us to believe that probably you are trying to make a point, which is that you want improvement in the relations between the American and the Russian people.

Among those incidents, large and small, are the recent friendly visit to the United States of your foreign commissar, Mr. Molotov; your own visit, with your associates, to the American embassy's Fourth of July party this month; relaxation of travel restrictions for Americans across your borders; the reasonable attitude you demonstrated in settling the Austrian peace treaty, and, finally, the fact that you and other leaders of the Soviet Union sit down today in Geneva with our President, our Secretary of State and the heads of our allies' governments.

Your objective, we hope, is peace between our respective peoples. We want to believe this because the American people individually, collectively, and sincerely want it.

You should know by now that we will not buy peace at the cost of compromise of our principles or the sacrifice of our freedom, political or economic. You will find, in the next few days, that President Eisenhower has gone to Geneva to negotiate with you as among equals. He will respect your words if you are willing to support them with deeds. But he negotiates from a position of strength and principle, and the American people freely and nearly unanimously stand behind him.

But what can be done at this meeting at Geneva is only to put into motion the mechanics of international agreement between governments. A real peace between the people of these two greatest nations of the earth should come from a much wider and deeper "people to people" understanding.

We have a suggestion which we believe will form a basis for that kind of understanding. We respectfully propose to you, as leaders of the Soviet Union, and to the heads of our own Government, this plan:

"You would permit the spokesmen of the American people, preferably President Eisenhower himself, to make one or a series of broadcasts over the Soviet Union's radio and television system. You would permit him to speak freely and without censorship, explaining to the Russian people the position of Americans and their Government, the principles we stand for, the actions we are taking in the world, and our attitudes toward your country.

"In return, the Government of the United States will make arrangements for your spokesmen—and you may nominate any man or men you believe qualified to speak for you—to have equal time over all American radio and television networks. In that time, you may explain to the American people the Soviet position, its policies and attitudes. You may be assured that a vast majority of the American people would be interested in hearing what you have to say."

We know that this is an unusual suggestion. Yet it is entirely feasible. We do not fear you or anything you say. Fear is based on ignorance and lack of understanding, and that is exactly what we are trying to combat.

If the motives behind your recent attitudes is the lessening of world tensions and, eventually, peaceful accord between us, you should welcome this suggestion. We make it sincerely and earnestly to you in the hope that it will be seriously considered.

Tribute to Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan, of Missouri, for Support of Food and Drug Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, despite the sentimentality that has attended tributes to the departing Mrs. Hobby, I think most people recognize that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has shown too little humanitarianism, too little concern for the problems of the people regarding schools, social security, health, and welfare generally. It has been hesitant and slow to move; it has refused to accept as valid the tremendous statistical evidence compiled previously to reveal what the people need.

Even in the field of food factory inspection, the Department had to be pushed and prodded by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], and it is good to observe that the gentlewoman's services have not been overlooked in her home city of St. Louis.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commenting on Secretary Hobby's resignation, Mrs. SULLIVAN's services, and the "second chance" the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now is given:

THE SECOND CHANCE

The nomination of Marion B. Folsom to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gives the newest Cabinet department a second chance to establish its national importance.

President Eisenhower named Under Secretary of the Treasury Folsom to replace Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby after accepting her resignation in a klieg-lighted, emotional ceremony. "This is a sad day, Oveta," the President said.

Mrs. Hobby had already explained that she was quitting for personal reasons. But it was no secret that the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was discouraged by criticism of her record.

That record included the polio botch, begun with fanfare and continued with rallies and retreats. Little was done about Federal aid to education. The Hoover Commission criticized Mrs. Hobby's agency for cutting medical research funds. The principal success in 2½ years was the expansion of social security, which was a bipartisan extension of previous policy.

In fact, the Hobby administration ended on somewhat the same note with which it began. It began with a routine problem of restoring food-factory inspection, and succeeded with prodding from Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, of St. Louis. Now Mrs. SULLIVAN is trying to add a million dollars to the Department's Pure Food and Drug Administration appropriation so that agency can do its important work.

From the record it appears that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stressed economies as much as health, education, and welfare in its first 2½ years.

The nomination of Mr. Folsom now promises a director experienced in the field to which he is assigned. Mr. Folsom was treasurer of Eastman Kodak Co. when he joined the Eisenhower administration in 1953. He had developed early employee-benefit plans. In Washington he helped to devise the social-security amendments and group insurance for Federal employees.

Mr. Folsom is a man of unquestioned ability. He also has been the assistant to the administration's leading proponent of economy, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey. And the problem confronting him will be much the same as that which faced Mrs. Hobby.

Will the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare go on scrimping and limiting its services, or will it treat its three special provinces as matters of national importance? Will it pioneer in exploring a new realm of government or will it hold back in timidity?

While extravagance has no place in public welfare, for the Nation cannot afford it, the growing problems of health and education and related fields cannot be viewed simply as columns of budget figures. This is a new agency and it needs new energy. Under Mr. Folsom, the Department should begin life anew even at its tender age.

Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Cordell Hull, Tennessee, the Nation, and the free world have sustained a tremendous loss. In addition to the tributes paid to this great American today in the Congress, I desire to have included in the RECORD other tributes to Cordell Hull which have appeared in three leading newspapers.

These editorials follow:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 24, 1955]

CORDELL HULL

In his own lifetime, as he himself once wrote, Cordell Hull, whose death has come with the close of the Geneva Conference, where others have pursued the same war-preventing objective that he long pursued—saw the United States make extraordinary progress. He saw it grow from a relatively provincial and underdveloped land to a position of wealth and power incomparably greater than that attained by any other nation since time began. But most of all, he saw its influence steadily expand as "a potent world force in the cause of peace and humanity."

Nor did he merely see all this. He was much more than an idle spectator watching other men labor at the task of building American greatness. He was one of the laborers himself, a member of that distinguished company whose vision and energy carried the Nation forward at a pace that amazed the world. His own particular forte was in the political realm, and his achievements there during his long congressional career and his unprecedented 12-year term as Secretary of State, have long since won him a secure place in history.

Above all things, Cordell Hull was a man of peace, laboring ceaselessly and seeking by every device—from the good-neighbor policy to reciprocal trade—to avert war. And even in the darkest days of the conflict with the Tokyo-Rome-Berlin Axis he gave of himself without stint to organize mankind in a way that it might never again take up the sword. His was the guiding genius behind Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco, and although ill health forced him to resign before he could see his task through—a supreme tragedy to him personally—he earned as no other individual had earned it, the title that President Roosevelt gave him: "Father of the United Nations." Indeed, it may well be said of him now that the course he followed over the years has contributed in no small measure to whatever progress has been made at the summit meeting in Geneva.

Deeply respected all over the world, Cordell Hull occupied in his own land a position of rare and affectionate esteem placing him far beyond the hurly-burly of politics. In the early phase of the New Deal some critic of the young and ebullient Roosevelt brain trust likened him to a full moon shining steadily in a sky full of momentarily flashing stars, and as time wore on and the solemn but controversial days of the war were here, much the same sort of view persisted and deepened. Republicans and Democrats alike, all parties, regarded him as a man who was in the fray but above it—beyond suspicion.

He was simple in his ways. He was honest. He was direct. His integrity stood out so clearly that no one could question it. And though he was a man of peace, he had only fire and wrath in him—as the Japanese learned on the day of Pearl Harbor—when he came across double-dealing and deceit. It was perhaps these virtues of character that made his face so fine to look upon. They were written all over him, and the world at large recognized them as America did.

Cordell Hull is dead, but what he stood for lives on. No one did more to make this country and its ideals "a potent world force in the cause of peace and humanity." A good man, a fine patriot, a tireless fighter in behalf of a decent and happy civilization, he was the first citizen of the United Nations and a truly great American who served his own people and peoples everywhere surpassingly well.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, 1955]

CORDELL HULL

If Secretary Hull had resigned in December, 1941, after he had "babied along" the expansionist Japanese for over 6 months, he would have gone out in a blaze of glory. No man had done a more valiant piece of work in the history of our diplomacy. With no man did the entire Nation feel so much as one as with Cordell Hull when, on the heels of Pearl Harbor, he gave the despicable Kurusu an old-fashioned "eussing." When the Tennessee dander of Cordell Hull—usually the most urbane of men—was up, it was something to behold and to hear, and the Japanese got from him a blistering foretaste of the wrath that was to come out of an embattled America. There was a toughness about Cordell Hull which resisted death to the end.

But Cordell Hull stayed on as Secretary of State till November 1944. In the meantime he aged rapidly, and was impatient with the criticism which blew up as the American people, locked in the greatest war of all time, began to develop a sophistication about their foreign relations. The people, wont to leave the State Department in its cloisters, wanted more responsiveness and representativeness in their diplomatic service. Hull reacted to this new-found questioning, even when addressed to him by his Cabinet colleagues, in a "Grandpa knows best" manner. His irascibility was sharpened by the fact that he and his Undersecretary, Sumner Wells, were engaged in a Homeric feud without equal since the days of Burr and Hamilton. Withal, Hull's memorable service to the Republic had not been extinguished. As a kind of swan song he flew to Moscow in October 1943, and laid the foundation with our allies for the United Nations. It was the finale to a career dedicated to the idea of a world community devoid of exclusiveness.

Cordell Hull used to be known as the stepchild of the New Deal. A son of the free-trading South, he was a liberal in the Victorian, not the New Deal, sense. That is to say, he believed in freedom, in private enterprise, and in the minimum of Government interference. Yet as a Member of Congress (he had served in both branches) he was a reformer, as was shown, for instance, by his introduction of the income tax.

Cordell Hull labored patiently in the all-American vineyard for good neighborliness. President Roosevelt declared the good neighbor policy; Mr. Hull (and Mr. Welles) carried it out. Good neighborliness was the heart, also, of his trade agreement policy to which he devoted himself with such single-mindedness that he was sometimes accused of having a single-track mind. In part, the policy was aimed at lowering tariff barriers. Mainly, however, it was intended to make a league out of the world by joining all nations in a pledge not to discriminate in commercial policy.

The granitic probity of Mr. Hull gave him a singular standing in his America. He used to top the list of all Cabinet members in popularity polls. President Roosevelt, even with his towering reputation, profited by the standing occupied by his Secretary of State. It is sometimes said that, but for this, Roosevelt would have got rid of him. That may be doubted. Unquestionably Mr. Hull could be as prosy and prolix as anybody, and bored the insouciant Roosevelt like a stubby needle. However, Roosevelt respected his Secretary of State highly enough to work with might and main to get for him the Nobel peace prize which was awarded to him in 1945. In his retirement public men found inspiration for their duties in savoring his salted, sometimes sulphurous wisdom. Cordell Hull had the type of character which adorns the public service and refreshes the soul of the people.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 23, 1955]

CORDELL HULL

WASHINGTON.—Cordell Hull, former United States Secretary of State who passed on here July 23, was regarded by many as "the father of the United Nations."

Mr. Hull had steadily maintained an interest in national affairs.

As the original sponsor of the reciprocal trade program, going back to his days in the Senate, Mr. Hull had been especially interested in United States trade policy and had closely followed the ups and downs in Congress of pending legislation to carry on the trade program.

Mr. Hull, as Secretary of State in three administrations of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, held the post longer than any other man in the Nation's history—from March 1933 to November 1944.

NOBEL PRIZE IN 1945

Illness forced his retirement during World War II, which he had labored to avert, then labored to use as a springboard for establishing an enduring world peace.

He was awarded the Nobel peace prize in 1945 in tribute to his efforts to develop a worldwide, effective plan to banish war from the earth. These efforts led to creation of the United Nations.

Born in a log cabin in Tennessee, Mr. Hull's whole adult life was spent in public service. He was in Congress for 24 years—22 in the House and 2 in the Senate—before he became Secretary of State. Prior to his election to Congress he was first a State legislator and later a circuit judge in Tennessee.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. Hull specialized in tariff and economic matters—an interest reflected later in his efforts as Secretary of State to promote world trade.

Mr. Hull was described by a close friend as considering five accomplishments to be of primary importance in his long career. These were:

1. His part in the development of the United Nations: The late President Roosevelt called him, in a letter at the time of Mr. Hull's retirement, "the father of the United Nations."

GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

2. The development of nonpartisanship in foreign policy: Mr. Hull played an important role in bringing about cooperation between the Roosevelt administration and Republican leaders in and out of Congress with the specific purpose initially of winning GOP cooperation in the creation of the UN.

3. His part in evolving the good-neighbor policy toward Latin America: The essence of this policy has been that the United States should conduct itself toward other countries in this hemisphere as a good citizen would act toward his neighbor.

4. The enactment of the trade-agreements program: This program, which is still basic to United States trade relations with the rest of the world, is built on the idea of reducing tariffs by international agreement in order to stimulate freer flow of goods and commerce.

5. His contribution to raising standards of international morality and conduct, which Mr. Hull considered to be of the utmost importance if nations are to learn to live together in peace and friendship.

Mr. and Mr. Robert Coar

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to add my congratulations to those of other Members of the House for Mr. and Mrs. Robert Coar on the completion of their 20th year of splendid service to

the Members of the House and Senate. Almost as soon as I came to Congress, I began to make weekly radio reports to my constituents through the facilities of the Joint Senate House Recording Facility operated so efficiently and effectively by the Coars. My contacts with them have been uniformly pleasant and they have been most cooperative.

Incidentally I may say that my belief is that these weekly reports have been at least partly responsible for the fact that I have had no opposition for reelection to the House since I was first nominated and elected in 1946.

One rather unusual incident occurred when once I returned to my home in Rome, Ga., and got into a taxi to be driven to my office. At the moment one of my recordings was being played over the taxi driver's radio and he remarked that he was astounded to see me in Rome since he was just listening to my report and thought I was in Washington.

The addition of television facilities has, of course, added much to the service rendered by the Coars to Members of the House and Senate. I have not used it myself but many other Members do and are loud in their praise of the splendid service rendered in this field of publicity by Mr. and Mr. Coar. My good wishes go with the Coars as they continue their fine work in the field of publicity for the Members of Congress.

The Whitfield Story: Not for the AEC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, when the announcement was made that Allen Whitfield, of Iowa, had been nominated for a place as a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, I raised the first protest. I protested because it was my information that Mr. Whitfield had held positions in the Republican organization in Iowa. I do not think that any official of any political organization, Republican or Democratic, should be selected to serve on the AEC, which has an overriding mission and should be completely free of partisanship.

I knew nothing at the time about other questions that later were raised about Mr. Whitfield. I offer no comment about them now. But I could not see that Mr. Whitfield had any special experience or background that equipped him for the AEC, and I think that his political background should have been an absolute bar. The AEC should not even think about politics. It should never have a Commissioner whose thoughts involve partisan politics.

I was criticized, Mr. Speaker, for raising the political question against Mr. Whitfield's nomination. But I would have raised such a question if, in the past, a man had been appointed to the AEC in response to Democratic political pressure from Iowa, or anywhere else.

The nomination was finally withdrawn, and I hope that the lesson has been learned by President Eisenhower. I hope that never again do we have a Commissioner appointed because of political influences.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial on the Whitfield issue from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

NOT FOR THE AEC

Personal and professional integrity should be required of any public official. So the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was justified in checking reports about the fiduciary conduct of Allen Whitfield, President Eisenhower's nominee for the Atomic Energy Commission. Whitfield has now asked the President to withdraw his name lest the Commission become involved in controversy.

There were, however, more fundamentally disturbing aspects of the Whitfield nomination, even if they did not carry the kind of implication which led to examination of his connection with the Valley Bank & Trust Co. of Des Moines. First there was the charge of Representative MELVIN PRICE of Illinois, a Democratic member of the joint committee, that Whitfield had been named in response to a demand for more patronage for Iowa Republicans. Even more serious was the lack of any indication that the man was qualified by training, experience or well-founded interest for the work of the AEC.

With the possible exception of the Central Intelligence Agency, the AEC is the most unusual of Federal agencies in that the people, and to a considerable extent, Congress itself, are kept uninformed about most of its activities. Secrecy about the AEC has been equated with national security. That is why it should be made up only of men in whose ability and fitness the public can have the utmost confidence.

If ever AEC memberships become plums for political lawyers and rewards for party workers, then some changes will have to be made. Whitefield's looked just like that wind of appointment, and that is the best reason for welcoming his withdrawal.

Recreation Facilities in Forests and Parks Falling Short of Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, every summer great hordes of families come out of the cities to camp and fish on national forests in my State. An editorial from the July 5 issue on the Redding Record-Searchlight tells what happened at Shasta Lake in Shasta County—in my district—over the Fourth of July.

When there are millions of men, women, and children wanting to go to the mountains they are going regardless of improvements to prevent fires, pipe-in drinking water, and provide toilets.

Paul Bodenhammer, editor of the Redding Record-Searchlight, forthrightly points out that "it will take the best efforts of local government and civic bodies, private developers, and the Federal Government to meet the need." I hope that the administration and the Congress see fit for the Federal Government to uphold its end in this public responsibility.

The editorial follows:

OVERCROWDED SHASTA LAKE

The big Fourth of July weekend has proved again that Shasta Lake doesn't have enough facilities for the number of people who want to use it—and that we'd better do some local development while urging the Forest Service to do all it can.

Visitors to the Jones Valley portion of the lake report there was a serious sanitary problem because there were dozens of families camped there—without any regular toilet facilities. One immediate solution would be for the Forest Service to set up at least one pair of privies, and we hope that will be done right away.

Sure, there isn't any public campground, officially, at Jones Valley, and the Forest Service may not want to put one there because of the lack of a water supply, etc. But the fact remains that one can reach the lake there by road and there's some fairly level ground for camping and gently sloping shoreline for boat launching. Even if people do have to carry their water supply with them, they're going to camp there, at least until there's enough space for camping in more desirable spots.

The Shasta Dam area chamber of commerce and the Redding recreation department are both working toward locally-controlled public parks and camping areas on Shasta Lake, and we say more power to them both. It will take the best efforts of local government and civic bodies, private developers, and the Federal Government to meet the need.

Several thousand people—yes, thousands—use Shasta Lake over weekends during vacation season, and the number will increase from year to year if they can be offered suitable places to launch boats, pitch camp, or enjoy a picnic—without having to stand in line or make advance reservations.

Toledo Doctors, Dentists, Lawyers Ask Social Security Coverage for Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a bill which would make important amendments to the Social Security Act. One measure would make women eligible for social-security benefits at 62 years of age instead of 65. Another amendment permits totally disabled workers to receive payments at 50 instead of 65. A third proposal, one which I sponsored, continues for life, if necessary, payments of benefits for mentally or physically handicapped children.

The final provision which we consider today extends social-security coverage to all self-employed professional groups except doctors. Because I wanted to know the views of those most directly affected by such a law, I wrote to all members of the interested professions in Lucas County to ask if they wanted coverage for themselves. Of a total of 1,507 questionnaires sent, 517 replies have been received. Here is a tabulation of answers to the question, "Do you favor extension of the present Social Security Act to in-

clude members of your profession in its coverage?"

	Yes	No	On voluntary basis	Keogh plan
Lawyers	134	22	35	9
Physicians	85	60	28	19
Dentists	69	13	4	0
Optometrists	15	2	0	3
Chiropractors	3	0	0	2
Chiropodists	3	1	0	0
Veterinarians	1	3	0	0
Total	310	101	67	33

(Six persons gave no opinion or expressed views not included above.)

If the results of this questionnaire in the Toledo, Ohio, area are similar to attitudes in other parts of the United States, self-employed professional persons emphatically believe that the benefits of our social-security system should be theirs, also. A number of professionals indicated their support of the plan sponsored by our colleague, Mr. KEOGH, which would make deductible from Federal income taxes payments to specified types of private retirement plans by professionals and other self-employed persons. I believe that Congress should support this proposal also in order to encourage those persons who have their own business or profession to set up their own retirement programs. This measure, as well as the important social-security amendments we are voting on today, will do much to strengthen the stability of the American economy while at the same time reinforcing the widespread purchasing power which is the basis of our Nation's economic greatness.

It Took a Hamburger To Show Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "It Took a Hamburger To Show Us," which appeared in the July 21, 1955, issue of the Courier Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

IT TOOK A HAMBURGER TO SHOW US

Though it seems to take something away from the ineffable wonder of it all, we suppose we ought to report that the split atom has become standard household equipment. Electricity generated in a plant run by atomic energy has been used to cook a hamburger. By now it is reasonable to expect that it has been used to milk the cow, warm the baby's bottle, and drive the electric shaver.

We can't help thinking that this means the atomic age has lost the honeymoon bloom, taking on as it has the humdrum of the domestic routine. This homely mission accomplished, perhaps we'll begin looking beyond to new realms and eras. Hohum, it was swell while it lasted. A hamburger, eh?

What happened was no great marvel. An atomic reactor, of the type that was devised to run the submarine *Nautilus*, was set to work making power for a utility in upper New York State. Some of this power was switched into the general system that serves 35,000 homes in the area. A housewife turned on the current in her kitchen stove, and some of it had to be the new stuff. It was as simple as that.

It was also inevitable. One of the odd things about our bemusement by atomic power has been our concentration on the big jobs. In his book, Report on the Atom, Gordon Dean, former Chairman of the Atomic Engery Commission, wound up with a look into the future. He foresaw the submarine with the atomic reactor and then pursued the thought of atomic aircraft, locomotives, automobiles and on to interplanetary rockets or space ships. They were possible; they raised technical problems. They caught attention which might better be turned to ordinary uses, but now at last the proper diversion has come, just as Mr. Dean likewise got around to homework for the atom.

It is, of course, a costly operation for now. It is also a small one. General Electric built the reactor for this pioneer retail consumer operation, to produce electricity at the rate of 10,000 kilowatts. As Mr. Dean wrote of the general theory, this sort of thing "probably will not change your electric-light bill very much, but it may make your city cleaner and more attractive place in which to live." The atomic reactor, you see, takes the place of the steam plant burning coal or gas. It also holds out promise of electricity for remote and undeveloped parts of the country—Mr. Dean mentioned the Rocky Mountain region—where fuel for steam plants is hard and expensively come by.

This may mean, he pointed out, that "some mineral deposits can be worked that are now undeveloped for lack of power, or that some areas can be irrigated that are now barren because there is no power, or not enough power, to pump in fresh water. The presence of ample power may also mean that new industries will move in, to be closer to raw materials produced there."

Prophesying in relation to the atomic age turns out to be good business. Everything is coming true, and the flurry of dispute in Washington over the atom-powered merchant ship, as against the President's peace ship, seems almost pointless. And just think, it took only a hamburger to show what we can do.

Miss Helen K. Wallace Retires From Cleveland Heights High School After 45 Years of Devotion to Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, second only to our homes, our schools shape the character of our children. The security of this country depends in great measure upon the character, intelligence, and competence of each succeeding generation of young people. This task we give to our teachers and educational administrators. Among them, a few stand out for the great impact they have had on an entire community.

Miss Helen K. Wallace is one of these. She has devoted her entire professional life to the young people of Cleveland Heights High School and now, after 45 years with the school, she is retiring as dean of girls.

Miss Wallace has seen enrollment at Heights High grow from 112 pupils to more than 2,000. From a suburban red-brick schoolhouse, home of the board of education today, it has grown into a teeming center of school activity at Cedar-Lee, and Helen Wallace was part of it all. Many of her young pupils were the children of early settlers on the Heights. She has been an inspiring influence for the finer things of life, morally and culturally, and her influence upon our young people will be sorely missed.

Miss Wallace started the school newspaper in 1916. She put out the first school yearbook in 1922 and then 2 years later the pupils dedicated it to her for character and faithful service. She was one of the first deans to organize an all-school program of social activities and the girls' cabinet which gives the pupils the task of maintaining their own high standards of dress and conduct. The Mothers Club, the Friendship Club, the Junior and Senior Literary Club, all resulted from her vision.

Miss Wallace has loved her work and her pupils have loved her for the years of selfless effort she has devoted to their welfare. All of us will miss her invaluable contribution to Cleveland Heights education. But she is not retiring from all activities and I sincerely hope the community will be able to draw upon her wise counsel for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the splendid article about Miss Wallace which appeared in the Cleveland News on July 15, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HEIGHTS HIGH LOSES ITS DEAN WALLACE

Miss Helen K. Wallace—who has guided through graduation many thousands of Cleveland Heights High School pupils during the last 45 years—will not return as dean of girls in September.

Miss Wallace has spent her entire professional life at Heights High, joining the faculty as an English teacher when classes were held in the present Board of Education building.

She saw enrollment grow from 112 to more than 2,000. Some of the present pupils she has advised against corridor-crowding, bouffant petticoats and other extremes of dress are the daughters of earlier pupils whom she cautioned about too-filmy georgette blouses.

TIME TO QUIT

Today, in the Scarborough Road home where she has resided for 38 years, Miss Wallace said:

"I'm leaving reluctantly, but it's time to quit. Everything is going well now. This isn't retirement, though. I'm planning new ventures."

Miss Wallace finds that pupils—and their problems—have changed over the years.

Shortly after her appointment as dean in 1921, she was one of six who organized the school's Mothers Club, forerunner of the PTA, which was primarily devoted to furnishing eyeglasses and supplying other financial assistance to needy pupils who came to Miss Wallace's attention.

MORE BROKEN HOMES NOW

"It's been a long time since a pupil came to me with a financial problem," Miss Wallace said. "Instead, in recent years, girls have increasingly sought my advice on upsetting family problems. * * * There are so many more broken homes, now."

Miss Wallace moved on from the worries of the hip-flask-toting flapper era to new problems created by a more independent, more socially mature, more sophisticated generation of Heights pupils.

But Miss Wallace's has not been a strictly problem job. "I've always enjoyed my job," she said, citing particularly her experience as chaperone on the school choir's 1953 European tour.

Until 10 years ago, Miss Wallace continued to teach English classes while serving as dean. She started the school newspaper, the Black and Gold, in 1916. In 1922 she put out the first school yearbook which, 2 years later, the pupils dedicated to her for character and faithful service.

Miss Wallace was one of the first deans to organize an all-school program of social activities and also organized the unique Girls Cabinet which has worked toward uniting the girls of the school and maintaining high standards of dress and conduct.

Miss Wallace was organizer of the Friendship Club, Junior and Senior Literary Club and, only last year, a group of pupil hospital volunteers. For many years she has supervised commencement activities.

A native Clevelander and graduate of old Central High School, Miss Wallace was awarded a bachelor of arts degree by Flora Stone Mather College where she has served on the board of directors. She studied at Harvard University, got her dean's training at Columbia University and was awarded a master's degree by Western Reserve University.

Miss Wallace is a former president of the Northeast Ohio Deans' Association. She is a member of the Women's City Club, former member of the College Club and, for the last 14 years, has been a member of the advisory board of Huron Road Hospital School of Nursing.

Miss Wallace, who was eulogized by members of the board of education as they accepted her resignation, said that her hope has always been to say goodbye to girl graduates who had developed good taste in manner and dress—and a love for learning.

Townsend-Plan Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to join my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN RHODES, and other cosponsors of the Townsend-plan legislation, H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, in voicing my support for consideration of this legislation. However, it was impossible for me to be present at that time. I would like, therefore, to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a summarization of my position on the Townsend plan, which I described in greater detail at the Townsend convention last May 2 in St. Petersburg, Fla.:

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES ROOSEVELT, DEMOCRAT, OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE TOWNSEND CONVENTION AT ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., ON MAY 2, 1955

Some people still insist the Townsend plan hasn't a chance of becoming law. I say this: Within the foreseeable future most of the principles of the Townsend plan will appear in the Social Security Act.

You are not fighting a losing cause. Some of the most important things you stand for will be the law of the land. And the time when they will be is not so far away. Here are points of the Townsend plan which I expect to see adopted:

Eligibility for benefits at the age of 60: This is proposed in many bills introduced in this first session of the 84th Congress. It recognizes the hard facts of economic life today.

Universal coverage: We have seen coverage under the original security law steadily widened. Last year the doors were opened to some 10 million people. The time will come when every American will automatically qualify on reaching a specified age.

Pensions as a matter of right: This goes with universal coverage. Old-age assistance will be abandoned. And with it will go the means test, the pauper's oath, the lien law, publicizing of the names of recipients of public assistance, and other distasteful features of old-age assistance as we have it today.

Pensions adequate to the cost of living: I myself am sponsoring a bill to establish a basic minimum of $100 a month. Maybe that is, in fact, not enough. But it would represent a considerable step forward and we can adjust as we go along. Benefits will be adequate in time. Of that I am sure.

These are the principles of the Townsend plan which I predict will be adopted in not too long a time. Now let me say that maybe credit will not be given the Townsend organization. But those acquainted with the history of social-security improvements will know where the credit belongs.

You members of this organization are fighting a good fight. You are fighting for a cause in which you believe. You are fighting for a program which you believe would be good not only for older Americans but for the entire Nation.

Our present system of social security, as you all know, originated under my father in the New Deal years. It was intended to meet a need of the time. He never claimed it was the final answer. He always said that programs must be changed as the times change. They must be revised and brought up to date with current conditions.

One of the essential freedoms which my father so deeply cherished is "freedom from want." The program of social welfare enacted during his presidency was designed to win this freedom for the American people.

As I see it, the Townsend plan is in this tradition. It is squarely aimed at achieving freedom from want. And in this blessed land of ours, so richly endowed with all the needs of a people, this freedom is surely attainable.

Third Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1955, this Chamber unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 149 which refuted colonialism as a denial of the inalienable rights of man and supported as a policy of the United States the policy of championing the people of the world in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence so as to permit them to assume an equal station amongst the free nations of the world. This action by the House which was later followed by the Senate served notice that the United States will not be identified with colonialistic policies.

Three years ago today there was created as a result of similar action by the House and Senate the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The terms of the enabling act which made this possible served similar notice at that time that the United States scorned colonialistic policies and believed in and promoted the principles of self-government, and all of the attributes thereof. It was thus that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was created. It was thus that the United States showed it did not merely talk freedom and self-government, but practiced freedom and self-government for those under the Stars and Stripes.

The people of Puerto Rico through their Resident Commissioner petitioned Congress for authority to organize themselves into a commonwealth government, associated with the United States under an arrangement of specified relationships agreed to in the nature of a compact. This political development was certainly something new to the United States, and for that matter to the world. Political scientists were interested in its characteristics, ultimate development, and workability.

That the commonwealth idea has been successful comes as no surprise to the Puerto Rican leaders who conceived it and the Puerto Rican people who gave it enthusiastic support. As to those who studied its emergence, it has proved almost flawless. It is indeed significant to note that whereas in recent years and months and even weeks, both the smoldering and violent unrest of the remaining colonial peoples has been continually manifest, whereas in Puerto Rico, energies have been devoted not to violence and protest, but to continual attention to what must still be done to perfect details pertaining to political relationships with the United States and economic development in the island.

Many of the Members here have been to Puerto Rico. Some have recently followed up earlier visits. All are impressed with the almost unbelievable speed and degree of progress which is being made and the tremendous activity toward development and improvement. Especially those who are making second and third visits are struck by the changes which have occurred since their earlier visit.

This is what happens when a free and happy people are unhampered to devote themselves to their own self-improvement. In Puerto Rico they call it Operation Bootstrap—the uplifting through self-effort.

The action which the Congress took to make possible the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has proved to be a wise move in more ways than one. Not only are these 2¼ million American citizens working together for economic progress, but the commonwealth has proved itself to be one of the weapons in the United States arsenal against communism. It is significant that there is no problem with Communists in Puerto Rico. It is significant,

also, that Puerto Rico is continually host to great numbers of visitors from South American and from all the undeveloped countries of the world to view this indisputable example of what is possible where there is given understanding and recognition of the freedom-craving heart that beats in every man, where there is cooperation, and where a helping hand is offered when it is needed.

Students throughout the free world are studying the commonwealth precept as exemplified by the case of Puerto Rico. Admittedly, it was a political experiment. Convincingly, it has proved successful.

So, today, on the third anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, just 53 years after the landing of the American troops in the island during the Spanish American war, it is appropriate to give proper recognition here and to extend best wishes to the Puerto Rican people in their work that lies ahead to complete the task for the welfare of the Puerto Rican people.

Our Unsound Social-Security Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our unsound, dishonest, inequitable social-security setup that has been sold to the American people as a plan to provide security in their old age has again been extended and made more actuarily unsound than it was before. It really is a plan to tax our children and grandchildren when the time comes to meet the obligations that the present generation supposedly has paid for and are entitled to receive when they reach retirement age. It is a Ponzi-type shell game that is bound to collapse when the load becomes too heavy to carry.

Mr. Speaker, the social-security amendments of 1955—H. R. 7225—proposes that the tax rate for social security shall keep on increasing until it reaches 9 percent in 1975—4½ percent upon employer and 4½ percent upon employee—and 6¾ percent upon all self-employed. This means that the social-security tax load will amount to $20 billion per year by 1975—a colossal tax load superimposed upon the present backbreaking tax load.

Take as an example a farmer with a net income from self-employment of $4,200 in 1975. Assuming that he has a wife and two children and uses the standard deduction, his Federal income tax, under present rates, will be $276. His social-security tax, on the other hand, will be $283.50. In this example, which is a completely average case, the social-security tax, as a percentage of net taxable income, would be in excess of 20 percent. If the same individual had three children, his income tax would be cut to $156 but his social-security tax would still amount to $283.50. In such a case, the latter tax would be the equivalent of a net income tax of 36 percent. Is that the tax load we want to place upon the backs of our children?

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune carried an editorial in its issue for July 21, 1955, analyzing and summarizing the provisions of H. R. 7225, and stating briefly what the effect of its passage would be. The editorial also points out very clearly wherein the present social-security setup is unsound. Because it is such an excellent summary of the whole subject, I include it as an addition to my remarks, and perhaps as a vindication of the same.

The editorial is as follows:

THE SOMETHING-FOR-NOTHING BOYS

Revisions of the Social Security Act, sponsored by the Democratic majority in Congress and passed by the House on Monday, represent a new low in the something-for-nothing game that the demagogs of the Nation have been playing on the public since 1936.

Not the least distressing part of the exhibition was the part played by Illinois Republicans who know better and who usually can be depended upon to vote their convictions. Just one of them, Representative NOAH MASON, opposed the bill after denouncing it for placing the social-security system on an even more unsound actuarial basis than now obtains. Most of the rest voted for it, apparently depending on Senator BYRD and other conservatives in the Senate to keep it off the lawbooks.

Social security is called insurance. It is not. Insurance is based upon premiums which bear a direct relation to the benefits accrued. The premiums for old-age and survivor insurance, the official name for social security, are collected in equal amounts from employer and employee when the alleged beneficiary is not self-employed. The tax has no relation to the benefits. The law was deliberately written to make higher paid employees pay most of the benefits of lower paid and casual workers.

Furthermore, no one now pays enough into the social security till to provide the benefits he is promised by law. Neither are his employer's tax payments, added to his own, sufficient for this purpose. There is, it is true, a reserve of more than $20 billion in the social-security fund, but this is only because virtually everyone who now works is taxed, while only a relatively small number of persons—about 1 to every 10 persons paying taxes into the fund—are collecting pensions.

When the time comes for the more than 61 million present social-security taxpayers to collect, they will have two sources on which to call for the money. The first is the reserve fund. But there is no money in it. The money has been spent, and Government bonds put in its place. To provide money, other people will have to be taxed to pay off the bonds. But the reserve fund will fall far short of meeting pension requirements, long before the majority of present taxpayers come to collect. The rest of the money will have to come from social security taxes paid by their children and grandchildren, at constantly increasing rates.

The current phase of the something-for-nothing racket consists of a lower pension eligibility age—62 years instead of 65—for women, and the payment of pensions to totally and permanently disabled persons after they reach the age of 50. Disabled persons now are relieved of further pension taxes, but must wait until they are 65 to collect.

To the persons, about 1,300,000, affected by these new provisions, the payments will be largely velvet. They will contribute less and get more. But people who keep on working will be presented with a constantly increasing bill. The cost of the increased benefits will be $2 billion a year during the next 20 years and $2.5 billions a year thereafter.

The bill raises social-security tax rates beginning next January 1, when employee and employer will have to pay, together, 5 percent of every pay check into the social security fund. Further increases are provided for 1960, 1965, 1970, and 1975, by which time the social-security tax collector will be taking 9 percent of the Nation's payroll.

Experience shows, however, that when the time comes to increase these taxes, Congress will back down. It has done so already more frequently than it has enacted scheduled increases. All that does is shift more of the burden to future generations.

The man who retorted to a plea to think of posterity with the question, "What did posterity ever do for me?" now has his answer. Posterity is going to pay his old-age pension. Or will it?

Posterity can vote, too, and the increasing burdens of social security are going to make it less popular politically as the taxes necessary to keep the system solvent mount higher and higher. That, of course, is of no consequence to the something-for-nothing Democrats in the House. They aren't looking for posterity's votes—only those of the 1,300,000 whose benefits, if the Senate concurs, will be increased a few months before the polls open next year.

Separate Minority Views, H. R. 7474

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, with our expectation of the highway bill coming up for consideration in the House this week, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the Davis-Bacon provision which has been incorporated in this bill. I intend to offer an amendment to strike out section 11. There is even a question in my mind whether the Davis-Bacon provision can be considered germaine to the bill. If it is, there remains the other strong objections which I have summarized in the separate views of Report No. 1336 accompanying H. R. 7474:

SEPARATE MINORITY VIEWS, H. R. 7474

We are all aware of the danger of overcentralized Federal Government with its vast bureaucracy. Our Founding Fathers propounded and we too have accepted a belief in the basic rights of the several States. This belief is embodied in our Constitution. The course of events in our national life and growth has greatly centralized and emphasized the Federal functions but has not disproved the wisdom, need, and reaffirmation of the original basic concept of our Government, nor have we changed the letter of the law.

Now we have a choice again—whether we will hold fast against further centralization and imposition of Federal will upon the States to the loss of their rights, or whether we will permit the States to continue to manage their affairs.

The Davis-Bacon Act provision in this bill is not just an expression of concern for the workingman's wage, but is a bold frontal assault on the God-given rights recognized

by our forefathers and embodies in the limited form of Government set up in the balance between Federal and State authority.

This provision endeavors through the Secretary of Labor to recognize and prescribe the prevailing local wage. Behind this simple statement of intent moves in the Federal bureaucracy to duplicate and take over the work already being done by the State to the extent which local conditions require the State to take part. Obviously, the local prevailing wage must be paid in the past, now, and in the future, or men will not take the work.

What do the workers want? They do not want wages set by a Federal mandate. What the Government bestows it can take away. Are not supply and demand and free negotiation a better basis for wages than a decision from Washington, far removed from the local scene and whose decisions can upset the local economy?

When government is necessary, that government is best that is closest to the people, and if wages must be set let the State exercise this function through the fine highway departments that are now in operation. State officials know more about their own local rates and economic conditions than do Federal officials.

Further, a labor matter, if such this provision is, should be properly considered in the time-honored legislative way by the Labor Committee of Congress and not tied onto this legislation to be railroaded through on the merits of other legislative needs.

How about the cost? Here's a matter which we watchdogs of the public purse must always consider. We agreed in Committee that we wanted the most roads for the money. It has been variously estimated that imposing the Bacon-Davis provision would add to the total cost between 4 percent and 10 percent. At the lower figure this would either add approximately 2,000 million to the cost or result in loss of the equivalent amount of roads.

In brief, the Davis-Bacon provision attempts to gain through this backdoor method the enactment of a Federal labor law not now in force. It has no place in this bill. It should stand on its own merits and be considered by the proper committee of Congress. All other arguments, therefore, for its inclusion, and certainly its merits, are immaterial and irrelevant at this time. Therefore, it should be stricken from this bill.

Shirtsleeve Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Shirtsleeve Diplomacy," which appeared in the July 20, 1955, issue of the Ownesboro Inquirer, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SHIRTSLEEVE DIPLOMACY

With statesmen meeting at Geneva for the Big Four talks, now is perhaps the time to take another look at diplomacy in our age.

Once diplomacy was regarded as a skilled game played by crafty but polite gentlemen on a diplomatic chessboard. As an old proverb put it, "If a diplomat says 'Yes' he means 'Perhaps,' when he says 'Perhaps' he means 'No,' but it is not becoming to a diplomat to say 'No'."

The Communists were the first to discard this elegant 19th century diplomatic routine. Now it is the West Germans who have introduced something new in world diplomacy, a type of shirtsleeve diplomacy, from which the Western powers can learn a trick or two—especially in their negotiations with the Moscow-Peiping Axis.

What happened to the typical German militarist-diplomat, arrogant and monocled? He seems to have vanished with Hitler and the ruins of the last war.

Bonn's diplomat speaks softly. He is no tea-drinking-striped-pants gentleman tied by diplomatic ritual and an intricate system of protocol.

A typical example is Heinrich von Brentano, the Bonn Republic's new Foreign Minister. In his early 50's, he is stanchly pro-Western and a political liberal who helped frame West Germany's United States-style Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Another German diplomat in shirtsleeves is Dr. H. L. Krekeler, Bonn' Ambassador to the United States. A soft-spoken and an unassuming man who has had the courage to fight both Nazis and Communists, he is primarily a scientist and a businessman rather than an old-style diplomat.

However, it is 79-year-old Chancellor Adenauer himself—a man who thinks, feels, and acts like a Westerner—who stands at the summit of Germany's new diplomacy.

For instance, consider the skill with which the Chancellor evaded the trap set for him by the recent Soviet invitation to visit Russia.

The invitation itself was anything but a surprise. It merely showed again that Muscovite diplomacy sees nothing strange in issuing a polite invitation to a man whom Red propaganda long depicted as a bloodthirsty tyrant.

However, if the Kremlin leaders were under any illusions that Adenauer would fall for their gambit and rush to Moscow they clearly misunderstood not only the Chancellor's devotion to Western ideals but also the new type of diplomacy gradually emerging in Bonn under his leadership.

Adenauer neither accepted nor rejected Moscow's invitation. He simply suggested that before a decision on such a meeting would be made it would be necessary to examine and clarify what subjects are to be discussed and on what basis.

With one simple stroke he thus took away the diplomatic play from the Russians and upset their plan for the Geneva summit meeting. For clarity in international relations is one thing the Kremlin rulers fear like fire.

United States as Minerals Tycoon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, obviously there are certain elements and individuals in our Government who are determined to confiscate private property at the slightest provocation.

Those of us who fought the fight against the tideland grab by the Government, warned at that time that private property was next on the grab list.

Only recently there has developed some outrageous incidents of the Government grabbing private property under the guise of defense, holding the mineral rights to private property under misrepresentation and specifically in the instance of the Department of the Navy, treating a big corporation quite differently from private owners. The incident of the Houma (La.) Air Base is a disgrace and a discredit to the Navy.

Senator RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, recently introduced and had passed by the other body a bill which would require the Government to prove the necessity of grabbing mineral rights as a requirement for the national defense before being allowed to deprive individuals of their private holdings.

This legislation is being fought in this body by those who are hell bent on socializing this Government by first taking that which belongs to the several States and now conducting a campaign to take privately owned mineral rights from the individuals. Where will they stop?

The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which has always been alert to this vicious practice, has written an editorial which points up the danger of the situation and I hasten to call it to your attention as a warning signal of what is to come. The fight against such encroachment is far from an end.

UNITED STATES AS MINERALS TYCOON

Senator LONG has a bill, passed by the Senate and now before a House committee, which would fix a slowing-up point for the combined process of original ownership, land purchase, and plain "grab" whereby the Federal Government, according to testimony at a congressional hearing last week, has become the owner of half of the mineral rights in the United States.

Under this measure the Government no longer would acquire mineral rights along with the land it buys for specified purposes unless it can show a compelling need for ownership of the minerals.

Various factors contribute to the Government's mineral-rights ownership outstripping the percentage of its surface-owned land. Oil reserves in such public-domain States as Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, could be named. More important probably are the immensely valuable deposits of uranium bearing ore on land so barren and worthless that no one but the Government has ever wanted to own it. Then there was the overnight "grab" of the Continental Shelf's oil reserves, after Louisiana, working with the oil companies, had shown their fabulous value.

More interesting than important to the whole picture is the quaint procedure whereby the Federal land bank retains half the minerals on farmland acquired by foreclosure and later redeemed by the original owner.

Officialdom appeared in full force against the Long bill at the House committee hearing, which, of course, is not news, but Louisianians will find some of their arguments naive. The Interior Department—instigator of the tidelands grab—unblushingly opposed the bill as unnecessary because the Government "should" acquire only real estate "for which it has an absolute need to carry out authorized programs" and when the need is ended should restore the property "to private ownership." The Attorney General's office—up to its ears in litigation over the tidelands grab, cause of the greatest title confusion in the history of the country—expressed to the committee its fear that the Long bill "could create endless litigation and have a confusing effect on land titles."

Had Senator LONG's bill been in effect during World War II, it would not now be necessary for Louisiana Congressmen to be pushing another measure to restore ownership of minerals to Terrebonne parish landowners on land purchased for a naval installation. Indeed it is difficult to see how the Government could justify a need for the ownership of mineral rights save under the most exceptional circumstances. But in case it did so, the landowners and the courts would be on notice that the minerals constituted a valuable property, for which due compensation should be given.

Analysis of Public Law 78—Appropriations for Department of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an analysis of Public Law 78 prepared for me by Elizabeth Elward, of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 78, 84TH CONGRESS—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1956

TITLE I. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary:	
Research in utilization of saline water	$400,000
Salaries and expenses, Oil and Gas Division	390,000
Office of the Solicitor	2,525,000
Office of Minerals Mobilization	225,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	3,540,000
Bureau of Land Management:	
Management of lands and resources	13,450,000
Construction	2,300,000
Range improvements	(1)
Total, Bureau of Land Management	15,750,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
Education and Welfare services	41,764,995
Resources management	12,432,000
Construction	7,979,003
Road construction and maintenance (liquidation of contract authorization)	7,000,000
General administrative expenses	2,600,000
Relocation of the Yankton Sioux Tribe	56,500
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	71,832,498
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3,100,000)
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	26,635,000

Footnotes at end of table.

TITLE I. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—continued

Bureau of Mines:	
Conservation and development of mineral resources	$12,893,000
Health and safety	5,000,000
General administrative expenses	970,000
Total, Bureau of Mines	18,863,000
National Park Service:	
Management and protection	9,825,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	8,950,000
Construction	5,425,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	19,654,300
General administrative expenses	1,175,000
Total, National Park Service	45,029,300
Fish and Wildlife Service:	
Management of resources	6,728,500
Investigations of resources	4,187,000
Construction	1,000,000
General administrative expenses	760,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands	[1] (1,827,600)
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	12,675,500
Office of Territories:	
Administration of Territories	2,609,500
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	4,500,000
Alaska public works	3,000,000
Construction of roads, Alaska	6,300,000
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska	3,500,000
Construction, Alaska Railroad	4,100,000
Total, Office of Territories	24,009,500
Administration, Department of the Interior:	
Salaries and expenses	2,065,000
Total, Department of the Interior	220,399,798

TITLE II. RELATED AGENCIES

Commission of Fine Arts	$21,200
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	70,000
Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural Research Service:	
Salaries and expenses	150,000
Forest Service:	
Salaries and expenses:	
National forest protection and management	35,511,500
Fighting forest fires	5,250,000
Control of forest pests	6,272,500
Forest research	7,754,000
Subtotal	54,788,000
Roads and trails	24,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:	
Weeks Act	190,000
Special act	[2] (10,000)
State and private forestry cooperation	11,337,129

Footnotes at end of table.

TITLE II. RELATED AGENCIES—continued

Dept. of Agriculture—Con.	
Forest service—Con.	
Cooperative range improvements (special account)	[1] ($700,000)
Total, Forest Service	87,580,129
Indian Claims Commission	119,500
Jamestown - Williamsburg - Yorktown Celebration Commission	100,000
National Capital Planning Commission:	
Salaries and expenses	143,000
Land acquisition	500,000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	643,000
Smithsonian Institution:	
Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution	4,000,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	1,355,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	5,355,000
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	10,000
Total, related agencies	94,048,829

TITLE III. VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Grants	390,000
Administrative expenses	[2] (160,000)
Grand total, titles I, II, and III	317,573,627

[1] Appropriation of receipts. Not included in totals of this table.
[2] Limitation on use of corporate funds.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Department of the Interior:

(a) Permits the employment of aliens in the field service of the Department for periods of 30 days in cases of emergency.

(b) Makes appropriations hereunder available for the reconstruction of damaged or destroyed facilities.

(c) Permits expenditures for forest or range fire suppression.

(d) Authorizes the temporary employment of consultants or experts at rates of up to $100 per diem, the total expenditure limited to $250,000.

(e) Authorizes maintenance and operation of aircraft, hire of passenger motor vehicles, purchase of reprints, payment for certain telephone services, and payment of library society membership dues under certain circumstances.

(f) Authorizes up to $200,000 total for payment for specified personal services.

RELATED AGENCIES

Forest Service:

(a) Authorizes the replacement of 165 passenger motor vehicles and the hire of such vehicles.

(b) Declares restrictions against employment of aliens inapplicable to (1) translators employed on a temporary basis, and (2) emergency employment on a temporary basis.

(c) Limits amounts for options to purchase land to a maximum $1.

(d) Requires the use of domestic twine except where no suitable product is available.

(e) Prohibits the use of funds for publicity or propaganda.

GENERAL

(a) Authorizes travel expense payments.

(b) Continues antistrike provisions.

Federal Aid for Indoctrination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, the controversial problem, Federal aid to education, has absorbed the minds of a great many people during recent weeks. There are those who feel there should be no extension whatever of our Federal aid to education. Their fear is based largely upon the feeling that with Federal aid goes Federal control, and they are mindful of what happened in Germany, Italy, and now Russia where education has been under the domination of national authorities.

Opponents of this position are quick to point out that we have had specific Federal aid to education for half a century, and there has been no disposition to control the philosophy underlying our education structure on the part of the Federal Government. Federal aid to public-school construction, it is pointed out, is specific aid, and there is no justification for the belief that with this type of aid there will necessarily be Federal control.

It is certain that both groups in this controversy do not want Federal control of education. The lessons we have learned from countries abroad which have become victims to such philosophy are too fresh in memory for us to fall into that error.

There follow excerpts from the Fact Finder magazine, edited by Mr. Harry T. Everingham, which contains an interesting discussion of this particular subject:

FEDERAL AID FOR INDOCTRINATION

Many people favor Federal aid to education. Maybe you would too if you'd heard a distinguished speaker before the PTA tell how badly schools are needed in Mississippi—backing up his point with the statement that "there is not a single elementary school for colored children in the city of Jackson, Miss." Wouldn't that make you favor Federal aid to education? It would if you believed it.

When we heard a congressional candidate make that statement last fall we asked him where he got his information. He said from the local teachers' union. Later, we checked the school situation in Jackson and found: There are no less than eight elementary schools for colored children in Jackson, Miss. Furthermore, just last May, Adlai Stevenson was there, looking at the colored schools in Jackson and praising them. We even have photographs of them.

Only a few Southern States could have any possible need for Federal aid for schools. Yet nowhere will you find a proposal to provide Federal aid only for needy States, permitting the others to run their schools without interference from Washington. It seems odd that every program advanced to improve education in a few States must involve nationalization of education for all the 48 States.

But it isn't odd when you realize that the real goal of the organized forces behind Federal aid is not really equal education for all, but control of education.

Another report appeared February 25, 1955, on the front page of the New York Times. It was prepared by a 15-man subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which included the Federal Commissioner of Education. The report said that Federal money for school construction is "not necessary." Also: "We have been unable to find a State which cannot afford to make more money available to its schools, or which is economically unable to support an adequate school system."

Another national authority, president of Indiana Central College, Dr. I. Lynd Esch, has made an exhaustive study of Federal aid to education and says he is personally opposed to it for several reasons.

FEDERAL AID IS UNNECESSARY

"I do not believe there is any State in the United States," he says, "which cannot provide the necessary improvement in its education if it has the will to do it. There is no State today that is spending as high a percentage of its income for education as it spent in 1929, or in 1933. There is no State spending as much as 3 percent of its income for education.

"There are some States with less opportunity than others in terms of dollar income, but the differential is narrowing very materially. The matter of teachers' salaries is a good example. The average teacher's salary in the last 10 years has about doubled in the public schools; but the States with the lowest salary income have almost tripled their salaries. So any State in the Union can afford it."

FEDERAL AID IS ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND

"It costs more money to do the total job if we turn it over to the Federal Government. The farther away politicians are from the source of income, the easier it is to spend the money and the greater amount of inefficiency in doing it. In Indianapolis we're building public schools at an average cost of $34,000 a classroom. That's a lot of money. But a school built by the Federal Government is costing $75,000 a classroom.

"It's economically unsound for another reason: the Federal Government can't afford it. We have just about reached the maximum of the public debt—nearly $300 billion. We have the highest tax rate in all the history of America. It's a rate that all of us think is too high, and we still have an unbalanced budget. Now how in the world can the Federal Government afford to take care of this situation? All the money the Federal Government gets has to come out of the 48 States in taxation. The individual States can tax themselves for their own purposes better than give it to the Federal Government. There is no State in the Union which financially is not much better off than the Federal Government."

FEDERAL AID IS UN-AMERICAN

"It will bring Federal control of education. The Federal Government has an obligation to control that which it subsidizes—an obligation to those of us who pay taxes—to see what happens to the money. The Supreme Court has ruled that this is true. It has to control what it subsidizes if it is going to be true to the trust we place in it.

"Control at one central place always brings standardization—which might be good or bad, depending upon the views of the political party in power. But that can change overnight. Germany had a good system of education before Hitler came to power, but in 7 years it was completely reversed because he had it under the control of one bureau, one minister. It is impossible to get aid without getting control. It's impossible to get control without getting standardization and then you get stagnation, because you've lost the incentive for a progressive, competitive program.

"You can't force education from the top. Education must go up. You can force indoctrination. You can force regimentation. But you cannot force education that is adequate for free citizens in a free society. That has to grow up from the local community with the best of community pride, initiative and goals to make it alive and real. You don't do that with dollars. We have to have more dollars for education, but along with the dollars we need the interest of the local community in building pride in that educational system."

Federal aid is a stepping stone to socialism.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Invitation to Sponsors of North Atlantic Treaty To Name Delegates to a Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement made by me yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12, JULY 25, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to this committee for your consideration in scheduling hearings today on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. If adopted in its present from this resolution would provide for the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a convention for the purpose of exploring means of further unity among the democracies.

As the committee knows, I was joined in offering this resolution by Senators FLANDERS, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, LEHMAN, LONG, MANSFIELD, MCNAMARA, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PAYNE, SCOTT, and SPARKMAN. I believe that my fellow sponsors would also join me in urging the committee to make any changes in the language in the resolution which you deem necessary in order to better define or make more precise its purposes. For instance, it is my understanding that the executive departments concerned may propose that the language be changed to have the invitation of the President issued on behalf of the Congress. Such a change would certainly be satisfactory with me and is in fact in keeping with our own constitutional history. The important thing is that we take a step now which the times demand and make such a convention possible.

The President's meeting at the summit emphasizes, in my opinion, the desirability of the step here proposed. In line with our own history of freedom in the United States and the comparable histories of freedom among our fellow democracies, these meetings of the heads of state serve to emphasize the desirability of meetings also among representatives of the people themselves.

We need now a meeting after the summit—a meeting of the sovereigns—a meeting of the people themselves from whom, under the democratic theory of government, all power derives.

I believe it to be significant that during the past few months an increasing number of the world's leaders have endorsed the plan here proposed. I have here the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, former Secretary of State, former Secretary of Defense, and former Chief of Staff which I think is of sufficient importance to read in its entirety:

"A few days before the death of Justice Owen J. Roberts, I accepted his invitation of May 5 to become a member of the Council of the Atlantic Union Committee which he has headed since its foundation in 1949. In accepting, I wrote him May 12:

" 'I am honored to be counted among those who support the unity of free nations.'

"Justice Roberts' services to defense as well as to the judiciary were manifold, but perhaps the finest thing he did was the sacrifice he made in resigning from the Supreme Court to devote himself to the cause of Atlantic Union.

"The subject today is vitally important and the period fateful. All probably agree to the importance of Atlantic unity but few act.

"Recently a resolution calling for action was introduced in Congress by a distinguished bipartisan group from both Houses. It proposes that delegates from the United States and other NATO democracies meet in a convention 'to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union.' This prudent proposal, which commits us only to exploration, deserves support.

"Thinking back on the development of our own Federal Union—on the doubts and difficulties which preceded the final union of the colonies, on the remarkable advance in freedom, invention, production, and living standards which followed on the solution of the early difficulties, and on the high degree to which the States have continued to maintain their individual personality and institutions—Americans should have a sympathetic understanding of this effort to overcome the limitations of national barriers in the approach to a solution for common problems.

"What I said when I addressed the conference of governors on July 14, 1947, I would repeat today: 'There is no blinking the fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the Old World.'

"Either it must finish the task of assisting these countries to adjust themselves politically to the changed demands of a new age, or it must reconcile itself to seeing them move in directions which are consistent neither with their own traditions nor with those of this country. Whatever course is adopted will affect the lives and fortunes of people in every State of the Union."

This from the author of the Marshall plan.

I have here another statement from Mr. Robert Schuman, Minister of Justice in the present French Cabinet, former Premier of France, which I should like to read:

"The setting up of an Exploratory Committee (Comité d'Etude) regarding Atlantic Union which is advocated at present in the United States Congress by so many distinguished Senators and Representatives, is of the highest importance to all nations belonging to NATO.

"I have long been an ardent partisan of a European federation to be integrated itself in the Atlantic community. But certain European nations have hesitated to advance far in this direction so long as the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were not disposed to explore in common with them an eventual political, economic, and military union.

"If the American Congress accepts the Atlantic proposal of Senator KEFAUVER, all the democratic European nations should be happy to accept the invitation to send delegates to such a Study Commission. Should there result from the work of this conference and from later proposals the outline of an acceptable plan of union, in which each of the member nations would be attributed an equitable voting right protecting it from any eventual domination by a single nation—which should be contrary to the democratic ideal of the Union—we would then certainly have made a great step toward world peace and general prosperity."

This from the author of the Schuman plan.

Paul-Henri Spaak, Foreign Minister of Belgium said, in endorsing this proposal:

"The Atlantic exploratory convention resolution proposed in the American Congress by Senator KEFAUVER, Senator FLANDERS, and other leading Americans seems to me a most praiseworthy effort to obtain at least a preliminary examination of the advantages and disadvantages of closer cooperation among western democracies. I personally hope that such discussion will take place between the citizens of the Atlantic nations very soon."

Former Prime Minister of Belgium Paul Van Zeeland said:

"Any step leading to the acceptance or the support by the United States of the creation of a truly well-balanced and equitable Atlantic community would, in my opinion, be a great support and a strong inducement for those who are doing their best to create a European union.

"To sum up, it would be a major step towards peace and prosperity throughout the world."

Foreign Minister of Italy Gaetano Martino said of the resolution:

"I agree with Senator KEFAUVER that the peace of the world cannot be assured by methods of formal diplomacy alone; and I feel that any efforts on the part of leading citizens in different democratic countries to explore and carefully discuss the probable advantages, obstacles, and problems connected with some possible form of eventual democratic federation are very desirable, because the more discussion we have of these problems the closer is the likelihood of eventual solution."

Now just exactly what is this plan, why do I think it is necessary, and how would it work?

NATO is now the most integrated and developed international organization of the free world as well as the principal bulwark of its security. But NATO is still fundmentally a military alliance. In the military field it has created an Atlantic defense force under a unified command exercised by a supreme commander. But in the political field, power of decision still rests with 14 separate national governments which must agree unanimously before action can be taken—and NATO action is strictly limited to making recommendations. NATO has as yet no adequate machinery for the exercise of civil control over its military forces, despite the fact that civil control over military force is a basic principle of every democratic people.

The purpose of the resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention is to bring about a meeting of the most competent citizens of the Atlantic democracies to determine what steps might be taken outside the military field to bring about unity of action. On behalf of the other sponsors of this resolution, I wish briefly to explain certain provisions in its enacting clause.

It requests the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty—Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—to name delegates to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates of the United States. There is no reason why the President should not, if he deemed it desirable, undertake this initiative jointly with the Prime Minister of Canada or Britain or of any other of these nations. Because these seven nations have already joined in sponsoring the North Atlantic Treaty, this exploratory convention can most appropriately be initiated by them.

But the resolution provides that the convention may invite other democracies to participate.

The delegates to the convention proposed in this resolution would be appointed by their governments, thereby insuring that men of the highest competence and experience would devote their full time to this high mission for as long a period as might be required. The delegates from the United States could appropriately be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. They would include members of the principal political parties, a provision which clearly envisages the participation of Members of both Houses of the Congress. They would, however, as the last paragraph in the Preamble makes clear, act as individuals, in accordance with their individual convictions, just as the delegates did in Philadelphia in 1787. Under this procedure, division of the convention into national delegations, which would be instructed by their governments and would negotiate and bargain with each other as in a diplomatic conference, would be avoided.

The purpose of the convention is delineated clearly in the resolution. It is to explore and to report to what extent their delegates believe their people might further unite within the framework of the United Nations and to what extent they might agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union. After comprehensive exploration of possible courses of action within this broad framework, the delegates would draw up a public report of their joint findings and recommendations.

There is no commitment in this resolution other than to call for such exploration and recommendations by a body selected from the peoples of our democracies. There is certainly no commitment to any action which would decrease the powers of the Government of the United States. Any such action which the American people might consider wise at some future date in the light of the recommendations of the convention would necessarily be undertaken by the Congress of the United States in accordance with our constitutional processes.

Anyone who believes in our political system and ackowledges the sovereignty of the people should favor the convocation of a convention of this nature, limited in its function to exploration and recommendation. To oppose it is to say "No; we will not give the American people and other Atlantic peoples a chance to explore possible solutions of their common problems. We insist that the task of seeking solutions of these problems, even though they involve the lives of tens of millions of Americans and the future of our country, shall be entrusted solely to diplomatic officials."

This concurrent resolution opens to the democracies a new and broad road toward the attainment of our objective of peace with freedom. It provides the free nations with a means of taking the initiative in the war of ideas. We cannot win the war of ideas if we remain on the defensive. To move forward toward ultimate victory in this ideological struggle, to make possible an expansion of the frontiers of freedom which have receded so far in the last decade, we must take the offensive.

The passage of this concurrent resolution by the Congress of the United States would electrify free men everywhere, providing them with a new and tremendously dynamic idea. It would generate hope and confidence wherever people are permitted to read the news and listen freely to the radio, and some of that hope would seep through the cracks in the Iron Curtain.

The initiative depends solely upon us. In seeking closer union between free peoples, there is no limitation upon our capabilities except ourselves.

National Rivers-Harbors and Flood Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an able address entitled "The National Rivers-Harbors and Flood Control Program," delivered by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army, at the 42d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on May 31, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL RIVERS-HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM

This Congress meets at a time when the question of water—water supply, water conservation, water distribution, water utilization—is gaining recognition as one of our foremost basic problems. Our water policies are being rescrutinized. Our water needs are being studied with growing concern. At the same time, the benefits of the water developments already built—the bulk of them within the past 20 years—are now beginning to reach a volume that proves the wisdom of foresighted water-resource planning.

In these circumstances, the Rivers and Harbors Congress is presented a unique opportunity to serve as a focal profit for crystallizing national concern and action on water problems. And its first step should be to establish common denominators of interest around which a national water policy and program can be shaped.

Let me first briefly report on the status of Federal water-resource developments entrusted to the Corps of Engineers, and then I shall discuss some of the problems confronting us.

This fiscal year, the Corps is operating under civil works appropriations totaling $442 million, which embrace funds for 98 construction projects, including 21 new starts or resumptions. The President has requested $509 million for next year, which would prvide funds for 113 construction projects, of which 34 would be new starts or resumptions.

We are making progress with civil works construction, though the rate of this progress should be examined most carefully in light of growing water resources requirements and the other problems and considerations affecting the fiscal policies of the Government.

In navigation, the Corps is now maintaining 22,600 miles of inland waterways and 700 coastal and Great Lakes harbors. Tonmiles of traffic on this system increased 800 percent in the 25 years preceding 1954. Tonnage handled at coastal and Great Lakes harbors increased by 51 percent in this period. And the trends are still up.

The 391 flood-control projects put in operation since 1928 have cut the average annual flood bills in half. But still, no major river basin yet enjoys a completed flood-control program; in fact, there is none which is more than two-thirds complete. Some have barely begun. And completion of all those presently authorized would still leave the Nation exposed to flood losses aggregating some $200 million annually.

When installations now under construction are completed, the Corps' present 3-million-kilowatt hydroelectric generating capacity will approach 7 million kilowatts. But another 7 million kilowatts could be provided by projects authorized but not yet started.

In the postwar period, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, with a cost-benefit ratio of 14.8 to 1, has been completed, and progress has been made on other urgently needed projects of great national and local importance. To briefly review some of them: Modernization of the Ohio River and Warrior-Tombigbee Waterways is underway, and we are moving ahead with the Missouri River Basin program, the complex Central and Southern Florida project and the Niagara Falls remedial project. The St. Lawrence Seaway has been placed in construction by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation under the able administration of Mr. Lewis G. Castle, with the Corps of Engineers performing enginering tasks in its construction. Both the Calumet-Sag channel linking the Great Lakes with the Mississippi River system, and the old river closure project which will prevent capture of the Mississippi by the Atchafalaya, are included among the projects for which the President has requested appropriations in the fiscal 1956 budget. The project to deepen the Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to Trenton has been authorized.

This leads us to consideration of one of our major current problems. The corps' backlog of unfinished or unstarted work symptomizes one of the basic questions of our time—the fact that, though building at an unprecedented rate, we are not building fast enough to keep abreast of the Nation's needs.

In 1927 our backlog totaled only about $400 million. Today it is approximately 22 times that size. The rise has been regular and inexorable. Each one of the unfinished or unstarted projects in this backlog has passed through the searching scrutiny of the corps' own screening processes and has been certified by congressional authorization as constituting a proven need meriting Federal remedy. Each one represents towns and farms left unprotected from floods, or industries and communities deprived of water and power that could help them grow and produce, or unimproved waterways and harbors that could reduce the costs of American-made goods to American consumers and in world markets. We have no adequate measure of what the failure to provide these improvements is costing the American people; but since corps projects built to date have returned about $2 in benefits for every dollar of cost, it is reasonable to assume that

the $8½ billion worth of unbuilt authorized and active projects would return at least $17 billion worth of benefits.

This situation starkly reveals the need for a national program, based on orderly and sequential plans of development, and aimed at eliminating the backlog within a reasonable time. And this in turn may well involve reconsidering our funding policies and perhaps a rescrutiny of other Federal expenditures in the light of water-development needs.

The backlog of authorized Federal projects is only one indication of the Nation's need for water-resources development. Another one, though less reducible to statistics, is the concern over water supply now being manifested in all parts of the country.

Recent droughts have made it all too apparent that our developed water supplies for domestic use, industry, and agriculture are inadequate. At the same time the demands upon water supply are constantly increasing. Our population is swifting growing and per capita use is rising. Irrigation in the East has increased to an extent sometimes threatening municipal supply, and State governments are having to take up questions of water-rights legislation. As new industrial processes require ever greater quantities of water, plants are coming to the riverbanks not only to obtain low-cost water transportation but to have access to the water itself. The waterways, too, require stream regulation that will protect them against inadequate stages at times of low flow.

It is becoming increasingly evident that adequate water supply depends upon water conservation, and that from now on most reservoirs built for river control should include storage space for water supply.

However, this need for planning water supply in river-basin developments raises difficult problems in project evaluation, cost sharing, and reimbursement. We may be reasonably certain that additional water-supply storage will be needed in a given area within reasonably short time, and it would be obviously poor planning not to provide for it; yet how are we to evaluate that water when no customer is immediately available, and who will contract to pay, on a job being built at present, for storage capacity for development to occur in the future? I submit to you the thought that we must achieve some modification of existing rules to assure foresighted development of the maximum potentialities of our river basins with provision for deferment of reimbursement contracts for supply storage.

A third manifestation of the Nation's increasing reliance on water resources is found in the growth of water transportation. Whereas in 1942 our waterways carried only 2 percent of the Nation's total ton-mileage of freight traffic, in 1953 they carried 17 percent, and the trend is still on the rise.

The Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization took cognizance of this trend in its recent report, when it pointed out that within one generation we have passed from a situation in which railroads held a virtual monopoly of transportation, to a highly competitive situation in which motor and water carriers help reduce rates and provide greater service to the public.

The committee pointed out that during wartime "in case of etxensive domestic damage, it might be necessary to place greater reliance on waterway facilities which are relatively more immune from destruction. Related to the foregoing considerations is the problem of developing and strengthening our coastal, intercoastal, and inland services by water. It is important to the national economy and to defense that these operations be both strong and prepared to meet their role in emergencies."

And the committee significantly omitted any recommendation for tolls on inland waterways.

The corps' development activities which in earlier days included railways as well as waterways, have always been justified only insofar as they contribute toward a national system which will provide needed transportation at the lowest possible cost to the ultimate consumer. Particularly in the case of waterways it has accomplished this not only directly by making available the advantages of low-cost water transportation, but indirectly by providing a competitive control upon rates. The Presidential Advisory Committee recognized this fact when it pointed out that new competitive controls upon common-carrier rates and practices had reached the point where they might now justify an easing of governmental regulatory controls.

This rivers and harbors Congress can help, through its studies and discussions, to shape a national transportation policy in which the advantages of water transportation are preserved for the benefit of the public.

The corps, the Department of Commerce, and other agencies and interests are now seeking broad agreements on such matters as standard bridge clearances that will help guide the way to solutions of individual cases. Unfortunately, there appear to be some groups more interested in inflaming controversies than in settling them—no doubt in the hope that one or the other interest in a bridge dispute will be injured to the benefit of the trouble-maker. Such efforts will contribute nothing to the solution of our pressing national water-resource problems. This Congress and its constituent groups, therefore, can render good service by helping to see to it that discussions and negotiations are always aimed straight in the direction of constructive solutions that will allow maximum progress for all interests and the best and most economical service to the public.

Similarly, some people appear to believe that the programs of the Corps of Engineers and of the Agriculture Department are hopelessly at odds and that neither compromise nor coexistence is possible. While admittedly much remains to be done in the resolution of this matter, such beliefs do not contribute to the solution of one of our pressing national water-resource problems.

Let me here and now wish thriving success to the soil-conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture—may they keep the soil in place and out of our rivers and reservoirs. You delegates to this congress, which has been in existence for more than 40 years, are well aware of the separate value and separate functions of each program—that neither is conceived to be a substitute for the other. But with teamwork, each program will serve in its own way to help provide our people with a richer, safer, stabler land.

Again, the problems of maintaining fishing, hunting, and other outdoor recreational opportunities, in face of the country's continued growth and the steady encroachment upon wild lands, have caused much concern. Considerable of this concern has motivated constructive efforts to take advantage of the potentialities of reservoir projects in furthering hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreation. This is most heartily encouraged by the Corps of Engineers. But on the other hand, this concern has also motivated unwarranted attacks and outright opposition to the reservoir projects, to the utter disregard of both the economic stake involved and the already tremendous outdoor recreational benefits attending the Civil Works program. Disregarded are such facts as the 54 million visitors who fished, boated, bathed or camped on Corps reservoirs last year; as the pollution abatement and low-flow regulation provided by Corps reservoirs, which made possible better enjoyment of whole rivers by millions of people who live along or come to their banks. As the country continues to grow, Corps of Engineers and other reservoirs will assume greater and greater importance to the preservation and enhancement of our precious privilege of enjoying the great outdoors, but we are confronted by a serious problem of establishing the better understanding and cooperation required to gain full benefit from them.

As to these outstanding questions which I have presented here, and to the many other problems confronting us, the Rivers and Harbors Congress can perform valuable service by helping to achieve better understanding and unification of effort between the groups concerned with water resources development to the end of welding more orderly and effective action on common objectives.

The problems of obtaining adequate programs in the first place present one kind of difficulty which can be helped best by presenting, fairly, honestly, and accurately, the picture of the Nation's needs. But the problems of working out the adjustments involved in carrying out our programs, on the other hand, call for detailed study and above all a constant effort on the part of all concerned to avoid the misunderstandings which can only complicate our difficulties and postpone solutions. The Corps and all its governmental colleagues in the water-resource development field need all the help and good-will this Congress and its constituent groups can give.

In this connection and at this time when much attention is being devoted to reviewing and analyzing governmental activities, it seems to me that this Congress and all other groups of private citizens interested and concerned in the development of our water resources, should insist that such analyses and studies be scrupulously fair, and that conclusions be founded upon all the facts. In suggesting your guardianship in this respect let me affirm clearly my belief that improvements in policy and procedures are much in order and will greatly assist the Corps of Engineers and other agencies to do an even more effective, economical, and consistent job. But the water resources of this Nation are far too important for us to allow their development to be compromised in quarrels over issues that are small by comparison. Let us be sure that the improvement rather is constructive in the form of policies and procedures which can be accepted by the vast majority of the American people and constitute a common bond and guide for public thinking, for congressional consideration, and for guidance of the highly competent, loyal, and industrious public servants in the Corps of Engineers and other agencies who have our water resources at heart.

By calling attention to the Nation's water needs, by helping to keep legislation abreast of modern problems and requirements, by helping the Nation to be foresighted in its approach to resource development, by refusing to tolerate deliberately divisive influences, and by helping to perfect teamwork among those whose aims and interests are fundamentally similar or complementary, the Rivers and Harbors Congress can contribute largely to the solution of our growing and vital water problems. And in so doing, it will perform great and patriotic services to the Nation.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter

addressed to me and written by one of the outstanding farmers of North Dakota, Louis A. Kostelecky, whose address is Route 4, Box 90, Dickinson, N. Dak. I have never seen farm problems so well discussed as they are in this letter, which consists of a page and a half, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *April 3, 1955.*

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the recent editorials in different farm papers and others, it seems to me that our publishers along with our Senators and Representatives know very little about our farm problems.

Some of these editorials say that when flexible price supports become law they are excepted as a big stride toward a saner agriculture policy.

Is it sane to cut the income of a large segment of our population while their costs of production remain high? If it is, why not do this to the industry also?

Why do so many people think the farmer does not need parity? Are we a different class of people that we can make our living producing below the cost of production? Are we not aware of the fact that industry is subsidized by the United States Government, take press for instance (Life magazine and others)? To be sincere, almost everything is except the farmer.

The manufacturers must have cost plus a profit on their products, they say. Labor must have a living wage—the grocer, the butcher, and baker, etc., say they must have a profit.

They say we have a surplus of farm products. Is this the only commodity in surplus? Take other products—farm machinery, cars, tractors, trucks, appliances, etc. Look around at the displays of dealers and the stores—merchandise lined up. Is that not surplus? Do they cut prices because of surplus—no—they must have a profit.

Take labor at present—between 3½ million to 4 million unemployed—do they cut wages? There is a surplus, is there not? No, they ask for higher wages. Here I think there should be a level at which to stop, don't you?

What does industry do when there is no demand for a product? Cut prices—no—they produce less and say they can't produce below cost of production. How can farmers produce below cost of production?

Mr. Benson says that the sliding scale will make it unprofitable to raise wheat, corn, and to milk cows. That will make the farmer switch to something else for Benson's sake. Supposing they do switch to something else? What is there that there is not a surplus of?

In a recent poll conducted of dairymen to find out if they milked less since the support on milk was lowered, all of them said they milked more cows and increased their volume so they could make ends meet. The same thing happens in wheat and other products. A person just must have so much money to survive.

How did the sliding scale help anybody? Wouldn't it be more sensible to give the farmers better prices and allow them to sell just a certain amount of each product at the supported price, and sell the rest on the world market, or store it on the farm, or feed to livestock, then to follow the sliding scale at ruinous prices for products?

Some also claim that rigid supports would raise cost of food to the consumer. It might some, but why should the farmers raise food below cost of production? According to Government statistics, labor people can buy more food per hour of work now than at anytime in the history of the United States. However, they still go out on strikes and try to bring our cost of production higher. I realize they are not to blame for all of these high prices, but they are to blame for a considerable amount of them.

Compare prices of industry between 1941 and now. In 1941 a 2-3 plow tractor sold for $1,280. Now the same tractor sells for $2,800 to $2,900. In 1941 a car cost $925. Now it sells for $2,100 to $2,200. You can go down the line as far as you want and you will find the same is true with everything. They do not say that they cannot raise prices because it would cost the consumer too much; they say it cost them so much and they must have a profit too.

Why put all the doggone blame on the farmers for high costs? In 1948 when wheat sold for $3.25 a bushel, bread sold for 20 cents a loaf. Now with wheat at almost one-half of this, bread sells for 24 cents a loaf. I don't think that is the farmer's fault. A farmer cannot make a living if he cannot make a living wage.

At the present time I think it is our duty to do something about these prices. Do something for the family-type farmer.

There is at present a tendency for the big operator to grab up the smaller farmers and chase them to the cities to make unemployment worse. If something is not done soon so the small operator can make a better go of it, there cannot be any peace among our farmers.

I think a lot could be accomplished toward a good farm program if the heads at Washington, D. C., were put together and used instead of raising their salaries in selfishness and forgetting about many things that should be done.

About the raising of Congressmen's salaries, I would like to say that this is the third time that their salaries have been raised since President Roosevelt's time.

The farmer's prices have been brought down many more times than that and nothing has been done to bring them up.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS A. KOSTELECKY.

Statement by Hon. G. Mennen Williams Before Senate Committee on the Judiciary

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made on June 8, 1955, by Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, before the Refugee Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am told that it is within the required limits as to length.

I think the statement will be of interest to everyone who is interested in this important matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, GOVERNOR OF MICHIGAN, TO THE REFUGEE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 8, 1955

My name is G. Mennen Williams. I am Governor of the State of Michigan. Our State includes about 4.3 percent of the country's population and we pay about 8 percent of the United States taxes. We are proud to be known as the arsenal of democracy.

At the outset, permit me to express my sincere appreciation for your kind invitation to give my views on the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. I am familiar with the fact that my distinguished predecessor in testifying before you, the well-beloved Senator from New York, the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN, undoubtedly is better informed on this subject than anyone in America. For a long time he has given leadership to the many in his party who have denounced our immigration policy and the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 as a refutation of our national character and policy, as well as blot on our reputation for democracy and humanity.

I have many times over the last year and before heard him in his State and in mine challenge the conscience of America to relight the torch held high by the Goddess of Liberty so that the immortal words of Emma Lazarus—"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free"—would not only be embossed upon the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor but be alive in our hearts and in our law.

I am proud to have been one of his humble colleagues in this fight for human dignity, and over the past months to have raised my voice for a reaffirmation of our traditional American policy of the "melting pot." I have studied Senate bill 1794, which Senator Lehman introduced some months ago, and wish to wholeheartedly endorse it. I have also read Representative Celler's measure, House Resolution 3300 introduced last January, and I am in agreement with his aims also.

It is gratifying to me that recently our President has recognized the widespread and long-felt dissatisfaction so ably expressed by Senator Lehman, and has sent a message to the Congress on this subject. I am sure that, though this demonstration of interest is of recent date, it is nonetheless sincere. I am hopeful, therefore, that at this point we can count upon overwhelming bipartisan support for Senator Lehman's bill.

Let me say at the outset, I am not an expert witness. But I believe I can establish a general competency. My ancestry is such that I can view this problem with a broad perspective. On the one hand, an ancestor fought in the Revolutionary War for Independence after his ancestors had been on this continent for over a century. On the other, a grandfather came over from Europe and Horatio Alger-like worked his way up from nothing to a modest fortune. My ancestry is not only Welsh and English and Canadian, but French and German and Dutch.

This year the Philadelphia Welsh Society honored me with their "Most Distinguished American of Welsh Ancestry in 1954" award. I am very proud of this. But I am also proud of my honorary adoption into nationality groups of Western and Eastern European peoples.

For many years I have been associated with them in their social, cultural, and religious activities. More recently, I have had a special national association with them as chairman of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee.

During my first term of office, I established an Americanism commission. On it we had representatives of many of our ethnic

groups, including our American Indians. The commission members worked well and harmoniously together, without regard to their several national origins. Michigan probably has a very typical ethnic pattern for large-population industrial States in that we can claim residents representing at least 40 groups with 5,000 or more people.

Like other Governors, I have assisted in the creation of a displaced persons commission, and have helped the commission through the vicissitudes of establishing new lives for those for whom hope had almost gone. I have seen these people become good citizens, and I have felt the pride and religious exaltation of those who have participated in this good work. Michigan was proud to be the new home of the 100,000th European DP, and we celebrated this family's arrival by an appropriate ceremony in our State Capitol.

Michigan is proud and happy that we are a people gathered from many climes and kindreds. It is not only our cities that are cosmopolitan in character, but our ethnic map of the State will show that our countryside is dotted with town and farm folk tracing their ancestry all over the world.

We believe that, as a people, Michiganders have made a successful contribution to America. It is not only that we developed and manufactured the automobile which has magnified our country's prosperity, but we believe we have contributed in most other ways as well. In wartime we proudly earned the title "Arsenal of Democracy" and we have contributed our proportion to the Armed Forces of our Nation. We always subscribed and over-subscribed our war bond issue. We pay more than our per capita share of taxes. The University of Michigan has more people listed in Who's Who than any other State university.

These things I say not to brag about Michigan but to point out that we—a veritable melting pot—have been at least as successful in our contributions to the general welfare as other States.

And we like the rainbow radiance of our diverse cultures. We believe it adds strength as well as color and interest to our way of life.

If I may look for a moment to the national scene, I might remark that our democracy was certainly defended by the immigrants who helped us develop the atomic bomb: Einstein who fled the Nazi Hitler; Fermi from Italy; Szilard and Teller from Hungary; Bohr from Denmark, and so on.

Basically, we are opposed to the kind of discriminataion in our immigration laws that makes of some people second-class human beings.

Incidentally, on my recent trip to the Near East, I was made painfully aware that we are not doing ourselves any good with our friends and allies by our present immigration policies. In Greece, for example, they have a difficult time squaring our respect for their courage in fighting Fascism and Communism and our longtime admiration for their cultural contributions on the one hand with our brusque reluctance to accept more than a handful of their emigres who in many instances want to join their relatives who are already proven and successful American citizens. This is a contradiction that either breeds perplexity or anger or both. How can we try to build friends to defend us from communism with our right hands and insult them by unjust immigration laws with our left hands, and expect good results. This is a question we are going to have to answer soon not only to the Greek people but to the people of America. Because in this question are the seeds of serious trouble to our national prestige and security, and our national honor as well.

In 1953 we sought to give these people admission through the Refugee Relief Act which President Eisenhower signed in August 1953. We were going to admit 214,000 refugees under special quotas. As of this date, we have admitted slightly more than 1,000 real refugees and escapees.

There has been, over the past year, a sufficient amount of criticism to indicate what the main causes for such a poor showing in our admissions policy have been. The administrator of the program, Mr. Scott McLeod, claims that the law is too restrictive. It is his belief that, in order to comply with the statutory requirements, it requires a processing of anywhere from 6 to 9 months for each application, and that other restrictions, such as political backgrounds and conditions of health, prevent any real consideration being given to the great majority of refugees.

Other criticisms of the program are directed primarily at the administration. These critics maintain that the inordinate quest for security which characterized our governmental employment policy over the past years has been extended to the refugee relief procedures.

Somewhere amidst all these charges there is undoubtedly some objective analysis to be had. This subcommittee should be commended on its investigation for I am sure that a reasonable and just policy will be resolved.

There is certainly one thing that is evident. Our present program is totally inadequate. The admission of slightly more than 1,000 refugees out of a potential of 214,000, with the program having less than a year and a half to go, is adequate proof of this.

In the face of this evidence there is no other conclusion than that the law is adequate or its administration is adequate, or that both the law and the administration are inadequate. Anyway—it's time for a change, and a big one.

To get down to specific cases, I'd like to make the following suggestions developed by the Michigan Commission on Displaced Persons and Refugees, and the Michigan Committee on Immigration:

1. A new definition of refugee so that persons applying as refugees will not be considered ineligible because they are "firmly resettled." We know of numerous instances of sponsors in Michigan who are eager to bring dependable, hard-working refugees who are relatives of persons previously admitted under the Displaced Persons Act, to join their families here. If these refugees have had sufficient energy to get jobs in Europe, they are denied visas under the Refugee Relief Act on the theory that they are firmly resettled.

2. A new definition of escapee and expellee. The present act requires that an escapee or expellee also be a refugee. Therefore, a person who will not qualify as a refugee is also barred under the clauses referring to escapee and expellee.

3. Abolition of the requirement that a refugee be away from his place of abode and unable to return thereto. We have numerous cases of Greeks who are refugees from guerrilla warfare, whose land has been mined and is utterly worthless for agricultural purposes. Still, if they live in a house on this land, they are considered to be in their usual place of abode. Similarly, farmers from the Netherlands whose land was ruined by salt water have been ruled to be ineligible.

4. Abolition of the requirement that adjustment of status for refugees within the United States be limited to those who can show lawful entry as a bona fide nonimmigrant. In Michigan, there are many Polish patriots of excellent character who deserted ships of Polish registry as the only way of escaping from an intolerable situation in Poland. They should be eligible for adjustment of status but are not under existing law.

5. Waiver of passports. As President Eisenhower pointed out in his special message to the Congress, "Obviously, people who have risked their lives to escape from totalitarian nations often have no passports."

6. Abolition of the requirement that a refugee be able to prove by the testimony of witnesses every move that he had made during the past 2 years. A person who has just escaped from behind the Iron Curtain can furnish no such proof unless persons who know him intimately escaped at the same time. The provision for a 2-year history has caused innumerable delays in the administration of the present Refugee Relief Act.

7. Provision for agency assurances over and above the assurances of individual sponsors. It is very difficult to get an individual sponsor to give a house and job to a refugee sight unseen. The voluntary agencies and the State commissions had much experience in getting blanket assurances during the Displaced Persons Act. We had no difficulty whatsoever in Michigan in finding jobs and in supplying housing when displaced persons arrived in Michigan. We feel confident that we shall be equally successful with refugees if agency assurances are permitted.

8. Unused numbers in one category should be allocated to other categories where there is need. Unused numbers should be used for family units. We have more adoptive parents than orphans and they should come in freely.

9. Administration of the act should be in the hands of a special commission or commissioner. This is essentially a social-welfare operation and should be treated and staffed in that manner rather than as a police or security operation, although reasonable security screening is certainly in order.

Let me say that I feel that I speak not for myself alone but for a great majority of Michigan citizens. This is something which we feel keenly. Our traditional open door is something we believe in and believe in strongly. Incidentally, let me say this is not just a matter of theory with me. My children go to public schools with these children, not only the second and third generation Americans but the DP's and Spanish-American born. They not only go to school with them but they play with them and bring them into our home. My wife and I believe they will be not only better citizens but better human beings for it.

When I say I feel that I speak for the great majority of the people of Michigan, I speak as one who has time and again visited every corner of our State, traveling the equivalent of 3 times around the world each year in the confines of Michigan, and as one who has been close enough to the people to be 4 times elected.

In addition I can say many Michigan organizations are actually on record as favoring amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Refugee Relief Act. The Michigan Commission on Displaced Persons and Refugees compiled the list I shall read:

Michigan Committee on Immigration.

Michigan Commission on Displaced Persons and Refugees.

Immigration Service, Archdiocese of Detroit.

Detroit Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Women.

Social Action Department, Detroit Council of Churches.

Jewish Community Council.

Michigan division, National Lutheran Council.

Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Western Michigan.

Free Hungarian Reformed Church.

American Veterans of World War II, Department of Michigan.

Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, Department of Michigan.
Jewish War Veterans, Department of Michigan.
UAW, CIO.
Wayne County Council, CIO.
International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit.
International Institute of Flint.
Nationality Department, United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit.
American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.
Polish-American Congress, Division of Michigan.
Central Citizens Committee.
United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Detroit chapter.
Latvian Association in Detroit.
United Ukrainian-American Relief Committee, Michigan division.
Ukrainian Congress Committee, Michigan section.
American Committee on Italian Migration, Michigan division.
Polish Activities League.
Polish Aid Society, Harper Community House.
American Aid Society, Inc.
Jewish Social Service Bureau.
B'nai B'rith, Greater Detroit Council.
Grand Rapids Committee on Displaced Persons.
Kalamazoo Committee on Displaced Persons.
Netherlands Pioneer and Historical Foundation, Holland, Mich.
Society for the Relief of Germans From Prewar Poland.
Michigan Labor Committee for Human Rights.
Epirotic Society of Michigan.
Estonian Aid, Inc.

This list is far from complete, I am sure. I request permission to submit a more complete list after further canvass. I know, for example, the State Democratic convention went on record as favoring these changes and the Steuben Society, of which I am a member, has made similar policy statements, so I am confident there are many more.

Permit me to sum up my ideas in this manner. We have, for more than two centuries, provided an inspiration for every freedom-loving person throughout the world. To forsake this tradition, at a time when democracy faces its greatest threat in history, international communism, would indeed be foolhardy.

Who Are the Friends of Organized Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Col. James C. Wood, Republican State Chairman of Arizona, entitled "Who's Who With Labor?"

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S WHO WITH LABOR?

Just who are the actual friends of organized labor? What individuals, organizations, and legislative actions have most helped rank and file labor in its phenomenal rise to security and dignity in the American economic and social system?

Whether you are of organized labor or just a sideline onlooker, hold your hat! The Taft-Hartley Act has done more for the benefit of labor in less than a decade than any other labor legislation enacted by Congress.

Yet in cold, blind, and unreasoned anger, political-actioners have been haranguing rank and file labor with the idea that Taft-Hartley was conceived to crush the labor movement and to enslave labor in some sort of totalitarian economic web.

In fact, Taft-Hartley achieved the first nationwide mandatory principle of collective bargaining. It provided Federal Government mediation between management and labor on wages and hours and working conditions. It protected the public interest. Since its inception, it has been amended to meet both labor and management objections. Senator Taft, just before his death, had promised his support of additional amendments that would make of the act an instrument of equal justice to all it affected. That's in character with the traditional processes of the Republic.

Here in Arizona we recently had the spectacle of a top labor union political official from Washington, venomously attacking United States Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, Arizona, and Representative JOHN J. RHODES, Republican, Arizona, and telling a delegation in Tucson that $23,000 was raised from union members between August 1 and December 31, 1954, which would be used in good part to defeat these Arizonians. A previous national figure of Labor's League for Political Education, also from Washington headquarters, had publicly said in Tucson that Senator GOLDWATER was the "most hated man in America by union labor."

These outland political-actioners came to Arizona to smear this State's right to work law and all who were for it. They either didn't know, nor did they heed the fact that they were smearing the vast majority of Arizona voters who made the right to work law a part of the constitution of the State. They didn't know nor heed the fact that when the law was made a part of the fundamental laws of Arizona that Democrats outnumbered Republicans by 4 to 1. The legislature that passed the enabling legislation that puts the issue before the voters was predominantly Democratic.

The political-actioners actually put the monkey right on the back of the Democratic Party of Arizona. And now they promise to spend Arizona's labor money to keep that monkey on the back of the Democratic Party of Arizona. So, it seems logical and fair to ask: "Who's who with labor and who's who with the Democratic Party of Arizona"?

What administration is responsible for the greatest era of peace and prosperity in the history of America? Conservative Democrats admit that the Eisenhower administration has done a phenominal thing in maintaining abundant prosperity without taking the country into war, as was done twice in the past two decades by Democratic administrations.

Employment in the United States has reached the alltime peak of 64 million, wages and standards of living have risen in parity to new peaks. Who are the actual friends of labor, those who have been able to lift labor to its alltime peaks, or those, who because they are Social-Democrats try to work their distortions through their political action committees? Are they not taking advantage of their captive audiences in labor union halls, to bellow out their prejudices?

Why did Arizona's attorney general, Robert Morrison, go before that same convention of labor in Tucson and apologize for failure of the Democratic Party to keep its promises to create an independent department of labor? Was Mr. Morrison's conscience bothering him? Did he fear the repercussions that would follow the professional attacks their boomeranging thrust at the Democratic Arizona Legislature and its Democratic governor, Ernest McFarland? "I am apologizing for the Democratic Party," said Attorney General Morrison.

Who and what party is the real friend of labor? Is not the record clear? The delegates at Tucson were told that Gov. "Goody" Knight, California Republican, had made a campaign promise to labor that he would create an independent labor department. He called legislative leaders into his office and demanded that they make good on his and their promises.

California today has an independent department of labor. Arizona has not. Governor McFarland and his Democratic colleagues had repeatedly promised in their campaigns that labor would have an independent labor department to administer their welfare problems and benefits under Arizona laws.

That's the record nationally, and, as between Arizona and California, it's a Democratic record of faithlessness to Arizona labor.

There's little wonder that Attorney General Morrison tried to stop the storm of bitter protest from the labor delegation at Tucson. He concluded his apology with, "I think when you make political promises you have a mandate to the people to carry them out."

The Democratic legislature apparently didn't think so, nor did the Democratic Governor of Arizona think so.

Southwestern Labor Record, official publication of the Tucson Central Trades Council, didn't think so, either, for it editorialized, under the caption "No Labor Department Yet." The Record said: "Despite the fact that we elected a few men to the legislature, we didn't do a good job at all. Next year if we don't get the job done with the men we elect, we should all be fired." The Record further said that "Governor McFarland, a Democrat, sat on his hands, too, in the matter of a labor department."

Organized labor in Arizona is cutting its political teeth on some gristly meat. It at least is finding out who its friends are not. Also, that true friends are not always the grinning, unctious, baby-kissing, back-slapping promisers and forgetters.

The Honorable Frances P. Bolton, One of America's Outstanding Women, Chosen To Contribute to New Book, The Spiritual Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Member of this House has written a chapter for a new book that deserves the attention and commendation of her colleagues.

The book is The Spiritual Woman, edited by Marion Turner Sheehan, and of the 14 notable women who have contributed chapters, our greatly respected colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] wrote on Woman in Politics. This article draws upon the experience Mrs. BOLTON gained in 15 years in the House of Representatives. It expresses her convictions about the religious and spiritual values that are needed in the important profession of legislating for this Nation.

Throughout her life, Mrs. BOLTON has been guided by the highest moral and ethical standards. Only last year, the Washington Pilgrimage named Mrs. BOLTON "Churchwoman of the Year" at the same time it gave President Eisenhower the award of "Churchman of the Year." And I had the privilege of being in the audience at the time this honor was conferred.

It gives me great pleasure to insert into the RECORD the chapter, "Woman in Politics," as written by the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON:

WOMAN IN POLITICS

Just at the close of the Second World War three other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and I were sent on a mission to Europe and the Near East. We saw the tragedy of destruction in England and France. The stench of death that was Berlin penetrated our very souls. We walked through the rubble that was Warsaw and its counterpart, Stalingrad. Everywhere we went there was the hideous aftermath of war reflected with unforgettable tragedy in the eyes of the women.

Returning from 2 weeks in Communist Russia with Moscow as our center, we stopped in Rome to avail ourselves of the high privilege of an audience granted us by the Holy Father. In his gracious words of greeting he singled me out (the one woman present), commending me for having recognized my responsibility as a woman to stretch out the walls of my home until they encircled the world.

It is in such wise that I envisage woman in politics.

Politics has many connotations. Primarily it is the science and art of government—yet it is also the machinery by which political parties manage their affairs. Through this machinery the citizenry expresses its will. Participation in these mechanics is both a privilege and a responsibility. We women of this free land have been recognized as full citizens: we have the franchise. We have become partners with men in this extraordinary enterprise which is the Government of these United States. We, as women, bring to this partnership additional gifts, a different understanding, a new approach.

In recent years, when the scarcity of manpower pulled women into many fields heretofore not open to them, they proved their ability to do as well as, and in certain areas even better than, the men they were freeing for more dangerous assignments. So it would seem that women have proven a definite equality of capacity with men that cannot be disputed.

But let us not fall into the error of interpreting "equality" as "sameness"—an identical capacity. It is because the essential reality of our woman's being differs from the essential qualities of man that it becomes more and more important that our voice be heard and our counsel heeded.

Woman is the giver and the protector of life. She is the matrix of God's life on earth. It is around her that the family revolves, the unit upon which civilization is built. She is the mother, the teacher, the counselor, the focal point of love within that unit. In her hands rests the future, for her children are the future. Together with the man of her household, consciously and unconsciously, she points the way, she holds the light. We know so well that without the father, children are tragically insecure. It is he who faces the outside world and gives protection and strength. But it is the mother who is both inspiration and comforter within the family circle. It is from her that the children discover the joy of sacrificial service for the common good. It is from her that they learn that America is a Nation whose trust is in God—whose strength lies in the belief that love is indeed the fulfilling of the law.

Women have influenced the destiny of nations down the ages. In ancient India, in China, on the islands of the Pacific, there is historic evidence of their power and their vision. Egyptian history is filled wth the names of queens who ruled alone or who shared equally with the Pharaoh the great responsibility of government. In ancient Greece and Rome, women played great roles of influence. We have but to turn to Europe to find Isabella in Spain, Elizabeth and Victoria in England, the Maid of Orleans Ste. Joan, who galvanized a nation into action only to be burned to death for her efforts. And in our own times as heads of states, we had Dowager Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, and her capable daughter, the present Queen Juliana, with the second Elizabeth across the channel.

Out of the darkness that covers the earth today will come a new day. An era is being born which will recognize the basic need for woman's influence and judgment upon all levels. The world that is destroying itself was largely a world built upon the overemphasis on the judgment of men alone. It has had its rightful place in the evolution of man upon earth, but the complementary judgment of woman is now being added. The world that is tearing its way into new life will be a world where men and women share the responsibilities for its existence and work shoulder to shoulder, heart to heart, for its establishment and its growth.

We who live today have behind us the courageous women of yesterday who saw the vision and pressed ever onward and upward toward the light. We could not stand where we stand today had these women of other days not excelled in the great reform movements in every field of human activity. Who were some of them? There was Elizabeth Fry who pioneered in prison reform, Elizabeth Garrett who broke new ground in the field of medicine, Florence Nightingale who created an entirely new approach to the relief of human suffering which Clara Barton then instituted as the Red Cross in America. There was Octavia Hill who, by her tireless efforts, awakened society's conscience to the matter of decent housing. And there was Josephine Butler whose outcry that "Injustice is immoral, oppression is immoral, the sacrifice of the interests of the weaker to the stronger is immoral" could well serve as a guideline in our own usages of political power. Closer to us, strong in her certainty of the right, we have our own Susan B. Anthony through whose zeal and indomitable will women were inspired to demand full citizenship. With her were such women as Carrie Chapman Catt, Jane Addams, Lillian D. Wald, and many others, whose lives contributed so much to the initial recognition of women as persons in a civil life.

Because they, and many who remain unsung, lived and worked and demonstrated women's capacities, the way was opened for women to take their place in all areas of national life. That they are doing so in ever-increasing numbers is heartening indeed, for it would seem to show that there has come to women a definite recognition of the new part they must play if the world we are building is to be more nearly the world God meant it to be.

We have grown accustomed to speaking of the Nation's manpower; it is a familiar term. But the newer term "womanpower" is still a little strange to us. We have been accustomed to thinking of ourselves as the weaker sex. Indeed, we have thought of ourselves as a minority, lacking in power, rather than recognizing the reality of numbers and the consequent possibilities of influence. But the 1950 census brought to us the dramatic realization that we are no longer a minority, our numbers topping those of the male population by something like 2 million. This gives new meaning to the picture of women in politics. It means that we must assume the responsibility of numbers. It means that we must accept the fact that we have power, and use it humbly in true service to Almighty God.

Analyses of the 1952 election show that the women of this country, both rich and poor, rose up as a great tide and exercised their right of franchise as never before. As many women voted as men, and the various polls indicate that from 2 to 4 percent more women voted for President Eisenhower than did men. Important as this outpouring of women was, it is but a small part of what every American citizen who is a woman must do if government is to become the instrument of freedom envisaged by those mighty men through whom the spirit moved when our Constitution and the Bill of Rights were inscribed.

We are agreed that the family is the unit upon which civilization is built. We are agreed that, theoretically at least, the man stands between his family and the outside world. We are agreed that within that family the woman is the spiritual and moral force which holds it together, from which its members draw the strength, the fortitude, and the knowledge with which to meet the problems of living as they unfold step by step. I would enlarge upon the suggestion given me in Rome. I would say that in today's world life has taken on new aspects—the complex problems of an industrialized society have taken the mother from her weaving at the hearthside to the textile factories outside the home, to the offices, and to the steel mills. The economic pressures of just bare living have forced women into industry all too often. Home has ceased to be a place of peace and close companionship. It has been invaded by a sense of insecurity—of danger and suspicion. It has all too often become a center of tension and anxiety where there is little chance for peace and love.

Just as women have moved out of the home into industry, children no longer learn the fundamentals of their education at their mother's knee. They have moved into mass public education in huge schools where today there is a shortage of more than 58,000 teachers and 300,000 classrooms. It is too soon to know what the outcome of such a situation will be; it is too soon to evaluate the results. Yet on every side we see the demoralization of the home—the deterioriation of morals of both old and young. The family unit—the center of our civilization—is fast ceasing to have integrity. With their parents seldom at home, can we blame the children if they no longer stay there? It should shock us wideawake to find that a recent report paints the tragic picture of 1 million children picked up by the police in 1 year—young children not even in their teens. Can we blame some of their mothers if they must be at work to make possible the food and clothing necessary to the life and growth of these very children? Such things as these are the necessities of life. They do not represent the luxuries for which, unfortunately, some mothers abandon their homes in an effort to accumulate more and more material conveniences and thereby deny their children the more important spiritual and physical comforts of motherly care.

What of the nurseries and the recreation centers to which these youngsters should be going? Why do so few exist? But, equally important, we must be on our guard lest nurseries and recreation centers assume the parents' rights over their children. The right of authority over the children must always remain vested in the hands of the parents.

It is a God-given right as well as a civil right and constitutes the very foundation of a free democracy. If this right of authority over children is ever transferred from homes where mothers are working out of necessity to the organizations supporting the nurseries and centers, it would be a serious threat to our form of government and to the very institution of family life based on the law

of God. The nurseries or recreational centers, whether supported by State or community organization, can help and assist the parents, or parent, in promoting the welfare of the child. They can offer care, recreation, guidance, counsel, and medical attention, but always with the full knowledge that the final decision in regard to such assistance for the child is solely up to the parents (unless, of course, the parents are judged by court order to be incompetent). We have seen too much of the agony of parents in other countries whose children have been taken away from them and whose right to parental authority has been grossly negated to allow any infraction of this right ever to creep into any extension of our community nurseries and recreation centers.

For those children who need it, is it not the business of a woman to see that her own community finds ways to establish such extensions of the home as will protect them? Must she not go out from the confines of her home in order to secure such protection? The moment she steps across her own threshold bent upon such a mission she begins to assume her larger responsibility as a citizen. Fortunate indeed is the community whose women have accepted the challenge of today's world for the moment one step is taken others follow in rapid succession.

This first step opens up a new world and brings to a woman an overwhelming sense of the need to know how these things are done and by whom. Almost automatically she asks where she may go to learn the methods by which she can make her opinions known. This usually leads her to a group of those who, like herself, have determined to do something about inadequate or intolerable situations. Before they are aware, they have become "women in politics." Once awakened, women rapidly develop an eagerness to understand, a determination to know, which can well change the course of living in their communities and so in the Nation itself.

Awareness of her own community's problems brings recognition of the fact that they are tied into the problems of the county, the State, and of the Nation as a whole. Politics become dramtically and vividly the climate in which she lives, for she realizes that we are all of us knit so closely together that this which she thought of as a thing apart is in reality the machinery, the structure, the method of daily living. She soon loses all sense of strangeness, for the matters which have carried her into this new aspect of life are all of vital moment to her as wife and mother.

Bit by bit she finds her way to the town council meetings. Soon, perhaps, she is on the library board or the board of education. As another step to assuming actual responsibility she enlists the help of the various church groups, the civic clubs, the local league of women voters, the veterans' auxiliaries, the PTA, and she becomes one of a group of influential citizens. The walls of her home have started to move out into the community and she begins to realize that she is part of a nation and of a world.

Some there will be, and in increasing numbers, who will seek elective or appointive office. This is not an easy path. It requires, to be fruitful, peculiar gifts and special training and experience. Most of all, it requires understanding of and love for other human beings, a willingness to work and tireless energy. But the enormous number of women who will be recognizing their responsibilities as full citizens of a free nation will work quietly to further those matters which are most clearly theirs.

We cannot escape the fact that we have ceased to be a minority group. We have demonstrated the possibilities of our concentrated interest and determined action. No longer can we permit ourselves any apathy, any inertia. The welfare of the Nation, even of the world, is in our hands.

Although we have not yet come to appreciate the full meaning of the fact that our financial holdings alone give us a basis for action in areas where such power can make our voices heard, we recognize a new attitude toward us in the market place. We hold title to at least 40 percent of the Nation's 30 million and more homes. We are the beneficiaries of 80 percent of the life-insurance policies of the country and 35 percent of us carry our own life insurance. We are said to hold 65 percent of the mutual savings funds of America and at least 42 percent of all income-tax returns are paid by women—as are 80 percent of all inheritance taxes—and this means that there is in our hands economic strength we could well use. An even more potent force is ours in the area of retail buying. Fifty-five million of us are the retail shoppers. Would we not be taking a more realistic hold upon the influences that surround our children if we denied our economic support to unwholesome publications and stage and screen features? Concerted, intelligent determination must precede active political action if it is to be successful. The voice of woman can make itself felt. But if it is to be effective, it must be a constructive voice of reminder to all people that the family is the unit around which our civilization is built and that the structure of the family is as strong as as its faith in God.

This is but a rough sketch of our backgrounds, of some of our potentialities. Let us look at our record in public service over the years for a moment, remembering that nothing so far-reaching as this sense of our woman's obligation to the Nation bears fruit overnight.

It was in 1786 that the first women (two postmasters) were accepted into Federal service. In 1862, the United States Treasurer inaugurated the plan of using women in appreciable numbers to alleviate the wartime manpower shortage. In 1870, legislation was passed formally permitting the employment of women in the Federal Government service. Today it is estimated that approximately one-fourth of the total roster of Federal employees are women. Only about 1,000 of these occupy executive positions of marked authority in policy-making and administrative fields. President Taft's appointment of Julia Lathrop as head of the then newly created United States Children's Bureau, gave women their first appointment as chief of a major bureau. That post is held with distinction today by Dr. Martha M. Eliot.

Women are to be found in the greatest numbers in county offices. There is no county office that has not at some time been filled by a woman unless it be that of coroner. At least 12,000 women are serving today as county officials in 3,072 counties of the United States. They have taken the first steps across their home thresholds. On the State level, a recent check showed 304 women on the rosters of the legislatures as against 29 in 1920. In the judicial field at least 125 women are on the Federal and State courts, as well as on the domestic relations and juvenile courts where they work closely with local welfare groups and social agencies.

But it is not just on local and State levels that women are found. Congress has claimed 60 women since 1916 when Jeannette Rankin first took her seat in the House of Representatives. Today, MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine, with a background of 9 years in the House, is the one woman in the Senate, while 16 women are serving in the House. Women have held official positions in many of the departments and bureaus for a quarter of a century. In the State Department and the Foreign Service it was estimated that there are some 3,000 American women serving in 294 missions abroad, hundreds of them in the higher classifications, with 75 career women serving in Washington. Some 200 consuls and vice-consuls have been women—and several outstanding women, Mrs. Daisy Harriman, Mrs. Ruth Bryan Rohde, Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, and Mrs. Perle Mesta have represented us as ministers and ambassadors, while Clare Booth Luce was appointed our Ambassador to Italy and Miss Frances Willis, Ambassador to Switzerland, is our first career ambassador.

With the establishment of the United Nations, an even wider field of influence opened before us. Here Eleanor Roosevelt has served with diligence. I, myself, was the first woman to be appointed a delegate from the Congress. It was not an easy trail to blaze—but she has shown an appreciation of the dramatic need of all nations for the contribution which women in particular can make to the great future that has opened the way to all who will follow.

All across the world women are assuming greater responsibilities in the political life of their own people in order to build a world that will indeed be "closer to the heart's desire." Although there are still many lands where women do not have the franchise, yet in some of these they hold positions of far-reaching influence and great responsibility. Here in America it is becoming more and more the accepted fact that we who are women have a contribution to make in the field of active politics. Women long active in political fields know that power lies not in the invasion of those areas of endeavor in which men excel, but rather in the areas where their very womanhood is a shield, a strength, a force. We know, too, that we are but the vanguard. We know that the full value of our contribution will not be made until all women throw open the windows and doors of their homes, not only to let in the sun and wind of clearer perception and deeper understanding, but, perhaps more importantly, to let their own vision and humble determination to serve the infinite purpose of life become a part of the active forces of national and international policy and action.

With the world in darkness and confusion, the increasing power of women in government, here and everywhere, is not a question of equal rights. It is a question of the dramatic national and international need for the understanding women have of the fundamental life-giving truths. It is woman's primary function to give life, to renew life, to protect the young, to give them their first lessons in the art of living. It is our part to keep alive faith and hope and the certainty that because God is, we are.

It is no longer enough that we seek only to influence our men to wiser decisions, to better living. Those of us who are able to do so must seek office in every area of government. Those who cannot must find ways to encourage and strengthen those who can. Just as the individual must examine his own soul before he assumes duties which involve others, so must we who are women go deep into our hearts and minds to ascertain what it is that we have which is so vital to the full purposes of the infinite. Once we are convinced and aware that only as we take upon ourselves these broad aspects of our womanhood can we hope to see the dawn of peace, the day of light—only then shall we give richer meaning to citizenship in this free land of ours.

Politics is the machinery of citizenship. Let us who are women take our places quietly, intelligently, and unselfishly within its organization, accepting in full measure the duties of such citizenship in a land established upon the immovable rock of trust in God. Politics needs an elevation out of its present context which tends to be exclusively temporal. It should take its true place in society in the service of human beings whose total lives are spiritually dedicated to God. Politics should be the development of true peace and prosperity of mankind; it is a link in the chain of total prosperity which is spiritual. Woman's duty is to reforge the link which binds politics to a higher order.

Marion Bayard Folsom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's appointment of Marion Bayard Folsom as successor to Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been acclaimed throughout the Nation.

The Washington (D. C.) Daily News says:

In the new Secretary, Mr. Folsom, the department with the three-way name will get an administrator of demonstrated ability who also has a record of some accomplishment in the fields with which he now will be dealing.

According to the Rochester (N. Y.) Times—

The President is not likely to offer a more conspicuous example of finding the right man for the right job.

While the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal declares that—

Georgians find pride and satisfaction in the appointment.

Newsweek recalls that Mr. Eisenhower once told a visitor:

Folsom is the type of man that makes my job so satisfactory.

Newsweek also refers to a statement Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey recently made of Folsom:

He's a man you can't stampede. He's intelligent and courageous. Once he's studied the facts and made up his mind you can't get him off the tract.

Writing in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, Thomas L. Stokes describes Folsom as—

A recognized forward-looking businessman with a pronounced sense of public and social consciousness.

Marion B. Folsom has been described by many people as a founding father of social security. He has been active in Government or private industry social-security programs for more than a quarter century.

His work in Government social security goes back 20 years to service on the President's advisory council which helped draft the original Social Security Act in 1934. Prior to that he was a pioneer in developing private company benefit plans for employees.

Born at McRae, Ga., November 23, 1893, Mr. Folsom was graduated from the University of Georgia in 1912 and Harvard Business School in 1914. He immediately went with Eastman Kodak Co. in Rochester, from which company he resigned as treasurer and director to join the Eisenhower administration as Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1953. While with the Eastman Kodak Co., Mr. Folsom was a major participant in the development and operations of the company's employee benefit program.

In addition to helping draft the original Social Security Act, Mr. Folsom served on the Federal Advisory Council appointed jointly by the Senate Finance Committee and the Social Security Board in 1937–38, and the Social Security Advisory Council to the Senate Finance Committee in 1948. Both councils studied operations of the social-security system and made recommendations to the Congress. Mr. Folsom worked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the Eisenhower administration's plan which resulted in the 1954 congressional amendments to extend the coverage and benefits under the social-security system.

Mr. Folsom was principally responsible for the development of the group life insurance program for Federal employees which was voted by the Congress and put into effect for nearly 2 million Federal employees in August 1954. Several years earlier he had helped organize the group medical care insurance plan in Rochester.

Mr. Folsom was also staff director of the House of Representatives Special—Colmer—Committee on Post War Economic Policy and Planning of the 78th and 79th Congresses. The Colmer committee reports led to enactment of contract renegotiation legislation and many other postwar measures which were put into effect in the years immediately after World War II ended. He was a division executive of the National Advisory Defense Commission from 1940 to 1941, and was on the National Advisory Board for Mobilization Policy in 1951–52. He has been a member of the Business Advisory Council, Department of Commerce, since 1936.

In the civic field Mr. Folsom was one of the original trustees for the Committee for Economic Development, which was formed in 1942, and resigned as chairman to come to the Treasury in 1953. In his home city of Rochester he served for three years as president of the Rochester Council of Social Agencies and on the boards of several charitable organizations.

Mr. Folsom is an overseer of Harvard College and a trustee of the University of Rochester. Prior to 1953 he was a director of several financial institutions including the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Mr. Folsom served as a captain in the United States Army in World War I and was overseas with the 26th Division. He is married and has two children, Marion B. and Frances.

The new Secretary is an outstanding type of appointment of the right man for the right place, which is typical of the Eisenhower administration.

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, by request, two bills designed to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibiting the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested with respect to their safety.

The first of the two bills, entitled "A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," has been prepared by several organizations representing the food industries of the Nation. This bill supersedes a bill—H. R. 4099—which I introduced on February 16, 1955. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] introduced a similar bill.

The second bill, entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use," has been prepared by the Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc.

I have introduced these 2 bills in the hope that these bills, as well as 2 other bills dealing with the same subject now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—H. R. 4475, introduced on February 28, 1955, by Mr. DELANEY, and H. R. 5927 introduced on April 28, 1955, by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska—will receive the careful study and consideration of all interested Government departments, groups, and individuals.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, on the subject of the adjournment rush. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Did you ever stand and marvel at the way a circus is put together from what appears to be the most fantastic jumble of confusion ever created? Out of it finally comes a planned community of tents, of Big Top and side shows and rides and refreshment stands and everything is perfect down to the last detail.

Congress in the homestretch—in the midst of an adjournment rush—reflects a little bit of the fantastic confusion of the circus grounds early in the morning hours as the tents are just going up. There seems to be no order, no rhyme or reason, no plan, no recognizable pattern of activity—just confusion. And yet, it is remarkable how, out of all of this, comes a flood of carefully drawn, intelligent legislation under which our country can then operate during the 5 months, or so, of congressional recess.

Of course, if Congress let everything go to the last minute, this kind of record could never be accomplished. The "last-minute decisions" which seem to be made in the

closing days of a session are instead a final recognition by both sides of important issues that neither side will surrender on basic principles and so a compromise long under consideration will have to be agreed to. Legislation is almost always a case of compromise—but when you feel you might carry your point all the way, you are reluctant to compromise. In the final days of a congressional session, however, you face the choice of compromise or no legislation at all. So compromises are made.

And usually they are good compromises and good law.

The session now coming to an end has been a particularly productive one, and well run. The adjournment rush is a comparatively quiet one. Usually, at this point in a session of Congress, both the House and Senate are meeting almost continually, often in round-the-clock marathons, in an effort to get everything done which has to be done before adjournment.

Yet so current have we been on our work this year that the two Houses still can dispose of the business on the calendar in normal working days, and even take an occasionaly Friday off, as was done last Friday.

Of course, the intensive work—the long hours and the hard grinding—takes place primarily within the committees, where the bills are whipped into final shape for House or Senate consideration. The compromises are hammered out there, and consequently when a bill comes to the floor—generally with support from both Democratic and Republican leaders of the committee—the chances are 10 to 1 that it will go through as written in committee.

If we proceed at the pace we have been following in recent weeks, adjournment will come upon us almost by surprise. In past years, adjournment usually came simultaneously with mass exhaustion by all Members—they just seemed to wear themselves out and then quit in utter weariness.

It may yet happen that way this year, too; but it doesn't seem likely.

Judge Smith Runs Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared on July 24, 1955, in the News of Lynchburg, Va.

All of us who are privileged to serve in this House with the distinguished Representative of the Eighth Virginia District take pleasure, I know, in this well-merited recognition by one of the great newspapers of Virginia of the dedicated and efficient manner in which Judge SMITH discharges day by day his responsibility of service to his Nation, his State, and his congressional district.

The editorial follows:

JUDGE SMITH RUNS AGAIN

Representative HOWARD SMITH at 72 has no intention to retire to private life because of his age, or for any other reason. He is going to be a candidate for Congress in the Eighth Virginia District in 1956 and, he strongly intimates, thereafter.

In refusing to consider his age of just beyond the biblical limit—a limit which in this age of advancing medical science and greater knowledge of geriatrics means nothing—Judge SMITH has the justification of his clear mind, his physical condition and his will to work. As chairman of the House Rules Committee, which is no sinecure, he has performed his duties as energetically as younger heads of other, and less responsible committees. If he wishes further justification he can point to the cases of other Representatives older in years than he. In fact a Member doesn't get to be chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee in his salad years.

Judge SMITH's decision to run means that he will be returned. If he has any opposition it will be as perfunctory as it usually has been in the recent past. Those qualified and ambitious to succed him in the Congress will have to wait a while longer.

Two American Legion Essay Contest Winners From Sixth Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, for several years the Ohio department of the American Legion has sponsored an annual essay contest for students in Ohio high schools. As an incentive to participate in this essay contest, the American Legion awards as a prize a week's long trip to Washington, D. C., and other points of historic interest in this part of the country. Several hundred students participate in this essay contest each year. The subject assigned by the American Legion for the 1955 American Legion Essay Contest was The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today. I am happy to tell the House that this year two of the contest winners were from the Sixth Congressional District. They were Mr. Joseph Krug, of 462 Chestnut Street, Chillicothe, Ross County, Ohio; and Mr. Mark Lovett, a resident of Highland County, whose address is rural route No. 2, Bainbridge, Ohio. Because these young men have so clearly and concisely expressed the importance of spiritual guidance in the world today, I believe their essays are well worth reading, and therefore, I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Mr. Joseph Krug, Chillicothe, Ohio)

There has been no time in the history of the world when spiritual guidance was more needed than it is today. Although at the present time there are no shooting wars, there is great unrest among nations in addition to all the crimes, delinquency, violence, and the many isms throughout the world. All these things would be worse if it were not for the spiritual guidance we receive from our priests, ministers, and rabbis. But these wars and vices are still very prominent all over the world today because not enough people listen to the advice of their spiritual leaders.

In the time of Noah, God sent many good and holy men to warn the people against their wicked ways and to guide them spiritually, but the people still adhered to their life of corruption and sinning. Consequently, God punished the people by sending a terrible flood to destroy them.

We might say that, in a spiritual way, today is very much like the time of Noah, as spiritual leaders the world over are asking us to turn from our worldly ways back to God. They know that peace will be brought about only by the mercy and power of God, and not by military power alone. At this point it would seem that we are receiving the effects of spiritual guidance or the pleas of the clergy. For God has not yet punished us with a third world war, which would probably destroy the world as in the time of Noah. The difference is that this time we would probably be destroyed by devastating atomic weapons instead of by a flood.

It would seem that the prayers of the people who are turning back to God because of the pleas of the religious are appeasing Christ. More and more people are recognizing their helplessness in world affairs without the power and help of God. Even our national Government is recognizing God more, as can be seen in the words that were added to our pledge of allegiance.

So much for the international effect. Here at home the effects of spiritual guidance are shown by the stronger fights against communism, the condemnation of indecent and immoral movies, books, magazines, and comic books, which tend to wreck all good in our minds, and the increased interest people are showing in religion. The general effects of spiritual guidance are surely being seen more and more every day, but until they reach every nation, including Russia and her satellites, the harvest will not be completely reaped.

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Mr. Mark Lovett, Bainbridge, Ohio)

The result of spiritual guidance can be found in many places and in many forms in the world today.

The "Holy Spirit bears witness with" the spirit of man, as found in Romans 8:16, and this divinely reveals that we are the children of God. Therefore, by revelation, by direction and instruction, and by guidance, man has constructed a civilization which is basically Christian. The results of this Christian civilization are shown first in man, himself.

In nearly every situation where man must make a decision between right or wrong, between helping or hindering his fellow men, between selfish or unselfish desires, he will choose the better of the two, and expect no reward other than the satisfaction of knowing that he has done what is right.

It was spiritual guidance in the lives of consecrated men and women that caused them to organize many of the benevolent organizations that are present in the world, such as the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, YMCA, YWCA, and many others.

A deep spiritual insight has created a desire in devout people to build churches, hospitals, homes for the aged, schools for the retarded and handicapped children, and places for the care and education of underprivileged people.

Through the years many things have been done both nationally and internationally to help people of other countries. These acts are direct results of spiritual guidance in the lives of leaders of these movements. We have but to review the rehabilitation in Austria, the protection of refugees in Germany, provision for displaced persons in all of Europe, and the sending of millions of dollars in food and clothing from our great United States to all parts of the world. Even our President has created a new Cabinet position for the purpose of administering the point 4 pro-

gram. This is a United States legislative act which provides mainly for the feeding of the hungry people all over the world.

To summarize, I have stated in the above essay the effects of spiritual guidance to man individually, collectively in communities, nationally, and internationally.

All guidance in the universe may not be good, but all spiritual guidance is good, wholesome, helpful, and directed particularly to the betterment of man in his community, in this Nation, and in the whole world. The masses everywhere must be concerned with the difficulties and problems of human existence and of human coexistence. This, alone, will maintain spiritual well-being in today's world.

The Armed Forces Medical Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on the south side of the Mall at the corner of 7th Street and Independence Avenue stands the old red brick building which houses the Armed Forces Medical Library, the greatest medical library in the world, now in its 120th year. The library was instituted in 1836 by Joseph Lovell, Surgeon-General of the United States Army, as the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office. Known variously under that name and as the Army Medical Library, and since 1952 as the Armed Forces Medical Library, it serves for all intents and purposes as the National Medical Library of the United States. Its collection of the world's medical literature, numbering almost a million items, ranges in date from a manuscript of A. D. 1094 to the latest printed book of 1955. Besides its outstanding collections of historical works, medical theses, portraits of physicians, and its unique section of American and foreign government and statistical documents, the completeness of its holdings of medical periodicals makes it a fountainhead of information surpassed by few other libraries.

The phenomenal growth and development of this great collection was predominantly the result of the vision and efforts of the great American physician John Shaw Billings, who administered the library for 30 years between 1865 and 1895, and during his term of office the present library structure was built—in 1887. The library is world-renowned, and we can believe that Sir William Osler spoke for the entire medical profession when he said:

> For the teacher and the worker, a great library such as this is indispensable. They must know the world's best work and know it at once. They mint and make current coin the ore so widely scattered in journals, transactions, and monographs. * * * The unique opportunities of the Surgeon General's library have done much to give American medicine a thoroughly eclectic character.

The Armed Forces Medical Library carries on an active service program. Material of clinical importance flows into the library from nearly every country in the world. Russian publications, Chinese periodicals, Icelandic, Turkish, Hungarian, Portuguese, Dutch, Swedish, and Spanish monographs and journals all make their contribution to the library's collection. Over 10,000 serial titles are regularly recorded. Each year it acquires 15,000 monographs and 100,000 journal pieces, the housing of which requires over half a mile of linear shelf footage. Each year its unrivaled interlibrary loan service places 133,000 volumes in the hands of medical research workers throughout this country. Over 1,000 reference questions are answered by the library staff each month, in the course of which many long medical bibliographies are prepared. The library is carefully cataloging all of its acquisitions, and issues each year a printed record of this work for all to see and use. The library publishes a monthly index to the current periodical literature of medicine in which over 100,000 articles a year are listed by author and subject. Interlibrary loans, bibliogrhphical and photoduplication services make it possible for the doctor, wherever he may be, to have at his beck and call all of the library's resources. It is difficult to exaggerate the important influence this library has had on the advances in the medical sciences throughout the world. Indeed, Osler once remarked that this library and its publications constituted the outstanding American contribution in the field of medicine.

The Library has long since outgrown its present quarters. As early as 1917 a lengthy report to the 65th Congress proposed a new building for the institution. The quantities of literature which the Library has amassed have become so great that since 1942 over 30,000 of its most outstanding old and rare volumes have had to be shelved in rented space in Cleveland, Ohio, at the cost of more difficult and less efficient operation, due to the divided collection. While some temporary relief has resulted from the removal of the Library's sister institution, the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, to its recently completed new building, within 2 years the available stack space in Washington will again be full to bursting, and the collection will still be divided between Washington and Cleveland. Under such circumstances, a new building to house this irreplaceable national treasure is an absolute necessity, as a survey committee of the American Library Association declared in no uncertain terms in 1944. Since then the pressure of the Library's space problems has grown enormously until at the present time a really desperate situation is being faced which can be solved only by the provision of a new building.

In the military construction bills presently being considered by conferees of the House and Senate, the Armed Forces are presently concerned with an item for $350,000 for architects' services for a new Armed Forces Medical Library building. Eventually some $6 million additional will be required for the construction of this building. Surely no money appropriated could better serve the needs of all citizens of this country. When a recent report of the National Science Foundation tells us that during the current fiscal year the Federal Government is spending $94 million on research and development in the medical sciences, it is difficult to reach any other conclusion than that the expenditure of a relatively modest sum for proper housing of the national medical library, the services of which are absolutely fundamental and essential to the progress of these other, vaster, enterprises, is completely justified and extremely desirable.

For over a century the Armed Forces have operated this library in the public interest, and they have operated it well. How otherwise has it become the greatest medical library in the world? It is true that the library has had many setbacks, notably during the early thirties when, along with many other institutions, it suffered from a lack of funds. But since 1940, at least, the Armed Forces have directed a program of rehabilitation and reorganization of the library's collections which has in large part overcome the deficiencies of the previous decade. The Armed Forces have, in fact, developed a forward-looking service program, widely hailed as a sound one by both the library and the medical professions. Perhaps on no other issue, indeed, is medical thought so unanimous as on this: That the Armed Forces Medical Library ought to be adequately supported in the national interest, and that the outstanding item of current adequate support must be the provision of a new building for this monumental storehouse and nerve center of medical knowledge.

Today's demands for greater medical knowledge have placed heavy responsibilities on the Armed Forces Medical Library. To meet these responsibilities and to provide proper housing for its ever-expanding collection, a new and larger building must be secured. This great medical research library must continue to build and interpret its collection in support of medicine and its dedicated workers who seek the betterment of mankind through the prevention of disease and the alleviation of human suffering.

Those Who Judged Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks very interesting information appearing in the Catholic Standard of July 22, 1955, relating to what has happened to some of the key persons who figured in the persecution of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty:

THOSE WHO JUDGED HIM

One of the really astounding stories of our time is that of the fate of the persecutors of Cardinal Mindszenty.

A simple recital of the events that befell these people after the sentencing of the Cardinal tells perhaps better than whole volumes the tenor of life behind the Iron Curtain.

These are the names and the reported fates:

Laszlo Rajk, chief of police when the Cardinal was arrested. Hanged.

Janos Kader, who organized the Cardinal's "questioning." Hanged.

Gyula Decsi, who led the "questioning." Jailed.

Sandor Zold, who planned the propaganda campaign against the Cadrinal. Shot himself to avert arrest.

Istvan Riesz, minister of justice who signed the Cardinal's arrest warrant. Sentenced to 25 years in prison as a "spy," later found dead in his cell.

Col. Gyula Osko, who arrested the Cardinal. Shot while trying to flee Hungary.

Ferenc Donat, charged with fabricating "public demonstrations" against the Cardinal. Deported for slave labor.

Imre Zipser, warden at Cardinal's prison. Deported for slave labor.

Laszlo Sulner, admitted forger of incriminating documents against the Cardinal. Died of mysterious poisoning in Paris.

Colonel Biedermann, who took a prominent part in the examination of the Cardinal. Died suddenly under strange circumstances in the canteen of police headquarters in Budapest.

Professor Kaftanov, the chief Russian doctor who "prepared" the Cardinal for trial. A patient in a Russian asylum.

Doctor Blaukop, his assistant, also a Russian citizen. Found burned to death in his bed.

Emergency Military Service by Commissioned Corps of Public Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill "to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes."

In order to give the Members of Congress adequate information as to the background and purposes of this bill, I would like to make public Secretary Hobby's letter, addressed to the Speaker, requesting introduction of this legislation, and a summary of the bill prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The letter and the summary are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
July 18, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are enclosing for your consideration a draft of a bill "to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes."

This bill is designed to strengthen the personnel system governing the commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service by providing certain authorities which are required for the effective performance of the responsibilities of the service during war and emergency periods, by authorizing the payment of uniform allowances, and by alleviating certain problems pertaining to personnel management.

A major purpose of the bill is to carry out the proposal in the President's health message of January 31, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 81), that the Congress take steps to "Strengthen the Public Health Service commissioned corps by improving its status * * *." The mission of the Public Health Service, as a major health arm of the Federal Government, is one of considerable scope and diversity. Although normally its functions are civilian in character and vital to the maintenance of the health and welfare of the civilian population, the Public Health Service through special use of its commissioned corps is available, as a standby service of the Armed Forces, to perform in time of war or national emergency, at the discretion of the President, functions and duties relating to the responsibilities of the Armed Forces and such other defense functions as may be assigned to it. Legislation, however, is necessary in order to enable the Public Health Service to perform these functions and duties more effectively during periods of national defense emergencies.

Under present law the President is authorized to convert the commissioned corps to military status in time of war only. The same considerations which underlie conversion to military status during such periods obviously may prevail during periods of emergency related to the national defense. It is therefore desirable to authorize the President to convert the commissioned corps to military status in time of national-defense emergency as well as in time of war. Authority for conversion of the commissioned corps to military status during such periods would constitute a firm basis for the full utilization of the Public Health Service, including the Inactive Reserve, in mobilization planning.

The personnel system of the Commissioned Corps needs to be strengthened in certain other respects. In the first place, as recognized by the President in his above-mentioned health message, legislation is urgently needed to provide an adequate system of survivor benefits for the dependents of deceased members of the Corps, which is now lacking. A specific proposal to accomplish this has been omitted from the enclosed draft bill only because such legislation has been reported favorably by the House Select Committee on Survivor Benefits as part of a broader proposal (H. R. 7089) covering all the uniformed services.

Another needed improvement—which is covered by the enclosed draft bill—relates to uniform allowances for members of the Corps. Existing law authorizes an allowance of $250 to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service in the lower three grades entering on active duty in time of war or so serving at the commencement of a war. No such uniform allowance is at present payable despite the fact that approximately 40 percent of such officers are now required to wear uniforms during duty hours. We recommend an amendment to section 213 of the Public Health Service Act which would authorize a one-time uniform allowance for these officers regardless of the existence or nonexistence of a state of war, but which would limit payment to those who are required by directive of the Surgeon General to wear uniforms.

The bill also contains certain other proposed amendments (more fully described in the enclosed summary) designed to simplify administration and result in better personnel management, which would extend the term of Reserve commissions; equalize the provisions for crediting prior noncommissioned service of Public Health Service officers toward retirement for age or length of service with the provisions for crediting such prior service for disability retirement purposes; and extend the present authority for extramural training assignments of Regular officers to Reserve officers and round out and otherwise amend such training provisions.

In addition, the bill contains purely technical amendments, which would clarify existing authority to make reappointments to the Regular Corps without examination, delete obsolete provisions and references, etc.

The enactment of the bill would result in increased costs to this Department, with respect to the payment of the uniform allowance, in an estimated amount of $110,000 for fiscal year 1956 and $60,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. Other potential costs, such as those arising out of the proposed authority for conversion of the Commissioned Corps to military status during defense emergencies, are not susceptible to an estimate at this time.

We should appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

SUMMARY OF BILL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED CORPS

SECTION 1

Section 216 of the Public Health Service Act at present authorizes the President, in time of war, or of emergency proclaimed by the President, to utilize the Public Health Service to such extent and in such manner as shall in his judgment promote the public interest. It further authorizes the President, in time of war only, to declare the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service to be a military service and a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States. And it provides that while in such military status, the Commissioned Corps shall, to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, be subject to the Articles of War and to the Articles for the Government of the Navy. The proposed amendment, the need for which is explained in the letter of transmittal to the Congress, would authorize the President to declare the Commissioned Corps to be a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, as well as in time of war. Furthermore, reference to the Uniform Code of Military Justice would be substituted for the now-obsolete references to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

SECTION 2

Subsection (a) would amend section 213 of the Public Health Service Act to authorize the payment of a one-time $250 uniform allowance to those Regular and Reserve officers of the Service who (i) are on active duty on, or enter on active duty after, the effective date of the amendment, (ii) are receiving the pay of the junior assistant, assistant, or senior assistant grade, and (iii) have not at any time received a uniform allowance from the Service. The general effect of this amendment would be to delete from existing law the limitations of the uniform allowance to war periods. The need for this amend-

ment is explained in the letter of transmittal to the Congress.

Subsection (b) would repeal, as no longer necessary, section 707 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended, which authorized the retroactive payment of uniform allowances to officers who were appointed to the Regular Corps or called to active duty in the Reserve Corps after December 7, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1944, and who would have been eligible for the uniform allowance under section 213 of the Public Health Service Act but for the fact that their appointment or call to active duty occurred prior to July 1, 1944, the effective date of such act. Eligibility under section 707 is limited to officers who were on active duty on or after November 11, 1943. After a lapse of 11 years it can be assumed that this section has been executed.

SECTION 3

Subsections (a) and (b) would amend section 207 of the Public Health Service Act by adding a new subsection thereto which would authorize the reappointment of former officers of the Regular Corps within 2 years after the termination of their prior commission in the Regular Corps without a new examination, except as the Surgeon General may otherwise prescribe, and without regard to the numerical limitations with respect to the appointment of officers in the full grade and above. For purposes of pay, promotion, and seniority in grade, such a reappointed officer would receive the same credits for service to which he would be entitled if such reappointment were an original appointment, but in no event less than the amount of credits he held at the time his prior commission was terminated. These amendments parallel existing authority contained in Public Health Service Regulations. However, we believe that it would be desirable to make explicit in the act the basis for the existing regulation.

From time to time officers of the Regular Corps who have resigned from the Service find it desirable to return to the Service within a relatively short period of time following the termination of their commissions. These candidates are well qualified professional persons who because of former association with the Service, are familiar with the responsibilities and the mission of the Service. The amendments made by these subsections would facilitate the reappointment of these candidates.

Subsection (c) would amend section 207 (a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend the term of Reserve commissions from 5 years to an indefinite period. This amendment would parallel the practice of the Armed Forces to grant Reserve commissions for indefinite periods. Reserve commissions in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection would not, however, be affected unless the officer consents in writing to such extension.

SECTION 4

This section would amend section 210 (d) (2) of the Public Health Service Act by striking out the words "pay period and for purposes of." The words to be deleted had reference to the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which provided for longevity increases in pay every 3 years. This law was superseded by the Career Compensation Act of 1949. The language to be deleted no longer has any meaning.

SECTION 5

Subsections (a) and (b) would amend subsections (a) and (b) (1) of section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to authorize the crediting of all noncommissioned service with the Public Health Service for purposes of age and length-of-service retirements without regard to the date of appointment of an officer to the Regular Corps. The term "noncommissioned service" is used to describe any employment with the Public Health Service other than in a commissioned status.

Under existing law (sec. 706 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended), the crediting of prior noncommissioned service with the Service for the purposes of age and length-of-service retirements is limited solely to those Regular officers who were appointed prior to July 1, 1944. An officer who has been appointed since that date may not receive credit for any noncommissioned service for purposes of retirement for age or length of service, notwithstanding the fact that from the date of his appointment to the Regular Corps he is excluded from the Civil Service Retirement System and his rights thereunder terminated. While such an officer receives a return of all contributions paid into the retirement fund, he loses all credits toward retirement for his prior noncommissioned service which he had accumulated under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

These amendments would equalize the computation of service for nondisability retirement purposes with the computation of service for disability retirement purposes at present authorized under the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Under that act, Public Health Service officers may be credited for physical disability retirement purposes with their noncommissioned service with the Public Health Service regardless of the date of their appointment.

Although these amendments would grant in some few cases, a number of years of civil service credit for staff-retirement purposes, the number of officers involved would not exceed more than a small percentage of the total strength of the Regular Corps.

Subsection (c) would amend section 211 (c) of the Public Health Service Act to authorize the recall to active duty of a retired officer of the Regular Corps without his consent while the Corps has military status. Existing law authorizes such recall only in time of war. The amendment is necessary to complement the amendment to section 216 of the Public Health Service Act proposed by section 1 of the bill which would permit conversion of the corps to military status in times of national defense emergency as well as in time of war. This subsection would also incorporate into section 211 (c) of the Public Health Service Act substantive legislation contained in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 254, 42 U. S. C. 212b) which authorizes the recall to active duty of an officer of either the Regular or Reserve Corps with his consent at any time.

Subsection (d) would repeal the provision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954, referred to above, which would be incorporated into section 211 (c) of the Public Health Service Act by section 5 (c) of the bill.

Subsection (e) would repeal section 706 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended. See discussion under subsections (a) and (b) above.

SECTION 6

Subsection (a) would amend section 218 (a) of the Public Health Service Act which at present authorizes the training of Regular officers at educational institutions.

The amendment would extend this training authority to include Reserve officers. Within the Commissioned Corps very little distinction exists between Regular and Reserve officers, both of whom have already obtained their professional degrees. They work side by side on the same projects which may require advanced professional training in order that they may keep abreast of changing times and new professional techniques. Authority to train Reserve officers on the same basis as Regular officers would be in the best interests of the Service.

The scope of subsection (a) of section 218 is somewhat ambiguous with respect to training courses and programs, both within and outside the Federal Government, which may not technically be described as training at educational institutions. Non-Federal training programs are given from time to time under the auspices of various professional associations such as the American Medical Association, the American Trudeau Association, and the American Psychoanalytic Association. Within the Federal Government, Public Health Service officers have need for training given by various Federal agencies, such as the Foreign Service Institute conducted by the Department of State and the biological warfare defense course conducted by the Department of the Army. Although such programs are normally short-term courses, they are, nonetheless, essential to the training activities of the Public Health Service. The amendment made by this subsection would, therefore, clarify the authority of the Service to train officers at educational institutions or training programs, both within and outside the Federal Government.

Subsection (b) would amend section 218 (b) of the Public Health Service Act which now provides that an officer whose tuition and fees have been paid by the service while attending an educational institution shall reimburse the service for such costs if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after the cessation of such attendance. In view of the fact that 62 percent of such training is for periods of less than 3 months, and that such training assignments are, in many instances, for a period of no more than 1 week, the requirement of 2 years of subsequent service is unduly harsh on the officer and is unnecessary from the point of view of the Government.

This amendment would require an officer who receives training in excess of 30 days for which tuition and fees are paid by the service to reimburse the service for such tuition and fees if thereafter he voluntarily leaves the service within a period of time which is equal to twice the period of such training, with a minimum period of 6 months of service and a maximum of 2 years. Such period of subsequent service would commence upon the cessation of the officer's prescribed training program which may also include other training for which no tuition and fees are paid, regardless of whether such other training is in a Service facility or otherwise. The amendment would also authorize the Surgeon General to waive, in whole or in part, the recovery of tuition and fees when such recovery would be inequitable or not in the public interest.

The amendment would provide a more reasonable and equitable basis for determining the conditions under which the recovery provision would be applicable. For example, it would exclude from such provision an officer who is assigned to a training course of 30 days or less, as a training course of such short duration is mainly for the benefit of the Government and may provide only a small degree, if any, of personal benefit to the officer. Likewise, it would permit a remission, in whole or in part, of the required reimbursement when such reimbursement would be inequitable or not in the public interest.

The proposed "two for one" formula with respect to service to be performed subsequent to a prescribed training period relates to the period of training for which tuition and fees have been paid, as compared to the fixed period of 2 years of service required under existing law. This formula is more equitable from the officer's point of view and yet would sufficiently safeguard the interests of the Government.

Mystery of Missing Meat Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Long Island Press of July 21, 1955, concerning a fraud perpetrated on the consuming public of New York City and ask the agencies whose duty it is to investigate what is being done about this case and what is being done to prevent future occurrences of a like nature:

MYSTERY OF MISSING MEAT STAMP—NO ONE WANTS TO TALK ABOUT IT

(By Austin Perlow)

How would you like to have a United States Mint plate that prints $10 bills?

You could make a million dollars, but you'd also land in jail.

You could also make a million if you could get your hands on a Department of Agriculture gadget that could turn 49-cents-a-pound meat into $1.10-a-pound beef.

There are such gadgets—rollers 3 inches wide used to stamp carcasses with either "USDA Prime," "USDA Choice," "USDA Good," or "USDA Commercial."

The initials stand for United States Department of Agriculture.

In the hands of an unscrupulous person, a "USDA Prime" roller could convert inferior grade carcasses into expensive sides of prime beef with the flick of a wrist.

And it would also turn a lean bankroll into one big enough to choke a steer.

But it's just as illegal to possess and use one of these rollers as it is to have United States mint plates.

Both are counterfeiting offenses.

Strange to relate, the Department of Agriculture admits that a "USDA Prime" meat-stamping roller was missing for 18 months, and has now been recovered.

But that's just about all the Department will admit. It has clamped down on all other information concerning the roller.

The Agriculture Department won't answer these questions:

Who is investigating the disappearance and the reappearance of the Prime roller?

Was it stolen or mislaid or borrowed? Where was it found; in whose possession?

Was it illegally used during the 18 months?

If it was not stolen and not criminally used, why doesn't the Agriculture Department say so?

If it was stolen, why is there no prosecution?

Most important—how many pounds of meat were upgraded illegally while the roller was in the wrong hands, and how many housewives were overcharged as a result?

The Press asked C. F. Beard, head of the Standardization and Grading Branch of the Livestock Division in Washington.

But all he would admit was that his office had completed an investigation and turned over the findings to procurement officials in New York City.

Apparently, Beard added, meat illegally upgraded with the missing stamp had been bought by the city.

The Department of Agriculture will take no further action until the city completes its investigation, he said.

Deputy Commissioner Abram Mattes of the Department of Purchase told the Press he believes not one but several rollers were missing, but that his Department could do nothing until a final report was submitted by the Department of Investigation.

"We've already received an interim report that the investigation is in progress," he said.

Deputy Commissioner Patrick J. Murphy, who Mattes named as directing the probe, said a mistake must have been made somewhere.

He hadn't heard anything about a missing roller until a Press reporter told him about it.

"If there's any investigation going on," he said, "it is being handled by the Livestock Division downtown."

Joseph Sullivan, supervisor of the Standardization and Grading Branch at 139 Centre Street, Manhattan, is on vacation, but an assistant said investigations were conducted in Washington by Beard's office.

It took weeks and weeks of patient effort to make the full circle and wind up once more back at Beard's office.

The time was wasted, because the Press learned nothing on the official merry-go-round.

Here's why the Press was so persistent in trying to track down the cause and effect of the disappearance of the Government "prime" stamp:

Only the most select carcasses are stamped "USDA Prime," following an examination of the amount of lean meat, the amount and type of fat and distribution and size of bones.

Prime-beef hindquarters from 1,400-pound Angus steers brought as high as 57 cents a pound last week at wholesale. Commercial, range-fed cattle, as light as 600 pounds, and running mostly to tough, lean meat and bone, brought as little as 32 or 34 cents a pound for hindquarters.

A single hindquarter of 140 to 220 pounds could net a wholesaler from $35 to $55 extra if it were stamped "prime" instead of "commercial."

Fifty-five dollars is "peanut," but a wholesale house with 20 meat handlers averages about 200,000 pounds of meat weekly. A "prime" roller could, in the wrong hands, be worth as much as a United States mint plate.

Gaining Security Via Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very timely address by Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University:

GAINING SECURITY VIA FREEDOM

(From an address by Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University, delivered at the Freedom Forum, sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City)

Judge Curtis Bok said recently that "in the whole history of law and order, the longest step forward was taken by primitive man when, as if by common consent, the tribe sat down in a circle and allowed only one man to speak at a time."

This process has culminated in an educational system in which ideas can be presented without fear or favor. One person is listened to at a time and no one is shouted down because his position is unpopular. This is the essence of democracy. One of our greatest achievements has been to make educational opportunities available to all of our people. The public school is the most important single tool of democracy.

In order to win the struggle for freedom, we must vitalize this procedure by which ideas are examined, never putting handcuffs on notions because they are opposed to tradition or because they open new avenues for thought. Unless we believe that truth can stand up under testing, our faith in the future is only flimsy ground. The teacher is not an all-wise proclaimer of the truth, but a scholar, sharing his knowledge and engaged in seeking more truth. The personal equation in permitting freedom to explore and offering a welcome for the intellectually curious may be more important than the subject matter he teaches.

For education is more an art than a science. It stimulates learners to feel and to appreciate the values they learn about. And all of the conclusions reached by scientific techniques depend on certain intangible qualities that cannot be measured. A total view about life, cherishing the worth of persons, recognizing the responsibility of an intellectual, are basic.

EDUCATION'S PLUS FACTOR

It now seems quite clear that literacy is not enough; science is not enough; presentation of facts is not enough. Investigations may reveal problems, they cannot create an improved quality of spirit. With the largest commitment to education of any nation in history, we are seeing an attack on the procedures on which true education depends and a conscious confusion of issues which persons to be educated must clearly understand. Suspicion of motives of people who disagree with the conventional attitudes, libel by label, attack by innuendo are the methods being used.

Poison in the pipelines of communication kills the spirit of freedom as it depletes confidence in causes and wrecks the careers of persons.

On October 18, 1951, the following statement was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the title "The Greatest Subversive Plot in History." "How anyone who venerates and loves Old Glory as the symbol of the deathless march of the United States through the years, to fulfill its destiny as a free and independent republic can read this documented evidence of the greatest and most malignant plot in history, against the future of his country, and its children's children, is more than I am able to comprehend. Just how careless and unthinking can we be that we permit this band of spies and traitors to exist another day in this land we all love?"

This Congressman was not describing some Benedict Arnold or some group plotting the overthrow of our Government. He was talking about the United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), an official body of 69 nations which Soviet Russia had not joined.[1]

This is the innuendo unsupported by fact, the generalizations from prejudice instead of inquiry through which freedom of the individual decreases and national security is endangered.

In education we are obligated to support free inquiry and to expect reliable reporting about findings and responsible conduct among faculty members and students alike. Education should support differences of opinion and conviction.

Underlying all educational efforts must be a faith in the capacity for improvement on the part of all normal persons, regardless of past record or present performance.

The creative potential within each individual can be identified, released, and guided and so result in extraordinary achievements, even among ordinary people. Belief in an individual, conveyed to him until he feels confidence in himself, is often the key to personal transformation.

[1] Soviet Russia did not become a member of UNESCO until 1954.

EDUCATION IS AN ADVENTURE

Support for objective investigation and of adventure with ideas must be built into the educational process. The real, uncoerced zest for learning goes out of education when it is reduced to a routine transmittal of predigested information. Passive acceptance, without pointed questioning, enervates the educational process and renders it stodgy, dull, and lumpy. When a teacher treats ideas as routine and learning as a mechanical process, he deprives students of the golden opportunities for making discoveries that could serve as compelling invitations to creative effort and for scholarly achievement.

Real education is an adventure in ideas. Contact with truly big ideas sets the mind on fire. They stir the imagination and lift up new visions, purpose, and hopes.

Fear of being criticized for reporting unpopular findings or the feeling of misgiving for one's reputation or the family well-being because of the discussion of controversial issues tends to paralyze the motive for inquiry and to reduce the adventure in problem solving to a mechanical routine among conventional facts.

The leadership needed to revive the love of learning must come from persons who are unafraid of labels, whose curiosities are unbounded and whose enthusiasms are contagious.

The power of inspired living, of inspired teaching and of fearless treatment of issues, remains the most needed force to combat reaction, discrimination, complacency, prejudice and mediocrity.

We educators seek to train people to think objectively, to withhold judgment until all of the known facts are in, to revise positions as new information is gained. We seek release from blind allegiance to the past and the devolpment of an intelligent loyalty to current ideals that hold the key to the future.

Liberal education changes people by revealing the bases of irrational and accidental loyalties, by extending contacts, opening new windows on cultures, groups and eras.

The educated person must know how to absorb the shock of new proposals without stiffening in blind resistance or accepting with uncritical approval. He can adjust to the obsolescence of an idea, an institution or an invention without panic or paralysis. He can understand the infinite complexity of individuals and of civilization and refuse to adopt oversimplified suggestions of solutions and "either-or" propositions as the only choices in complicated situations.

EDUCATION CONFRONTS A CHALLENGING FUTURE

Since all areas of modern life are becoming increasingly complex, requiring new skills and knowledge, we must rely more heavily on college trained men and women. It is therefore more important than ever that gifted young people should have access to college education. Hope for freedom is related to the number and quality of trained leaders. The college-age population attending college has increased from 11 percent in 1934 to 31 percent in 1954. This represents 1 percent in college each year increased over last year.

Looking ahead toward 1970, some educators are panic stricken. They view with alarm the growing determination of American youth to gain an education. I oppose all artificial quotas or limits of student population. No youth should be penalized because he was born in 1943 or later. Yet 31 percent will take us from 2.6 million to 4.6 million. But 1 percent increase per year would yield a total of 5 million by 1970.

One million, six hundred thousand young people will graduate from high schools this spring. Of the top 25 percent in the graduating classes only 49 percent, or 200,000 will enter college. Half of the remainder, or 100,000, who are in the upper one-quarter of their graduating classes, will not enroll in college because of lack of finances.

Here is a great potential for future leadership, now largely immobilized and consigned to less than their highest contribution to their generation. We must find how to educate our qualified youth population and not complain because we have them on our hands.

EDUCATION NOURISHES INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE

True education must seek to pull away the layers of unquestioning custom and to nourish individual response beneath them. Otherwise the results of education will be the development of a generation of citizens who think, feel, act and look alike.

The question in education for a free world is how we develop within each generation a philosophy built on the central idea of freedom and self-disciplined performance in behalf of every person. Without such a philosophy the free world will cease to exist and any similarity will be merely coincidental.

Personal freedom can exist only when an individual has enough insight about himself to be released from the destructive tensions of anxiety, insecurity, loneliness and frustration, and to respond wisely and warmly to people and to life itself. The individual must learn to maintain a dynamic equilibrium between dogmatic assurance about everything and docile emptiness concerning anything. He must learn to welcome unconventional and even controversial ideas because of his belief in the compelling power of truth and its long-run victory.

EDUCATION, FREEDOMS, AND SECURITIES

Every educational institution can serve the interest of freedom and national security by:

(1) Making the quest for knowledge an invigorating and fearless adventure, with more and more of the truth as the goal.

(2) Developing special projects designed to improve human relations.

(3) Illustrating how secure responsible freedom is—no segregation or discrimination in the university community, in admissions, elections, housing, or honors.

(4) Introducing the university community to distinguished leaders among different races.

(5) Providing intellectual security for faculty members who hold unconventional attitudes.

Underlying all of the struggle for freedom is the battle for quality; for quality of scholarship; for quality of responsible action; for quality of faith in God and man; for quality of performance; for quality of character. With these we may weather the current social storm and illustrate in a healthy way the true kinship between individual freedom and national security.

Widest Spread Between Farm and Factory Product Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Farm and Factory Product Prices Reach Widest Spread Since World War II's End" which appeared in the July 7, 1955, issue of the Wall Street Journal. I feel that this article should be read by all Members of the Congress, for it points out what is happening to America's farmers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM AND FACTORY PRODUCT PRICES REACH WIDEST SPREAD SINCE WORLD WAR II'S END—WAGES HOLD MANUFACTURED ITEMS UP AS CROP STAPLES SKID 23 PERCENT IN 4 YEARS

Divergent chart lines for prices of farm staples on the one hand and manufactured products on the other have reached the widest spread since World War II's end.

In computing its wholesale price indexes, the Bureau of Labor Statistics uses the 1947–49 average as 100. Figures released over the weekend by the Bureau of Labor Statistics placed the farm price index at 89.8 as of July 5. The price index figure for all commodities other than farm and food products was placed at 115.7. That's a spread of some 25 points.

The trend has been underway since early 1951. In March of that year the two indexes were within a fraction of a point of each other. By the start of 1953, a little over 2 years ago, the spread had reached 17 points.

THE 4-YEAR PATTERN

Compare with the high-water mark of March 1951, prices on all commodities other than farm and food items have declined less than 2 percent. Farm product prices, meanwhile, have tumbled 23 percent.

Two factors seem clearly responsible for this fork-in-the-road picture in the price charts:

1. Sharply rising factory wages have propped up the prices of manufactured goods.

2. Superabundant production, coupled with waning foreign markets, has pulled down the farm product prices despite efforts to hold them up by Federal edict.

The farm price support program, ironically, has contributed to the decline in farm exports. While the propping efforts have failed to keep prices from falling, they have succeeded in keeping most United States farm prices above those of competitive foreign producers.

BIG BULGE IN WAGES

Stiffly supporting the present level of manufactured product prices is a climb in factory wage rates that is sharper than generally realized.

As recently as 1951 an all-industry average placed the factory worker's weekly pay check at less than $65. It's now above $76. That's a rise of some 17 percent.

Workers in some industries have scored bigger gains than the average. The folks in auto factories stand out in this respect. Their average weekly pay of $75 in 1951 has climbed above $96—up nearly a third.

Here are some weekly wage figures for different industries—those of 1951 compared with the latest:

Industry:	*1951*	*Now*
All manufacturing	$64.71	$76.11
Lumber	59.98	67.89
Steel	77.30	91.71
Automobiles	75.45	96.54
Machinery	76.38	86.94
Aircraft	78.40	83.88

Most recent wages increases—as in steel and auto making—are not included in the above figures. They bring another nudge upward to prices. Steel prices have already been raised. Higher prices on 1956 model autos are predicted.

WHEAT, COTTON, CATTLE, HOGS

Behind the big slide in the Government's all-inclusive index of farm product prices are some steep spills on individual farm staples. In grains, in livestock, in Dixie's cotton—the price charts point downward in almost any farm market you peek into.

Steers that brought $40 a hundred pounds in Chicago's stockyards in early 1951 bring

less than $25 today. Hogs that sold above $30 a hundred pounds in the summer of 1948 are now around $20—and some livestock men are predicting that the avalanche of porkers that will hit the market later this year will shove hogs on the hoof below the $15 level.

Wheat at Kansas City brought above $3 a bushel back in early postwar 1947. Today you can buy the bread grain in Kansas City at less than $2.15 a bushel.

Cotton has come down despite a drastic slash in plantings. Compared to their postwar high, cotton fields have been cutback nearly 40 percent—some 11 million acres. Yet cotton was close to 45 cents a pound in 1951—and is now under 34 cents.

SUPPLIES UP, EXPORTS DOWN

The monumental United States farm production behind these price slides has been widely publicized. This year for the first time the wheat surplus is above a billion bushels—4 times as big as it was just 3 years ago. An indicated cotton surplus of around 11 million bales is the fattest in a decade—twice as big as just 2 years ago.

As wheat and cotton acreage has been slashed in recent years, the idled land has been turned to pasture and feed grains—and this in turn has been converted into massive supplies of meat. Just since 1949 the number of beef cattle on farms has jumped from 41 million to 58 million—up 40 percent. Hogs and chickens have likewise multiplied.

In the years since World War II, while the United States has been carrying on with its hefty farm production, the outside world has been increasing its farm output, too. And the result has been that the early postwar hunger for United States farm products is simply not there any more. Some lands that begged for wheat at the war's end now seek foreign markets for their own wheat.

In the export year beginning July 1, 1951, the United States sent abroad over $4 billion of farm products. Exports in the year ended last month are figured around $3.2 billion—and would be much less were it not for big Government subsidies aimed at getting rid of the surpluses.

Three years ago the United States exported over 5.5 million bales of cotton in 1 year. The current export year's total is expected to be only about 3.7 million bales. Wheat exports that topped half a billion bushels in 1948 are now well under 300 million bushels yearly.

THE ROAD AHEAD

Will the price spread between farm and nonfarm products continue? Present indications are that it will. The Government's farm crop appraisal, due out today, is expected to predict whopping harvests all along the line. And the current round of wage increases will give new support to prices of manufactured products.

But wage increases can't be expected to bring sharp price rises in finished consumer goods. The heavy hand of high-production competition exerts a counterbalancing downward pull on prices. When the Norge division of Borg-Warner Corp. announced last week that it would not raise appliances to cover steel price increases, Norge President Judson S. Sayre commented that "like a lot of other manufacturers, we're just going to have to absorb higher material costs." Many other manufacturers agree.

The history of recent years demonstrates that the level of prices on manufactured goods does not have to follow the level of factory wages precisely. While factory wages have increased 17 percent since 1951, the actual decline of about 2 percent in nonfarm, nonfood prices shows how competition and more efficient production can hold prices down.

Wholesale price indexes for week ended July 5, 1955 (1947–49=100):

Commodity, group	Weekly indexes, July 5, 1955	Percent change to July 5, 1955 from—	
		June 28, 1955	July 1954
All commodities	110.0	0	−0.4
Farm products	89.8	−1.2	−6.7
Processed foods	102.7	+.2	−3.6
Meats	86.7	+.6	−8.2
All commodities other than farm and foods	115.7	0	+1.2

Coal Industry Is Stepchild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to an interesting editorial which appeared in the July 17 issue of the Huntington Herald-Advertiser under the caption "Coal Industry Is Stepchild."

While the article in question does not offer a permanent solution to the struggle of the soft-coal industry, it does raise the question of discrimination not only in favor of other industries here at home but questions seriously the economic wisdom in the "bleeding America white" in order to buy friendship abroad.

The article follows:

Coal producers are fond of saying that most of their troubles in the famine cycles of their feast-and-famine existence are due to the fact that there are too many of them. They produce too much coal and actually beg consumers to buy it at less than cost.

This may be true, but their number is pitifully small in a political sense. There are far too few of them to impress Congress and win the kind of political consideration that is given, say, to the Nation's farmers.

On many of his most important cash crops, the farmer is guaranteed a fair price by the Government. Corn, wheat, dairy products, and other farm commodities are accorded Government price supports. Uncle Sam will buy the corn, the wheat, the butter—for which he has about as much use as for another hole in his head—and store it in sheds, mobile bins, and abandoned caves until it spoils or can be given away without danger to the price structure.

But what about the poor coal producer? Does the Government help him to maintain a fair price on his product? Does Uncle Sam regard this basic industry as important enough to justify some subsidization to keep it in business?

He does not. On the contrary, he persists in practices which make the lot of the coal producer even more difficult.

For one thing, he permits enormous quantities of low-grade fuel oil to be dumped on the eastern seaboard, where it actively displaces coal as a fuel.

For another thing, he permits agencies like TVA to establish price schedules on the coal they buy which do not give the producer a fair return. These schedules are followed by privately owned utilities, largely in self-defense. Industrial purchasing agents use the schedules for shopping purposes until they find producers who will sell at distress prices.

Uncle Sam maintains a growing stockpile of some minerals—such as zinc, lead, and copper—on the logical theory that they would be needed in quantities in case of war. By his purchases, he helps these industries maintain a fair market price for their products.

The stockpiling of coal is not regarded as practical, it is true, but that is all the more reason for concern over the industry's ability to meet any emergency as it arises.

There is no substitute for coal in the production of steel. There is no substitute for steel in the fabrication of weapons with which the Nation would have to fight if worse came to worst.

How can a Government, knowing this, contribute so intimately and in so many different ways to the financial insecurity of the coal business?

The most obvious answer is that the coal producers and their employees—including the 225,000 miners who have lost their employment in the mines since 1940 and the thousands of railroad employees furloughed because coal was not moving—are not numerous enough to count politically.

Either that or their representatives in Congress are not making the most of their opportunities. You may take your choice.

A Vaccine Against Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have long urged that civic-minded citizens concentrate on developing constructive outlets and facilities for America's young people. I have pointed out that the great mass of our youngsters are healthy, wholesome, lawabiding, and sound in mind and body. It is our task to keep them so.

One of the ways of achieving this is through community centers, through YMCA's, YWCA's, YMHA's, and YWHA's.

Indeed, the activity of America's great religious faiths in sponsoring organizations and facilities to provide healthy outlets for young people's energies represents one of the great assets on the American scene.

I was pleased to note a few days ago a fine article which has just been contributed by one of America's leading authorities concerned with our young people, an outstanding law enforcement officer in his own right and former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Jacob K. Javits, attorney general of the State of New York. Through the medium of the National Jewish Welfare Board, Congressman Javits contributed an outstanding commonsense statement to the Jewish New Year edition of many community publications.

I should like to underline my complete agreement with Attorney General Javits' comments. I agree not only with respect to the splendid role of Jewish community centers, but with regard to the funda-

mentally constructive approach—whatever the channel—which brings out the best in young people. There is no finer way of doing this than by training youngsters in the religious faith of their fathers, helping them to understand the heritage which is theirs, the heritage of their religion, the heritage of their country.

I trust and believe that in the year 5716 our fellow Americans of Jewish faith will carry on the fine job which they are doing in supporting their Jewish community centers. I hope, too, that Americans of every faith will likewise support similar constructive activities in the common interest.

I send to the desk the text of Jack Javits' article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
New York, N. Y.

A VACCINE AGAINST DELINQUENCY—THE PREVENTIVE ROLE OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

(By the Honorable Jacob K. Javits, attorney general of the State of New York)

The current emergency over juvenile delinquency and youth crime is producing black headlines and futile anger. But let it be said to the credit of our youth that no matter how sensational the headlines, delinquency involves only a tiny proportion of our youth population. Only 3 percent of children and youth have been involved in what we call juvenile delinquency, but millions of our young people are undelinquent juveniles. If parents and legislators and civic leaders spent as much time understanding our children and finding healthy outlets for them as many do in getting excited and alarmed and indulging in rash statements and proposing impractical solutions, more good would be done.

Children want to be recognized for their own worth, they want respect for their rights, they need pride in achievement, and opportunities to care and share. Agencies that help children achieve these are creating a kind of "Salk vaccine" against delinquency. Among the most successful institutions that project these feelings for our children are the Jewish community centers that now serve more than 250 communities throughout the country. The center's program of clubs, hobby groups, cultural projects, sports, social activities, and opportunities for sharing in communal life is a natural for young people.

Activities and sound moral standards that make for good home life, for friendly family togetherness produce solid young citizens at any age. All youngsters suffer growing pains but they can be withstood by well-established relationships between parents and children. The fact is that the surest preventative against delinquency is a happy, responsible family life. It is an old truism that the family that plays together stays together. And I have found that the Jewish community center is a kind of extension of the home for it serves the entire family.

When unhappy, angry children strike out blindly against society, the active role of good recreational facilities and planned leisure-time activities can be most helpful. Individual parents are often hard put to deal with this problem, which is not limited to the underprivileged. But through participation in community efforts such as Jewish community centers and YM–YWHA's they can find help not only for themselves and their children but also for other parents and children too.

For the past decade the Jewish community center movement, under the leadership of the National Jewish Welfare Board, has been expanding at a record pace throughout the country. Millions of dollars are being poured into new buildings, enlarged services, better programs, improved facilities, all in an effort to keep up with an insatiable demand from the Jewish community.

Two years ago, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, in a statement published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the centennial of the center movement, said that "the organized leisure-time group activities made possible by Jewish community centers play an essential role in affording wholesome release from the anxieties and tensions and fears that beset every home and every family and every community under the pressures to which we are subject. Children and old folks, whose needs are too often neglected in a crisis, find the Jewish community centers particularly concerned with their recreational and social problems." That statement is even more valid today.

Although juvenile delinquency has traditionally been less a problem among Jews than among our non-Jewish neighbors, we cannot be smug about this. The old maxim about an ounce of prevention is still sound. Instead of getting mad and frustrated about the problem, let us concentrate our available resources on the tried and tested programs that have demonstrated their capacity to prevent delinquency while we deal with the law-enforcement emergency which the failure to support prevention adequately has produced.

We need to see that Jewish community center programs are made available to every Jewish youngster and every Jewish family that wants them. We need to mobilize and train volunteer leadership to meet an enormous shortage of such people. We need even more to provide scholarships and other practical inducements to young people to enter center work as a career. We need to develop more preinduction programs to prepare young people for military service which will be part of their lives. We need to strengthen Jewish family life to buttress the traditional Jewish bulwarks of education and learning that have so successfully resisted juvenile delinquency.

The desire for expanded center programs is everywhere manifest. If in the year 5716 we can give new impetus and support to our Jewish youth-serving agencies, to our Jewish schools, to our morale-building organizations, we in the Jewish community will have contributed immeasurably toward building a generation of better citizens and more understanding and self-respecting Jews. I hope that in the new Jewish year we can benefit from some of the special interest in juvenile delinquency to develop a passionate concern for and interest in the needs and desires and hopes of the overwhelming proportion of our teen-agers. Let them know that we have not let them down and they will not let us down.

Arab States and Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the July 25 issue of Jewish Newsletter.

It is an acknowledged fact that stability in the Middle East is essential to world peace. This article by the editor of Jewish Newsletter is important to those who have an interest in the problems that exist in that part of the world:

ARAB STATES AND ANTI-SEMITISM

"The Arab position on Israel is in no sense a position against the Jewish people," stated Ambassador Mohamed Kamil Abdul Rahim, Ambassador from Yemen to the United Nations and director of the Arab Information Center in an exclusive interview with a representative of the Jewish Newsletter. Amplifying his statement, the Ambassador continued: "For centuries before the state of Israel was created, Arabs, who are themselves Semites, lived side by side with Jews in peace and in harmony in the best tradition of Islam. In the Arab part of the world they still do. Just because of the tense Arab-Israeli relations, the Arab countries take special measures in protecting citizens of the Jewish faith." As an example, he cited a recent act of the Egyptian Government which withheld news in Cairo concerning the recent events in Gaza in order to protect Egypt's 80,000 citizens of the Jewish faith.

Dr. Fayez Sayegh, the center's director of research, who was also present at the interview, supplemented the Ambassador's words, by quoting from a statement released by the Arab Center, dated March 31, 1955, which pointed to the contrast between the strained Arab-Israeli relations and the friendly neighborly Moslem-Christian-Jewish relations in the Arab world, and read in part: "Enlightened people think not in terms of man's religion, but of the man himself. There is an eternal battle against bigots who want to lump people together and treat them by wholesale hates and wholesale affections. We are glad to say that in Arab countries, citizens of the Jewish faith enjoy the same rights and privileges as other citizens. We wish we could say the same thing about the 180,000 Arab Moslems and Christians in Israel, but they are treated as second-class citizens."

Dr. Sayegh added that the Arab Information Center was opposed to antisemitism but that it would scrupulously refrain from taking a stand on individual issues as such, nor would it intervene in any disputes between American organizations of opposing points of view. The Arab Center plans "to supply the answers to questions about such problems as Palestine and the striving for independence in North Africa."

The Jewish Newsletter has learned from other reliable sources that the Arab Information Center has taken steps to keep Arab representatives and speakers informed about the character of the various organizations that they are called upon to address with a view to shunning meetings of organizations known to advocate racial and religious discrimination. The Arab Information Center itself has never sent any speakers to such organizations. Some Arab speakers who accepted such invitations in the past, were said to have done so largely through ignorance of the real purposes of the organizations inviting them.

Ambassador Rahim's statement helps to clarify an issue which was raised by a recent address delivered by a representative of an important Arab state at a meeting of an outspoken anti-Semetic organization (reported Jewish Newsletter, June 13). That incident gave rise to doubts about the position of the Arab states toward antisemitism. We are glad that the Ambassador's statement makes it clear that the Arab Information Center and the states it represents, repudiate a policy of antisemitism in their own countries and association with antisemitic organiza-

tions here. We are particularly pleased with the assurances that the controversy between the Arab states and Israel does not affect the treatment by the Arab governments of their citizens of the Jewish faith. We look for continued evidence of good will which will result in an improved relationship and greater friendship between the Arabs and the Jews in the United States and in the Moslem world.

Position of AAA With Respect to Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. Andrew J. Sordoni, president, American Automobile Association, and a statement by Mr. Sordoni which he delivered at a hearing of House Public Works Committee on July 12, 1955. The letter and statement outline the position the AAA is taking relative to H. R. 7474:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1955.
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: On July 12 the American Automobile Association, by authority of its executive committee, presented a statement before the House Public Works Committee on pending highway legislation, copy of which is attached.

The Public Works Committee has reported out H. R. 7474, which you will soon consider. We know that you are under great pressure from commercial vehicle and rubber interests to reduce proposed taxes on commercial vehicles and to shift more of the tax load to the passenger car.

The position of the AAA, with a membership of 4,767,000, on the pending Federal aid highway legislation is briefly as follows:

1. The American Automobile Association supports H. R. 7474 as a practical means of securing, within 15 years, the toll-free completion, at high standards, of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and an accompanying large improvement of major Federal aid highways.

2. The association feels that, in the interest of equity, the proportion of taxes levied on the commercial vehicles should be higher than now provided for in H. R. 7474. We also oppose any tax exemption. Nevertheless, we recognize that this bill now provides at least a more reasonable distribution of the tax load than heretofore has been the case.

3. The association vigorously opposes any further shifting of the tax load to the passenger car, which is already carrying more than its fair share of highway costs.

A vote for this legislation is support for a greatly improved, efficient, and safer highway system for our country and all our people.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW J. SORDONI,
President.

STATEMENT BY ANDREW J. SORDONI, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 12, 1955

I am Andrew J. Sordoni, president of the American Automobile Association, and am appearing here to present the views of the association, whose executive committee, meeting yesterday and today, has given careful consideration to the proposals before you.

First of all, we should like to compliment the members of this committee for the careful and extensive consideration which you have given to the proposed Federal-aid highway legislation.

As one of the sponsors of the first Federal Highway Act in 1916, the American Automobile Association has always had a special interest in this important field of legislation. From the inception of Federal highway aid up to the present, the Congress has recognized that the major responsibility for improving the Nation's streets and highways lies with the several States and their respective political subdivisions.

The role of the Federal Government in this field was one of spurring the States on to accept their responsibility and to give leadership and impetus to the development of integrated and effective highway improvement programs. This participation of the Federal Government in State highway affairs was justified under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution and in the interest of national defense. Hence, from its very beginning, Federal aid has been recognized as a legitimate charge against the general revenues of the Federal Government.

Now for the first time, there is before the Congress a proposal that the Federal Government assume, not a minor role, but the major responsibility for financing a national system of interstate and defense highways. This network includes the Nation's most important roads from the standpoint of the national welfare and the national security, as well as the needs of the Nation's highway transportation. This proposed program, while a complete departure from the traditional role of the Federal Government in highway affairs, nevertheless ties in with the aims and objectives of the American Automobile Association. The American Automobile Association was probably the first organization publicly to advocate a concentration of funds upon the interstate system and to point out the advantages of its early completion to adequate standards. We are in general agreement with the principles and objectives of the highway legislation now under consideration by this committee.

This, then, brings us to the problem of financing this greatly expanded Federal aid highway program. It is our view that the adoption of a pay-as-you-go plan is more desirable than credit financing. We realize that a pay-as-you-go policy will require the imposition of some additional taxes. And we have no objection to that action so long as these tax increases are reasonable and are apportioned equitably among the several beneficiaries.

We believe an undue proportion should not be saddled on automobile owners merely because we have not urged our members to protest to you against the unfairness of any increase in their tax burden.

It should not be necessary to point out that everyone will benefit from the proposed highway improvement program. The national defense and the national economy justify contributions from general tax sources. The fact that no exemptions are provided for in the proposed increase in Federal gasoline tax would indicate that you are aware of this fact, and we certainly urge that no exemptions be granted. We ask the question, "Why shouldn't everyone make a contriution to the Nation's defense and its general welfare?"

There are, of course, special beneficiaries of highway improvements such as the people we represent, the Nation's motor-car owners. Their tax contribution in dollars will be the greatest of all. But other beneficiaries too should be required to pay in reasonable proportion to the benefits derived. It should not be necessary to remind you that the private passenger-car owner is already carrying a very heavy tax burden. The requirement of matching in the States will undoubtedly further increase this burden. How much more taxation can be imposed upon automobiles without doing serious injury to our national economy is open to speculation. No one knows the precise answer to that question. In any event, the passenger-car owner should not be asked or compelled to carry any tax burdens which rightly belong to others.

It must be assumed that your original proposal for taxing diesel fuel, heavy truck tires, tubes, and camelback were intended to achieve some measure of equity in apportioning the tax levies among the several beneficiaries of this road-improvement program.

Under such circumstances it would seem reasonable to ask reconsideration of the action taken in relieving commercial vehicles from what is believed to be their equitable share of the new tax burden. To the extent that such restoration increases the total revenues beyond the requirements of the program, we ask that there be a corresponding reduction in the proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there have come to me two communications dealing with the minimum wage legislation now in conference. These communications address themselves to that provision of the bill, as approved by the Senate, dealing with Puerto Rico. Without passing judgment on the exact position taken by the organizations sending these communications, I believe the views and attitudes expressed are worthy of note, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that these communications and their attachments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT MINIMUM WAGE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1955.
To Members of Congress:

I have been asked by Hipolito Marcano, president of Puerto Rico Federation of Labor-AFL, and David Sternback, regional director, CIO, Puerto Rico, to transmit the attached cablegram to you.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Director, Joint Minimum Wage Committee.

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.
Lt. ARTHUR GOLDBERG,
Chairman, Joint Minimum Wage Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Urge offset reproduction and immediate distribution to all Congressmen following cable just sent to Speaker SAM RAYBURN:

"Unable to cablegram individually all Congressmen due prohibitive expense to us; therefore, respectfully request you convey following message to House during debate on bill 7214, 'On behalf major groups organized labor of Puerto Rico with combined membership over 125,000 in industry trade and agriculture, urge you to secure passage of Senate bill 2168 through floor amendment in lieu House bill 7214. Increased minimum wage

rates for Puerto Rico along lines Senate bill long overdue. They can be paid without curtailment insular employment or affecting competitive position Puerto Rico industry. We look to Congress to rectify injustice long perpetrated against people of this island by inadequate adjustments minimum wages up to now.'"

HIPOLITO MARCANO,
President, Puerto Rico Federation of Labor-AFL.

DAVID STERNBACK,
Regional Director, CIO, Puerto Rico.

JOINT MINIMUM WAGE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1955.

To Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Members of Congress from the State of New York:

Enclosed is a resolution passed at an overflow meeting of Puerto Rican workers held in New York City last night. This resolution petitions the Congress to enact Senate bill 2168 on Puerto Rico simultaneously with any change in the present mainland minimum.

We enclose also a story from today's New York Times reporting the meeting at which this resolution was passed.

In view of the fact that minimum wage revision is presently before Congress, we thought that the enclosed would merit your interest.

Sincerely yours,

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.

DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, AFL.

EMIL RIEVE,
President, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

ALEX ROSE,
President, United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union, AFL.

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Director, Joint Minimum Wage Committee.

RESOLUTION ON HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE FOR PUERTO RICO, ADOPTED AT SPECIAL MEETING, JULY 14, 1955, ROOSEVELT AUDITORIUM, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Whereas the minimum wages in Puerto Rico are far below the mainland minimum, even, in some cases, as low as 22½ cents an hour, a starvation wage that makes it impossible for Puerto Rican workers to maintain even a minimum level of health and decency against a cost of living that is higher than on the mainland; and

Whereas thousands of Puerto Rican workers are annually driven from the island in search of a living wage as a result of the miserably low wages; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States committed a great injustice in 1949 when, after raising the mainland minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour, no comparable adjustment was made for Puerto Rico, and since this failure of Congress in the past has created an even greater differential between mainland and island wages; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States has passed a bill to raise the mainland minimum to $1 and to raise the Puerto Rican minimum wage so that the differential between minima in Puerto Rico and on the mainland shall not become even greater than at present; and

Whereas government officials in Puerto Rico—contrary to the best interests of workers in Puerto Rico and to the best interests of Puerto Rican workers on the mainland—have publicly opposed the Senate bill; and

Whereas Puerto Rico is part of the United States and its workers should not be excluded from the general benefits and progress of American labor: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this public meeting of Puerto Rican workers in New York City petition the Congress of the United States to raise the minimum wage in Puerto Rico along the lines of the Senate bill so that the workers of the island may begin to enjoy the higher standards to which they are entitled as human beings and as citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting call upon the Governor of Puerto Rico—in the best interests of the economy and the workers of the island, and in the interest of safeguarding our wage standard on the mainland—to join with us in demanding a statutory minimum-wage increase for the workers of Puerto Rico.

[From the New York Times of July 15, 1955]

BILINGUAL RALLY BACKS WAGE BILL—FIFTEEN HUNDRED PUERTO RICAN GARMENT WORKERS HERE ASK SAME RISE FOR UNITED STATES, ISLAND

(By Peter Kihss)

Fifteen hundred union members rallied in what was called the city's first meeting of Puerto Rican garment workers last night. Enthusiastically they demanded passage of a bill to raise Puerto Rican and mainland minimum wages by the same margin. This, they said, would aid island workers and safeguard mainland wage standards.

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, called the bilingual session. David Dubinsky, union president, said the cost of living in Puerto Rico was higher than in New York.

"Give Puerto Rican workers a decent wage," he demanded. * * * As long as they want to keep Puerto Rico on a starvation wage of coolie workers, Puerto Rico will become a school where people learn a trade and then go to Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York to make a living."

Asserting mainland unions had overcome "sweatshop" conditions, Mr. Dubinsky voiced fear that a widening wage gap might mean that the island "may get the work and we get the wages only on paper." The differential, he said, had doubled since 1939 so that the New York wages last year were $1.83 an hour, or $1.44 above Puerto Rican earnings.

INCREASES SUPPORTED

The meeting endorsed a Senate-passed bill that would increase the Federal mainland minimum from 75 cents to $1 an hour. It would provide a one-third increase in steps by January 1, 1958, in Puerto Rican wages that are worked out, industry by industry, by special committees.

Meanwhile, at the New York office of the Puerto Rican Labor Department, Joseph Monserrat, director, said the Commonwealth government favored improving the committee system and increasing wages when "economically feasible." But he contended the Senate bill would force rises as high as 257 percent for sweater and bathing-suit workers. The last time a flat minimum was legislated for Puerto Rico, in 1940, "it did create unemployment," he said.

Edward G. Miller, Jr., chairman of the mayor's committee on Puerto Rican affairs, conceded yesterday that he hadn't consulted the committee before writing a letter to the New York Times favoring a more flexible approach than in the Senate bill. But, in answer to protests from labor members, he asserted, "I thought it entirely consistent with everything the committee has been trying to do."

At the rally, Mr. Dubinsky asserted that mainland garment manufacturers were taking their work to Puerto Rico. He denounced a Federal Labor Department memorandum that reportedly recommended a flexible approach and described Puerto Rico as competing with Japan and the Philippines in such industries as hand-sewn needlework.

Hipolito Marcano, president of the Puerto Rican Federation of Labor, said island workers favored the Commonwealth program to attract industry by tax exemption, loans, and factory aids, but "reject starvation wages." Saby Nehama, business agent of the dressmakers local, presided and translated into Spanish speeches by Mr. Dubinsky and Representative IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, Manhattan Democrat. The latter hailed the union stand.

Airport Development Aid Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Needed: Airport Development Aid," written by Larry Cates, Air Line Pilots' Association legislative representative, and published in the magazine, the Air Line Pilot.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT AID—LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ALONE CAN'T FUND THE MANY IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED BY THE NATION'S AIRPORTS—FOR SAFETY AND PROGRESS, FEDERAL AID IS NEEDED TO MEET GROWING DEMANDS

(By Larry Cates)

Air airports are rapidly becoming the weakest link in our air transport system. Pilots see no relief in sight unless an airport development is undertaken.

From a safety and air progress standpoint, ALPA firmly supports Federal aid to airports.

ALPA's stand was outlined recently by President Sayen in a statement to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in connection with S. 1855, a bill designed to assist in the proper development of airports throughout the Nation. It would provide $63 million annually for the next 4 years for such development.

Behind ALPA's support are these facts:

Present airports are incapable of meeting even present needs efficiently and safely.

The problem will be compounded in the immediate future.

Other nations are recognizing this problem and meeting it.

Tools to do the job are necessary to maintain our safety records, and, next to planes themselves, the airports are an important tool.

Air travelers are being increasingly inconvenienced because of lack of airport development, which lack also acts as a barrier to the maximum flow of commerce.

ALPA'S POSITION

Some pertinent and condensed excerpts of Mr. Sayen's statement follow:

"The Air Line Pilots Association wishes to go on record in firm support of this statement to the Federal Airport Act, which would provide expenditures of $63 million annually over the next 4-year period for the development of our airports. * * * It is indisputable that our own present airports are incapable of meeting even our present needs efficiently and safely. In the large metro-

politan areas, many of the airport facilities are presently greatly overtaxed with resultant delays and inconvenience to the traveling public, and smaller communities are handicapped by lack of adequate airports to permit essential air services and their growth.

INDUSTRY'S GROWTH

"This problem will be compounded in the immediate future with the advent of faster and heavier aircraft and developments possible in turbine aircraft. Airport need is demonstrated by statistics showing that the airlines are rapidly moving into a key spot among common carriers with respect to the carriages of passengers. As recently as 1946, the airlines hauled only 6.5 percent of the Nation's travelers. By 1954, that figure had jumped more than four times to 28.2 percent, and this year, it is estimated that 1 out of every 3 people traveling by other means than automobile, or better than 33 percent of all travelers, will travel by plane. Further, the national business fleet of airplanes is several times larger than all the aircraft in domestic airline operation. These airplanes fly more plane miles than the scheduled airline fleet. In addition, the use of civil airports by our military fleet is constantly increasing. That the Congress orginally anticipated this growth in some measure, is evidenced by the fact that the Federal Airport Act, which this bill seeks to amend, provided the means for an appropriation of over $500 million for airport construction aid through fiscal 1955. However, concurrent with an expansion in excess of that anticipated, the Congress has appropriated less than half the amount of funds originally intended for such purpose. That this acute problem is being more adequately dealt with in other nations, is evidenced by the fact that Canada, our neighbor on the north, plans to spend $75 million on an airport development program this year.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

"The responsibility for the safe and efficient conduct of a flight resides with the pilot. The excellent record of the past few years is evidence of the fact that his obligation in this regard has been effectively assumed. However, under present conditions and with modern airplanes, this obligation is becoming increasingly difficult to fulfill. In fact, our safety record will be impossible to maintain unless we provide the pilots with adequate tools to fufill this objective.

"A major part of the solution to this problem resides in proper airport development. This development in terms of safety must include the lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, the elimination of those hazards in our approach lanes, runways of proper length and strength to accommodate the speed and weight of our transports, the proper marking of those runways to assist visual accommodation and the essential aids to navigation, such as runway approach lights and the proper instrument landing systems. One of our airline captains, with many thousands of hours experience, describes the airport approach problem as follows:

" 'Ten years ago the common weather minimum was 500 feet and one mile and the common approach speed was 90 miles per hour. Today, in some fields, we find minimums lowered to 200 feet and 1½ miles. Approach speed has risen to 150 miles per hour. True, the alinement problem is more accurately solved where ILS is available, but nevertheless, the time available for the pilot to orientate himself properly after becoming visual has decreased tremendously—40 seconds to 12 seconds.' "

INADEQUATE FACILITIES

"Airline travelers have been inconvenienced at times by the fact that the pilot could not land at a particlar airport and it became necessary to conduct the flight to an airport other than that of intended landing. However, as Mr. R. B. Rowe of the Sperry Gyroscope Co., recently said, 'This is no reflection on the professional ability of the airline pilot for he is doing the best possible job with the tools at hand. It does, however, demonstrate graphically the inadequacy of his tools.' It is a somewhat surprising fact that many of the tools to eliminate these problems are immediately available. The industry and Government have reached agreement on many matters relating to approach lighting, runway strength and dimensional standards for civil airports, runway and taxi marking, uniform requirements for runway and landing strip lighting and miscellaneous criteria relating to airport development. For example, the industry has been in agreement on a proper configuration for approach lights for over 3 years. In fact, the configuration was approved by the Air Coordinating Committee in 1953 as a national standard. At the present date only six airports have this essential aid installed. The stumbling block has been the lack of sufficient funds to procure and install the necessary improvements."

NEED CITED

"The report of the President's Airport Commission, published on May 16, 1952, called the airport problem to the attention of the Nation. A strong recommendation, that matching funds for Federal aid to airports should be implemented by adequate appropriations, was included in that report. The record aptly demonstrates that development of our air transportation system is clearly in the public interest, both from an economic and national defense standpoint. The airports of this Nation constitute the originating and terminal points of the flow of interstate air commerce and the springboards for national defense. Unless funds are immediately appropriated to assist in the development of those airports, they will become an effective barrier to a maximum flow of that commerce. In fact, a reverse trend in the use of airports is already making itself felt as evidenced by previous testimony that air carriers in the past 4 years were forced to suspend service at 88 points throughout the country because of inadequate airport conditions.

"We are very hopeful that the Congress will recognize this very obvious problem and provide the appropriations under consideration as rapidly as possible. Such appropriation will, in our opinion, fall short of answering the problem, but will serve as a proper starting point."

Louis C. Cramton: Champion of Michigan's FEP Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1955, in special ceremonies, Gov. G. Mennen Williams signed into law Michigan's fair employment practice bill. We, of Michigan, are exceedingly proud that our State legislature has through legislative mandate declared, confirmed, and evoked to practice the democratic principle of equality of opportunity. It is a paramount victory for democracy and in the words of our great Governor shall witness "the end of morally indefensible and economically wasteful hiring policies."

In this victory, the gratitude of the people of Michigan is fullheartedly extended to Representative Louis C. Cramton, Republican, of Lapeer, Mich., who was sponsorer and champion of the FEPC bill. The Honorable Mr. Cramton, a former United States Congressman representing the Seventh District of Michigan and a former circuit judge, stated that the principle of FEPC was burned into him by a friend he met in Washington, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University. As a Congressman, Mr. Cramton helped prepare the Federal budget for Howard and when he came back to Michigan, he said, he made up his mind he could not let his old friend down.

The enactment of FEPC legislation in a major industrial center such as Michigan is of great import to the Nation and to the world in its example of leadership in the realization of democratic concepts. The major issues which face our Nation today on a worldwide basis are concerned with human rights so that this action in Lansing, Mich., is of national and international consequence.

In recognition of this service, the Michigan civil liberties department of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World in its State convention civil liberties program, held on June 17 in Saginaw, Mich., presented its 1955 annual award for outstanding public service to Representative Cramton. In the representative's absence, his son Leo Cramton, of Midland, Mich., received the award from Lt. Gov. Philip A. Hart.

The following letters and telegrams tell the story of this momentous occasion. I ask unanimous consent to include them in the RECORD:

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
Congressman,
House of Representatives:

Many thanks for the invitation. The answer is "Yes." Am grateful for the opportunity.

PHILIP A. HART,
Lieutenant Governor.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
House Office Building:

I appreciate very greatly the honor you suggest but present commitments take me out of the State on June 7 and I will be in Miami on June 17. I particularly appreciate this suggestion from you. With my best wishes.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Lansing, Mich., June 2, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am so appreciative of the honor suggested in your telegram which I have just received and your personal congratulations on the passage of our fair employment practices legislation, that I desire to write you more fully this letter following my telegram.

Mrs. Cramton went to Miami, Fla., by air 2 weeks ago with a definite promise on my part that I would drive down immediately after the close of the session to spend a little time with her in Miami and then drive her back to Michigan.

It is for that reason that I am leaving Lapeer next Tuesday morning to drive to

Miami and do not expect to be again in Michigan until about the end of June. I greatly appreciate the honor suggested and the invitation you extend to attend the State convention of the Elks at Saginaw June 17, but it is impossible.

I think you will be interested to know that I consider the bill as it goes to the Governor a very good one with sufficient authority to enable the Commission to render great service to the State.

With best wishes, I remain

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS C. CRAMTON.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, June 2, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
Michigan State Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLEY: Thanks ever so much for your kind invitation to attend the civil-liberties program of the State Elks convention on Friday evening, June 17, in Saginaw.

It would indeed be a real pleasure to be on hand for this fine event and I certainly wish it were possible for me to do so. Unfortunately, however, previously arranged plans will take me to Detroit that night.

With every good wish for a most successful program.

Sincerely,

———,
Governor.

R. F. BAXTER,
General Chairman, Elks Michigan State Convention, IBPOE of W, care of Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church:

Please extend my personal good wishes to all attending your annual State convention for a most successful and enjoyable get-together. Sincerely regret unable to be with you.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor of Michigan.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS,
Member of Congress,
Bethel AME Church,
Saginaw, Mich.:

Please convey to the assembled group my sincere good wishes and my personal congratulations to Judge Cramton, a great champion of the people.

PAT MCNAMARA,
United States Senator.

Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World,
Care of Bethlemy Church:

Please extend my congratulations to Representative Cramton upon his receiving the civil-liberties award. The judge has a fine record of service to all the citizens of Michigan.

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

Congress CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
Saginaw, Mich.:

Award to Judge Louis Cramton for contributions to civil rights by the civil liberties department of IBPOE of W is in keeping with highest traditions of Elkdom.

Fraternally,

State Senator CORA M. BROWN.

Congressman CHARLES C. DIGGS,
Elks Convention,
Civil Liberties Committee,
Saginaw, Mich.:

Congratulations to the committee and Representative Cramton on a great and courageous job in the interests of FEPC. Your work was outstanding. It expressed the sentiments of right-thinking people everywhere.

Representative JAMES BRADLEY,
Of Detroit.

Michigan Civil Liberties Committee of the Elks of Michigan, Saginaw, Mich.
Attention: Congressman CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.

Congratulations on your fine and timely recognition of Judge Louis Cramton. He is perhaps the outstanding legislator of this age. All Michigan is proud of him.

CHARLES M. DIGGS,
State Representative.

Congressman CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
Saginaw, Mich.:

Chairman of Michigan Civil Liberties Committee permit me to extend to you and your organization greetings. Sorry I cannot join you in paying tribute to Representative Louis Cramton with whom I have had the privilege of working for more than 6 years. I have learned to respect and admire him for the great leadership he has attained in his more than 50 years of public service. I admire him for his vigor and sincerity through humiliation to carry through with a fight to bring to the minorities by law and equal opportunity in employment regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. May God bless and keep him.

EDGAR CURRIE,
State Representative.

Congressman CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.
Chairman, IBPOE Civil Liberties Committee, Saginaw, Mich.:

I wish to congratulate you for the untiring effort you put forth as chairman of the Civil Liberties Committee, enabling the State of Michigan to have an FEPC law. I personally know you were one of the guiding forces behind Representative Cramton in securing the passage of this law. Please express my best wishes to the officers and delegates for a successful convention. My best wishes for your continued success.

Representative ROGER TOWNSEND.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
LANSING, MICH., *July 6, 1955.*

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIGGS: My son has reported to me fully on the honor given me even in my absence at the State Elks convention at Saginaw, and I very deeply regret that it was impossible for me to be there.

I assume that the award was set forth in a resolution or a citation. I very much desire to have a copy of such resolution or citation if it is possible.

Kay mentioned also some messages that were read at the convention and these I would like or copies of them for my files. I will greatly appreciate anything you can do to aid me in these matters.

I had hoped that the success of our campaign in enacting an FEPC law in this outstanding industrial State might be of material aid in the general battle against racial discrimination in the Nation, but little, if any, notice seems to have been taken of it by Congress or the press of the National Capital. I trust, however, that this very definite forward step by our State will have some effect in your national struggle.

Governor Williams used five pens in signing the new law which became Public Act 251 of 1955. He gave one to me and I sent that one on to my friend, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, at Howard University, whose friendship has meant so much to me.

I wish to express to you and your civil liberties committee and to your Elks' State organization my deepest appreciation of the honor given me and thank you.

With best wishes, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS C. CRAMTON.

Report on Moral Rearmament Trip Through Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day I received a copy of a letter from a friend of mine, Bill Grogan, a very great labor leader from Florida. He has been traveling with the Moral Rearmament Group in the Far East. He is peeking into scenes which none of us have had the pleasure of looking at. He is becoming acquainted with world situations by mingling with leaders and common people. The letter which I hold in my hand is a very interesting document, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON MRA TRIP THROUGH ASIA: No. 4

DEAR FRIENDS: The journey continues and after many touching scenes of farewell, we left Japan and winged our way toward Formosa. Formosa looks beautiful from the air—it's a mountainous country and is a beautiful verdant green. When we arrived at the airport we were stunned at all the elaborate preparations that were made to receive us. Crowds with banners at the airport, and all the roads were garlanded with flowers with banners across the streets with MRA slogans on them.

Gen. Ho Ying-chin, chairman of the Military Strategy Board, and wartime commander of the Chinese Army (he was the general who accepted the Japanese surrender for China and later he presented the sword which was surrendered to Dr. Buchmann, the founder of MRA) received us at a banquet for 400 people where he said, "This visit is unprecedented in the history of China, or, for that matter, I believe, to any other Asian nation before."

President Chiang Kai-shek gave a reception for us the next day and later the Prime Minister followed suit. I could not begin to quote the many speeches and statements made by all of the Government, civic, educational, business, and labor groups, who all lauded MRA and the sentiment is pretty well summed up by the editorial in the China Post which stated, "With the flashing clarity of an electric bolt from the heavens, a new group has appeared on the world scene. Moral rearmament, a unified mission of world peoples, has made itself known and its power is rapidly being felt over more and more of the world's surface. Free China, ready to join forces with the principles of MRA, stands as a springboard from which this new force may stride into the world and gain its objective of world peace and understanding. They have set up a great global strategy which is aimed at destroying the misunderstandings and differences which exist."

Chiang Kai-shek, after praising the aid received from United States of America said this moral aid was even greater because it

had raised the morale of the people as well as affecting all of the top officials in political and military life.

As you lived in Formosa, you had the sickening feeling that war was not too far away and that you never knew when the spark would flash that would ignite the next holocaust of war. The feeling lent real urgency and awareness to our mission. As a matter of fact, the day after we left Formosa, the Reds shot down a civilian plane and two MIGS were shot down in retaliation. As I see it now, the complacency in America is frightening and in the mad race of materialism, we are too engrossed in our own selfish personal interests to pause for a moment and give thought to the powerkegs that surround us.

After we left Formosa, I was convinced that we had penetrated every phase of community life in that island, and given those people the answer to the rebirth of a free China, with a people living and government based on observance of moral standards.

When we arrived in the Philippines, the mayor of Manila turned out all the city officials as well as a colorful crowd of young people dressed in the native costumes. After they had sung songs of welcome to us and our MRA chorus had reciprocated, we were whisked into town from the airport with a police escort with sirens at full blast and off we were to a new round of activities in Manila.

The pace is backbreaking and there is no letup. I thought I was used to long hours but this is the limit. We start about 7 a. m., and get back to our rooms after 12 midnight when the show is over, and no day off either. However, it really is wonderful how everyone works and gives everything they've got. It's amazing to be with a crowd where there is no trouble with drink, girls, or bickering, where everyone works as if the very world depended on him—inspired living—if we could get this devotion and dedication into political and trade-union activities, we'd really have something—and the amazing truth is that it is possible to achieve. But, there's an awful amount of personal change needed first—especially with a guy like me.

After the first flush of welcome died down, it looked as if we had a crisis on our hands, as the newspapers carried some statements allegedly made by the Catholic archbishop. This carried real significance as I was amazed to learn that the Philippines are 95 percent Roman Catholics. However, after a lot of confusion, I cut through to the source and was delighted to learn from the archbishop himself, that he had nothing against MRA and we had quite a good time with him.

President Magsaysay received us at the palace, and told us he was convinced that the principles of MRA were good and do work, referring in particular to our principle of absolute love among mankind and how to win over your enemies through real caring for them, he told us how he was opposed and ridiculed when he proposed to extend the hand of friendship to the Huks (Communists) in the mountains and his offer of amnesty—a piece of land—medical aid and food. Some people insisted "Kill the Communists," but he pointed out he knew that hungry bellies were the reason that made these people Communists and when he made his offer to them, over 9,000 surrendered and today, virtually only a handful of Huks remain in the mountains. He made a good point when he said, "You have to find out what made the patient sick and then cure the sickness—don't kill the patient."

It was heartening to hear a man like this putting our theory into practice. As he put it, "We've won these people over to us by being their friends and recognizing their needs and caring for them." That's MRA in action.

Some of us stay in the Manila Hotel, and they say from where you stand in the lobby you can look out on a big green where 106,000 Filipinos were killed in the last war. From the side of the hotel you can look over Manila Bay, where the hulks of sunken vessels stick out of the water. There were 73 Japanese vessels sunk in the bay. (The United States lost 150 planes sinking those 73 ships.) Across the bay you see Corregidor and Bataan. Yes, there are plenty of mementos of the war, and when you talk to the Philippine people about peace they know and appreciate what you are talking about.

The play is packed out each night, and the people really show their warm appreciation. On the opening night in Manila the Japanese team were on the stage, and when they were introduced an angry murmur swelled from the crowd when they heard the Japanese language. When Hoshizima, who is the supreme adviser to the Japanese Government and is assigned by the Premier to represent the Japanese Government on the team, spoke and told the audience that he wanted to apologize to the Philippine people for all the wrongs and horrors they brought to them, and humbly asked their forgiveness—a spontaneous "No"—but then just as quick they shouted "Yes," and burst out into a real wave of applause. What a thrilling experience.

One of the men on the Japanese team is Nakajima. He was one of the human torpedoes, and later that evening he confessed he was really scared to appear before that audience, and, frankly, under the circumstances, I would have been, too. However, this humble apology did an awful lot to heal the breach between these two nations who were former enemies. It was repeated over the radio and to Government officials, and the response guarantees unity between two more of our allies in the free world block.

The Philippine Government has officially assigned Congressman Limm to accompany the team on the rest of the mission representing the Philippine Government. It's great how the team picks up strength as we move along.

The team is leaving Manila today, bound for Bangkok, Thailand. However, it splits and another group, including my wife and I, goes to Saigon, Indochina, and then to Singapore, Malaya Peninsula. We'll then meet up again in Rangoon.

The Vice President gave a reception last night for us to celebrate a truly inspired Fourth of July. It was a stirring occasion. I stumble around trying to find words to explain things as they happen on this trip, and I know I'm totally inadequate. However, I'm enclosing a column from the Manila Evening News which tells a little about our play and the impact of our work. I hope you like it, as it says things much better than I can.

With all best wishes from your traveling salesman,

Sincerely,

BILL GROGAN.

Control of Bank Holding Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Banking of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on July 14, 1955, on bank holding company legislation, may be of interest to our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the privilege of coming here this morning and hope that I may contribute something of value to your deliberations.

I do not have a prepared statement but with your permission will submit a complete statement to be made part of the record.

Senator FREAR. Without objection, it will be made part of the record, sir.

Mr. MULTER. I am presumptuous enough to come here and think that I can be of some help to the committee, not merely because as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House I sat through the same hearing that you are conducting. I either heard or read every bit of evidence submitted there. I have read, I believe, almost every word of evidence submitted to this committee thus far by officials of our Government. I have read, I believe, almost every word that was submitted to the Judiciary Committee of the House by officials of our Government on the question of merger and consolidation of banks.

In addition, I bring to bear my own experience of some thirty-odd years of practice of the law in the city of New York, where much of my work has been devoted to representing banks, insurance companies, finance companies, and business enterprises of almost every nature.

The bill before you, I believe, is of tremendous importance. I, like many others, have from time to time said that I am not opposed to big corporations or big banks just because they are big, but as a result of all of this testimony I think we must amend our vocabulary, or at least the use of it, to a certain extent and possibly borrow from the motion-picture industry their words "stupendous" and "colossal" when we talk about bigness in the banking industry. I think we must differentiate between the "stupendous" and the "colossal" and the "big."

Without spending too much time on the philosophy behind the necessity for this legislation, I believe that everybody will agree that one thing that will lead to nationalization of our banks and the banking industry would be a concentration of wealth and a concentration of credit power. I think that is the history of nationalization of the Bank of England. That is what happened there. If we review the history of what they did in Russia, you will recall what happened when the Kerensky government was driven out by the Bolsheviks whom we now know as the Soviets. They tried to nationalize their banks and insurance companies and industries.

They very soon saw they could not just move in and take everything over, so they gave those enterprises back to private industry but concentrated each industry in the hands of a few. And after the enterprises got working smoothly in the hands of the few, the government was then able to walk back in and nationalize. And that is the way they operate there and in almost every satellite country.

I am sure that no member either of this committee or of the Congress wants to see anything like that happen. But it can happen here if we do not do something to prevent the concentration of economic power in the hands of the few.

Now, it is not necessary in order to support the bill that is before you or any one of the bills before you to determine that holding companies in and of themselves are bad or have done bad things, but if the potential for evil is there, then I think we must legislate on the subject.

May I recall to you that in 1945 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation issued a

unanimous report, and they said this with reference to holding companies, and I quote:

"Holding companies not only tend to become monopolistic but increase the problem of supervision. The ease with which assets may be transferred from one affiliated corporate unit to another and the possibility of the manipulation of the accounts of these enterprises make adequate examination of affiliated banks and the appraisal of their condition and capital position extremely difficult. The Corporation," meaning FDIC, "recommends that Congress enact legislation which will prohibit the future creation of holding companies and which will require the liquidation of existing holding companies after allowing a reasonable time for orderly distribution to their own stockholders of the bank stock which they now hold. The Corporation," meaning again FDIC, "believes that such legislation is distinctly preferable to the enactment of further regulatory laws in the bank holding company field."

There is some division of opinion in the FDIC today. That was a unanimous report. None of the legislation proposed now goes as far as that recommendation.

The legislation now before you does not recommend the complete liquidation of holding companies, but it does seek to regulate them both as they exist today and as they may exist in the future, as they may attempt to expand in the future, and I think that that is important.

One reason I believe that the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency and the FDIC have not heretofore come in strongly urging regulatory legislation—and I get this from reading all of their testimony before this committee as well as before our committee on the House side and before the Judiciary Committee—I think might best be expressed in the words of Mr. Gidney, the Comptroller of the Currency, when testifying before the Judiciary Committee. He said in so many words that he was not always conscious of and indicated that he is not familiar with the antitrust legislation on our statute books. In his entire testimony there—and I think it is reflected by his testimony here and that too of Mr. Martin as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—there has been no attempt on the part of any of those Government officials, either the Comptroller of the Currency's Office, the FDIC, or the Federal Reserve Board, to examine into the extent to which holding companies evade the banking laws.

You will remember that there was written into the law provisions giving jurisdiction to the Federal Reserve Board to review those matters and take action with reference to any possible attempts to create a trust or monopoly in the banking field. There has not been a single recommendation all through the years by the Federal Reserve Board to the Attorney General for prosecution in that field. There has not been a single attempt all through the years by the Federal Reserve Board to do anything or, for that matter, by the Comptroller of the Currency to attempt to restrain expansion of banks. Not a single application for permission to merge or consolidate has been disapproved by either of them.

Now, what did I mean when I said a few moments ago that there has been an evasion of the banking laws? If the principle that is written into the statute is a good one, I think this must determine what you will do with this legislation. There has been writen into the State laws and into our national laws that banks should be restricted to banking, that they should not engage in any other business enterprises, and, further, that banks should be restricted to operating within the geographic limits of their own States. Neither State banks nor national banks under those laws are permitted to engage in any business except the banking business, and they are restricted to acting within their own States.

Now, if those principles are good, then you must enact this holding-company bill with restrictions that will apply the same way to bank holding companies. If they are bad or we do not agree with them any longer, then let's change the law and let's say banks can engage in any other enterprise and let's say they can spread out over the country and across State lines. But if we are going to adhere to those principles as they now exist in the law, then you must implement them by this bill.

The testimony as submitted shows that a bank holding company can go into my State or your State or any place in the union and qualify their dummies by buying stock for them.

Their applications to the Comptroller of the Currency show that a bank holding company—now let me strike out the word "bank"—that a holding company, because many of these holding companies do more than just banking business, will go into a community and using all of their own funds will recruit the personnel, stockholders, and directors and organize a bank, and the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation all have gone along with that practice.

Now, again, if the statute is intended to mean what it says—it says that only individuals may be organizers of banks and only individuals may be directors who own enough stock to qualify them. True, it is a minimum; it is only a thousand dollars. But if the statute means what it says—that only individuals can organize banks and the individual directors must own qualifying shares—then I say to you that the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency have been permitting through the years evasion of that statute. They have told us that when a holding company comes in with an application to organize a bank it sets forth the fact in its application that "we will put up all the capital and we will control this bank," and they get approval and open up new banks that way.

And, what is worse, they open new banks where branches have been denied to existing banks.

Again, if the law is intended to mean what it says, then we must see that it is enforced that way and that individuals from the community, as intended, are the majority of the owners of the bank and individuals from the community are the directors who will exercise their independent judgment.

I say to you, with all due deference to the gentlemen who testified here, that they were less than frank with you, Senator DOUGLAS, and with you, Senator LEHMAN, when in answer to your questions about option stock they did not tell you the full facts.

The fact of the matter is that in most instances of holding companies controlling the directorate, either they have the stock assigned back to them by the director, the qualifying shares, or they take from him an agreement requiring him to sell that stock back to them any time they want to buy it back. Not only must he sell it back to them when he resigns and ceases to be a director, but his agreement requires that he sell it back to them whenever they call upon him to do so.

Senator DOUGLAS. Would you pause for just a minute?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. May I ask the clerk of the committee, Mr. Yingling, whether the Comptroller of the Currency has furnished the material on the so-called stock-option plan which I requested him to furnish, and which he promised to provide?

Mr. YINGLING. I do not believe it has come in yet.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest this: That the committee immediately request, by telegram or otherwise, the Comptroller of the Currency to immediately transmit this material. He has now had 10 days in which to furnish it.

Senator FREAR. Is there any objection?

Would you first like to have the clerk of the committee call and see what the prospects are?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes.

Senator FREAR. Then if it is not forthcoming we will follow your instruction.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; that will be all right. (See p. 93.)

Mr. MULTER. You will be told by representatives of the bank holding companies, I am sure, as we were told in our committee, that they make sure that the directors are out of the community and exercise their independent judgment. But I am sure that you will agree with me that any director sitting on a board of directors of a bank or of any other organization who can sit there only as long as he owns some stock and who can sit there only so long as the owner of the stock does not require him to turn it over, either with or without a return, either with or without getting the thousand dollars, which may have been advanced by him or may have been advanced by the holding company for him, the man's job is dependent upon the owner of the stock who controls his right to sit there, and whether he does it consciously or unconsciously he looks to his boss to find out what policies he wants followed.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Senator FREAR. Senator DOUGLAS.

Senator DOUGLAS. Congressman, these are very interesting statements that you are making. Have you developed the facts behind these statements as a result of hearings in the House or your own independent investigation?

Mr. MULTER. I think that the hearings on the House side will substantiate to a large part what I have said, and my own experience in the field substantiates those facts, too.

I am sure that very few holding company representatives will dispute the fact that somehow or other, either through the option to buy or an out-and-out agreement they have the right to buy back the stock of the director. Once they buy a director's stock, they do not have to wait for an annual meeting. There is a vacancy immediately. The directorship is vacant once he surrenders his stock.

You will be told, as I have indicated, that these directors are left on their own, that they are free to exercise their own free judgment. Well, I say no man can exercise his own free judgment when he knows he is subject to removal by a call for his stock.

Senator FREAR. Senator DOUGLAS, the Congressman when he started his testimony said that he would give to this committee a full statement, which I am sure will substantiate the remarks he made.

Mr. MULTER. Yes; I will indicate it with examples wherever I can, sir.

Now, with that background, and having in mind the extensive hearings that have heretofore been conducted by this committee in prior years, I think everyone will agree that this legislation is essential, and I think we then must come to what form it shall take.

Your staff has done a very fine piece of work in the preparation of their tabular comparison for the use of your committee. I ask permission to have a copy of it and have it in front of me. I would like to now address myself briefly to a few of the dif-

ferences between the bills that are before you that were introduced on the Senate side and the bill as passed by the House.

I start with the definition. We thought on the House side we were following the practice originally laid down by the Federal Reserve Board when we put into the definition the words which meant that a holding company owning a single bank would be exempted from the provisions of the act. We did that because under the limited jurisdiction the Federal Reserve Board has had through the years to control holding companies, and that was in their granting them a permit to vote the bank stock which they owned if they applied for it when they wanted to vote the stock. The Federal Reserve Board through the years has made a blanket exemption in favor of all holding companies that owned a single bank.

Possibly we should have inquired more closely into why they did it and whether there was a good reason for it. Instead, we proceeded on the assumption that there was good reason behind it, and that is why we exempted in our bill, in the House bill, holding companies that own a single bank.

Senator FREAR. Well, Congressman, in your experience do you think that the bill that came from the House is quite an appropriate and a proper one? In other words, do you believe that single banks should be exempted?

Mr. MULTER. I would not raise any serious objection to a single bank owned by a holding company, that is, the holding company which owns a single bank, coming within the jurisdiction or under the provisions of the laws.

Senator FREAR. Giving the Federal Reserve the authority to exempt it?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator FREAR. I mean your experience has not proven anything but what you would go along with that?

Mr. MULTER. I cannot think of a single instance where it is needed. But, of course, what will apply to 2 banks may very well apply to 1 bank. But where we are talking about the concentration of power, economic power, across State lines in the main, and going into nonbanking businesses, I do not think it applies as much to a holding company owning a single bank as it does to the ones that own more than one bank.

But I can easily see where it can be developed and might become the implement of evading the statute.

As I say, if it is going to engage in business other than the banking business, let it divest itself of its bank interest and engage in any business it pleases other than banking. But if it is going to be in the banking business, it should be solely in the banking business and divest itself of other business interests. It could easily become an implement of evasion of the statute where a corporation does own other interests and also own a single bank. That probably could happen only where branch banking is permitted.

Now, there have been some instances where, for instance, the Grace Line owns a single bank, and there are other companies of the same kind. A company would open a bank because nobody else would come into the area and open it, and they needed it for the convenience of their own customers in the area who could not otherwise get banking facilities, or they needed it for the convenience of their own employees.

Now, the philosophy of that I am not going to argue, but I can see that in those instances it is good and rendering a public service. But I also can see that there may be instances where it will be used for evasion.

So I think if you give the Federal Reserve Board, so far as members of the Federal Reserve System, or the Comptroller of the Currency, or the FDIC as to State banks which are insured but are not otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve Board the right to say yes or no to the holding company that owns the single bank, I think we may close a possible loophole.

But I do not think that you do violence to the principle if you should exempt the holding company that owns a single bank.

Now, the next provision is on the question of exemptions. The Federal Reserve Board indicated that they wanted no discretion with reference to this particular matter and preferred that you set forth precisely who should be exempt and who should not be exempt and indicated their objections to various exemptions.

In S. 2350 you have a provision requiring corporations owning a majority of the stock, while in the bill as passed by the House it has less than a majority of the outstanding stock. As far back as 1947 the distinguished ranking minority member, who was then chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Wolcott, introduced a bill in which he provided that as little as 10 percent of ownership of bank stock should make them subject to this bill. I think what he had in mind was that one large holding company which crosses State lines, engages in both business enterprises and banking, with as little as 11 percent of the outstanding stock, controls the election of directors. And that is possible because, as we know, many stockholders neither sign proxies nor attend annual meetings at which the directors are elected, and once a quorum is established a majority of the quorum elects.

That is why I think it is important that the House bill provision be continued or be adopted by this body, which will permit the supervising agencies to determine whether or not there is actual control of the bank even though there is less than a majority of the stock owned by the holding company. Without that kind of provision, you will not reach the holding companies that you want to reach under this bill.

Going to item 5 as listed in the comparative analysis, you have a provision in S. 2350 which does not appear in the House bill. I think it should be incorporated in the House bill. That provides for a merger or consolidation of bank holding companies with any other bank holding company being prohibited without approval of the Board. That is the provision that is in S. 2350. It does not appear in either of the other two bills. Frankly, I think it was overlooked. No one on the House side suggested that that provision be inserted. I think it belongs in the bill or you will have evasion of the principle.

I noted that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board indicated that there was no need to have a provision in this bill, and there is none in S. 2350, requiring approval of the Board before acquisition of bank assets. I think that is as important a provision as acquisition of bank stocks. As a matter of fact, the matter was pointed up very strongly when the Congress enacted, the amendment to the antitrust laws, so as to include acquisition of assets as well as stock.

At the present time I think the House Judiciary Committee is ready to report a bill which will have the same restriction as to banks. There is now a restriction in the Clayton Act against acquiring bank stocks if it is going to lessen competition. We seek to amend the law and I trust it will pass both Houses so it will apply also to acquisition of assets.

If that principle is good there, it is just as important that it be applied to the holding companies.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Senator FREAR. Senator DOUGLAS.

Senator DOUGLAS. In other words, what you are saying is that you should apply to the bank holding companies the same principle as in the Celler-Kefauver Act, for industrial companies?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir. And I believe there is a similar bill on this side now as to acquisition of bank assets, which is similar to the Celler bill on the other side which is about to be reported there.

Senator LEHMAN. May I ask a question even thought I am not a member of the subcommittee?

Senator FREAR. Surely, Senator LEHMAN.

Senator LEHMAN. As to these large mergers that have taken place in New York over the last few years, how were they effected? Was that through a purchase of the stock or through the acquisition of the assets of one bank by the other?

Mr. MULTER. It is my recollection, Senator, that it was done mainly by stock acquisition. And where informal representations were made that they could not do it on the national level because they involved a national bank and the Federal authorities might oppose it, they did it on the State level and became a State bank and got out of the national bank system.

But there it was done I believe in the main by stock purchase. But it can be just as easily accomplished by acquisition of the bank assets.

Since testifying before your committee, on July 15, 1955, United States Deputy Comptroller of the Currency Jennings, told the House Banking and Currency Committee that in 1954 there were voluntary liquidations of 58 banks after their assets were sold. I believe a large part of that was by State banks taking over the assets of national banks in order to evade the necessity of getting approval to merge or consolidate.

Now I pass on to item No. 8 in the comparative analysis. There we have the Federal Reserve Board, and I believe the FDIC chairmen also, recommending that the Board shall be required to consider the views of the interested State and Federal agencies before approving an acquisition of bank stock or assets by a holding company, while in the House bill, which is the same in large part as S. 880, before approving the acquisition of bank stock the Board must notify the Comptroller of the Currency as to national banks, and if he vetoes it that is the end of it. As to State banks it must notify the State banking authority, and if the State banking authority says "No," the Board would go no further.

I think that the provision in S. 2350 giving discretion to the Federal Reserve Board to review and take into account what the Comptroller of the Currency may say or what the State superintendent of banks may say in a particular instance and merely consider it is a bad provision.

You must bear in mind that what we have tried to do is keep the dual system a dual system.

If a State banking authority says, "This State bank subject to our State laws and our State supervision should remain a State bank and should not become part of a holding company," I do not think the Federal Reserve Board should be vested with the power to override that. And if the Comptroller of the Currency is properly vested with the right to say when a new bank should be organized and when it may or may not have branch banks, then the Federal Reserve Board shou'd not be in a position to overrule that as to holding companies. If these authorities have decided that a bank does not need another branch or there should not be another national bank in an area, the bank holding company device should not be availed of to get around that kind of a ruling, and it has been done many times.

In many instances where the Comptroller of the Currency has ruled or a State banking authority has ruled there is no need for any additional banking facility in a particular area, that decision has been evaded by the device of the bank holding company. If we are to maintain the right of a State to supervise its State institutions and the right of

the Comptroller of the Currency to determine when and where new banks should be organized, then we must give them the same right as to bank holding companies.

Now, it may be that it will be necessary to have very sympathetic administration to accomplish the legislative intent, but I think in writing the principles we should assume we will get sympathetic administration of the principles that we write into the bill.

Senator DOUGLAS. Congressman, it is sometimes said that one reason why the veto power being given to the State bank authority in the case of State banks and the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of national banks is preferable to ultimate discretion and decision on the part of the Federal Reserve Board is that the Federal Reserve Board is not as solicitous about small banks as the local banking authorities would be at least in the case of State banks. What do you think of that contention?

Mr. MULTER. I think there is much substance to the charge, Senator, that the smaller banks do not get the same consideration as the big banks.

Senator DOUGLAS. From the Federal Reserve?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. I am of the opinion that the Federal Reserve Board entirely overlooked their duties as imposed upon them by the Clayton Act through the years until the clamor arose against bank mergers and bank consolidations as they are happening in the present era. I think they entirely overlooked the fact that they had the right to say "There shall be no merger or no consolidation because of the provisions of the Clayton Act." Their entire tendency as indicated by their constant approvals, their failure to stand up and say, "No, this merger shan't go through, and that consolidation shan't go through," indicates a sympathy for the colossus, for the stupendous, in the banking industry.

Senator DOUGLAS. In justice to Mr. Eccles, however, should it not be said when he was Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve he called attention to the danger of bank companies and did his best to check at least some of the difficulties in that field?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; you are quite right that he did, sir. I think his was the lone voice in the Federal Reserve Board on the subject.

Senator DOUGLAS. And in recent years the ardor of the Federal Reserve Board has diminished on this subject?

Mr. MULTER. I think you are right, Senator?

I have not taken the time to indicate the tremendous concentration of banking in the various cities as a result of these mergers and consolidations, because I am sure your record is already full of it and will be filled even more before your hearings close. But there cannot be any doubt that there is an overconcentration of banking within large units in the various metropolitan communities.

I think back in 1900 four banks controlled 20 percent of the deposits and assets in the city of New York, and today 4 banks in New York City control more than 60 percent.

Senator DOUGLAS. Excluding mutuals?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, excluding mutuals. You have the same thing in Philadelphia. You have the same thing in Washington, D. C. Through the holding company device you have the same thing throughout the entire country, and I do not think it is good for the economy of the country.

Senator DOUGLAS. May I interrupt for a few minutes?

Senator FREAR. Yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. Congressman MULTER, may I ask you another question?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. It is sometimes said that the holding company device is only a fraction of the problem of concentration of economic power in banking. That in addition you have the problem of branches, you have the problem of mergers, you have this curious problem of trusteeship which affects one State, personal trusteeship, and therefore we should spend our time on these other problems rather than take up bank-holding companies. What do you say to that, Congressman?

Mr. MULTER. I say all of the problems are part of an overall problem. They all require our attention. I think we should give them as much attention as possible, but we should not say, "Let's push this bill aside now and take up a bill dealing with some other segment of our economy."

Let's take them one at a time and do the best we can with each of them as we go along and eventually try to correct the entire situation as it affects the overall economy.

With reference to that specific matter, I think it is important to emphasize that with the strengthening of the antitrust laws so far as banks, bank stocks and bank acquisitions are concerned, and if our Federal agencies will now be alerted to their duty to step in and make sure that there are no violations of the antitrust law—and the whole history of it up to date shows that there has been no attempt to look at this situation up to the present moment so far as banks are concerned with any view as to whether or not they will be monopolistic or in violation of the antitrust laws—the minute we strengthen those laws and the minute our enforcement agencies begin to look into this situation of bank-stock acquisition and bank-asset acquisition and begin to bring to bear the full force of the antitrust laws, then bank holding companies must become the device to evade the law unless we enact a bill such as this. They can accomplish the identical thing through the bank holding company that you are seeking to prevent by regulating bank acquisitions and bank-stock acquisition.

Senator FREAR. Senator BENNETT.

Senator BENNETT. I have been puzzled by a statement you made, Mr. MULTER, a little while ago, and I would like to have you clear it up.

As I understand it, you testified that if the State banking authorities decided that a particular area could not support another State bank and if the Comptroller of the Currency decided that the same area could not support a national bank, the bank holding company device could be used, presumably, to get another bank into the area. I would like to know how that can be worked.

Mr. MULTER. It can be worked only with the cooperation of the Comptroller of the Currency or the State authority.

Senator BENNETT. Well, that clears it up. It is impossible for the device by itself to put a bank in there. That seems to me obvious.

So it is your point then that the bank holding company has sufficient improper power that it can exert influence on the Comptroller or on the State banking authority to persuade them to put a bank holding bank in where they would not put a privately operated bank in?

Mr. MULTER. Let's not say "improper" but say "they have enough influence." And let me make this clear: If both the Comptroller of the Currency and the State banking authority were in agreement that there should be neither a State bank nor a national bank in the area, I do not think the holding company could get in with a new bank. But if the State banking authority says there is no need for another banking facility here and by that they do not mean another national bank or another State bank but they mean there is no need for an additional banking facility either national or State they still have no right to tell the Comptroller of the Currency what to do and they can only recommend to him what to do. The State will turn the application down, as has happened in New York State many times. The banking authority, the banking superintendent, has gone in and made a complete study and he said, "There is no need for an additional banking facility in this area." Then the same people came down to the Comptroller of the Currency and got a new national bank charter or another existing national bank in the area got a new branch bank from the Comptroller of the Currency.

Sometimes it has happened just the other way. The Comptroller of the Currency has said, "You do not need another bank there, national or State." But he has no right to tell the State authority what to do.

Senator BENNETT. Is not that situation inherent in our dual banking system?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; and I say keep that inherent in the bank holding company situation by continuing to give the State authority the right to say whether a bank holding company which is a State corporation may come in. There are no national holding corporations. None of them are chartered by the Federal Reserve Board or the Comptroller of the Currency or by any Federal statute. They are creatures of the State. And if a State says, as it has a right to say, "We want no holding company in here," or "We want our holding companies regulated in accordance with the same way we regulate our banks," then we should let the State do that as to the State institutions.

Senator BENNETT. I do not think this bill changes that; does it?

Mr. MULTER. S. 2350 says that the Federal Reserve Board will review the matter, having in mind the recommendations of the State authority, but it gives the Federal Reserve Board the right to overrule the State banking authority if the Board so desires, and I say that is wrong.

Senator BENNETT. Well, I have got to get straightened out on that one step deeper. If the State authority says no bank, no State bank, should go in this area and the Comptroller agrees with him and says that no national bank should go in this area, then the Federal Reserve has no power to overrule either of those or both of those and put a bank in there just because it is owned by a holding company; does it?

Mr. MULTER. No; the Federal Reserve cannot put a bank anywhere.

Senator BENNETT. That is the point I wanted to make, and I think your testimony left the inference—at least it did with me—that there was a device that the holding company had by which it could overrule both the State and the Comptroller and get a bank in an area when these people said no bank should go in.

Mr. MULTER. No; I am sorry if I created that impression. I am very happy you called my attention to it, because I did not want to create that impression.

But I do want to make clear that the holding company device can be used to evade a State bank authority's veto of a new bank there as to the State bank. It can be used to evade on the State level, with State cooperation of course, the national bank veto.

Senator BENNETT. In other words, it can only operate through cooperation with the agency that does not refuse?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Senator BENNETT. All right.

Mr. MULTER. And I say that when the agency refuses a bank holding company the right to acquire an additional bank in its State, the Federal Reserve Board should not be able to say, "You, Mr. Holding Company, a New York State corporation, go in nevertheless and acquire a State bank in New York."

Senator BENNETT. That is a different problem.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. That is a completely different problem.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator BENNETT. We must not get them mixed up.

Mr. MULTER. No, we should not.

Senator BENNETT. All right.

Mr. MULTER. I think if I have indicated now precisely why H. R. 6227 is better than S. 2350 in that respect, I have made my point.

In other words, S. 2350 gives the Federal Reserve Board the discretion to do what it pleases with bank holding company acquisitions.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is, existing banks.

Mr. MULTER. Of existing banks, yes. And we will have to strengthen the law—it is not in this bill—so as to prohibit or at least we can say in our report that we mean the National Banking Act means exactly what it says and holding companies cannot organize new national banks as they are now permitted to do by what I call administrative misinterpretation of the law.

Now, you can write into this provision that a bank holding company shall be prohibited from organizing new banks. I think you could. It is not there now.

Senator DOUGLAS. New national banks?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Now going on to item 11 in the comparative analysis, S. 2350 provides for an exemption of companies which manage or control banks. If that language remains in any bill that is passed, you defeat the entire purpose of the bill. It is not in H. R. 6227 or S. 880, and I do not think it should be in either bill as finally passed.

Senator DOUGLAS. Would you develop that point, Congressman?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir. The language in S. 2350 will permit a company to manage a bank. Now, it is my understanding of the very principle and very purpose of this legislation that it will be to stop just that kind of activity. If the holding company without owning the stock is going to actually operate and manage the bank, you do not get the kind of personal management that the banking laws are intended to require of banks. The stockholders should elect directors responsible to them, and those directors should be men who will exercise their independent judgment in accordance with the statute and the regulations of the various regulatory bodies and their best judgment, in order to do a good banking job. If you are going to have some holding company, whether it owns the stock or not or is just hired to manage the bank, you are supplanting the discretion and the judgment of the individual directors by some other authority that is not responsive to the stockholders.

If our theory is that bank directors should run the bank and be responsible for the exercise of their own discretion and judgment, then you cannot countenance any other company being called in to manage or operate the bank.

Oh, yes, when it gets into difficulty and FDIC must come in to supervise and try to bring it back to a solvent position or prevent it going into insolvency, you have a different situation, but there it is a Government agency coming in and saying what should be done. It is not some private company.

Senator BENNETT. Then that is a weakness of H. R. 6227 because it provides for the same thing.

Mr. MULTER. You are quite right, sir. It is a weakness in both bills. There should be no outside company permitted to manage the bank. The directors of each bank should be charged with and fulfill their responsibility of directors using their own judgment and not look to some outside company as to what they should do, how they should do it, or when and where they should do it, and I suggest its elimination from any bill that is enacted.

Senator LEHMAN. May I ask a question?

Senator FREAR. Senator LEHMAN.

Senator LEHMAN. I wanted some education on this point. The provision is made that a holding company can operate a bank if it has even a minority ownership of the bank.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Senator LEHMAN. The amount of stock varies. Twenty-five percent, I believe you mentioned, and even as low as 10 percent.

Mr. MULTER. Eleven percent in one instance, sir.

Senator LEHMAN. In either case a majority of the stock is not necessarily held in certain cases by the holding company.

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Senator LEHMAN. How can the bona fide owners of the stock in a majority amount assert themselves?

Mr. MULTER. Only by attending the annual meeting or sending a representative there as their proxy to represent them. But you see the difficulty is that much of this stock is held in small sums, in small quantities, by diversified interests. Much stock is held in pension funds and by foundations. The practice seems to be among the pension funds, the trustees of pension funds, and the trustees of foundations not to get involved in management.

They will buy the stock for investment because of its potentiality of continued good return, the potentiality of capital increment, and they do not want to get mixed up in the management. By and large, you will find they do not execute proxies and do not send a representative to vote their shares.

That is one reason why you get in large corporations and in large banks a small minority actually in control of the institution. These trustees will step in occasionally when their attention is specifically called to the fact that there is something very bad about the management. Then they reluctantly sometimes will get into the picture and authorize somebody to vote their proxy.

Senator LEHMAN. Do you know whether the proxies are sent out to the stockholders of the bank by the holding company or by the alleged management of the bank?

Mr. MULTER. The holding company would not have to send out any requests for proxies except in those instances where they controlled a minority of the stock of the bank. In most instances you will find the holding company owns a large portion or percentage over and above a bare majority of the bank stock. It will only be necessary in those instances where they own less than a majority that they solicit proxies.

I believe that you raised the question of proxy solicitation during the course of this hearing, and I think the regulations with reference to solicitation of bank proxies, proxies for bank stock, require strengthening. I do not think that is the subject of this bill, but I think attention must be given to that and possibly——

Senator LEHMAN. I was not referring to those cases in which the company holds a majority or more than a majority of the stock. I am referring to those cases in which the bank holding company holds 25 percent, 15 percent. What I am getting at is this: Let's assume a bank holding company owns 25 percent, leaving 75 percent in other hands. What recourse have the 75 percent of the owners of the stock to take a bank out from under the hoding company?

Mr. MULTER. Only to attend an annual meeting and make their voices heard and offer an appropriate operational procedure to the stockholders and ask for action on it.

Now, in some instances it might require their getting control of the board of directors first. In others it may be possible for them to take action directly at a stockholders' meeting. But that would depend upon the bylaws and the State statutes in each particular instance.

I do not see that there is any way of their doing it effectively, except that they actually attend the stockholders' meeting and assert their rights at an annual meeting when it comes to the election of the directors and then follow through with the election of directors who would respond to their will.

Senator LEHMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MULTER. I have taken much more time than I know this committee has to devote to me. You have many other witnesses you want to hear. I will try to hurry along and finish up on this analysis of the bills.

S. 2350 has no provision against so-called self-dealing.

Senator BENNETT. Will you identify the number you are talking about?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. Under item No. 15. That is the provision against self-dealing—that is, a holding company borrowing from the bank it controls or the bank lending to the holding company.

I believe that a provision of that kind is important and should be contained in any legislation that is passed.

The matter of judicial review in item 16 I think is extremely important. I believe that it works both ways. There may be a holding company that seeks the right to go in and acquire a bank and the supervising agency says no. They certainly should have the right to go in and urge that the supervising agency, whether it be the board or the comptroller or the State supervising authority, has erred and made a mistake and they should have that right of review.

On the other hand, where they have granted the right to a holding company to go in and acquire a bank, I think if a stockholder of the bank has come in before the granting of the application and has submitted good and substantial objections to the acquisition and the supervising authority nevertheless overrules that objection, that stockholder has a vital interest in the matter and should have the right to have the matter reviewed just as much as the holding company should have a right to review an adverse decision.

I disagree with Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board when he says that this provision will let "everybody and his brother" come in and review the matter. The act does not permit "everybody and his brother" to come in and butt into it. The man who comes in and objects will have to have some substantial interest in the matter. If I am not a stockholder in either the holding company or in the bank, I have no right to be heard. But if I am a stockholder, I have a right to be heard. If I come in with a substantial objection that has been capriciously or arbitrarily shunted aside, I should have a right to have it reviewed.

The same way if the bank holding company making the application has been denied the right to acquire the bank and there is good reason why it should and the action in denying the application has been arbitrary or capricious, there should be review.

Therefore, I say that the H. R. 6227 and S. 880 provisions in that regard should be incorporated in any bill that is finally passed.

Now, then, passing on to item No. 19, technical amendments to existing law. The provisions of existing law as to voting permits I believe will become obsolete and unnecessary if we have this legislation enacted. We do not have a similar provision in S. 2350. If you have this complete regulation of the holding company activity, then I do not think you need burden the Federal Reserve Board with the right or the duty of passing on whether or not a holding company should vote the stock of the bank it holds.

Now, on item No. 20, which is the last item in the matter of reports, S. 2350 requires a report sometime before 5 years after the enactment of the law. H. R. 6227 has a pro-

vision requiring such a report within 1 year and requires the report to state practically the same matters as S. 2350 does. I think because of the newness of this approach, not in our review of the situation but of the legislation, we ought to sit on it rather closely and watch it carefully, and I think that the 1-year report provision is much better than waiting for 5 years.

I am sorry I have taken so much time, gentlemen. I appreciate the opportunity of being heard. If I can be of any further assistance to the committee, I will be very happy to respond.

Senator FREAR. Thank you, Congressman. We are very happy that you came over and gave us your views, and I am sure the subcommittee and the full committee will be interested in your testimony.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you.

Senator DOUGLAS. May I express my appreciation to you, Congressman MULTER, for your able testimony.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Senator FREAR. Congressman, the testimony should be corrected and any additional testimony that you would like to present should be in by 4 p. m. tomorrow. The subcommittee will meet next Tuesday, and in order to have this printed the deadline has been established at 4 p. m. Can you do that?

Mr. MULTER. I will do my best. I may have to shorten my statement very much. I will try not to add too much to what I have already said, but my corrected testimony surely will be back by that time.

Senator FREAR. Thank you.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you very much.

In view of the pressure of time, I will merely correct my testimony and will be compelled to forego the opportunity of submitting a complete statement for the record.

To Foresee Probable Future Actions of Red China It Is Necessary To Study What the Communists Are Doing Within China

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Kenneth Medley, from Nation's Business, reporting the essential findings of a 4-year study of Communist China by Air Force evaluators under the direction of Dr. Maurice T. Price, at Maxwell Air Force Base.

FORMOSA AS RED CHINA SEES IT

(By Kenneth W. Medley)

Communism has firm control over China and there appears to be no chance that this control will be shaken soon, either by forces inside China or outside.

Because of this strength, seizure of Formosa—like Korea, Indochina, and the Tachen Islands—is a step toward Asiatic domination that Mao Tse-tung can be expected to take as soon as he believes he can win.

This is the inference to be drawn from an extensive study of Red China's strengths and vulnerabilities. The study, begun in 1951, was made for the Air Force by a special staff at the University of Southern California, under the direction of Dr. Theodore H. E. Chen, head of the University's Department of Asiatic Studies.

Called the Chinese documents project, it was initiated by the Air Force as a broad introductory effort to learn how communism works in China, how the people live under it, how they accept—and comply with—the dictates of the Red regime.

The study was made by a group of Chinese social scientists and an American.

With that one exception, all were born in China. All got their early education in China. All have done graduate work.

The researchers used almost exclusively documents in the Chinese language from behind the Bamboo Curtain. They studied some 1,000 Chinese books and pamphlets, files of about 15 Chinese-language newspapers, and key Chinese periodicals. Some personal letters and a few reports in English were also used.

The project consists of 20 reports which total more than 2,500 pages.

These reveal the extent to which the people have been forced to bow to communism. control over more than 600 million individuals is so utterly complete that dissent is not tolerated.

The overwhelming fact about the communization of China is that it has eliminated a freedom heretofore unrecognized—the freedom to remain silent. Each citizen is required to demonstrate his enthusiasm. He must cheer the Communist parade. This is the essence of brainwashing.

Mao Tse-tung expects Red China to dominate the Asiatic flank of world communism. The final liberation of the proletariat in any country, he says, depends upon the liberation of the proletariat in all countries.

In this program the capture of Formosa is merely a step. It is a step similar to the victories in Korea, Indochina, the Tachen Islands, and any other islands along the China coast which the Red leaders may consider worth taking. Such victories are less strategic than psychological. The United States is pictured in China as the No. 1 enemy. Wherever Mao can engage the No. 1 enemy—and win—he will do so. Since the Chinese are told that America intends to invade China, even a military stalemate becomes a victory as the Reds see it.

When will Formosa be invaded and how? To answer this means delving into the mind of a strategist. There is no hurry, Mao would say. Time is on his side. Strategy may require other victories first.

The Chinese documents project, though cut off when only two-thirds completed, provides the Air Force, both at policy levels and in training programs, with a more thorough knowledge of life behind the Bamboo Curtain. By understanding Red China's vulnerabilities, in continuing studies of this nature, Air Force strategists can plan for any eventuality.

To learn the significant findings thus far, Nation's Business interviewed Dr. Maurice T. Price, an Air Force evaluator at Maxwell Air Force Base who is the official in charge of the study. Dr. Price's answers come solely from the Chinese documents project.

INSIDE RED CHINA: AN AIR FORCE SURVEY

What are the Chinese Communists' intentions regarding Formosa?

Formosa, like Indochina and Korea, is a step in a vast, anticipated campaign. Although the study does not touch on Formosa directly, it does reveal persistent principles which indicate probable policy.

First, Chinese Communist leaders think of their regime as linked with the Soviet Union in a world-wide struggle in which the United States is the chief antagonist. Anti-American feeling, which was bitter in the forties, was passionately increased in connection with Communist China's part in the Korean war.

The Communists also harp on the United States' successive steps in establishing military bases, diplomatic alignments and military assistance, interpreted as move against the world Communist bloc. Particularly emphasized have been United States support of Chiang Kai-shek and invasion of Formosa.

Furthermore, Mao Tse-tung has definitely claimed that the final liberation of the proletariat in any country depends on the liberation of the proletariat in all countries. Liberation of Formosa is, by this reasoning, a necessary Communist act.

DOES COMMUNIST CHINA WANT WAR?

China is developing and modernizing her war machine and military forces with utmost speed. In addition, the overriding principle of expediency and of rationalizing whatever action is decided upon a basic in the Communist operational code. Basic considerations of ideology, of attitude, of operational policy led to outright military opposition to the United States in Korea. There is no significant evidence that they have abated.

The Chinese Communists' military policy has been to strike only where and when they thought they had overwhelming superiority.

What do mainland Chinese think of Chiang Kai-shek?

They have been filled with accusations and propaganda against him and the corruption of his regime. But those who remember his rule know that his land policy was more lenient than Mao's. He did not force his family code upon the people. He did not use a veritable army to compel compliance with farm and family policies. He encouraged business and cooperated with the business community.

For these and for other reasons, Chiang's policies would be rated more favorably by large numbers of Chinese people than they were previously.

How do the Communists reconcile China's military policy with her peace campaigns?

They say the Chinese have been put on a war footing because China supports the peace movement led by Soviet Russia. Internationally, America is portrayed as the warmonger and aggressor.

Do the people support Mao's international policy?

If support of the regime is measured in terms of the government's ability to mobilize the people for great efforts, then we must say that the people are supporting the international policies.

However, there is no true measure of resistance. There have been a great many cases of individual and group opposition, but there is no valid way to determine the enthusiasm with which a farm youth volunteers for the army in preference to going to slave labor camp.

How do the Communists gain this support?

By propaganda, threat, and some promises. Where these fail, compulsion and liquidation are used.

The regime has one of the largest and most powerful propaganda machines in the world. It permeates the entire population and reaches admost everyone. Propaganda is a required activity in every unit of the Communist Party.

What is the general nature of the propaganda?

The Communists themselves say it is basically political warfare. As such, it is carried on against the people of China. Lenin's dictum that the Soviet regime rested on a balance of coercion and persuasion is often quoted in Chinese Communist literature. It probably best describes one of the most important aspects of Chinese communism. It is a master key to understanding the dynamics of Chinese Communist society.

How is propaganda handled?

The regime controls all the forms of public mass communication. It has a net work organized to reach 500 million or 600 million individuals. This network has supposedly come to involve 4 million or 5 million workers.

Propaganda includes the educational process and the school system. It includes the use of the arts, from literature to the village theater. Most of all it involves agitation for

specific activities, including local Communist objectives such as economic production, raising money, etc., as well as things to be done in the local factory, or vilage, or family life.

Broadly, it also includes the reforming or brainwashing of individuals who do not loudly advocate the party line. Anyone who does not applaud the Communist line, even in the local situation, is subject to brainwashing. He is forced to make confessions and criticize himself severely. Even the party leaders are subject to this.

Toward whom is propaganda aimed?

Toward three groups—the lower officialdom of the Communist regime, the broad masses, and the intelligentsia.

Judging by severe newspaper criticism of the Communist cadres, the party has real difficulty indoctrinating many of its own workers—keeping them in line. Indoctrination of this group is never ending. It is necessarily complicated because of the constant changing of objectives.

The second group—the broad masses—is largely illiterate. To reach these people the Communists have developed a personal network of propagandists who address them at meetings, in small groups, and in casual personal contact. Their methods also include use of pictures, comic books, loud speakers, and so on.

For the intelligentsia, the special propaganda device is brainwashing. This is undertaken according to elaborate plans in each educational institution or section of a community. In the case of schoolteachers, it involves remolding of thought.

Two publications are devoted to brainwashing. One is called Hsueh Hsi, which means study, learning, training. It is aimed at the intellectual and educated class. The other, Hsueh Hsi Ch'u Chi Pan, which means study primer, is aimed at persons of a lower educational level.

Is anti-Americanism the central theme of their propaganda?

Not exactly. It is a device. During the Korean war, anti-Americanism became the basis for gaining support for numerous programs—not only for backing up the cost of mobilization but also for supporting such things as working harder to increase production on farms and in factories, and for making cash contributions. It helped the Communists gain general support for the regime.

The Communists attempted to build up a concept of America as an imperialist power, aggressive against China for 100 years. According to this concept, America is accused of invading Formosa and Korea, bombing the Manchurian border, supporting Chiang Kai-shek, refusing to admit delegates of the People's Republic into the United Nations and the Allied Council in Japan, supporting fascism in Japan, rearming Japan, developing a chain of military bases from the Aleutians to Burma and India, sponsoring espionage activities throughout the Far East.

The Communists told their people that had the Korean invasion been successful, American forces would have proceeded through Manchuria into China.

Today a handbook called How To Understand America has wide distribution in China. It stresses three reasons for hating America:

1. Her imperialistic policies toward China.

2. Her false democracy at home and abroad.

3. Her foreign policy, said to be characterized by the exploitation of other peoples and the instigation of war.

What has this campaign had to say about United States military strength?

It emphasizes that China should scorn America's reported military might. It teaches that America is a paper tiger and, if she dares start a war, she will suffer worse defeat than Hitler and Japan.

Do the people believe this?

This question cannot be answered satisfactorily so long as Chinese Communists are in power and the anti-American policy remains unchanged. One might raise the question of whether or not American friendship and influence in China in the past 100 years have been a total loss. American missionaries who have lived under the communists report many evidences of friendship between the suppressed Chinese and the United States. Thousands of Chinese have been in contact with these missionaries and educators in China. Other thousands have been to American universities, cities and homes in this country. Some of these people have been liquidated and the communists are doing their best to brainwash the others.

There is no doubt that American economic, political and cultural influences in China have greatly diminished.

Do the Chinese people resent the communists?

A public opinion poll in China today would not register the real sentiment of the people toward Russia—or toward America, for that matter. Fear keeps people from expressing their real sentiments. Spying penetrates even the family and communists have taken great pains to liquidate secret organizations which do not support them.

Back in 1949, some 3,000 agents lost their lives in trying to collect taxes for the regime. This resistance continues.

Yet there is a certain amount of idealizing Russia.

What groups are loyal?

The 5 million or 6 million members of the Communist Party are loyal. They are the privileged elite. People of the military forces have been made a group with special privileges. This generates loyalty among them.

Also loyal are many who are profiting by supporting the regime—these are called the people as against the nationals. The former are workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie, and the larger industrialists, businessmen, bankers, and others who are tolerated in the present transitional period.

The nationals are landlords, or other capitalists and counterrevolutionaries who are subject to brainwashing, reeducation in labor camps, liquidation.

Does the Communist Party represent a unified block of single minded workers?

The party consists of 75 to 100 top leaders, a broad selected and trained body of lower rank leaders called cadres, and the rank and file membership. Thet top leaders have felt it imperative to insist upon continuous learning or study campaigns, periodical ideological remodeling campaigns, and what is called inner party struggle conducted through many forms of ruthless criticism.

In addition to these came the noted three-anti campaign against corruption, waste, and bureaucratism, which led to actual replacement of tens of thousands of cadres. Taken together these various measures may be referred to as a party rectification and consolidation movement. Obviously the party has its troubles.

How important is the leadership of any individual?

Mao has more influence than any other person in China. However, a small, undefined group is closely associated with him. Eight or ten of these top leaders make up a Politburo.

In 1953, 29, including these Politburo members, had important positions in all three of the chief power institutions of the regime. A wider group of 80 to 90 persons constituted the top leadership at that time. Each held several positions.

Of this larger group, the majority are in their forties and fifties. The largest number from any one province are those from Hunan, the revolutionary province of central China. None came from Chiang Kai-shek's home province of Chekiang on the east coast. Very few of them came from workers' families.

Of those whose fathers' occupations are known, most are of peasant origin. About half have had at least a high-school education. More than half have had contact with foreign countries. The majority have been associated with the party for more than 25 years. The majority are well experienced in military affairs. About a fifth of them are propaganda specialists. About two-fifths are organization specialists.

Has China's new position of power and influence aroused national pride?

Yes. The success of Chinese soldiers in forcing back United Nations forces in Korea appears to have done more than any other single thing in China to gain support for the Communists' programs. The people are proud of a winner.

What is the likelihood that the Red regime will collapse, or that the people will revolt?

No evidence was found of any group with power enough to overthrow the regime in any considerable region.

Is there a possibility of a split within the party?

A study of top leadership since the founding of the People's Republic in 1949 gives no evidence of any faction powerful enough to threaten either Mao's position or his leadership. There have been no sweeping purges like those in Russia.

Dissension and even friction possibly exist among the top leadership, but it is too early to speculate whether it will lead to major splits in the party.

There is a lot of talk by non-Communists on the fringe of China about cliques that exist within the leadership. For instance, in terms of international policy, they mention the pro-Soviet clique versus the native clique. In terms of regional loyalties, they mention the Hunan clique (central Chinese) versus the Szechuan clique (west Chinese). In spite of such talk, there appears to be no evidence now, with Mao Tse-tung still alive, for regarding these rifts as threatening the unity of the party.

Has there been any widespread discontent?

There has been discontent among the intellectuals although they are a small segment of the total population.

Discontent has also been prevalent among the business groups—shopkeepers, industrial people, traders, and so on—against whom the famous five-anti campaign was waged. This campaign was a form of aggressive class war against the bourgeoisie. The Communists called it "counteroffensive to repel the ferocious attacks on state economic organization by the bourgeoisie." The five evils proclaimed by the Communists were bribery, tax evasion, fraud, theft of state assets, and leakage of state economic secrets.

The most widespread discontent has been in the countryside. The main cause has been the so-called aggrarian reform. It arose when the larger landlords were dispossessed and their land distributed to the farm laborers and poorest peasants. This was accompanied by severe taxation and the demand for gifts or donations to support various propagandic movements. Peasant resistance to this taxation has appeared throughout the whole country.

How was farm reform carried out?

In three broad phases. The first was the redistribution of the larger land holdings. The second was the launching of mutual-aid teams and agricultural producer cooperatives. The third is the establishment of collective farms.

Is collectivization their long-range objective?

Yes. But the Communists could not wait for collective farms to increase production, so they have achieved as complete control of production as possible by regulating production and requiring that all crops be sold to the Government.

Did reform increase production?

Production dipped in the period when redistribution was going on.

Later the Communists claimed an increase.

But this increased production, if true, is probably due more to such things as favorable weather conditions than to reform.

Other contributing factors were relative peace on the countryside, improvements in water conservation, and reclamation of wasteland. Government pressure may have had both positive and negative effects.

Have the transfer of land ownership and the asserted increase in production helped the peasants?

They have contributed nothing to the financial position of the peasants as a class. The reasons are: Increased farm taxes and heavy donations and contributions levied against the peasants' savings and income.

It must be remembered that, under the forcible land distribution, land, on the whole, was merely wrested from one group of peasants and transferred to another group. Except in suburban areas, where the confiscated land was nationalized, the aggregate of land in private ownership remained practically unchanged.

What is the agricultural outlook?

Controls over the farm economy have been gradually tightened. Since the landlord class has been eliminated, there is greater dependence on the Government and its agricultural measures such as marketing, credit, crop policy, and so on.

Therefore, future development of the farm economy will depend on considerable part on two things: One is the adequacy of Government help, and the other is the attitude of peasants toward collectivist pressures and policies.

What has happened to farm labor manpower?

First, the Communists have drawn off large numbers of the vigorous young men for the army and for party and Government duty. Second, large numbers of resistors have also been drafted into slave labor camps. Third, women have been encouraged to assist more in production on the farm as well as elsewhere.

After the redistribution of land, there was some labor surplus. There was, however, considerable seasonal shortage. Mutual aid teams and cooperatives and more women working have tended to relieve the shortages but it is too early to tell what the long-range effect will be.

Does the Chinese Communist attitude toward ownership of property differ from that in Russia?

The Communists have followed up Sun-Yat-sen's program of state ownership of major industries—as advocated by the Nationalists—and have both expanded state ownership and greatly increased state control of industry and business. The air force project was terminated before such comparisons with the Soviet Union could be made.

How effective has the industrialization program been?

China has had comparatively little modern industrialization. The income of the country has been predominately a farm income. Therefore, the greatest effort has been to increase farm producion to feed the large army and to provide exports for purchasing industrial equipment and modernized army equipment—largely from Russia.

Are the Communist Party and government officials corrupt?

Out of about 1,400 letters to Chinese newspaper editors sampled from files of six Chinese-language newspapers covering June, 1949, to June, 1952, 8½ percent dealt with corrupt public employees. This was more than those dealing with treacherous merchants or production efficiency, each 8 percent, or counterrevolutionary elements, 5 percent.

Probably the most striking testimony is the widely heralded three-anti campaign aimed to expose and to eradicate corruption, waste, and bureaucratism from government organs and public enterprises. This, however, had several purposes, including greater productive efficiency, and the elimination of various persons not wanted any longer, as well as riddance of the untrustworthy. The great attention given to the subject of replacements suggested that this lower level purge was a sizable one. It has been called the biggest purge so far undertaken.

How far is the People's Republic of China really democratic?

First of all, note that Mao Tse-tung's other name for it is "The Peoples' Democratic Dictatorship." This dictatorship is nominally over the nonpeople or nationals. They are the reactionaries such as "the running dogs of imperialism, the landlord class, the bureaucratic nationalists, and their representatives the Kuomintang reactionaries." These, in spite of universal suffrage, are deprived of political rights.

Second, the basic principle of political organization in Communist China is the famous "democratic centralism," the principle which in China as in the Soviet Union is carefully calculated and manipulated so as to keep government under the control of the Communist Party's top leadership. This means the dictatorship is over the people as well as the nationals.

What are the people's courts?

They were intended as a predominantly political weapon. In the name of justice they intensified the class struggle against landlords and others who did not go along with the practices of the Communists.

They consist of well-rehearsed accusation meetings and public trials before people's tribunals where, in typical instances, planted cadres shout accusations and in mob atmosphere individuals go up and beat, bite, and even kill a so-called defendant before he is convicted.

No case was found where the defendant was acquitted. It is conservative to say that hundreds of thousands of persons have been executed in these courts.

What significant changes have taken place in Chinese society?

Such nonreversible events as the killing of perhaps several million landlords and other resisting bourgeoisie and the destruction of land deeds in many places. Temporarily the army has gained a superior status; and the former intellectuals have lost theirs.

What features of the Communist rule are most hated?

There is no definite knowledge—but blood has been spilled on every level of the population and over big and little matters of all sorts and the revolution is only beginning to be implemented.

Do the people know that Russia dominates the regime?

They are constantly told that the Soviet is helping the regime in many ways and she is held up as an ideal.

Are there many Chinese political prisoners?

The actual number was not estimated. But evidence is conclusive that slave labor is a firm and settled policy of the regime.

Is ideology as important to Red China's leaders as to the Kremlin bosses?

Probably more so. Heavy emphasis is put on Marxism-Leninism and Mao's interpretation of it. Twelve classics on Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism are required reading for all cadres. They range from the Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels, and Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, by Engels, to History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Indoctrination is emphasized as essential for all leaders. Intellectuals particularly are required to saturate themselves in Communist ideology and to abandon all contrary ideological positions. This includes all schoolteachers.

Are the conditions shown in the survey likely to continue?

They are dynamic and changing. The country is in a transition to a genuinely communistic phase which will be introduced only as fast as the Communists believe feasible. That goal is not yet discussed or disclosed publicly. One must expect new developments from month to month.

Of what value, then, is this past record?

You cannot understand and evaluate present actions and objectives except in the light of the experience and trends of recent years.

The Poles Among Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled, "The Poles Among Us," written by Albert Q. Maisel, which appeared in the Reader's Digest, June 1955. As Representative of Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District, where thousands of fine citizens of Polish ancestry live, I concur wholeheartedly with Mr. Maisel—the Polish people have contributed mightily to this country in all phases of our society. They are extremely industrious, inventive, and loyal. I am proud to represent such a group in the Congress.

The article follows:

THE POLES AMONG US

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

Barely a year after it was founded, England's first settlement in America stood on the verge of collapse. Jamestown had a magnificent leader in the tall young soldier, Capt. John Smith; but most of the colonists sent out with him were "gentleman adventurers"—no match for the tough job they faced in the wilderness. Soon Smith was beseeching his London backers to "send but 30 carpenters, blacksmiths, and masons rather than a thousand such as we have here."

On September 25, 1608, the small ship *Good Speed* sailed up the James River bearing six broad-backed artisans. Axes in hand, they followed Smith into the woods and set about making a clearing. Within 3 weeks they had a roaring fire going under a glass furnace, the first factory in the English Colonies in America. They tapped the pine trees and distilled tar and pitch. They set up a soap works and erected a sawmill. Presently, goaded by their example, the entire settlement was hard at work.

Surprisingly, this handful to whom Smith later gave credit for saving the colony—thus insuring that America would develop as an English-speaking nation—were not Englishmen at all. Their names were Michal Lowicki, Zbigniew Stefanski, Jur Mata, Jan Bogdan, Karol Zrenica, and Stanislaw Sadowski—and they landed in America 12 years before the *Mayflower*.

A few years later these earliest Polish immigrants set another precedent. Virginia's

new Governor had authorized the election of the first legislative body in America, but only natives of England were to be allowed to vote. Indignantly, the Poles laid down their tools until they were granted full equality. In this, America's first strike—staged not for economic gains but to establish the principle of universal suffrage—the all-essential craftsmen scored a quick and total victory.

Today the Poles among us—and their American-born descendants—total 6 million. Yet their essential character has never changed. Fleeing from impoverishment and oppression, most Polish immigrants have come to America endowed with two precious possessions—an astounding capacity for hard work and a flaming love for freedom denied their in their homeland.

Among the early Americans of Polish stock, men outnumbered women 10 to 1. Many married the daughters of Dutch or English families and in time their native tongue and customs were largely forgotten. But their names—though often simplified for the convenience of their neighbors—were proudly perpetuated. Typical was the Indian trader, Jan Antoni Sadowski, whose name—because it sounded that way to Americans—was soon turned to Jonathan Sandusky. In 1735 he pushed through the Alleghenies, 200 miles beyond the nearest English settlement, and set up a trading post near the western end of Lake Erie where the city of Sandusky now stands.

In the American Resolution the Poles, with hardly an exception, joined the fight for independence. At least a thousand names of unmistakably Polish origin can be identified in the muster rolls of the Continental Army. The achievements of these Poles who were already Americans have been largely overshadowed, however, by the fame of two spectacular young volunteers from abroad, Tadeusz Kościuszko and Casimir Pulaski. Both had been exiled from Poland for resisting the dismemberment of their country, by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. With a love of liberty that knew no national borders, they saw America's struggle as their own.

Even before the Declaration of Independence was signed, Kościuszko—the first foreign officer to arrive here—offered his services to General Washington. Commissioned a Colonel of Engineers in October 1776, he erected soon thereafter the breastworks at Saratoga from which Burgoyne was battered into surrender. Later he fought as a cavalry leader through the Carolinas and played a major role in driving the British from Charleston.

Jefferson hailed him as "the purest son of liberty I have ever known." Congress voted him a grant of 500 acres and a cash award of over $12,000. But Kościuszko never used these funds. As he boarded a ship for Europe, he handed Jefferson his will, directing that his estate be used to purchase Negro slaves and give them their liberty.

Pulaski fled into exile only after he had held the czar's armies at bay for 4 bitter years. When he offered both his services and his sizable fortune to America, he did not wait for official recognition. He was heading a troop of cavalry at the time of Washington's Brandywine retreat and was credited with saving much of the Army by his slashing rear-guard raids. Four days after the battle, Congress hurriedly voted him a generalship.

During the winter at Valley Forge, Pulaski repeatedly led raids through the British lines, returning with captured food and supplies. Then he begged permission to form the independent cavalry corps that became known as the Pulaski Legion, and spent $16,000 of his own funds to equip it. His career was ended at Savannah where, charging the enemy, he was killed by grapeshot.

Through all the years the followed, America opened its gates and its heart to Polish patriots. Most of these were young members of the educated classes who came here with professional or artistic training. Thus our arts were enriched by such great musicians as Leopold Stokowski, Artur Rodzinski, Josef Hofmann; opera stars Marcella Sembrich and Jan Kiepura; the Shakespeareon actress Helena Hodjeska, and the silent-movie star Pola Negri. Among scientists were the world-famed anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski; the University of Michigan's pioneer Professor of Aeronautics Felix Pawlowski and its equally distinguished mathematician, Prof. Louis Karpinski; the engineer Ralph Modjeski, who built the spectacular 8-mile bridge between San Francisco and Oakland and more than a score of other great bridges.

From 1880 onward, however, the majority of Polish immigrants were of different degree. At that time, Poland, partitioned among the great powers, was ruled with ruthless oppression. Peasants saw their sons conscripted into the German, Russian and Austrian armies. Rapidly growing population condemned many to work for starvation wages as laborers on the big estates. Repeated crop failures brought misery to those who still owned a few acres.

So, first by dozens and later by the tens of thousands, the young men of Poland's peasant villages set out for America. From an insignificant 30,000 in 1870, our Polish population grew to over 1 million in 1900. By 1910, 875,000 more had arrived. The tide reached its crest in 1912, when nearly 175,000 came in a single year.

Soon Poles formed a large segment of the working force wherever heavy industry had need for their sturdy muscles. In Chicago they became meat packers; in Detroit, engine-block casters; in Buffalo and Pittsburgh they worked the Bessemer converters and the blooming mills; in Scranton and Wilkes-Barre they replaced the Irish and the Welsh who'd had enough of coal mining.

Deeply devoted to their religion, they began to attend the existing Roman Catholic churches wherever they settled. But they missed the elaborate pageantry of their village churches in Poland. After some resistance, the right to set up their own churches, manned by Polish priests and following Polish customs, was granted to them. Today there are more than 900 such parishes.

It became the goal of almost every Polish family to live within walking distance of its own church, around which all sorts of social activities centered. Thus, in many cities densely populated Polish neighborhoods developed. But these were seldom slum areas. Unabale to express their peasant love for the land in any other way, Polish industrial workers scrimped and saved to buy homes of their own with at least a backyard in which to raise vegetables. In Bayonne, N. J., Americans of Polish stock own 60 percent of all the real property. And Hamtramck, Mich., the most solidly Polish city in America, has the highest ratio of homeowners in the Nation.

Lack of education condemned most of the immigrant generation to work all their lives in humble, heavy-labor jobs. Yet they never ceased to think of America as the land of opportunity. And, in the tremendous advances of their children have made here, they found full vindication for that belief.

A good measure of their progress can be found in the field of sports. Until 1915 only a few Polish-Americans stood out as athletes: among them, Frank Piekarski, who made the all-American football team in 1904, and Stanley Ketchel (originally Stanislaus Kiecal), who won the middleweight boxing title in 1907. Today, in baseball alone, the list of Polish-American stars is impressively long. Stan Musial, who gets $80,000 a year from the St. Louis Cardinals, has been batting champion of his league six times. Ted Kluszewski hit 49 homers last year for Cincinnati to earn himself a $50,000 contract. Then there are Ed Lopat, Joe Collins, Jim Konstanty, Ray Jablonski, Hank Majeski, Steve Gromek, George Shuba, and more than 20 others.

In college football, all-American honors have been pinned on one or more Americans of Polish descent in almost every year since 1927. At one point the "Fighting Irish" of Notre Dame had so many boys with Polish names on their squad that Knute Rockne was asked how he picked his players. "It's a cinch," he answered with a grin. "When I can't pronounce 'em, they're good." Today there are about 300 Polish-Americans on major college teams.

In recent years Poles have moved to the top in other sports. In golf there are Ted Kroll, Bob Toski, and the speculator Ed Furgol, who, despite a withered arm, won last year's National Open Championship. Frank Parker ranked among the top 10 in tennis for more than 15 years. Stella Walsh, one of the greatest all-round women athletes, has captured 41 National AAU championships and set 65 world and national track records.

But the performers who currently exercise the greatest influence—among the jukebox set, at any rate—are the leaders of polka bands. For many years such groups provided Polish-language radio programs with lively mazurkas and polkas, attracting only Polish audiences. Then they changed their style, put in a Gene Krupa beat (he too is a Pole), wrote a batch of lively new lyrics. Suddenly, low-power radio stations found themselves capturing network audiences as millions of high-school live wires began arguing the relative merits of such hits as Frank Wojnarowski's pressing of the "Broke-but-Happy Polka," and Bernie Witkowski's recording of "Whá, He Say Mambo." In Chicago recently, one disc jockey casually asked his listeners to name their favorite polka band—and in 3 days received 22,000 postcards.

Comparatively few among the immigrant generation from Poland ever entered the world of business, except to open small stores that relied on the trade of their fellow immigrants. Similarly, today, most of the young Polish-Americans who have attended our universities have chosen to enter the professions rather than business. There are now, for example, about 5,000 American physicians of Polish descent, including such distinguished men as Dr. Thaddeus Danowski, professor of research medicine at the University of Pittsburgh; Dr. Joseph Adamkiewicz, assistant clinical professor of surgery at Marquette University; Lt. Col. Edwin Pulaski, formerly chief assistant surgeon at Walter Reed Hospital.

The last decade has seen the rise of a whole crop of young Polish-American physicists and engineers, foremost among whom is the 43-year-old Emil J. Konopinski, who has been credited with much of the theoretical work that made possible the development of the H-bomb. Other atomic physicists include Dr. Gerald Pawlicki of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Dr. Bruno J. Zwolinski, of the National Science Foundation; and Dr. Roman Smoluchowski, professor of physics and metallurgical engineering at Carnegie Institue of Technology. In engineering, the firm of Piasecki Helicopter Corp. is pioneering in helicopter development.

Coming from lands where the opinions of Poles—and particularly of peasants—were never consulted, the immigrants at first had no experience to guide them in American politics. But their horizons have broadened remarkably. Since 1932 the membership of the United States House of Representatives has included from 10 to 12 Congressmen of Polish stock. JOHN DINGELL, with 20 years of seniority, is a member of the powerful

Ways and Means Committee. ALFRED SIEMINSKI is now serving his third term in Congress as a member of the Appropriations Committee. The election of Edmund S. Muskie as Governor of Maine last fall indicates that non-Polish voters will readily support a strong candidate without regard for his ancestry.

In the defense of America, recent generations of Polish-Americans have played as devoted a role as did their predecessors in Revolutionary days. When we entered World War I the astounding total of 40,000 Polish names was on the roll of the first 100,000 to enlist. Before that conflict ended, 300,000 Polish-Americans served. In World War II more than 900,000 served in the Armed Forces.

That conflict returned Poland's history to an old and dismal course. Invaded and ravaged, first by Germany, then by Russia, its people emerged from the struggle to find themselves behind the Iron Curtain with Soviet troops in occupation and Communists in full control. Once again America resumed its traditional role as a haven for exiled Poles. Since 1945 nearly 180,000 have been admitted here under the various refugee relief acts.

Through recent years our culture has been enriched by the skills and talents of such Polish exiles as Florian Znaniecki, professor emeritus of sociology at the University of Illinois; Dr. Hilary Koprowski, assistant director of virus research at Lederle Laboratories; historians Oscar Halecki of Fordham and Jan Karski of Georgetown; the Arctic explorer Henryk Arctowski, formerly at the astorphysical observatory of the Smithsonian Institution—and hundreds of others.

For Americans of Polish birth, the current condition of Poland poses a particularly heartrending dilemma. Everything in their tradition and background leads them to reject communism. Yet ties of sympathy and family relationship bind them closely to the Polish people. They resolve the dilemma by drawing a careful distinction between the Poles and the Communist Government that controls them. Through more than 100,000 food packages a month, they try to relieve the suffering of their relatives in the old country. But at the same time, in every letter they send, they seek to keep alive the thirst for Polish freedom.

Their primary interest, however, lies in America. As they view Poland's present travail, they value all the more highly the freedom, the opportunity and the human dignity that has become their American birthright.

Palmyra 100 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to represent the people of Palmyra, Ill., who are celebrating the 100th anniversary of their city this week. Perhaps this celebration would be somewhat insignificant from a national point of view if it were not for the fact that Palmyra embraces the spirit which has made our country great. Situated in the agricultural area of Illinois, this progressive little city survived a most devastating fire which wiped out most of the business area, and in a year's time the progressive people of this community converted their charred ruins into a city with a new look, which included modern and attractive business buildings which Palmyra proudly displays today.

This week, Palmyra has been selected as the honor town of the week, and I wish to include the following editorial from the Illinois State Register, Springfield, Ill., paying tribute to this typical midwestern town whose citizens I proudly claim as my constituents:

One of the most progressive communities in Macoupin County, the village of Palmyra, will observe its 100th birthday anniversary this weekend. For the 750 residents of the town, the forthcoming celebration has a very special significance.

A little over 4 years ago, a devastating fire swept through the Palmyra business district. Eleven buildings were destroyed. The heart of the community was a charred ruin. Rebuilding looked like an almost impossible task to Palmyra citizens, but pledging themselves to work for a newer, more progressive town, they began reconstruction immediately.

Today, through the efforts of these public-spirited people, Palmyra boasts one of the most modern, attractive business districts in central Illinois. When the festivities begin Saturday, Palmyra citizens can proudly show off their town to centennial visitors.

For its inspiring triumph over disaster, the Illinois State Register happily salutes Palmyra on this festive occasion as honor town of the week.

Our Changing City: Flatbush to Coney Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress representing the Coney Island section of Brooklyn, N. Y., I am proud to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article, written by Charles G. Bennett, which appeared in the July 25, 1955, issue of the New York Times:

OUR CHANGING CITY: FLATBUSH TO CONEY ISLAND—ONCE-DOWDY SECTION IS ACQUIRING POLISH AND POPULATION

(By Charles G. Bennett)

Much of the Flatbush-to-Coney Island region of Brooklyn, once staid and a bit frowzy at the edges, is growing up to be educated, alert, and sophisticated.

In the middle 1930's Brooklyn took its place among the boroughs having a municipal college campus. Brooklyn College, before then inadequately housed in scattered buildings in the downtown business district, moved into its own buildings on a tract at Bedford Avenue and Avenue H.

A recent report showed an enrollment of 8,112 day students and 12,017 night students, nearly up to Manhattan's City College.

For many years this physical plant of higher education in the heart of Flatbush was little changed. But recently expansion got under way.

The initial investment in the college buildings and site was about $11 million. Last fall the city completed and put into use the $4,700,000 Whitman Hall, the new college arts and student center. Last October the board of estimate approved plans for a library extension building at a cost of $2,482,000.

If all of this were not enough to establish the place of Flatbush as an educational center, one could add the $14 million basic sciences building of the State University's Downstate Medical Center on Clarkson Avenue between New York and Brooklyn Avenues in Flatbush.

Now under construction, this 800-room 11-story building will house the basic science department of the country's largest college of medicine when it is opened. The building, it is expected, will be turned over to the trustees of the State University by June 1956.

Nor are the lower levels of education being forgotten in the Flatbush-to-Coney Island area.

There, since the end of World War II, the city has built 12 elementary and secondary schools. And in the near future work will begin on a $2,600,000 modernization of Erasmus Hall High School on Flatbush Avenue, near Church Avenue, and on a $6,900,000 high school for Sheepshead Bay.

EXPANSION IN HOUSING

For the entire area, maturity in education has gone hand-in-hand with population growth and an expansion in housing, both public and private. The Shore Parkway section of the Belt Parkway system, skirting much of the southern rim of the region, has been a vital factor in the housing growth.

As for Coney Island, now as for many years a haven for recreation seekers from far and wide, it is fast trading in its storied glitter for genuine glamor.

Between Flatbush and Coney Island, as the Brighton train of the B. M. T. subway line travels, Sheepshead Bay has maintained for the last quarter century its popularity with boating enthusiasts and others who like a typically shore atmosphere.

Excellent restaurants near or directly on the waterfront still tempt those who delight in shore dinners. At all times when weather permits, fishermen abound. Throughout the boating season the picturesque bay itself is dotted with pleasure craft.

A general street-widening and rehabilitation program carried out during the 1930's helped to keep Sheepshead Bay bright and shining.

Coney, formerly administered by the Brooklyn borough president, was taken over in 1938 by the parks department and its all-pervading commissioner, Robert Moses. He decided he wanted better conditions for the millions who visit the beach.

In 1940 three-fourths of a mile of boardwalk was moved 200 feet inshore, tremendous quantities of sand were pumped in, and maintenance forces assigned. Tides no longer touched the boardwalk. In 1941, after the city acquired Brighton Beach, the boardwalk and beach were extended several miles farther.

To the east of Coney Island, the Manhattan Beach section, for many years a private swimmining development and later occupied by the Coast Guard, is being developed for park purposes. The area extending 1,700 feet east of Ocean Avenue and south of Oriental Boulevard—a 40-acre tract—is gradually becoming a bathing beach, including promenade and picnic and play areas.

The city is considering a proposal to take for park use a 2,000-foot existing waterfront walk, privately owned and known as the Esplanade. Assuming it is rebuilt as a connection between Manhattan and Brighton Beaches, it will complete a 3-mile waterfront promenade from the west end of Coney Island to the east end of Manhattan Beach.

A new aquarium now being built just off the boardwalk near West Eighth Street is

emerging as a symbol of the resurgence of Coney Island. Ground was broken October 24, 1954, for the first portion of the structure—a $1,500,000 segment of the $10,000,000 ultimate building.

The aquarium—replacing the old one at the Battery which was closed October 1, 1941, to make way for the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel—is a joint undertaking of the New York Zoological Society and the Parks Department. The section now being built is slated for completion in the early summer of 1956.

Also being built is a pedestrian ramp that Coney visitors may use to walk from the reconstructed West Eighth Street station of the B. M. T. Subway to the aquarium.

Zoning, drafted by the city planning commission under the leadership of Chairman John J. Bennett, is the key to many of the changes taking place at Coney Island. Through a new zoning pattern, new housing there is being encouraged. Honky-tonks are being confined to the traditional amusement area.

New housing is taking advantage of the welcome mat. A 634-apartment Gravesend Houses—a public-housing project—is already in operation for low-income tenants.

The City Housing Authority is building a 534-unit Coney Island Houses for middle-income families. One more public-housing project is in sight—the 1,200-apartment Luna Park Houses is slated to rise on the site of the burned-out amusement center, Luna Park, near West Eighth Street.

POPULATION IS GROWING

The population of the Flatbush-to-Coney Island region grew from 604,203 persons in 1930 to 796,300 persons at the end of 1954. Included in these figures was a white population that went up from 600,798 in 1930 to 787,300 in 1954, and a nonwhite population that grew from 3,405 in 1930 to 5,800 last year.

In the 25-year period Puerto Ricans moved into part of the area, with 3,200 living there at the end of 1954.

City statisticians estimate that 10 percent of the families in the area are in the upper-income bracket—$5,000 a year and better. Some 38,000 families reported incomes of more than $10,000. Eighty-three percent of the families are in the middle-income level, $3,000 to $5,000 a year, while 7 percent are low-income living on less than $3,000 a year.

In the last few years substantial apartment houses have sprung up in once remote territory made accessible largely by the Belt Parkway.

A majority of these have been single-building apartment houses accommodating about 100 families each. But some larger developments have sprung up. In the Marine Park area, at Gerritsen Avenue, Avenue U and Avenue W, there is Brigham Park, an 18-building cooperative housing 1,080 families.

Fred C. Trump, Brooklyn realty man, has erected Beach Haven, a 31-building private development north of the Belt Parkway and west of Ocean Parkway.

Nowhere has the spurt in housing been more dramatic than in the Sheepshead Bay territory bounded roughly by Bedford Avenue, Shellbank Creek, Avenue U, and the bay itself. In 1930 this tract was largely farmland. It is now bristling with 1- and 2-family houses.

Along Ocean Avenue and in the Midwood and Flatbush areas there is a substantial amount of top middle-income housing with rentals near $50 a room a month. Flatbush now, as 25 years ago, represents good, solid almost suburban living, with many large, prosperous one-family homes still in evidence.

More and more, however, apartment buildings have invaded Flatbush. Many garden apartments have appeared not only here, but also in Bensonhurst, Bath Beach, and Coney Island.

In addition to the new developments at Coney Island, public housing already has been provided for 3,392 middle-income families in the Flatbush-to-Coney Island region. Also, 1,610 units are under construction in the area for middle-income families and 1,765 apartments for low-income families.

There are those who say that residential Flatbush has changed little over the years. In fact, Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore recently wrote:

"From its beginning as a small hamlet more than 300 years ago, Flatbush has never failed to give expression to the spirit of good neighborliness and the Golden Rule."

Throughout the area progress has been marked in many fields. For 25 years the 1,792-acre Marine Park has been slowly emerging from a desolate tract to a filled-in play area complete with golf course, baseball diamonds, picnic groves, sitting spaces, and a boat basin. Much work remains to be done, but the long-awaited improvement is on its way.

The 394-acre Floyd Bennett Field (Municipal Airport No. 1) has been operated since May 26, 1941, by the United States Navy and other military units as a major service airfield. From 1931, when it was opened, to 1941 it was owned and operated by New York City, with sightseeing plane jaunts a specialty.

Many years ago Flatbush, the cradle of the $1 billion motion-picture industry, lost out to Hollywood.

STUDIO IS BEING REVIVED

But now the old Flatbush Vitagraph Studio at Elm Avenue and East 15th Street will relive its old glory. The National Broadcasting Co. has spent $3,500,000 to convert the sprawling structure, which in the early nineteen hundreds sheltered the beginning of big-scale movie production, into the largest in the network's nationwide chain of television studios. The studio will be used largely for color telecasting.

Two events recently occurred in this Brooklyn region, which perhaps prove that the old and wornout must go, but that the popular will endure:

1. The old Brighton Theater at Ocean Parkway and Brighton Beach Avenue, once a gay amusement spot for a now vanished race of prosperous all-summer Brooklyn beach vacationists, was demolished 4 months ago to make way for a new apartment house.

2. Nathan's Famous, Inc., on Surf Avenue near Stillwell Avenue, has been dispensing hotdogs and other resort delicacies since 1916. Last July 6 the place commemorated a milestone in its business career—it sold its 100-millionth frankfurter.

Iowa Farmers, Religious Groups, and the Boston Symphony Orchestra Aid the President in Lifting the Iron Curtain—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of Saturday, July 23, 1955, Anthony Leviero gives President Eisenhower's proposal to lift the Iron Curtain a better chance of success in Washington than his plan for a mutual inspection of defenses. Both countries will have to tear down many barriers, real and psychological, before ideas, people, and trade can flow freely between them, according to Mr. Leviero who goes on to say, quite accurately, I believe, that the chances for freer trade with the Soviet bloc are poorer than those for an exchange of peoples and ideas, "at least until the Soviet Union gives some convincing evidence of seriousness in the search for peace."

Beginning with the historic speech which William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, delivered at the National Press Club in Washington last February, there has been an increasing amount of interest among broad masses of our people in cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. This movement culminated in the President's proposals at Geneva for lifting the Iron Curtain.

I include articles from the New York Times and the Washington Star newspapers which document the interest of the American people in the success of the President's plans:

[From the New York Times of July 23, 1955]

CAPITAL ASSESSES IRON CURTAIN BID—GIVES PRESIDENT'S CULTURAL PLEA TO REDS BETTER CHANCE THAN ARMS SCRUTINY PLAN

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, July 22.—President Eisenhower's proposal to lift the Iron Curtain was given a better chance of success in Washington than his plan for a mutual inspection of defenses.

Nevertheless, both countries would have to tear down many barriers, real and psychological, before ideas, people and trade could flow freely between them. Observers believed that the chances for freer trade with the Soviet bloc were poorer than those for an exchange of peoples and ideas, at least until the Soviet Union gives some convincing evidence of seriousness in the search for peace.

The United States is expected, however, to accept a Soviet proposal for a world economic conference, if it is made at Geneva. In the recent 10th anniversary celebration of the United Nations in San Francisco Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov said the time had come for such a conference "to facilitate the development of world trade."

By the executive order of the President, strict controls are maintained to prevent the sale of hundreds of items of strategic goods to the Soviet Union or its satellites and Communist China. A general revision of these controls, as officials see it, would occur only if there were a drastic improvement in East-West political relations.

However, the President and his advisers went to Geneva with comprehensive statistics on East-West trade and the possibility of increasing commerce in peaceful goods.

In anticipation of the conference, Joseph M. Dodge, special adviser to the President on foreign trade policy, called on all the agencies concerned to supply the needed data.

INQUIRIES BY INDUSTRY

Interest in more trade with the Communist countries has also been indicated by industry in its inquiries to the Bureau of Foreign Commerce of the State Department. Exporters of automobiles, producers of light machine tools and parts, manufacturers of processed food and producers of tractors and other farm machinery have been seeking the trade information.

In his 1954 report to Congress on export controls, Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, said that in the last quarter of 1954 export licenses with a value of $10,355,000 were approved for shipments to the Soviet Union and its European satellites. This was $1,340,000 more than in the previous quarter,

and $2,043,000 more than the last quarter of 1953.

In the realm of ideas and people some of the barriers are just as concrete as the embargo on strategic goods. The Soviet Union has been turning a smile to the West since Nikita S. Khrushchev became dominant in the Kremlin. Westerners, by comparison with the Stalin era, are now swarming over the Soviet Union under a liberalized visa policy.

Russians are free to come here, too, but they must submit to fingerprinting. This requirement kept a group of Soviet school editors from coming here. It is true, American officials were somewhat suspicious about some of the editors when they learned that some were in the 40-year-old bracket. Student editors in this country range in the twenties.

The fingerprinting requirement was dropped to admit the Russian farmers who are having a bourgeois good time in Iowa. That was done by the Government's winking at the law and admitting them as officials who along with diplomats and United Nations representatives are exempt from the fingerprinting requirement.

Only Congress can do way with this requirement, and it is unlikely to do so in its present mood, because it is a provision of the Immigration and Naturalization (McCarran-Walter Act.

The exchange of people, if present mutual visiting means anything is expected by officials to go a long way toward mutual understanding and easing of tensions, Russian farmers gulping ice cream sodas and being feted by chambers of commerce in the Middle West, stronghold of American conservatism, are being accepted as people rather than as Russians.

And similarly well-dressed American farmers, asked in disbelief to show their callouses to Ukranians to prove they live by the soil, are giving Russians a more wholesome understanding of Americans.

The big hit made by the American chess team in Moscow is also viewed as a measure of how easy understanding may be achieved.

JAMMING VOICE OF AMERICA

But the Kremlin still keeps an electronic curtain around the Soviet Union in an effort to keep the message of the Voice of America from getting through. It is reported here that an estimated 1,000 jamming units are operated in the vicinity of Moscow in the costly effort to swamp the Voice.

The Soviet Union still severely restricts the admission of United States books and periodicals while the Post Office Department here has been intercepting and withholding printed materials from the Soviet bloc that it deems to be propaganda.

Both countries still strictly limit the movements of the other's diplomats. In reprisal for long-existing Soviet restrictions, the United States earlier this year listed large areas of the United States that were proscribed, as far as Soviet representatives were concerned. The State Department informed Moscow we were ready to relax the restrictions any time the Russians did the same.

[From the New York Times Magazine of July 24, 1955]

RUSSIANS IN IOWA

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

DES MOINES.—A fabulous combination—corn and hogs—has given Iowa the most successful farm economy in the world. Twelve Russians, with smiles on their faces and many questions on their lips, are trying to find the secret of how this combination works. It is the first time any of them—all important in the Soviet agricultural hierarchy—has seen the tall-corn State. And the first time most of Iowa has ever seen any Soviet Russian.

The meeting of Russians and Iowans has been somewhat more successful than in all probability either side thought it would be. Most of the Soviet delegates, including their chief, Acting Agricultural Minister Vladimir V. Matskevich, hail from the Ukraine, which is Russia's closest approximation of Iowa. Ukrainians are traditionally warm and outgoing, and the Soviet delegation is in that tradition. The result has been a spontaneous demonstration of Russian-American good feeling such as has not been seen since Churchill made the "cold war" official with his speech at Fulton, in neighboring Missouri.

The moment they hit Des Moines the Russians took off their coats, rolled up their sleeves, and, with many a wisecrack, went about seeking answers. Before they arrived a good many Iowans wondered whether they were genuinely interested in farming. After watching them clamber over farm machinery, duck under barbed-wire fences, give the hogs a familiar slap on the flanks, and sift the corn-producing soil with their fingers—as shown in these pictures—Iowans have rapidly lost their skepticism. There is no doubt: the Russian delegation is seriously interested in the business of turning corn into hogs, and particularly in why Iowans can do it so well. And Matskevich says freely he and his colleagues are intrigued by the income side of farming as well as the technology.

[From the New York Times of July 24, 1955]

SYMPHONY OFFERS TO PLAY IN SOVIET—BOSTON ORCHESTRA IS EAGER TO AID IN EISENHOWER PLEA TO LIFT IRON CURTAIN

(By Howard Taubman)

LENOX, MASS., July 23.—The Boston Symphony Orchestra offered today to tour in the Soviet Union as a step toward implementing President Eisenhower's request in Geneva yesterday for lifting of the Iron Curtain.

The orchestra is planning a European trip in September 1956. It also would be willing to play in the satellite countries.

After consulting with other officials of the Boston Symphony who are here at Tanglewood, Henry B. Cabot, president of the orchestra's trustees, issued this statement:

"We welcome the President's suggestions to help remove the Iron Curtain by a cultural and intellectual exchange with the Soviet Union. The Boston Symphony Orchestra is ready and eager, if the President wishes, to be the first American orchestra to play in Moscow."

As far as the records show, no American orchestra has ever visited Russia, either in Czarist days or since the Communists took over power. A few individual American musicians have appeared there, but virtually none since the cold war started.

Mr. Cabot disclosed that in the early years of World War II, when Serge Koussevitzky, Russian-born conductor, was head of the Boston Symphony, an invitation was sent to Moscow through the State Department to Eugen Mravinsky, Leningrad conductor, to be a guest leader in Boston.

Though Mr. Mravinsky cabled that he would be delighted to come, neither the Boston Symphony nor the United States received an official reply, and he did not come.

Charles Munch, conductor of the Boston Symphony since the late Mr. Koussevitzky's retirement in 1949, expressed enthusiasm about the plan to take the Boston Symphony to the Soviet Union.

Since foreign tours by modern symphony orchestras comprising more than a hundred men take a lot of arranging, the Boston officials feel that it would not be a moment too soon to start negotiations.

The New York Philharmonic Symphony will be touring in Europe this September. But it has a full schedule and could not be rerouted to Soviet cities without canceling engagements in other European capitals.

By coincidence, an official of the International Exchange Program, which has been arranging the sending of American cultural units to foreign lands, arrived at Tanglewood today. Robert C. Schnitzer, executive secretary of the program sponsored by the American National Theatre and Academy, was here to confer with Thomas D. Perry, Jr., the Boston Orchestra's manager, about the next year's European trip.

Mr. Cabot said that should the Boston Symphony make the Soviet trip and should the Russians respond by sending an orchestra or ballet to the United States, the Boston Symphony would be glad to sponsor the performances in Boston.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of July 24, 1955]

COEXISTENCE PROGRAM PLANNED FOR CHURCHES

A coexistence program between Soviet and Western religious groups is underway. Some Western church leaders are hopeful the development will go beyond mere coexistence and lead to real fellowship.

Whether this hope is justified only the future can tell. Since religious leaders in the Soviet orbit are subject to the political policy of the Communists the outcome of the current trend will likely depend upon the genuineness of Russian pretensions of goodwill toward the West.

For the moment, Western Protestant and Anglican leaders are taking advantage of the new policy to promote contacts with churchmen in Iron Curtain countries, a goal which they have sought for some time. Eastern Orthodox leaders seem to be somewhat more cautious.

The outstanding development has been the 2-week visit of an 8-man delegation of Soviet church leaders of Great Britain which ended this week. Four members of the party were Russian Orthodox theologians, 2 were Lutheran bishops, and 2 Baptist leaders.

The most striking result of their visit was a tentative decision by the Orthodox theologians and representatives of the Church of England to hold a joint conference in Moscow next year. Purpose of this conference will be to discuss intercommunion between the two churches.

The decision to hold the Moscow meeting emerged from preliminary talks on intercommunion held at Lambeth Palace in London between Anglican officials and the four Russion Orthodox theologians. At this meeting an agenda for the Moscow conference was drawn up.

During their visit to England the Soviet delegation stayed at Lambeth Palace, headquarters of Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Earlier, Metropolitan Pitirim of Minsk and Byelorussia, leader of the Orthodox members of the delegation, told newsmen he had been authorized to invite group of British church leaders to visit the Soviet Union.

Presumably, such a delegation would be selected by the British Council of Churches under whose auspices the Soviet church party visited Britain.

It was believed in London that should such a visit to Russia materialize it will coincide with the Russian Orthodox-Anglican talks in Moscow. The occasion also is expected to be utilized by other Christian groups in the Soviet Union—such as the Baptists—to discuss matters of common interest with their coreligionists in the British delegation.

Meanwhile, several delegations of Western churchmen who visited Russia reported on the state of the church there, as they saw it.

A four-man group of Dutch protestant theologians said Russian Orthodox leaders are eager to establish contacts with religious

bodies outside the Iron Curtain. They reported that religion is deeply rooted in the life of the Russian people.

Seven Church of England parish priests said relations between officials of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Soviet Government can be described as "peaceful coexistence." The group reported they saw packed congregations in churches.

But a Norwegian theologian who visited Moscow and Leningrad said the great danger facing the church in the Soviet Union is that of a "museum death."

Prof. Nils Alstrup Dahl, dean of the University of Oslo, theological faculty, said there is no persecution and, within its limited sphere, the church has freedom.

"But the state has succeeded to a considerable extent in keeping the church 'on a reservation' similar to the way Indians were treated in the United States," he said. "The reservations are under the state's protection and visitors may go to them to see how well 'this special type of human being' is cared for."

Other visits by Western church delegations to Russia are in the offing. Four prominent Baptist clergymen, including three Americans, are scheduled to arrive in Moscow early in August.

Iowa Farmers, Religious Groups, and the Boston Symphony Orchestra Aid the President in Lifting the Iron Curtain—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, hearings are being held by the House Education and Labor Committee on a number of bills which would establish a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. Primarily, these bills would make the activities being carried on under the President's Emergency Fund a permanent part of the armament of the United States during this cold-war period.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, has just introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 2613, which is a companion measure to the bills being considered by the Subcommittee on Distinguished Civilian Awards and Cultural Interchange and Development of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House. The program which these bills would authorize was given great impetus by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, in a highly important speech which he delivered at the National Press Club in February of this year.

I include here a letter which I have received from Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, as well as a statement by Abbott Washburn, Deputy Director of that Agency, in support of the bills which Senator MURRAY and I have sponsored.

The letter and statement follow:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, July 21, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Please accept my sincere thanks in behalf of the Agency for your fine work in support of the President's Emergency Fund. I am sure your interest and help were factors which led the committee to refrain from further cutting the President's request.

We hopefully anticipate restoration of the fund in the Senate Appropriations Committee and will look forward to your continuing interest when the bill returns to the floor of the House.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE C. STREIBERT,
Director.

STATEMENT BY ABBOTT WASHBURN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY, PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN AWARDS AND CULTURAL INTERCHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON H. R. 6874

It might be helpful if I prefaced my comments with a brief remark or two about the United States Information Agency. This will show the nature of our interest in the subject matter of the bill before your committee (H. R. 6874).

As you perhaps know, the United States Information Agency is an independent Agency established by the President in August 1953, to carry on the overseas information program of the Government. Formerly this function was carried on by the State Department, but the President and Mr. Dulles felt it should be handled as an independent operation. Shortly after the Agency was established, the President issued a formal directive defining the task of the new Agency. It is a short directive and reads as follows:

"In carrying out its responsibilities in accordance with pertinent statutes and Presidential directives, the United States Information Agency shall be guided by the following:

"The purpose of the United States Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace.

"The purpose in the paragraph above is to be carried out primarily:

"1. By explaining and interpreting to foreign peoples the objectives and policies of the United States Government.

"2. By depicting imaginatively the correlation between United States policies and the legitimate aspirations of other peoples of the world.

"3. By unmasking and countering hostile attempts to distort or to frustrate the objectives and poliices of the United States.

"4. By delineating those important aspects of the life and culture of the people of the United States which facilitate understanding of the policies and objectives of the Government of the United States."

The Agency carries out this mission through a variety of means. We have some 209 information posts in 78 countries abroad, operating as an integral part of the United States diplomatic missions. Through our Voice of America facilities we broadcast all over the world. We also have an extensive library system, a press division, and a motion-picture production and distribution program.

The essence of our task is to encourage favorable attitudes toward the United States and toward our policies and objectives. One of the biggest obstacles we face in this effort is an opinion prevalent in many parts of the world that the United States is a materialistic, artistically illiterate society—that we are "cultural adolescents." Therefore, anything that is done to show people abroad that this is ont true will not only make the Information Agency's job easier but will immeasurably help the effectiveness of our country's foreign policy. Obviously the United States cannot maintain its position or fulfill its function as one of the leading nations in the world if we cannot command the respect of the nations with which we deal.

Actually, the high level of artistic, literary, and other cultural achievement in the United States is something we can all be proud of. Anything that will further raise the level of such cultural activities is all to the good. For this reason the information agency is in sympathy with the general objectives of this bill.

Whether the particular methods recommended in the part of the bill having to do with cultural development here in the United States are sound is, however, a matter on which I do not feel qualified to comment. Our job is strictly an overseas one: we do not have the competence to comment on domestic policies nor do we feel it appropriate for us to do so.

I would like, however, to comment on title I of the bill, which concerns overseas activities.

This title would authorize a continuing program for sending artists, athletes, dramatic and ballet companies, symphony orchestras, and other talented groups abroad to demonstrate our country's true cultural achievements. We in the information agency (and Mr. Nelson Rockefeller's group in the White House) believe strongly in this type of program. As you know, this has been done extensively during the past year under a special $5 million Presidential emergency appropriation. (Two million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of this fund has been, or is being, used for cultural presentations; $2½ million for trade fairs; and the remaining $250,000 for promotion and exploitation of these events.) The administration is now seeking $6 million from the Congress for the same purposes during fiscal 1956.

The importance of a cultural program of this kind cannot be exaggerated. In recent years the Soviet Union has been putting a great deal of effort into such activities. The number of delegations into and out of the U. S. S. R. in 1954 was over 1,000—double the number in 1953. Their musicians, ballet companies, soccer teams, and other performers are journeying to all parts of the world. The Chinese Communists are also heavily engaged in this cultural offensive. The Peking Opera just a couple of weeks ago, scored a tremendous success in Paris. The number of trade fairs the Communists plan to participate in during 1955 is somewhere in the neighborhood of 65. This compares with 45 in 1954. There's no question about it. The Communists got the jump on us in this field, but under the President's emergency program we have done a great deal ourselves during the past year, and the reaction has been overwhelmingly favorable.

In the case of major projects such as the "Porgy and Bess" tour and the NBC "Symphony of the Air" concerts, the enthusiastic press reaction abroad has been unprecedented.

The impact 100 men equipped with musical instruments can have upon a whole nation's attitudes toward the United States is demonstrated by the remark of a Japanese cabinet minister on the subject of the "Symphony of the Air" as reported by an American

journalist: "If America were to withdraw all their security forces from Japan, I am sure that we would defend your orchestra to the last man." On this same subject, Bob Considine recently reported in his column:

"Japan has never before been visited by a Western symphony orchestra. Every seat was sold within 2 hours of the announcement of the playing dates. For student concerts kids stood in line for as long as 30 hours.

"The men of the orchestra have created such a flood of good will and understanding of what America stands for that we have emerged in a wholly new light to tens of thousands of Japanese who considered our culture questionable.

"Mind you, this is not a propaganda deal as such. The orchestra doesn't know from propaganda, caps or lowercase. The men regard themselves merely as American musicians, playing good music as well as they can. If they have overwhelmed Japan, they are just as overwhelmed themselves. * * *

"The cost to our Government of this tour is a tiny fraction of what it pays for a single fighting plane. We buy the plane in the hope that we'll never have to use it in anger. How about buying a little more of the first, and using it more and more all over the world?"

How can we make more of these presentations possible? Unfortunately, private commercial presentations in many of those areas of the world where they are needed most are just not feasible. The box office returns and other receipts are inadequate to support the venture. In the past a few projects have been supported by the Department of State, USIA, or by private philanthropic groups. The task now is far beyond those resources, and a program of the kind contemplated by the bill before you—together with adequate appropriations—is imperative if we are to meet the challenge of the Communist cultural offensive.

While the Information Agency is strongly in favor of a continuing program of the kind authorized by the bill, the executive branch has not reached a decision as to what kind of permanent legislation is desirable. I cannot, therefore, speak for the executive branch. However, the following is our thinking on the bill:

First of all, it seems to me there ought to be something on participation in trade fairs in the same legislation. The President's emergency program embraces trade fairs as well as cultural activities. And we have scored outstanding successes at some of these fairs. Cinerama was a smash hit at Damascus. Later, at Bangkok, the Reds were scared out completely by Cinerama. The United States exhibit at Paris was outstanding, too. Such fairs give us an opportunity to show that our free system is the most productive in the world, and that we are producing primarily for peace, not war, contrary to the constant charges of Communist propaganda. The Communists, as I mentioned, have also been stepping up their activities at international fairs, trying to show that their system is more productive than the free ecenomies of the West. Incidentally, the productivity of the Soviet economy—and for that matter even the Red Chinese—while it appears second-class to us, looks wonderful to the people of underdeveloped areas. In my opinion, then, a trade-fair program ought to go arm-in-arm with any cultural program abroad. (Sports participation, by the way, is included in the cultural program.)

Secondly, any legislation ought to provide for full promotion and publicity of these activities. This is a big part of the job the Information Agency does for the President's program. We see to it that any coming visit by a United States artist or performing group, or United States representatives to a trade fair, is made known in advance to the local people. We also see to it that the performance gets full publicity over the radio, in newspapers, and magazines, etc. In this way the effect of what the United States does is multiplied many times. For every person who actually sees what the United States has brought to his country, hundreds hear about it, and hear what local critics or commentators have to say about it. This is a most important part of the program. It maximizes the results to the taxpayer of the dollars put into the President's program.

Finally, I think any legislation in this field ought to vest authority and appropriations in the President and give him broad discretion as to the precise administrative means to carry out the program. Vesting authority and appropriations in the President will make sure that the left hand always knows what the right hand is doing, that the several parts of the program work together and complement each other, and do not gradually drift apart. It will also give the program the stature that it needs and the necessary flexibility. The experience gained in the past year in operating within the framework of the President's emergency fund should be taken into consideration in setting up the legislative means to implement this important program in the future.

H. R. 7474, Utility Reimbursement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7474 contains a provision that 50 percent of the cost of relocating utility facilities necessitated by the construction of projects on the interstate, Federal primary, secondary and urban highway system may be paid from Federal funds whenever, under the laws of the States where the project is being constructed, the entire relocation cost is to be borne by the utilities.

Stated rather baldly, this means that even though a utility has made a solemn, written, legal contract with a State that it will relocate its facilities in consideration of being given the use of highway rights-of-way, or even though it has requested and accepted a franchise to enter upon highway rights-of-way as a result of a statute enacted by a State legislature by which it specifically obligated itself to relocate its facilities to permit highway improvement—this reimbursement provision nevertheless would induce a vitiation of the legal contract, a violation of the valid State law and shatter every principle of State sovereignty.

This provision in the bill might have been stated another way in complete truthfulness and frankness. It might have said that if a State has passed a law which is sound in morals and in equity; a law that is solely and completely within the police power of the States, and completely without the powers and jurisdiction of the Government; and if, under such law, solemn, written contracts have been made between the utilities and the States at the specific request of the utilities by which the utilities gained valuable rights that saved them great expense—all in consideration of their one contractual promise to relocate their facilities when necessary to permit highway improvement—then, in that event, will not you, Mr. Sovereign State, vitiate your solemn contracts, violate your valid State laws, and destroy your sovereign rights by giving the poor utilities—such as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Union, and the great electric-power companies—50 percent of their relocation costs out of this money that we have collected from your citizens, presumably to build highways, but which we now send back to you only in part.

Before considering other aspects of a provision which can result in $970 million of these road funds being given to the utilities, let us treat for a moment some of its legal aspects.

State legislatures have sovereign control over highways—a control that is ordinarily delegated to its State highway department and lesser agencies of State government. The primary use of highways is for the traveling public, but other uses that serve the public interest are generally allowed. Thus, it is generally accepted that utilities may be permitted to place their facilities on highway rights-of-way under certain considerations and restrictions—always provided, of course, that their use does not inconvenience the traveling public in its primary use. Even though a utility is allowed to do this, its rights are secondary and subordinate to the interest of the traveling public, and always remain so.

No utility ever acquires a vested right to remain in any specific location on the highway. That is true because neither the State nor its delegated agency can make any contract which impairs its police power. It is universally held that highways is a proper subject for the exercise of police power.

Every decision in courts of last resort, without exception, has held that the State, acting through its legislature, its highway department, or its local governmental units has every legal right and reason to require a utility, at its own expense, to relocate any facilities on the public rights-of-way in order to permit highway improvement. Nothing in the nature of a Federal program of highway aid alters the fact that the State, in the exercise of its police power, has every right to request the readjustment of utility facilities in order to properly serve the highway user. Federal aid to highways consists merely in the appropriation of money derived in taxes on citizens of the States, to be matched in some amount by the States, and spent on a designated system of highways, provided certain standards are met. The Federal Government does not initiate these highway projects. The States have the sole discretion of determining whether highway projects are undertaken, the nature of the project, and whether it will be financed from State funds or from both Federal and State funds.

Thus Federal participation does not prevent the State from exercising its solemn police power in connection with

a highway project. And, the Federal Government exercises no such control over these projects that would make highway departments merely agents of the Government. The Federal grants recognize only that the Federal Government has legitimate national interest in the improvement of highways.

Recognizing that the police power of the States, exercised through delegated agents, is supreme in the matter of rights-of-way as against everyone, let us revert to the present situation with reference to the utility provision in the highway bill.

Why should the Congress think of doing this? What is causing all the deep solicitude for the poor utilities? Just what is the reason for this effort not only to break State laws and vitiate solemn, legal contracts which the utilities requested and signed, but also to destroy the sovereign police power of the States, even though the States are now pleading with us that they want and need no intervention in this matter by Congress?

Just what would this provision do? In cases where valid State laws have given a franchise to a utility for use of rights-of-way, conditioned on their removal to permit highway improvement, it would authorize the States, regardless of such condition under their law, to pay 50 percent of removal costs out of Federal funds. Secondly, it would authorize the States to pay 50 percent of removal costs even though the States have made, and there are in existence, valid written contracts with the utilities, entered into at the utilities' own request, whereby the utilities gain the valuable right to occupy rights-of-way, free of any charge, as a result of their contractual promise to pay their costs of removal to permit highway improvement. Thirdly, it would authorize the payment of these removal costs with Federal funds even though the State has both a legal enactment and a valid, written contract with the utilities which pledged the utilities to pay its own removal costs in return for use of rights-of-way.

Stated quite bluntly, this is no business of the Congress. A powerful lobby, over a course of 2 or 3 years, has attempted to exert a pressure which would make the Congress do something which is wrong legally, equitably, and morally. It is something which should not be legislated in this body. Its effect, under the circumstances and in the manner it is being attempted, would destroy every remaining vestige of state sovereignty. This is made no less true because of the subtle approach and the seemingly benign language of the provision in question. The language is permissive in the House bill but it is mandatory in the provision passed by the other body and it likely will be mandatory in the conference report provided we pass it in any manner here. The result sought to be attained, that of getting the money for the utilities, is the same in both measures and there is little doubt that it would bring about that result.

If Congress has determined to wipe out State capitols in their entirety and make Washington a completely all-powerful, centralized bureaucracy regardless of the laws of the States, regardless of existing legal, written contracts made by the States, and regardless of the States' sovereign police power, it has picked a perfect issue on which to do so.

What are some of the facts of this case which show the extent, the import, and the viciousness of this provision? Forty-three States either have legally enacted laws providing for the issuance of franchises permitting utilities to use highway rights-of-way under the condition that their facilities must be moved by them when highway improvement is needed or have entered into legal written contracts with the utilities, at the utilities' specific request, in which the utilities solemnly contracted to readjust and relocate their facilities in order to secure rights-of-way.

These laws were passed and these contracts were made under their sovereign State police power. Were these laws enacted by the States and the contracts entered into by the States at the request of the utilities, fair laws and fair contracts? Are they equitably and morally just? Were they entered into to protect the primary use of the traveling public on the highways? Were they a proper and just exercise of the police power of the States through their delegated agencies, the State highway departments? They would seem to be all of these. Then why should we even consider doing something which would subvert the laws passed by the States, which would vitiate contracts legally made by the States for the protection of its citizens, and, worst of all, why an effort which would effectively destroy the sovereignty of the States in the exercise of their police power?

The laws permitting utilities to use rights-of-way, under certain conditions and restrictions, were enacted because the utilities asked for them. The contracts they have made with the States were at their own insistence. They have saved great sums of money as a result of these laws and contracts. Rights-of-way have been maintained for them at the expense and inconvenience of highway users and without expense to them. The new rights-of-way required for the interstate system will cost the highway users billions of dollars. The utilities will not pay 1 cent of it, but they expect to occupy it free of any charge. They expect it to be maintained for them, also free of charge. But the spokesmen of the utilities now demand, in this legislation, that the highway users not only build new rights-of-way for them, and maintain it for them, forever, but that they also move the facilities on to any new location and pay the removal bill, all without legal sanction, and, in most cases, in direct contravention of solemn contracts which the utilities asked the States to make with them by which they acquired the valuable right to enter upon the highways in the first instance. This would completely and permanently change the historic and legal relationship between the parties. It would destroy the States police power in regard to highway rights-of-way and would make the States completely subordinate to the utilities, instead of the reverse, as it is at present under the sovereign power of the States.

But possibly there are some who feel that the utilities are in such desperate financial straits that any action, however extreme and however destructive of State sovereignty, is justified. That could be the only possible reason by which anyone might seek to justify what is being attempted here. Let us see what the facts are in that regard.

Moody's Manual of Investments gives figures which show that the utilities will make for their owners during the 13-year period of the proposed road program clear net profits, after all taxes and expenses, of considerably more than $25 billion. Now let us say that removal costs will be $2 billion in those 13 years, a figure higher than I have heard estimated. Two billion dollars in removal expenses would cost the utilities less than $1 billion, since 52 percent of the $2 billion would otherwise be paid in taxes. Are not the removal costs, then, almost insignificant when compared with the lush guaranteed profits of the utility owners?

Now, under the facts, who actually would get the almost $1 billion handout, provided the highly benevolent and philanthropic spirit of Congress toward the utilities is expressed through the passage of this provision of the highway bill?

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., by its own statement, owns 90 percent of all telephone lines. That means it will get more than 90 percent of all reimbursements paid to telephone utilities, one of the largest of our utility groups Since it has no legal right to any payment whatever the only question that remains is whether it has any moral claim to reimbursement. That seems to be conclusively answered by the fact that it has made a great number of contracts throughout the years with the States, many of them recently, in which, in order to secure free rights-of-way for its facilities, it pledged itself in writing to remove such facilities to permit highway improvement. Every one of these agreements is a legal contract and is in full force and effect today. They have saved American Telephone & Telegraph Co. great sums of money. Does it need the money it will get under this provision? In addition to the cash yearly dividend of $9 paid for many years on each of the 50 million shares of stock owned by its stockholders, it recentely reported retained earnings of almost $800 million. Does not such prosperity, practically guaranteed under present laws, give a conclusive answer as to whether it needs the approximately $200 million which could be paid to it under section 7 of the highway bill? Should we pass a law which says to the States that we are willing to have them pay A. T. & T. approximately $200 million of any highway funds we provide them? I am not willing for the States to have congressional authority to do that because A. T. & T. is not entitled to it. Certainly it does not need the benefits of this beneficient provision nearly

as much as does our Treasury and our highways.

Then we have our telegraph utilities. Really it is now only one utility since Western Union, with Government approval, became a complete telegraph monopoly a few years back. Does Western Union, contrary to State laws and contrary to its legal contracts with the States by which it is obligated to pay its removal costs, need a handout? Within the last 3 years—and since it became a monopoly—its common stock has increased in value more than 800 percent. I do not believe we should suggest to the States that our Treasury be raided to give Western Union a considerable sum of taxpayers' money. In fact, I don't believe we should even say to the States that we would pay one cent to Western Union, the circumstances being what they are.

Then we come to the electric power companies. There is little need for comment as to their solvency or even as to the state of their financial prosperity. Their prosperity is guaranteed as much as anything can be guaranteed in this country of ours. The class A and B utilities alone—the biggest ones, of course—in recent reports show retained earnings of $2,200,000,000 over and above dividend payments through the years. What a nice, fat, backlog that is. Just $2,200,000,000. A conservative estimate would seem to be that the electric power companies will receive a cut of some $250 million of the bounty provided in section 7 of the highway bill. Do you want to give the States the permission to hand them all this money when you know it would not only be a violation of State laws but a vitiation of legal contracts these companies have themselves made with the States by which they secured valuable rights enabling them to save great sums of money, part of it at the expense of the highway user? I can hardly believe that you want to do that, but that is exactly what this bill does.

But there are those who say that they know of a small utility which may need a little help. It is being reported that the representatives of the major utilities, which will get at least 90 percent of the benefits from this reimbursement provision, are saying in the corridors of the Capitol and the House Office Buildings that their great interest is in some small utilities which they feel might be unduly burdened if it is not passed. Their great concern for some little man, imaginary or otherwise, is, I am sure, responsible for their tremendous effort, sustained for some time now, to pass this legislation.

It might be well to remember in this connection that employees of the State Highway Departments live and work in every section of every State of the Union. There are few counties in our country which do not have residents who are employees of the State highway department. These employees take their place in the life of their communities and they know its problems. They mix, mingle, and go to churches and clubs with the people among whom they live. Should there happen to be a small utility for which road improvement would create a burden, would not the highway department know about it? If the State felt it a highly meritorious case it would require no act of Congress for it to be helped. Certainly it would not require the payment of hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds to the major utilities of our country in order to move a few poles for some little fellow in Podunk, Pa.

What do the State agencies exercising the State police power in the matter of States rights-of-way have to say of this reimbursement provision? They have come to Washington from great distances twice in recent months and even though they welcome the opportunity to build the great highway system which they feel the country needs, they had the courage to state their very strong opposition on each occasion to the inclusion of this provision.

The president of the American highway officials characterized it as an effort on the part of the utilities to avoid contractual obligations by Federal legislation. Could anything be stronger, or a more correct appraisal, than that?

We should remember that by this provision the Congress is saying to the States that they may do something which the States have been insisting, and are still insisting, that they do not want to do and which they feel would be very unjust for them or anybody else to do. In that position, the States seem to be on eminently sound ground.

Purely Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by the distinguished editor of the Jewish News, Mr. Philip Slomovitz. It is a forceful commentary on Russia and Her Jews, significant in terms of our peace negotiations and the prime objectives for which America must strive.

The article follows:

PURELY COMMENTARY

(By Philip Slomovitz)

THE FRIGHT OF THE RUSSIAN JEWS

Haim Shurer, in an article in the Davar of Tel Aviv, describing his recent visit in Russia, made some interesting revelations.

It is evident that Jews there are frightened. The very mention of the word Israel or Zionism scares them away from the messenger from both.

He relates several interesting stories. He had met three men with definite Semitic features and asked them to be directed to a synagogue. In surprise, they asked him, "Why, do you have to say Kaddish?" When he replied, "No, but I'm from Israel and I'd like to visit a synagogue," one of the men started to get away, pulling another with him, and "only the third paused long enough to tell me how to get there."

Another incident: In the Moscow "Metro" he struck up a conversation with a woman "with a Jewish face" whom he told he was from abroad. "'Where are you from?' she asked. 'Israel,' I answered. She looked around her as soon as I had said that and made a quick getaway."

Jews, apparently, are not the only ones who are frightened. Shurer tells about a non-Jewish woman who evidenced an interest in his visit: "When she suggested that we get together to talk about it the next day, I asked whether, as a party member she could make a date with a foreigner. Surprised and angry, she affirmed that she would come. She did not."

Shurer's article also relates the following incidents that are most revealing about Russia and her Jews:

"At a hotel in yet another city a Jewish youth asked me whether I really meant it that I came from Israel. A few minutes later he invited me to lunch with him. 'And you are not afraid of inviting me to your house?' I asked, the wiser by my earlier experiences. He jumped in anger. 'Why? What is there to be afraid of? I am a party member, and I do not see why I should be forbidden to talk to you.' Then he excused himself, saying that he'd be back in half an hour to take me to his home. He did not come.

"And somewhere else I had a short conversation with my neighbor at a restaurant table. 'Come over to my shop tomorrow,' he said, 'I don't see why you shouldn't.' When I got there, a woman came forward to meet me. The man was sick, she told me.

"But as I passed a market where kolkhoz farmers sell the produce from their private plots one late afternoon, all of a sudden I heard the snatches of a conversation in Yiddish, and, unable to repress my curiosity, I came closer. There were 5 young Jewish cart-drivers, sitting in their wagons and standing about them. They were young and strong, and they reminded me of Zalman Schneur's Noah Pandre.

"'Where are you from, Yidden?'

"'From here. And you?'

"'From Eretz Yisrael.'

"They laughed. They thought that I was joking. Then they surrounded me and started asking me how many Jews there were 'over there,' how they lived 'over there,' what the situation was between us and the Arabs, and so forth.

"I replied briefly, and they were surprised to hear that I had been 'over there' for over 40 years. And they found it difficult to believe that I had simply asked to visit Russia as a journalist, and been granted permission.

"All of a sudden they started to whisper among themselves, and I told myself 'There it goes. They've remembered that it is dangerous to carry on this conversation in public.' Aloud, I asked what was going on.

"'Come over and have a drink with us,' said one of them.

"It was an out-and-out surprise. It never occurred to me that in the market place of a Soviet town Jewish cart-drivers would want to invite me to a glass of wine. I made no secret of my second thoughts about the wisdom of this genial offer. They had some too, but stood their ground.

"'And where do you want to go to drink?'

"'Not a long way from here. Two streets down, at a Jewish stand.'

"One of them went before me, the rest put their carts in order and came along too.

"They filled large glasses with red wine and each took up a piece of brinzza cheese. We drank 'Lehaim.'

"'Come over, Moishe,' they called out to the owner. 'It's a Jew from Eretz Israel. Have a drink too.'

"He had a drink too.

"I looked at those friendly, healthy lads. They did not talk much, they did not ask many questions, they told no stories, and they did not complain. They were simply expressing their brotherhood in an invita-

tion to have a glass of wine and cheese with them.

"It was getting dark. I said goodbye and each of them shook my hand. There was sadness in their eyes, and one of them said longingly:

" 'You couldn't take me along inside your trunk, could you?' "

And so—there was a redeeming feature in the affirmation of the belief that freedoms are taboo in Russia. Our visitor did find some Jews who dared make a "Lehaim" with him. And we learn from his report a very important fact: At least one Jew wanted to be taken along to Israel "inside your trunk." Knowing what we know, he is not the only one.

YITZCHOK GORDON KEEPS YEVSEKTZIA'S SPIRIT ALIVE

The Canadian Jewish Standard carries this news item under the heading "Yevsektzia Spirit Still Lives On":

"The spirit of the Yevsektzia still lives on years after its liquidation. (The Yevsektzia was the Jewish section of the Bolshevik party whose assignment in the early years of the Russian revolution was to eradicate all elements of religion and tradition from Jewish life). In a Yiddish-language broadcast from Radio Warsaw on the occasion of the 12th anniversary of the ghetto revolt, the speaker, Yitzchok Gordon, laid the blame for World War II on the 'obscurantists, cosmopolitans, Bundists, the Zionists, lackeys of imperialism who wouldn't listen to Moscow's warnings.' Yitzchok Gordon was a Communist in prewar Poland escaping to the U. S. S. R. in 1939. Despite his record he was arrested as a Polish spy, his wife was executed, and he was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment. After the war he was released and returned to People's Poland to resume his political career as a Communist."

Thus, an echo from the days when Jews persecuted Jews. But the bigots who began as henchmen of the Bolsheviks still hold on to the stupid view that Jews were responsible for the war: Jews caused a war which culminated in the death of 6 million of their kinsmen. How stupid can people be? Cairo would welcome Yitzchok Gordon as an ally against Israel. What's he doing in Warsaw?

Meeting With Red China To Discuss Formosa and Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday a distinguished and experienced Member of the other body of this Congress publicly suggested over certain television facilities that the Secretary of State of the United States meet soon with the so-called Foreign Minister of Red China to discuss Formosa and other questions in Asia.

Because of the prestige which this distinguished Member of the other body enjoys in this land, and because it appears that this suggestion is part of a calculated and well-planned effort to bring about recognition of the Red Chinese Government by the United States, and because the distinguished Member of the other body is a member of the Democratic Party, in which I also have membership, I am compelled to publicly state as a matter of record that this suggestion does not represent my views or the views of many other Members of Congress and that it is contrary to the best interests of the United States and of the free world.

Besides, it is opposed to the expressed will of Congress; and moreover, in conflict, I believe, with the will of a majority of the American people.

Curiously, this suggestion with respect to Red China comes from one who appears to be close to the foreign-policy makers of this administration.

Interestingly, the suggestion was made the day that the President arrived home from Geneva, and only a day before the State Department announced that the American Ambassador to Czechoslovakia would meet with Red Chinese delegates in Switzerland next week to discuss American prisoners presently confined in Communist China.

Remarkably, a similar suggestion was made by this same distinguished Member of the other body over the same facilities on the same program some months ago, and no spokesman for the administration criticized or repudiated the proposal made at that time.

In addition, and in the course of making this suggestion, it was intimated that the proposed meeting take place while Congress was not in session to avoid possible "trouble" with Congress.

Further, when it is recalled that this same distinguished Member of the other body with increasing frequency has been hailed as the congressional bipartisan spokesman on foreign policy, I feel compelled to warn the Members of this House and the public at large that there is ample evidence of a plan to rig de facto recognition of Red China now, and ultimately to obtain de jure recognition as an easy consequence of these now suggested diplomatic negotiations.

Those who would bring about the recognition of the lawless warmaking Red Chinese Government must be aware of the fact that in order to accomplish their aims, a back-door route, and devious methods and devices must be utilized.

To enter into these suggested conversations on a foreign minister level would alienate our friends in the Far East, would weaken our influence in the world, and debase our honor.

Because I fear that this suggestion will be carried into effect while the Congress is in recess, I record these words of warning and of exception today.

What Is Ahead for the Members of the House on the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that every member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is confronted, as I am, dozens of times each day with the entirely legitimate question, "What is going to happen on the gas bill?"

I doubt if any member of that committee has been or is able to answer that question with any certainty.

We do know that when the amended bill was before the committee back in June, the first vote was 14 to 14 and that then after reconsideration was moved and carried, H. R. 6645 was reported out by a vote of 16 to 15.

These facts are of particular significance for the following reasons:

First. The subject matter of exempting producers and gatherers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission has been before that committee for several years but up to date the proponents of exemption have not been successful in their efforts.

Second. One of the most significant votes with reference to such exemption occurred on March 31, 1950, upon the adoption of a rule which would have taken such an exemption bill from the Speaker's table "to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to."

Third. Those who are still members of the House will probably recall that the rule was called up and considered at approximately 6 p. m. on Friday, March 31, 1950. The rollcall vote was 176 for the rule, 174 against it and 2 present. Thereafter this bill was vetoed by the President and there was no further consideration of the matter for obvious reasons.

Fourth. The committee held extensive hearings on H. R. 4560—the predecessor bill to H. R. 6645—during March, April, and May of this year. The printed record of the hearings includes nearly 2,000 pages.

H. R. 6645, which was reported by a majority of 1, with the full membership of the committee present and voting, was reported on June 28, 1955.

There followed a period of considerable uncertainty, even more confusion, and extensive polling of the House Members as to the possibility of passing the bill. In the interim, statements were published in the press and made over the radio and television to the effect that only President Eisenhower could bring about the passage of this bill by his active support of it.

Although this did not result in any such action by the President, a hearing was scheduled before the Rules Committee for Tuesday, July 26, 1955, at 10:30 a. m.

Fifth. If anything was demonstrated at that hearing, it was that this bill is a highly controversial one, technical in the extreme and one that cannot be considered adequately by Members of the House at this late date even though a most liberal rule for debate should be granted.

During this public hearing before the Rules Committee, the point was repeatedly brought up and emphasized that it would be most unfortunate if such a bill should be sent to the floor of the House during these closing days and hours of

the current session. It was also pointed out that the morning press had quoted the acting leader of the other body as stating, after a 2-hour conference with the Democratic policy committee of that body, that this bill with one other bill was informally shelved for the session.

The question naturally arises as to why such an extraordinary effort should be made at this time to force this particular bill to a fruitless vote by the House. The answer to this question must be determined by each Member of the House who may be called upon to take any action with reference to H. R. 6645 during the next few days.

What Are the Facts About the Independent Producers Who Would Be Exempted From Regulation by the Federal Power Commission Under H. R. 6645?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, among the other confusing aspects of the testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with reference to the exemption of producers of natural gas from regulation is the lack of anything like exact or adequate information with reference to those producers.

This cannot be attributed to any lack of interest or effort on the part of members of that committee. Rather, despite the reported $1½ million educational campaign on the part of those seeking exemption, any careful reading of the printed hearings will disclose a noticeable inadequacy of factual information from those producers themselves as to the essential facts of their activities.

However, fortunately, Members of the House who may be called upon to vote upon this bill during the last few days or even hours of this session can have certain information of considerable significance.

From data compiled by the Federal Power Commission, it appears that in 1953 there were 4,365 independent producers who sold natural gas to natural-gas companies.

Of this number, 174 such producers, with sales exceeding 2 million thousand-cubic feet per year, sold 90.74 percent of the total volume of such gas.

Conversely, 3,736 such producers sold only 2.1 percent of such gas.

The balance was devoted to other purposes.

Next, any examination of the available statistics makes it crystal clear that there is an enormous concentration in a few producers so far as natural-gas production and ownership of reserves are concerned.

According to these statistics in 1953, something over 4¼ billion thousand-cubic feet was so sold.

Twenty-nine producers accounted for sales in excess of 2¼ billion thousand cubic feet.

Turning to the sales of individual producers, it appears that Phillips Petroleum Co. was by far the leader, accounting for 457,445,147 thousand cubic feet.

The next company, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, sold 202,562,446 thousand cubic feet.

The third company, Humble Oil & Refining Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, sold 175,975,859 thousand cubic feet.

The fourth company, Magnolia Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., sold 157,553,211 thousand cubic feet.

The fifth company was the Shell Oil Co., with sales of 156,356,923 thousand cubic feet.

In short, these 5 companies alone sold in this period 27.07 percent of all the natural gas sold by nontransporting producers to the interstate pipeline companies.

There then appear such extensive and prosperous activities as those undertaken by the Gulf Oil Co., the Atlantic Refining Co., Skelly Oil Co., the Texas Co., Sun Ray Oil Corp., Union Oil Company of California, Continental Oil Co., Pure Oil Co., Tidewater Associated Oil Co., and Sinclair Oil & Gas Co.

The conclusion has not been disputed and cannot be disputed that in this period 29 producers, mostly large oil companies, sold 63.24 percent of such natural gas.

It was because of facts such as these and because of the complaints arising as to hardships which might be placed upon small producers under Federal regulation that I introduced H. R. 4924, which would exempt approximately 96 percent of the natural-gas producers who sell less than 2 billion cubic feet a year.

It is clearly established that such a classification is entirely legal.

I wish to cite the following cases in support of that legal proposal: *Wilson* v. *New* (243 U. S. 332), and *Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 80, 93).

Moreover, I do not think it will be disputed that the elimination of this large body of the very small independent producers would remove a most substantial administrative burden from the Federal Power Commission. Incidentally, this has been and undoubtedly will be used as an argument in favor of the overall exemption provided by H. R. 6645.

Furthermore, I do not think anyone can study these statistics without coming to the positive conclusion that these thousands of small producers could not, under any stretch of the imagination, affect or control the price of natural gas in interstate commerce.

It is my intention to offer the substance of this bill as an amendment at the proper point in the consideration of H. R. 6645 if the bill is brought up for consideration on the floor.

I hope that this brief explanation of the reasons justifying such an amendment will result in the support of all those who are interested in a realistic and effective regulation of the flow of natural gas in interstate commerce, which is clearly a congressional responsibility.

The Pursuit of Peace Is a Challenge to American Intelligence and Patience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD. D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a most thought-provoking article entitled "The Long Road Peaceward," which appeared in the June 22, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

This summary analysis of the underlying currents in the struggle for peace very forcefully reminds us that success in our objective rests in great measure upon the average American's capacity for persevering patience and intelligent understanding.

The editorial follows:

THE LONG ROAD PEACEWARD

In the big brownstone edifice of the Pacific Union Club at the summit of San Francisco's Nob Hill the Western Big Three have begun what may prove to be a very long chapter in East-West diplomacy. They have worked out suggestions for conducting talks at another summit—the coming top-level Big Four conference at Geneva.

These suggestions aim at limiting the time of the heads-of-state meeting to a matter of days. They would also keep it general enough to promote a relaxation of feelings. This, it is hoped, will make settlement of specific issues easier to reach in later Foreign Ministers' meetings.

But the Nob Hill proposals do not envisage any time limit for reaching specific agreements. These may take years to work out in the view of the Western leaders.

There are at least two points worth noting about this Western position.

STRENGTH AND LIABILITY

For one thing, it is a position of obvious diplomatic strength. Not only is the West now—as it was not a few months ago—ready to negotiate and therefore in better standing before nations neutral or uncommitted in the cold war; the West also is in the comfortable position of a bargainer who is prepared to wait.

Western governments are under no compelling necessity to achieve a quick and spectacular result for their own sake.

The second point, however, is that a liability exists for the West's cause in long-range negotiation. It is that democratically ruled peoples can make their impatience felt more readily by their governments than peoples under totalitarian regimes. And Americans, perhaps more quickly than even Britons or Frenchmen, can both generate and effectively express their impatience with what they may assume is appeasement or unnecessary compromise, or too-devious diplomacy.

For this reason the Big Three may sometimes find themselves under pressure to get on with the job—to reach a settlement or force a showdown—just when to do so will play into their opponents' hands.

This will not happen, however, if Western peoples recognize that they may now be entering a period more like normal for diplomacy than they have seen for decades. Something like a world balance of power has appeared, due to the combined influence of arms, alliances, and a vast and more assertive body of neutral opinion in the world.

Future negotiations must, therefore, aim not simply at great solutions to provide underpinnings for future peace, but at preserving the balance on which a present absence of war rests. The latter has been a traditional function of diplomacy. It promises to become very important again in the period now opening.

CRUSADES AND SHOWDOWNS

This does not mean that aims of Western peoples, such as restoration of freedom to those who have lost it to communism and increase of self-government in colonial or other dependent areas, must be abandoned. It may well mean, however, that pressures for reforms must take less popular forms than merely emotionally satisfying crusades.

It also may mean that showdown is out, and that new emphasis must be placed on avoidance of clash—as between East and West, so also, logically, as between allies.

For "older" nations like the Europeans this would require less readjustment of outlook than among newer leaders in world affairs. But if method seems to become somewhat "old world" in this process, it need not and should not follow that "new world" convictions are to be disregarded. They will not be, for they are too strong.

Sometimes they may seem almost hidden by method, however, and it is at such times that free peoples will be called upon for special discernment as to what causes are really being served and how well.

A MORAL EQUIVALENT

Just as the United Nations has spread responsibility for keeping world peace more widely than it had been spread before, so has the Nob Hill meeting. Taking place on the same stage with the UN's 10th anniversary celebration, Nob Hill forecasts new and more challenging responsibilities for peoples as well as statesmen.

The fundamental challenge is to wage peace and reform without aid of sheer excitement that usually goes with waging war or revolution. Or, better still, to discover a "moral equivalent" for such excitement in satisfactions which come from discovering unsuspected depths of steadiness and steadfastness in ourselves.

Government Spending in the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely article entitled "Government's Role," appearing in the June 22, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, which points up the practical wisdom of initiating a study now to determine how greatly American economic standards are dependent upon Government activities.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Solomon Fabricant, research director of the National Bureau of Economic Research, says an intensive study should be made of the scope of Government activities, and their effect on the Nation's living standards.

This is a field that has been scarcely touched, because the big impact of Government activities did not come until the New Deal era. As Mr. Fabricant suggests, the Nation needs a thorough understanding of the Government's role in our present economy.

A few figures tell in themselves the importance of Government. Last year, for instance, Government at all levels employed 15 percent of the total working force, and some 17 percent of all personal income came from the same source. In 1954, Government made 32 percent of the Nation's expenditures on new construction and equipment, and it bought some $46 billion worth of goods and services from private business enterprises.

A big operation like that certainly has a tremendous effect economically, and has certainly been a factor in keeping the postwar boom rolling. But there are questions involved in such a heavy reliance on Government spending and employment, and a survey might help answer them. For, after all, Government itself is not productive of goods, and heavy Government spending can be definitely inflationary. And every dollar spent by Government comes from a taxpayer—either an individual or a corporation—and is, therefore, not available for private spending.

If the Nation becomes dependent on Government spending to keep its economy rolling, it is headed for trouble.

No Use Hemming and Hawing About Ghee, Let's Import It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the editorial No Use Hemming and Hawing About Ghee, Let's Import It, which appeared in the July issue of the Farm Bureau News, written by Mr. Leland J. Melrose. Ghee, the subject of this piece, is made out of spoiling butter in India. He have plenty of that. Why not send it to India and get back ghee in trade? It has marvelous medicinal health-giving values we have not yet discovered. Mr. Melrose says:

Only orientals and readers of Kipling knew there was such a thing as ghee until recently. Now we know a lot about it.

Ghee is a wonderful dairy product. We should import it.

Ghee is the highly prized cooking fat of the people of India and Pakistan. A luxury to the poor, they still manage to buy a lot of it.

Ghee will keep endlessly in any climate. It has been known to keep for a hundred years, with no worsening of flavor.

Ghee is used to treat eye diseases, wounds, dyspepsia, and ulcers. It increases mental powers and improves the voice and personal appearance.

Ghee is made of boiled buffalo milk, with sour milk added to speed up curdling. Then the oil is skimmed off. This is ghee. It can be made of cow's milk, too.

A product with all these qualities surely should be imported. A great market is waiting in the United States.

Right now the makings of ghee are being shipped from Commodity Credit butter stocks, as they start to spoil, to India and Pakistan. The butter oil we ship there goes through final processing in the ages-old methods of these ancient lands. Life-giving, voice-improving ghee is the result.

But none of this wonderful stuff, so far as we know, is being imported into the United States.

The market is crying for it, or would if some merchandising genius geared himself in on the product. People who eat oleo should be just nuts about it. We have never heard that oleo improves mental processes, as ghee does. We have assumed that oleo has the opposite effect; otherwise one purchase would be enough.

The One Worlders, who are always tinkering with international matters but have not yet succeeded in giving everything we own to our listless friends and active enemies overseas, should be able to do wonders with ghee. Let the United States Government buy all the good United States butter it can get its hands on to support the market, let this butter start spoiling in the storage facilities that cost the taxpayers up toward a million dollars a day and after processing it into oil ship it to India, where it gets another going over that turns it into fine eye medicine and a voice treatment that will make radio crooners of everybody, Saints forbid.

Then, after the ghee has been created, ship it back here to fill a yawning void. Just why the One Worlders and the social planners haven't worked this one out proves that they are not infallible. They have overlooked a bet.

You might write to your Senators and Congressmen about it. Set them to work on this ghee business and thus pull them off from more harmful didoes.

Until we can start importing ghee how about making out as best we can with butter, before it gets into the hands of the Government and the One Worlders and the social planners?

If you have dyspepsia, take butter. If you have ulcers, take butter. If your voice is harsh rather than dulcet, take butter. Make believe that butter is ghee. Buy it and use it as ghee.

You might try using more of it as butter, too. There's nothing that compares with butter as a spread on bread. Not even ghee.

Election Day in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, because free elections are the symbol of a genuine democracy, I believe that all Members of this body rejoice in the fact that in one of the youngest democracies in the world, Israel, today is election day. Every citizen of Israel, over the age of 18, regardless of race, color, creed, or previous nationality, has the right to vote and it is estimated that 85 percent of the citizens of Israel will today make use of that right. The voters will go to the polls to determine the composition of the Knesset, or Parliament of Israel, the most important governmental body in the country. The current election will produce the third Knesset in the 7 years of Israel's history as a modern republic.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States many millions of Americans have followed with pride and hope the struggle of this new nation to build a free land. It is encouraging indeed to see this vigorous people strengthening the cause of freedom and democracy in the Middle East.

A Move in the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before Uncle Sam gets a dollar someone has to earn it and then turn it over to the tax collector.

Without those tax payments, Uncle Sam could not stir a foot nor lift a hand. Of that fact, everyone is aware.

Nevertheless, there are those who have been able to entice some agency or department of the Federal Government to go into business in competition with taxpayers. Always the result has been to deprive some taxpayer of his opportunity to establish and continue a business, give employment, and meet tax levies.

Usually the Government has gone into competition with private business because some Congressman or some group of Congressmen, at the request of their constituents, insisted that Uncle Sam engage in a specific business so as to benefit the local community.

The 83d Congress last year passed a bill which died in the Senate, which it was my privilege to introduce, the purpose of which was to have the Government discontinue the activities of its departments which were in direct competition with individuals, or private corporations, and which could be carried on by those private interests, without injury to the national defense.

A similar bill was introduced this year, is now pending before the Committee on Government Operations, and it was hoped that it would go through Congress before adjournment.

Not waiting for the enactment of this proposed legislation, but acting on its own initiative, as is proper and commendable, the administration—and here I mean the President—has instructed the Department of Defense, wherever it can be done without impairing our national security, to discontinue its competition with the taxpayers.

The Department of Defense, notwithstanding bitter and vicious criticism from some Members of Congress, has already discontinued 143 establishments operated by the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, including tire retreading activities, cobbler shops, sawmills, bakeries, office equipment, furniture and automotive repair shops, laundries and dry-cleaning establishments, ice and cement-mixing plants, tree and garden nurseries.

The Department recently ordered the discontinuance of some 37 additional facilities, including scrap-metal baling, coffee-roasting plants, rope and paint manufacturing.

Recently, when Congress inserted in the $31 billion defense appropriations bill a provision which, if enforced, hampered the President in his effort to minimize this ruinous competition, the President asserted that under the Constitution the Congress could not prevent the use of the order which he had made, and that unless the courts ruled otherwise, he would continue to get the Government out of competition with private enterprise.

A statement of the facts shows that the President is on sound ground, both from a legal and economic standpoint.

The administration is to be commended for this forthright, effective, courageous action.

Guaranteed Disarmament Is a Necessity for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD. D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely article entitled "Achieving Disarmament, An American Dream," which appeared in the June 16, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette. Let us pray that this disarmament dream is one of those destined to come true in the near future.

The editorial follows:

ACHIEVING DISARMAMENT, AN AMERICAN DREAM

Disarmament, said West Germany's Chancellor Konrad Adenauer on Tuesday, is the basic point in restoring Europe's security against war. Dr. Adenauer wants both Russia and the United States to work with determination for the reality of controlled disarmament when the Big Four prime ministers meet in Geneva next month.

Dr. Adenauer, we hope, will be assured during his visit here that the United States sincerely wants disarmament. We hope he will be able to observe that the American people, like the people of his own new republic, see their real advantages and material gains in an economy which wastes as little as possible on purely military production.

At the same time, the chancellor will probably find that few Americans are now hopeful of disarmament as a policy unrelated to the facts of life in world diplomacy. Nothing is more desirable than some arrangement by which both the Western World and the Soviet empire can both disarm at the same time—each assured that the other is acting in good faith.

But disarmament, as we see it, must evolve from new diplomatic situations which render further armament needless. Such situations must be physical facts, like the physical liberation of East Germany and other areas held by the Reds. A Soviet policy which lifted the Iron Curtain could lead to disarmament.

If disarmament itself is not discussed at Geneva, it is certainly our intention to discuss matters leading to disarmament. We hope, with Chancellor Adenauer, that Russia will enter the discussions with similar genuine purposes.

Conservationists Restate Stand on Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial issues before the 84th Congress has been the legislation providing for the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

The conservationists of our country have been opposed to this project in view of the construction of the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument, stated by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior as the heart of the project, which would thereby establish a precedent for the future invasion of our national parks system.

A statement of the conservationists position is fully stated in the letter to Senator WATKINS from Fred Smith, director, council of conservationists. The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR WATKINS SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

JULY 23, 1955.

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: It is regrettable that we must answer in so blatant a fashion as this the charges against the country's leading conservationists, which you so quietly slipped into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14. The Council of Conservationists, which you call a now-perverted organization, does not have the freedom nor the immunity of the Senate floor to expound its opinions and its points of view. It cannot place long, diffuse, misleading, and accusing statements in the hallowed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with an eye to quick distribution on the eve of an important House action—knowing that the action is likely to take place before the truth can overtake the groundless accusations. So forgive this billboard. It is our only possible chance to focus attention on the facts in the case, in time.

First of all, may I ask why, among all the exhibits poured into the July 14 RECORD, you did not include a copy of the letter upon which you based your blast at the Council of Conservationists?

Could it be that you do not want your fellow Senators—and the Congressmen who are considering the upper Colorado project—to read the letter and discover for themselves how meticulously you picked it apart, segment by segment (but leaving out some of the more vital segments) so you could instruct your associates, with your superior wisdom, how to read perfectly plain, unmistakable English?

Let me reproduce the letter that appeared in the Washington Post:

"To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

"Last Tuesday's thoughtful editorial concerning the "shearing" of the Colorado project, raises a few points that should be explained.

"The position of the conservationist forces on this issue should be made abundantly clear. The conservationists of the country have supported in a gratifying way the campaign to prevent the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument. This is all we oppose. We do not oppose water for the West. We would not oppose an upper Colorado River

project which did not invade protected public lands in which we are interested.

"We are fighting the present upper Colorado River project, because we have no choice but to believe Senator WATKINS and the Department of the Interior when they say that Echo Park 'is the piston in the engine,' and is indivisible from the project as presently planned. We are against the project also because congressional supporters of the project have published statements pointing out that in spite of the House committee action, 'Echo Park Dam is not dead,' and they intend to restore Echo Park Dam either in the House-Senate conference, or at some later date.

"If we expect to kill Echo Park Dam, we have no course but to do our utmost to defeat the project in which they expect to restore Echo Park Dam one way or another.

"Our record in fighting the project has been straightforward and aboveboard from the day we started. Here is that record:

"1. Last November, before any upper Colorado legislation was introduced, a meeting was held under the auspices of the National Parks Association. At this meeting, representatives of 22 major conservation, garden, and women's clubs, agreed to fight Echo Park Dam if it appeared in the legislation; and if the proponents made Echo Park Dam indivisible from the project as a whole, we would then fight the project by calling public attention to the project's many economic weaknesses which were already apparent.

"2. This position was made clear to the proponents of the project previous to the introduction of legislation. We were ignored.

"3. The project's supporters took the position that there could be no upper Colorado project without Echo Park Dam.

"4. Senator WATKINS attempted to prove that Dinosaur National Monument was not really a protected area insofar as power dams were concerned, and he implied that the present boundaries of the monument are probably illegal anyway. This indicated the lengths to which people would go to invade protected land.

"5. When a supporter of the conservationists' position introduced an amendment in the subcommittee to remove Echo Park Dam, it was defeated. When reintroduced later by another Congressman, it was passed and immediately nullified by ASPINALL'S time-bomb amendment to appoint a committee of engineers (with no interest in conservation) who would again decide that Echo Park Dam is essential to the project. This course of action had been clearly delineated well ahead of time in the Salt Lake papers, where it was explained that the dam would be taken out of the project while the House voted, and put back later by a special committee that would find it essential.

"6. The full committee, made fully aware of this previously revealed strategy, wisely removed the time-bomb amendment. If an amendment had been substituted, in place of the Aspinall time-bomb amendment, to investigate all alternative sites but not Echo Park Dam, the conservationists would have supported it. Must we believe that the upper Colorado people do not want this project badly enough to even seek an alternative for Echo Park?

"In the face of this evidence, what course do we have, except to continue to bring about the defeat of the present project, which we are repeatedly told by its designers must include Echo Park Dam to be successful? How can we take any different position with the proponents of Echo Park reiterating, over and over again, that they will get Echo Park Dam back into the project if it passes the House?

"If we did anything but follow the clearly marked road, we would be unfaithful to our quarter-million cooperating conservationists, and the millions of people who actually use the national parks, many of whom have joined in waging so unselfish and commendable a battle to prevent this major invasion of a national monument area—which we are convinced would be the beginning of the end of the National Parks System.

"None of the leadership of the conservationist forces, and certainly an infinitesimally small minority (if any) of the cooperating conservationists, have any direct interest in any water compact that may exist, or in the division of water from the Colorado now or in the future, nor have they any quarrel with the principle of reclamation, nor with the known need and desire of the West for more water. Our campaign has had no support, financially or otherwise, from any person, group, or agency directly concerned with the use of Colorado water. We have no concern except the pure conservationist considerations involved, and our financial sources—which the records will show, have provided only a fraction as much as the supporters of the upper Colorado River project have been able to raise—came wholly from conservationists concerned exclusively with conservation and national park principles.

"If the people of the upper Colorado Basin some day are given a plan that doesn't need a dam in Echo Park, or doesn't in some other way attempt to exploit protected public lands and resources that concern conservationists, they need have no fear that the present effective opposition will again be aroused.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRED SMITH."

My dear Senator, can there be any honest doubt what this letter says? Can anyone seriously question the reason for writing it?

The Post suggested in its editorial that the conservationists had won their battle, and the project might now well be authorized. Inferentially, it wondered why we were still fighting the battle of Echo Park, now that the House committee had removed the dam. That is an eminently fair question to ask, and one that deserved an answer. This was the time to say, in irrefutable black and white so there could be no possible question of doubt about it, that "if the people of the upper Colorado Basin someday are given a plan that doesn't need a dam in Echo Park, or doesn't in some other way attempt to exploit protected public lands and resources that concern conservationists, they need have no fear that the present effective opposition will again be aroused."

Could anything in the world be clearer than that?

But we wanted the Post to know that in these days of unimpeded, high-speed transportation, we manage to keep abreast of what is printed in the Sale Lake papers, and these papers have repeatedly quoted you, Senator WATKINS, and your associates as saying that Echo Park Dam is not really dead at all, and implying in unmistakable terms that it will somehow be returned to the project, some time after the House votes on its version of the bill. For this reason, we wanted the Post to know, we had to continue the policy we established last November: That we would oppose the project as long as Echo Park remains even potentially a part of it.

So, Senator WATKINS, it is not we who have changed our policy, but you. You change your policy every time you cross the Mississippi River, taking one determined stand—that the dam is not dead—in the West, and quite the opposite—that the House has killed the dam—in the East. My poor smalltown mind, in spite of the agility which you attribute to it, simply cannot accommodate this flexibility; so I have ardently supported the position that we should play it safe and plug away tirelessly in an honest effort to prevent this major invasion of our National Parks system. We owe that much to the thousands of conservationists who are counting on us not to fall asleep at the switch.

If I may burden you with a few more facts, I should like to correct some other misconceptions which seem to have you terribly confused.

1. No one has taken over the council of conservationists as you charge. The Johnny-come-latelies in the organization, which you condemn so vehemently, simply don't exist.

Our executive committee, consisting almost wholly of what you call honest conservationists, has not changed, and its members maintain their original close and friendly relationships, and have agreed on everything we have done. The council has no supporters now that it didn't have last November. The cooperating groups have grown, but all the new ones have joined because of their interest in conservation, and for no other reason.

2. As far as I know, no one in our organization is (to quote you) "opposed to the Colorado River storage project and to water resource development generally," except inso far as such projects impinge actually or potentially upon the interests of conservationists. This includes David Brower, of California, whom you single out for special suspicions. He certainly has never attempted to alter the policies of the Council of Conservationists.

3. I doubt whether the sincere and honest conservationist will deeply regret our position, as you predict; nor do I think they will feel in the slightest deceived by our position of being strictly from Missouri on whether or not Echo Park Dam is really out of the project. Those conservationists, myself, and our executive committee stand by our previous and oft-repeated statements that "we are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West," and we are "sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize water without seriously threatening the national parks system." We only want to make sure Echo Park is really dead, and the park system is really no longer threatened. The problem gets down to whether or not the present upper Colorado project will work without Echo Park Dam. Reclamation says it won't. You say it won't. We are not engineers, so we cannot effectively take issue with either of you on your position. We have to assume you are right, and fight on.

4. You say "but the real conservationists represent just a small, and now definitely minor part of the Council of Conservationists." This is news to me. As I have just stated, the council has not materially changed in any way since last November, except that we have had a vast amount of correspondence with people whom we don't know, but who represent garden clubs, conservation sections of women's clubs, and others in the same general category. An almost infinitesimal minority of our correspondents have been inspired to get in touch with us by the writings of Mr. Moley, Governor Miller, taxpayers' groups, or others who oppose the upper Colorado project for reasons far removed from ours. Virtually all of our moral support and 100 percent of our severely limited financial support has come from conservation-minded people who are interested in the National Parks system.

5. You quote at some length, and reprint among your exhibits, the interview I gave Mr. Wing of the New York Herald Tribune News Service last December. I assumed when Mr. Wing breezed into my office that he had been sent by the newspapers in your area to find out what the Council of Conservationists was all about and what we were up to. I welcomed the opportunity to tell him exactly what I thought you would like to know, and to inform the people of your area of the policy established—back last November, remember—that "we don't care about the upper Colorado project as such—we have no interest in it. But as long as

Echo Park Dam remains a part of it, then we are forced to fight the project, too." This statement, big as life, is in the interview which you inserted in the RECORD. I even went so far as to tell you, through Mr. Wing, where our money for expenses was coming from, because I hoped in this way to prove to you that we had—and have—no ulterior motives; that this could easily be one of the cleanest and most straightforward important conservation battles ever waged, because nobody involved is interested in anything but conservation. I said in this interview that we might accept funds from other people with the stipulation that we "would not continue fighting the project if the dam were not in it, or if we were satisfied that the dam was permanently knocked out of it." That stipulation was made deliberately to "include out" any stray water lobbyists, or die-hard foes of reclamation who might attempt to use us for their purposes. As it happens, we neither sought nor received any outside money. We do not need it. Virtue is on our side, and public support for our cause has come more readily than anyone would have believed possible. If I knew exactly how much money the council has spent, I would not object telling you here and now, but I won't know until the figures are complete. You are going to be surprised and deflated. I am sure that the big-league $80,000-a-year lobbyist talked about, will regard us as strictly from the sandlots. It will all be in the record and filed in Washington very shortly, including the sources. We have not, as you charge, made a concerted effort to raise money from individuals. We have had a few unsolicited contributions, such as one which came in last week: a check for $25 on a Texas bank, sent by a Colorado professor who wrote across the face of the check: "For the Echo Park fight. Keep up the good work."

6. You suggest pointedly that there is some relationship between myself, the Council of Conservationists and the $80,000-a-year lobbist, Mr. Northcutt Ely "who has been the directing genius behind southern California's still strenuous efforts * * *." In your heart, Senator, you know there is not a fragment of truth in this nefarious accusation.

I don't know Mr. Ely. I never saw him. I have had no correspondence with him, or anyone connected with him. If I were sure he gets $80,000 a year, I might make his acquaintance for the sole purpose of being able to tell my old friends back in Troy, Ohio, that I know a lobbyist who makes $80,000 a year. But I am sure I would not be interested in his clients or his projects.

In what appears to be a squinting, clucking sort of way, you suggest that the Senate ought to investigate the possible tie-in between the council and the lobbyist, and piously indicate that true conservationists would welcome such an investigation. In this case you may inadvertently be telling the truth: as a conservationist—if not an honest one by your standards—I would myself support such an investigation if there is any possibility that anyone anywhere believes you when you say the Council of Conservationists serves "as a front for, or the unsuspecting pawn of, a water power lobby," or any other selfish group.

7. You say: "Mr. Smith is serving notice on the House of Representatives that even if they pass a bill without Echo Park Dam in it, the great Mr. Smith * * * will continue to bring about the defeat of the present project." I would say the shoe is on the other foot. Senator WATKINS seems to have served notice in his hometown papers that if the House of Representatives passes a bill without Echo Park Dam, in it, the great Senator will put the dam back into it at his earliest convenience.

8. As a final point, I should like to clear up the misconception you are promoting that I have somehow lured into my lair a group of honest, sincere, unsuspecting conservationist dupes. It will interest you not at all to know that the honest conservationists, whom you admire—and you should—came to the council and asked for help because it was obvious that, as Peter Edson so clearly pointed out, we were about to have an exhibition of logrolling that would put a Paul Bunyon to shame.

The honest conservationist recognized that the facilities which you possess would be difficult to meet or match with their relatively poor equipment, no matter how sincere their views or how terribly they feared this invasion of the Parks system. Therefore, they asked the Council of Conservationists (which had been set up earlier for another unselfish conservation project in New York State) to cooperate and lend facilities to their forces. I agreed to help because I am interested, and because the preservation of national parks is dear to the hearts of some of my very closest friends. It has taken a lot of time that I might more profitably have spent otherwise, but I am gratified with the progress that the honest conservationists, the council, and others who have worked tirelessly, have been able to make—with the minimum of funds, against the most formidable of odds.

Our cause must be just, or we would have been out of the race long ago.

Sincerely,

FRED SMITH,
Director, Council of Conservationists.

Communist Peace Offensive and United States Policy Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an analysis of the current Communist peace offensive prepared on May 30, 1955, by Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr., of Milwaukee, Wis., an analysis worthy of thought and consideration by others:

COMMUNIST PEACE OFFENSIVE AND U. S. POLICY INITIATIVE

(By Russell D. L. Wirth, Jr.)

In the early glow of summer there swells throughout the world a new and radiant hope. A hope that the cold war may at last have ended. A hope shared by all mankind that the Communists may have permanently abandoned the icy hostility of world revolution for the more seasonable warmth of peaceful coexistence.

Here at home this hope is expressed in a thousand different forms. In the taxpayers' dream that we may soon shrug off the heavy burden of aid and defense expentiture, amounting to over two-thirds of the United States budget. In mothers' prayers that we have seen the end of brushfire warfare which, in Korea alone, cost American homes some 150,000 casualties. And, in the rejoicing of little people the world over, that mankind may at last have come out from beneath the grim shadow and unspeakable horror of world war III. A war in which civilization itself might perish.

This great hope is born of the most extensive Communist peace offensive since the beginning of the cold war. In the past 2 months, the Communist Chinese, the Soviet Russians, and the East European satellites have concerted policy behind a wave of concessions on almost every major issue and at almost every trouble point on the globe.

In the Far East, the Soviets have reversed their policy of postwar hostility in order to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan. Hints continue to flow of possible return of the Soviet-held Kuriles, or Southern Sakhalin, or repatriation of 10,000 Japanese prisoners, or a seat in the United Nations, in return for Japanese friendship and the neutralization of this vital United States defense bastion.

The Communist Chinese have muted their warlike claims to Formosa with indications that they would welcome a relaxing of tensions in the Straits. Peking's assurance that "the Chinese people do not want war with the United States," has been followed by the deportation to freedom of four illegally held United States airmen. A treaty of friendship with Indonesia has released 2½ million overseas Chinese citizens from any arbitrary obligations to the Communist mainland. SEATO members Thailand and the Philippines have been promised that Peking would "not make any aggression or direct threats" against either. While shaky Laos and Cambodia have been reassured that Communist China has "no intention whatsoever to intervene in the internal affairs" of Southeast Asia. Hence, the Communists argue, there is little need either to arm in defense or to join military pacts with the West.

The Soviet Russians have gone even further, perhaps having led their more bellicose Sino-allies along the peace road. The Soviets suddenly negotiated a withdrawal of troops and a treaty of peace involving armed neutrality for Austria. They followed friendship bids to Yugoslavia with the humbling visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Marshall Tito. Here, for the first time, the rigid Stalinist code of orthodoxy was rejected with the formal acceptance of Titoist heresy and of doctrinal differences within the Communist empire. The Soviets have followed their Yugoslav venture with friendship feelers in Greece, Turkey, and Egypt. They have extended an open invitation to oft-denounced West German Chancellor Adenauer to discuss the reestablishment of diplomatic, cultural, and commercial relations. They suddenly repaid Iran $12 million in gold for services rendered during World War II. The Soviets capped everything with an announced willingness to negotiate an overall "end to international tensions" at a 4-power conference between heads of state this July.

One topic at this conference, in all likelihood, will be disarmament. The Soviets at once seized the propaganda initiative by proposing outward concessions to the Western position. These involve acceptance in principle of ceilings on armed forces, step-by-step reduction of atomic and conventional weapons, inspection and enforcement of atomic disarmament, and possible mutual withdrawal of troops and bases from foreign soils.

Looking at the global string of Communist concessions and peace moves, all concentrated within a period of 2 months, one cannot but ask what caused this sudden policy reversal? A very strong case can be made for a very simple answer: Today, largely as a result of United States foreign policy achievements, the free world has obtained a temporary favorable balance of power relative to the World Communists. The Communists want a genuine relaxation of tensions in order to reverse this balance before their next revolutionary advance.

In support of this argument, we might tick-off the actual facts of present free world strength and temporary Communist weakness.

The present power position of the free world is due, more than anything else, to

certain revolutionary advances in United States foreign policy and political thought.

For the first time in history, the United States has realized that free political institutions cannot survive anywhere except under conditions of reasonable economic freedom, prosperity, and growth. The United States has given more to building economic freedom abroad than has ever been given by any nation heretofore. Of over $50 billion worth of United States foreign aid, more than $33 billion has been economic aid to rebuild the free world from its war-shattered chaos to its present thriving state.

For the first time in peacetime history, the United States has accepted the principle that military strength, when confronting a world aggressor, is the necessary price of freedom. As a result, it maintains the largest defense force in peacetime history. Perhaps the most effective components of this force are the 1,500 jet B–47's. Stationed on 100 foreign bases, these United States medium jet bombers are capable of instant air-atomic retaliation against the World Communists anywhere along a 14,000 mile front.

Despite past continental isolation, the United States now recognizes that, in the air-atomic age, peace is indivisible. As a result, it is committee to the military defense of 39 foreign nations with an overall military aid program including some 63. Overall United States defense interests now extend to half of the land area and two-thirds of the peoples of the globe.

The United States has likewise recognized that permanent peace cannot be maintained outside of framework of law. In contrast with past ostrichlike rejection of the League of Nations, it has led in postwar international organization. The United States pioneering efforts in establishing the UN, NATO, SEATO and such functional organizations as UNESCO, GATT, and WHO, have encouraged perhaps the highest level of international cooperation in modern peacetime history.

The net result of these United States policy changes has been dramatized in two recent achievements: West German rearmament and Asian anti-Communism. Despite the most ominous Communist threats, the French signed the Paris Accords granting West Germany sovereignty and the right to rearm within a Western European Army. Despite the most polished pacifism of Premier Chou En-Lai, Asian delegates at the Bandung Conference refused to swallow the Communist line and damned imperialism of the left as heartily as that of the right.

On the scales opposing present Free World strength, are the multiple indications of Communist weakness. Temporary weakness, ironically, may largely be the product of the breakneck Communist drive to total power.

At the very summit of the World Communist empire there is no solution to the conflict for leadership. And it is doubtful whether this can ever be solved except through the process of destructive terror, assassination, and power seizure. Some 2 years after the death of Stalin, at least 6 top Soviet leaders continue to jockey for absolute power. Despite the purge of Beria and the removal of Malenkov, it is still difficult to say who will eventully replace the collective leadership of the Soviet State. In Communist China, puppet boss of Manchuria, Kao Kang has been purged for plotting to seize power in conjunction with army dissidents. There are continued reports of a split at the top between doctrinate party members, desiring to accelerate socialism at home and conflict abroad, and state and military leaders, who have become more conservative with their rise to power.

Agricultural failures and shortages continue to plague the world Communist empire. The Russian people are reported consuming 30 percent less meat per capita than before collectivization in 1928. It is estimated that the Soviet city laborer must work some 40 percent longer than in 1928 just to provide the minimum wherewithal for his family. In the past year, Communist China has been stricken with the worst combination of floods, frosts, and drought in a century. Official papers acknowledge that some 150 million peasants are short of food. The Peking government has cut food rations 20 to 50 percent in the cities.

The real standard of living within the Communist empire may actually be declining as a result of concentration on heavy industry and war production. With over 65 percent of the Soviets and 45 percent of the Communist Chinese budgets devoted to heavy industrialization, consumer output tends to lag behind rising population.

Both agricultural shortages and declining living standards have heightened discontent within the Communist empire. The summer revolts throughout satellite Europe in 1953 were but the outward signs of opposition to the Communist slave economy. Wholesale rioting was reported in the slave labor camps upon the death of Stalin. And present discontent with collectivization is heightened by famine conditions in Communist China. The official Peoples' Daily openly admits that Chinese party leaders are "afraid to lead" because of peasant opposition in the famine area.

As a final sign of temporary weakness, the Soviet Communists have expressed well-founded fear of United States air-atomic power. The Soviets mentioned United States foreign airbases three times in their latest disarmament proposal. They at one time even admitted that communism itself could perish in an all-out atomic war. Their present estimated stockpile of some 500 atomic weapons does not match United States stockpiles either in quantity or in quality.

Nor does the present striking power of the Soviet strategic air force equal that of the United States. With 1,500 B–47's on some 100 overseas airbases, the United States can strike at the Communist empire from any direction along a 14,000 mile front at an average range of but 1,600 miles. The Soviets, with no foreign bases and less medium jet bombers, can strike effectively only over a 1,800 mile northern arc at an extended average range of 4,000 miles. Despite rapid gains, it is doubtful that the Soviets could win even a sneak air-atomic war at the present.

In view of underlying temporary Communist weakness and free world strength, what general conclusions can be drawn about the present Communist peace offensive?

First, it appears obvious that the Communists genuinely desire a relaxation of tensions. For, they are not only promising, but are actually acting on promises, as in their negotiations with Austria. They furthermore appear carefully coordinating their policy throughout the globe so as to make no hostile move to belie peaceful intent.

Historically, it is important to remember that this same relaxation of tensions was desired by the Bolsheviks in 1917, under the policy of peace, land, and bread. It was desired in 1935 with the growing threat of nazism, under the policy of united fronts with all anti-Fascist elements. It was desired in 1953 upon the death of Stalin, under the Communist new look peace offensive. Yet, none of these relaxations involved a change in the Communist aim of world conquest. Nor did they result in abandonment of 19 successful revolutionary gains. Nor did they involve liquidation of the world Communist empire, which today enslaves one-third of the peoples and one-fourth of the land area of the globe.

Second, many of the present peace concessions merely involve promises by the Communists not to do what they never should have done to begin with. Without justification in international law and in violation of the Korean truce terms, the Communist Chinese illegally hold United States prisoners of war. Yet, they gained great credit in world opinion for yielding up 4, while continuing to detain 63. The Austrian Peace Treaty could have been negotiated at almost any of 400 prior meetings between the occupying authorities except for Soviet obstructionism. When the Soviets suddenly advanced those very points which they had previously willfully opposed, they gained worldwide acclaim for their peace initiative. Likewise, Communist China, by merely promising not to subvert southeast Asian regimes, won substantial praise for relaxation of tensions.

Thirdly, many of the present peace concessions are designed to build a propaganda advantage for communism while cloaking a demand for unequal sacrifices from the West. The prime example is, of course, the new Soviet disarmament scheme. By merely modifying past proposals which they had advanced in public and then repudiated in private, the Soviets further impressed world opinion with their new concessions.

Hidden within the Soviet disarmament proposal are a number of unequal sacrifices demanded of the West. The suggested withdrawal of occupation troops from Germany to their national frontiers would result in Soviet troops moving but the short distance back into Russia, while United States troops withdrew 3,500 miles across the Atlantic. The proposal to freeze and then reduce armed forces as of their December 31, 1954, strengths, would prevent West German rearmament, in that Bonn had no army as of 1954. The suggested withdrawal from all foreign military bases would neutralize United States striking superiority from 100 foreign airbases and might even involve abandoning the Panama defenses. The proposal to grant security-council control over defensive use of nuclear weapons would provide a Soviet veto over United States defense policy. The proposed nuclear weapons inspection and enforcement system, patterned on the Korean International Armistice Commission, would have all the limitations of its forerunner which has allowed an illegal threefold buildup in Communist striking power in North Korea.

Finally, all of the present Communist peace moves are obviously designed to induce widespread belief that the Communists have at last abandoned their goal of world domination and now are willing to pursue a consistent course of peaceful coexistence.

This Communist policy of peaceful coexistence is perhaps as old as world communism itself. Stalin spelled it out most concisely when he stated that the very survival of communism depends "on whether we succeed in delaying war with the capitalist countries, which is inevitable," until communism has gained decisive power. The actual technique of a peace offensive was perhaps best revealed by Manuilsky, one of the leading Communist revolutionaries. In a much-quoted address to the Lenin School of Subversive Warfare, Manuilsky states "war to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack * * * to win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record, * * * the capitalist countries, stupid and decadent will * * * cooperate in their own destruction." The logic of peaceful coexistence is further spelled out in a statement of the Communist international that there is a "glaring contradiction between the imperialists' policy of piling up armaments and their hypocritical talk about peace. * * * (But, there is no such contradiction * * * between the Soviet Government's preparations * * * for revolutionary war and a consistent peace policy."

May not the Communists today be doing exactly what these statements have implied

in the past: Outwardly talking and acting out a peace policy while inwardly preparing for heightened political and military warfare. A number of facts support this view.

The Soviet Communists are today allocating one-half of their entire industrial output to war production. They have enslaved 13 million people and are forcing their oppressed population to reinvest at five times the United States rate in heavy nonconsumer industry in order to support their war machine. The Chinese Communists are making every sacrifice, including starving their peasant population and enslaving some 15 million people, in their breakneck effort to build economic war potential.

As a result of this economic concentration on war, the world Communists have built what is perhaps the most powerful military machine in history. Today, they maintain the greatest land army, tactical air arm, and submarine fleet in the world. They outnumber free world forces 2 to 1 on the ground, and 4 to 1 in the air in Europe. They outnumber free world forces 8 to 1 on the ground, and 3 to 1 in the air in Asia.

In the postwar years, the Soviet Communists spent some $45 billion on naval construction alone, to raise their fleet from seventh to second place in the world. Their naval manpower today exceeds that of the United States. Their submarine fleet of 375 vessels is double that of the United States. And, it is estimated, that at present rates they will surpass the United States in overall naval strength within 5 to 10 years.

The Soviet Air Force today has several times more jet fighters and interceptors than the United States. It surpasses the United States in numbers of intercontinental jet bombers. It is challenging United States qualitative air superiority with its new TU-39 medium and TU-37 intercontinental bombers. Both are reported powered by jet engines with 70 percent more thrust than the best engines in the West. This alone may provide the key to overall Communist air superiority in the near future.

Although the Soviet stockpile of nuclear weapons is reported at but 500, there are only 215 targets worthy of atomic attack in the United States. Hence, both sides will soon reach a saturation point wherein sufficient nuclear weapons will exist for all potential targets. The Soviets are reported to have increased their nuclear weapons budget 1½ times and to have increased warplane production to twice present United States rates. On the basis of this concentration of effort, former Secretary of Air Finletter estimates that, as early as 1956 the balance of air-atomic power may shift decisively in favor of communism.

An analysis of Communist psychological warfare further reveals preparations for world revolution despite professions of peace. This year the Communists will spend some $3 billion to focus man's hate against the West and to identify his hope with themselves. This represents 35 times the amount spent by America on its Campaign of Truth. Communist psychological warfare is waged by some 6 million professional revolutionaries and by 26 million Communist Party members throughout the world. The continuous training of 325,000 propagandists, in such Soviet institutions as the Lenin School of Subversive Warfare, is neither theoretical nor diffuse. As a recent graduate stated, "We had target practice, science of civil warfare, revolutionary uprising * * * how to develop a general strike out of a local strike, how to develop a general strike into a city uprising, a city uprising into a national uprising."

With this general perspective of the Communist peace offensive, we may come to two alternative conclusions as to its objectives:

First, it may be waged to gain time to perfect the military weapons and techniques for final world revolution, or global war with the West, which the Communists have always believed inevitable. Today every basic Communist text repeats Lenin's classic statement that the coexistence of communism with the free world "for a long time is unthinkabe * * * before * * * (the end) * * * a series of frightful collisions * * * will be inevitable." Communist writings likewise repeat the doctrine that the free world today is in its final period of general crisis during which its complete destruction by world revolution is possible. This possibility is reflected in postwar official Communist journals, in which statements have appeared that "the second half of the 20th century will bring the complete victory of communism throughout the world."

The necessity for added time to build decisive military power is reflected in the present increase in the Soviet military budget for 1955 by some 12 percent. It is reflected in the fact that the Soviets have not yet developed an intercontinental rocket with a hydrogen bomb warhead. Soviet rocket experts have devoted some 30 years, Nazi experts some 20 years, to developing just such a rocket. At the end of World War II the Soviets not only captured 2,000 Nazi specialists, but also the principal rocket development centers at Peenemunde and Thuringia, along with plans for a rocket designed to bombard New York from Berlin.

Now these same scientists are reported to have developed the most advanced rocket motor in existence, with a 2 million horsepower thrust, to power an intercontinental rocket missile. At the same time, the Soviets are reported constructing missile launching sites along their Arctic, western, and eastern coasts. These sites plus rocket developments suggest that the Russians may be capable of bombarding the Baltic States, Japan, and North America with hydrogen missiles sometime within 4 to 6 years at the latest. There are no known defenses against such an attack. And the Soviets may now be playing for time until they can strike the decisive blow.

In line with this possibility, there has been a sudden change in the tone of Soviet military articles since the new regime has come into power. These articles, aimed not at the Western or Communist reading public but at the Soviet military leadership, formerly emphasized Communist defensive power and strength. Since late this spring, there has been increasing admission that there are no perfect defenses against surprise air-atomic attack. That Western "massive retaliation" may mean just such an attack. And, finally, that the key to survival may be soft talk, intensive weapons development, and Soviet surprise attack once present weapons have been perfected. As Deputy Minister of Defense Vasilesky wrote this May: "Soviet warriors are preparing themselves for difficult struggle against a powerful * * * enemy * * * (and) are being trained in a spirit of decisive offensive operations * * *."

Secondly, the present peace offensive may be designed to foster worldwide neutralism, to induce free world leaders to differ, and to establish a ring of isolated buffer states around the world Communist empire. Through manipulating the tools of neutralism and mutual differences, the Communists might then apply their proven technique of political-psychological warfare to penetrate and subvert the isolated buffers one-by-one in a gradual wearing-away process which would provide no clear provocation for massive retaliation.

The Sino-Communists are today fostering neutralist policy in India and throughout all of Southeast Asia with every blandishment and with arguments that joining military blocs will only heighten tensions. The Soviet Russians are attempting to complete the buffer ring by neutralizing an area from the Baltic to the Sudan to Kabul. The Soviet's humbling visit to Yugoslavia; their turnabout proposal to reestablish relations with West Germany; their friendship feelers with Turkey, Greece, Egypt, and Afghanistan; and their suggested general nonaggression pact to replace NATO—all fit into this policy pattern.

A successful neutralist policy might lead to decreased United States aid to free Asia and expanded East-West trade, in the belief that there was no longer a revolutionary threat. A cutback in further United States military support for SEATO and NATO along with continued inadequate United States weapons development and defense measures, as the Communists soft-pedaled all talk of war. An indefinite delay in German rearmament and a further cut in NATO military budgets, impelled by French fears and European neutralism. A piecemeal attrition of the coastal island defense and eventual complete neutralization of Chiang on Formosa, as United States opinion tired of petty tensions in the Straits. And, finally, a successful Communist policy would assuredly lead to world revolution against a weakened, disunited, and unprepared free world.

However, assuming an understanding of the present Communist peace offensive, it should be possible for the United States to reverse the tables, to regain the policy initiative, and make a decisive move in the cold war. At the present juncture, the Communists might be forced, either to abandon their illegal gains or else stand revealed as a continued threat to free mankind. And, should the latter prove the case, it should be possible to unite world sentiment behind an all-out effort to win the cold war before it is too late.

This twofold objective could be achieved through a formal United States policy statement, publicized throughout the world, to serve as the basis for United States negotiations at the July four-power conference. The United States policy statement could begin by documenting in detail the 19 Communist illegal power seizures. It could outline the exact revolutionary and terrorist methods employed, along with a chronological account of subsequent abuses of power by the Communist regimes. This documentation would provide the basis for a ringing declaration that mankind can never exist permanently half enslaved and half free. That, therefore, the United States will lead the free world in concerting all peaceful measures to grant freedom of choice to Communist-dominated peoples.

Freedom of choice might stem in part from widening each of the present Communist peace proposals. Thereby it would be possible to demand withdrawal of Communist troops and internationally supervised free elections in each of the satellite areas of Eastern Europe, North Korea, Vietnam, and Tibet.

Likewise, the present Communist disarmament proposals could be widened into a detailed, overall, staged, and enforced disarmament scheme. The United States could lead the free world in a formal commitment to accept this scheme once the Communists allowed a complete and worldwide inspection of all nuclear and military facilities and agreed on a formal written report to serve as the basis for subsequent disarmament.

The present Communist hints of unity for Germany in return for neutralism could be widened to apply to China, Korea, and Indochina. The United States might agree in advance to support any unified regime in these areas whose policies were determined by internationally supervised elections free of the threat of Communist troops or terror.

The United States policy statement might further include a detailed offer of food and consumer aid to all the various satellite peoples. Communist regimes would either have to accept this aid and, along with it, Communist economic inferiority, or else stand between their oppressed peoples and their own economic welfare.

Finally, the United States might propose a global campaign against economic want to be financed out of present free world defense budgets, provided only that the Communists accept disarmament proposals.

Should the Communists fail to negotiate in good faith upon a policy statement of this nature, they could then be revealed as pursuing present peace only to destroy future freedom. By dramatizing this fact, the United States might unite free world and neutralist opinion behind an all-out effort to win the very real race in the present cold war; a race to free some 800 million enslaved people before their will to freedom is destroyed by generations of Communist terror; a race to eliminate the Communist world revolutionary menace before it has developed tools of aggression against which there are no known defenses.

An all-out effort to win the cold war would involve sacrifices. It would involve an intensive program to regain superiority in air-atomic weapons and to overcome the Soviet lead in intercontinental rockets. It would involve building a highly trained and mobile land striking force and increased training of native troops. It would involve meeting and repelling Communist brushfire warfare and subversion wherever it occurred throughout the globe. It would involve extensive economic aid and trade within the free world to build a strong and integrated economy, while utilizing these same economic tools to encourage dissent and revolt within the Communist bloc. It would involve a massive psychological warfare effort to bombard the Communist-enslaved peoples with a global campaign of truth and with real offers of economic support and political aid.

Most of all, winning the cold war would involve fighting the Communist power cult with a creed of even greater intensity based upon the God-given right of man to freedom, for until this creed is pursued with an intensity equal to that of communism, until we recognize that the only alternative to victory in the cold war is defeat and heightened possibility of third world war, the present Communist peace offensive may, indeed, pave the way for future Communist world revolution.

Big Four Meeting Very Disquieting to Many Churchmen, Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that millions of Americans see the point which I and other legislators have been trying to make in relation to Russia in recent years. We see very little reflection of our viewpoint among the men who skim the top of the news, but among those who are farseeing and have a knowledge of history and events long gone, we find quite a bit of justification for our viewpoint of being suspicious of the Russians.

One of the Washington newsmen who has continuously expressed a realistic opinion on the objectives of the Russian Communists is Larston D. Farrar, editor of the Washington Religious Review. Mr. Farrar is primarily a business writer with a large audience of readers, but he has equal skill in understanding and expressing in his public writings the issues of the days in which we live. While a resident of Washington for more than a decade and editing the Washington Religious Review for some years, he has acquired a continuity of knowledge that is equalled by few journalists. As we all know, politics can get very bitter, so can religious controversy. Mr. Farrar has been an able writer on both religion and politics who has been able to present the facts and the viewpoint of all major groups on questions of importance.

The latest copy of the Washington Religious Review which has just come to my attention discusses the meeting at the summit which was held last week. Because of its timeliness and because it will have a bearing on the after thoughts of the Big Four conference, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD:

BIG FOUR MEETING VERY DISQUIETING TO MANY CHURCHMEN, LEGISLATORS

Quotation of the week: "The world seeks peace and liberty, but it seeks them on the path of trouble and slavery." (Jean Baptiste Lacordaire (1802–61).)

What started out to be a bit of campaign verbiage in British politics has become the most widely heralded meeting of chiefs-of-state of this decade. Literally hundreds of millions of people, it can be said without fear of contradiction, have their eyes glued on Geneva, Switzerland, this week, and their ears attuned to every word uttered by the Big Four leaders gathered there. Prime Minister Winston Churchill, emeritus, of Great Britain, plugged for this "meeting at the summit" and won President Dwight D. Eisenhower grudging acquiescence for it as a part of the strategy to make for a Conservative victory in Great Britain.

Because the Soviet leaders seem to have eagerly wanted to meet in a summit and because the results of the Yalta Conference and the Potsdam Conference seemed to bring little about which to rejoice among freedom-lovers, there are many who have viewed this conference with a jaundiced eye. Even while praying that it may be productive of good, these skeptics have pointed to the more-or-less obvious pitfalls entailed in such a meeting. The skeptics include plenty of churchmen, lay and clerical, as well as many legislators, particularly those of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

If President Eisenhower pays attention to what Congressmen say or do (and, in most instances, he doesn't), he could have obtained some gratuitous advice from Capitol Hill right up until the moment he enplaned for Europe, for legislators were declaiming all over the place.

"The Nation's legislators have joined ranks—regardless of political affiliation—behind President Eisenhower and the American delegation attending the Geneva Conference," Representative CLARENCE BROWN, Republican of Ohio, reported to his people. "While few Members of Congress believe many present worldwide problems will be solved at Geneva, they are hopeful the conference will pave the way for later meetings which may bring an end to the cold war and at least temporary peace to the world."

This cautious appraisal, carefully hedging Mr. Brown in case the Geneva Conference brings unforseen bad results, seems to be the usual thing among Congressmen. Just how closely Mr. Brown acts as a weather vane for the shrewder politicians may be seen by comparing what he hazards with what Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican of Indiana, a Methodist and the minority whip, has reported to his constituents:

"The atmosphere in the Congress prior to President Eisenhower's departure for Geneva was a mixture of misgivings and cautious optimism. Pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were filled for days with advice and expressions of good wishes to the President on the eve of his trip overseas. The inclination of the free world to be suspicious of Russian motives is understandable. The Soviet record of promise and performance in years past is not one to inspire confidence among men of good will. As a result, no one believes that all dangers of Communist aggression have suddenly dissipated and that trust and understanding will now replace all fear and distrust in international relations. We dare not be that naive * * *. Prudence dictates that America keep its guard up * * *.

"I do not share the undue pessimism of those who fear that the free world will lose ground at the Geneva Conference; that we will give more than we get; that we will compromise with principle; that we will be outmaneuvered, out-talked or out-guessed. One thing we all know: Dwight D. Eisenhower will never sell humanity short."

In short, Mr. HALLECK, like Mr. Brown, is straddling the fence, trying to encompass every possible viewpoint so that if in some future date he finds belatedly that something has gone wrong, he can claim to have foreseen it. Both men, and many others, are hoping that President Eisenhower will not pull a faux pas, or make any disastrous concessions to the Russians, as a result of too much vodka at one time or a temporary exhilaration of spirits due to reminiscence with Marshal Zukhov, with whom he was such a hail-fellow-well-met in Berlin 11 years ago, as they toasted one another until the dawn. It was this same Zukhov who imbued Mr. Eisenhower at that time with the idea that the Russians ought to get quick possession of some $8 billion worth of machinery, much of it in the Western Zone, without paying a single ruble for it. Since that time, this machinery has been replaced, at the expense of the United States taxpayer Mr. Eisenhower now represents in Geneva, but most Americans are so groggy with taxes they don't even remember this particular blunder. The marshal also found General Eisenhower in those days quite willing to acquiesce in giving his permission for the Russians to spirit away literally hundreds of the most intelligent German scientists, many of whom no doubt still are living and are contributing mightily to the growing Russian power in jet planes, guided missiles and atomic weapons.

Perhaps the memory of these things is what prompted one Member, a leading Republican, of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to say to Representative JERRY FORD, Republican, Michigan: "Russia will offer to give up policies which have been unsuccesful in return for which the United States and our allies may give up polices which have been successful." Another Republican cracked that the boo-boo on the ticker in the Republican cloakroom undoubtedly presaged the truth about the Big Four Conference. By error, the ticker read: "Ike To Be Given Big Deception In Geneva." A correction made it read "Reception."

Representatives JAMES T. PATTERSON, Republican, New Jersey, introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for the Sunday before the opening of the Big Four Conference to be observed as a day of prayer for its success.

"I think we should ask Almighty God to grant his peace and wisdom to our negotiators at the conference table, so that they may deal with the other nations of the world, and they with us, in the truest spirit of honor, justice, and charity," Mr. Patterson told the House of Representatives.

His words were echoed in Congress by several others, and, in fact, ministers, priests, and rabbis throughout the Nation, from the President's pastor on down, did pray for the success of the Big Four Conference.

Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, for whom the Big Four Conference has been a godsend, in that it has afforded him a means of regaining newspaper

notice without constant references to his "censure," inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy article by R. H. Shackford, carried in the Washington, D. C. Daily News, in which the broken Soviet promises and pledges of other years were enumerated. However, many observers, who have noticed Mr. Eisenhower's own proficiency in making promises and then blithely ignoring them, did not feel that this factor alone was a cause for alarm.

Representative ISIDORE DOLLINGER, Democrat, of New York, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Memorandum of Urgency, prepared by the Jewish Labor Committee of New York, N. Y., in which the organization implored both the President and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to discuss the fate of some 2 million Jews in the U. S. S. R. at the Geneva Conference. The memorandum is not likely to come up for discussion at Geneva, but it is well worthy of study by religious and political leaders in this country, for its points to "the critical condition of Jews in the Soviet Union, the practical liquidation of Jewish culture, Jewish religion, Jewish literature and language" revealed in recent years.

Perhaps the most scholarly critique of the Big Four Conference to be given by a legislator who personally was opposed to the meeting—and certainly the most significant from the standpoint of understanding the viewpoint of what seems to be a vast majority of Roman Catholics in this country—was the speech of Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, delivered even as President Eisenhower was packing his bags downtown. Handsome, pleasant-voiced, and scholarly, "MIKE" FEIGHAN is a fellow member of the Burning Tree Country Club with the President, but they've never played together. Another difference in the men is that Mr. FEIGHAN long ago was foretelling various moves of the Russians, and, although he always has voted on the side of labor in the House of Representatives, and long has been noted as a liberal, he never has trusted the Russians in their negotiations with this country. There is no question but that, on this issue, he speaks the considered judgment of countless Roman Catholics and millions of other citizens who have followed closely international power politics in recent decades.

In his judgment, "to put it bluntly, personal diplomacy is a dangerous practice when it involves the welfare of a nation or the cause of human freedom."

"The Russians will be represented by Bulganin, who may be the titular head of the presidium, but everyone should realize that the top man in the international Russian Communist conspiracy is Khrushchev. While Khrushchev can speak with authority for the conspiracy, we should not mislead people into believing that he will yield one single inch of real estate confiscated by the Russian autocrats or ease the chains of slavery which bind all the nations and people in the empire. Nor should we be so foolish as to believe that Zukhov, should he appear at the summit, will use his personal influence on Khrushchev or that he possesses any real sympathy for our ideals or our way of life.

"The Russians have been attempting to create the notion that they have eased up their tyrannical hold on the captive people. They have created all sorts of slogans which serve as a cover for their infamous treatment of the non-Russian nations and people which they now enslave. A classic example of my point can be found in what that popularity-contest boy, Khrushchev, has called a volunteer program for the development of new agricultural areas on the desert lands of Turkestan and in the tundra regions that lie above the Arctic Circle. Through this program, which has also been likened to the efforts of the sturdy pioneers who built America, funmaker Khrushchev has concealed the forced deportation and ruthless exploitation of additional millions of non-Russian anti-Communist patriots. There is also much talk coming out of the Russian propaganda machine about amnesties for those who cease to be enemies of the state. Such talk of amnesties is another boobytrap which the Russians are using to ensnare leaders of resistance movements behind the Iron Curtain, as well as those who escaped from the tyranny of the Communist empire into the free world. While all these things are being give lipservice by the Communist leaders, there has been no breath of freedom allowed by them and human rights are trampled under boots of finer grain, but just as heavy as those in the past.

"The Russians never yield on anything that they were not compelled by force to yield on. In this instance, hundreds of millions of non-Russian people enslaved by the Russian Communists have brought such pressure against their enslavers that the Kremlin knows it must yield or there will be an explosion hundreds of times more powerful than that caused by the hydrogen bomb. The failure of the agricultural program within the Russian Communist empire is, in my opinion, a classic example of the pressure the enslaved people are bringing against the Russian tyrants. Another example is the failure of the Russians to provide consumer commodities, both in quality and quantity, necessary to pacify the people. The Russians are begging for trade in which they will use gold which drips the blood of slave labor to purchase our surplus foods and other wonderful commodities of free labor in order to stem the rising tide of resistance by the common man throughout the entire slave empire. There can be no doubt whatever but what the Russians will appear at the Geneva Conference in the weakest position they have been in since 1941—the year when the tyrant Hitler could have won victory over the conspiracy of communism were he not possessed by the evil theories of racism and superstatism. Therefore, the Russian pleading for peaceful coexistence is nothing more than a plea for time—time to tighten the chains of slavery; time to liquidate millions more of those people who oppose the regime; time in which to mold a new generation of racial fanatics responsive only to the will of the masters in the Kremlin. That is what lies back of that Russian propaganda line of peaceful coexistence.

"The hopes of the American people have been stimulated to a point that suggests we are on the threshold of a just and lasting peace. This situation is best reflected by the tippy-toe artists in the Department of State who scream and shout that there should be no rocking of the ship of state (in obvious reference to the McCarthy resolutions of several weeks ago, which the Department of State fought viciously) lest we change the wooing mood of the Russian bear. These tiptoe artists do not lack uninformed supporters in this House any more than Nero lacked a fiddle to soothe his ego as he watched the destruction of a great civilization in which he was a recognized leader. Since these advocates of delicate diplomacy have had their generous share of allotted time, I consider the time opportune for some old-fashioned, down-to-earth American talk (this kind of thing can get a man censured these days).

"For some strange reason, there has been a steady and well-planned effort to prevent Members of Congress from getting into a full-blown discussion of the issues which should be taken up at the Conference. There has been a companion maneuver to confuse and dissipate all efforts calculated to bring about a clear and concise expression from Congress on the minimum goals which we should seek in our efforts to ease world tensions and to pry open the door to the road which leads to peace and freedom.

"How strange it is that here in the Congress, the very seat of free speech, it should even be alleged that if we dare to speak out on this critical issue which has to do with peace or war—freedom or slavery—we will thereby tie the hands of the President in the so-called Conference at the summit. Those who support this fallacy, in effect, hold that the conduct of our foreign affairs is above the test of congressional debate and that we, the representatives of the people, are or should be disinterested in the causes of war. * * * Such people as make this allegation had best turn their attention to preventing the Russians from tying a rope around the throat of American freedom rather than crying 'wolf' about tying the President's hands. Let us ask the question, 'Who is tying whom?' "

W. o. c.'s in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a w. o. c.'s is a Government official who serves without compensation from the Government. At the same time he receives income from nongovernmental sources, usually his prior employer. W. o. c.'s generally have been brought into service during emergencies to supply the Government the benefit of specialized knowledge or skills not otherwise available. During the First and Second World Wars persons serving the Government without compensation were termed "dollar-a-year" men because at that time such persons were required to sign contracts to work for the Government for the nominal amount of $1 a year.

In order for w. o. c.'s to be used by the Government exemptions must be made to the conflict of interests statutes. This purpose of the conflict of interests laws is to write into law the historic concept that a public office is a public trust. They express the principle that no man can serve two masters. To that end they provide that no public officer or employee of the Federal Government may engage in activities which are incompatible with the duties of his public office.

Section 1914 of the Criminal Code, for example, states:

> Whoever being a Government official or employee receives any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county or municipality * * * shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both.

This law also prohibits any person, association or corporation from contributing to or supplementing the salary of any Government employee for the services performed by him for the Government.

Other laws prohibit Government officials while employed and for 2 years after leaving Federal service from prosecuting claims against the Government or from

receiving compensation or acting as a representative in matters in which the United States has an interest.

Activities of Government officials and employees barred by provisions of the conflict of interests statutes have been a continuing problem in Government. The most recent example which has been brought to public attention concerns the activities of the Secretary of the Air Force, Harold E. Talbott, in connection with his interest in the Mulligan firm. This matter is now under investigation by Congress and I refer to it here only to illustrate an instance where the activities of a full-time Government official are called into question under the statutes. These laws set forth a sound and basic principle of Government which is suspended for w. o. c.'s.

One of the most obvious conflicts that can be imagined occurs when a man employed and paid by a private firm serves in a Government agency charged with regulating the industry of which his employer is a part. In time of war, however, full mobilization requires the Government to call upon business to provide staff needed to carry out the industrial mobilization program. No alternative has yet been found to permitting most of these men to continue to receive their salaries from their private employers.

Investigations by committees of Congress in past emergencies disclosed many instances where the dual loyalties of w. o. c.'s created situations adversely affecting the public interest and demonstrated the need for stringent safeguards in the use of w. o. c.'s. For example, the Truman committee, in investigating the use of dollar-a-year men in World War II reported:

Although the contracts obtained by the companies loaning the services of dollar a year and w. o. c. men are not passed upon by the men so loaned, such companies do obtain very substantial benefits from the practice. The dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men so loaned spend a considerable portion of their time during office hours in familiarizing themselves with the defense program. They are, therefore, in a much better position than the ordinary man in the street to know what type of contracts the Government is about to let and how their companies may best proceed to obtain consideration. They also are in an excellent position to know what shortages are imminent and to advise their companies on how best to proceed, either to build up inventories against future shortages, or to apply for early consideration for priorities. They can even advise them as to how to phrase their requests for priorities. In addition, such men are frequently close personal friends and social intimates of the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men who do pass upon the contracts in which their companies are interested.

These are only a few of the advantages which large companies have obtained from the practice, and it should be especially noted that they are the very same ones which the small and intermediate businessmen attempt to obtain by hiring people who they believe have "Inside Information" and "friends on the inside" who could assist them in obtaining favorable consideration of contracts. Therefore, in a very real sense the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men can be termed "lobbyists" * * *.

The committee is opposed to a policy of taking free services from persons with axes to grind, and the committee believes that the Government should not continue to the loan of dollar-a-year and w. o. c. by companies with so large a stake in the defense program.

During the hot-war period of the Korean conflict a committee of which I was chairman investigated into activities of w. o. c.'s and our investigation demonstrated that the same problems were present during that emergency. The committee concluded that from its investigation "the employment of w. o. c.'s during the mobilization period should be kept at a minimum."

We must recognize that the skill of men trained in industry may be of inestimable value to the Government in carrying out its proper and legitimate functions. On the other hand, we must recognize the dangers inherent in w. o. c. employment. At all times it must be remembered that the w. o. c. is in the awkward position of possessing dual loyalties: to the government for which he works and to the private employer to whom he looks for his salary.

W. o. c.'s in policymaking jobs are in a position to direct governmental lines of thought in a manner favorable toward their own companies or toward particular segments of the economy. Unfortunately, many of the practices legitimate in the give-and-take world of competition becomes inequitable when done in the manner of government, the supposed impartial arbiter.

The House Antitrust Subcommittee of which I am chairman has launched an investigation into the current use of w. o. c.'s by the Government. This investigation has started with an examination into the operations of the Department of Commerce where it is the deliberate policy of Secretary Weeks to use w. o. c.'s to head up many of his operating industry divisions. Our investigation already has disclosed instances where the w. o. c.'s activities extend far beyond those normally considered to be functions of public servants.

Our investigation also includes the use of advisory groups by Government agencies. Since advisory groups are organized to render advice and give recommendations to Government officials we will look into the relationships of these committees to w. o. c.'s. Certain elite advisory organizations are composed of the principal executives of some of the most important business firms in the country. W. o. c.'s serving as Government officials in charge of divisions dealing with a particular industry often are important but subordinate officials in these same firms. We intend to ascertain whether in operation the advisory committee procedures have the practical effect of creating a mechanism wherein fundamental questions of basic policy are initially resolved in the committee and the resulting Government action amounts to no more than giving effect to decisions already made by industry.

One advisory group used by the Government which we intend to investigate thoroughly is the Business Advisory Council to the Department of Commerce. The Business Advisory Council was organized in 1933 by the Secretary of Commerce to render advice and to make recommendations to him, and through him to other Government agencies and to the Congress. Its membership consists of representatives from the largest and most important companies in the United States.

The council is not a governmental organization but is an organization of private individuals acting in a voluntary capacity as Government advisers. It has private records, meets its operating expenses from contributions of its membership, and employs its own staff. It has operated during the period of its existence in an aura of secrecy. The press and the public have been barred from its meeting. Its documents and reports are not publicly available. Public information relating to the functions and the activities of the council are almost nonexistent. We intend to scrutinize carefully the operations of the council and to ascertain whether the use of this private organization in the Department of Commerce has resulted in the creation of a potent lobby within the executive branch of the Government.

Description of 23 Relief Portraits and 2 Paintings in the Redecorated Chamber of the United States House of Representatives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, having been heretofore granted unanimous consent so to do, I am pleased to present for the information and identification of all of my colleagues and any others who read the same, the instructive information about the 23 relief portraits of historical characters in the history of legislation and lawgiving, which relief portraits occupy valuable space upon the walls above the gallery of the House of Representatives.

I also include similar information as to the two large paintings of George Washington and General Lafayette.

Some of the reasons which caused me to make the necessary inquiry and study to obtain the information and data about these relief portraits on which we look each day, and the only two paintings which occupy our working Chamber, are as follows:

First. The lettering underneath each relief portrait giving the name of the historical legislator or lawgiver is so small and indistinct that as we sit on the floor of the House, many Members cannot readily read the name of each relief portrait because they are so far away from us.

Second. I have had many inquiries about said relief portraits and have been asked many times as to who each of these historical persons are as relates to the legislative processes. I frankly state that I have not heretofore been able to satisfactorily answer such inquiries.

Furthermore, I know that many Members have been similarly situated in being asked that same question.

Third. For myself, I have been sure that it would add to my information and inspiration as a Member of this great legislative body if I did know at whom I was looking when I daily sit in this great legislative body and look at these 23 portraits which appear in the marble high over the gallery doors and surrounding gallery walls of the Chamber of our House of Representatives, wherein I recognize the great privilege and honor I have of now serving my ninth year.

Fourth. I felt it would be of considerable interest to a great many American citizens and students of Congress to have this necessarily brief word picture of what is carried upon the walls of the House of Representatives.

These relief portraits were placed in the Chamber of the House of Representatives during congressional recess of the years 1949–50. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when we returned to our daily duties in January 1951, there were many interesting questions and many queries raised by some Members of the House in their speaking about it as to why these particular relief portraits occupied the valuable and significant space on the walls of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. Furthermore, and not least of all, queries were made by some Members of the House as to why so many of these relief portraits were those of historical characters of ancient times and from foreign nations. Well, Mr. Speaker, the text of the information I herein set forth, which was furnished me upon request by the Library of Congress, will give you some data on these relief portraits. I hope this data will not only prove of interest but of real value and assistance to Members and to their many friends who make inquiry on the subject. But before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all interested in that magnificent, large painting of George Washington which honors the wall of the Chamber at floor level just to your right as you stand in the Speaker's rostrum facing the membership of the House. It was painted by John Vanderlyn and was acquired by the House of Representatives in 1834 for the total sum of $2,500, by virtue of House resolutions in 1832 and 1834. The magnificent, large painting of General Lafayette was painted by the distinguished artist, Ary Scheffer, which honors the walls of the Chamber just to your left as you stand in the rostrum and was made a gift to the House of Representatives by the artist. These two paintings are the only paintings gracing the walls of the Chamber of the House of Representatives. Neither are there photographs or other paintings within the Chamber itself but in the private entrance hallway to the Chamber, which is largely limited to use by Members, are the large paintings of each of the distinguished Speakers in the history of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, behind your chair rests the flag of the United States of America, which is so beautifully draped. It is a daily inspiration to us Members as we sit in our respective places and listen to your scholarly, able, and fair parliamentary rulings and decision.

Mr. Speaker, because I am herewith endeavoring to make at least a simple word picture of the decorations of what is on the walls of the House and in the Chamber of the House itself, in addition to our seats and the 4 large mahogany tables, 2 of which are on each side of the political aisle, I herewith include a part of the text describing the mace, which rests to your right as you sit or stand facing the Members which you so ably govern in their parliamentary and legislative problems and procedures.

The mace of the House of Representatives is, aside from the flag, the only visible symbol of Federal Government authority. It has no counterpart in the United States Senate, none in the Supreme Court. It is as old as the Government itself, having been provided for in a resolution adopted by the House during the First Congress in 1789. Ever since it has served as the active symbol of authority of the Sergeant at Arms, who is charged with the duty of preserving order on the floor of the House.

The first mace used by the House was destroyed by fire when a British Army burned the Capitol in 1814. Thereafter a mace of painted wood did service until 1841, when the present mace—a fine example of the silversmith's art—was made by William Adams of New York in reproduction of the original. It is 46 inches in height and consists of a bundle of 13 ebony rods, representing the Original Thirteen States of the Union, bound together with a band of silver in imitation of the fasces originally carried by the lictors in ancient Rome. From the center of this bundle of rods protrudes the stem of a silver globe which is 4½ inches in diameter. The globe is surmounted by an eagle of solid silver with outspread wings.

When the House is called to order each day an assistant Sergeant at Arms places the mace on a cylindrical pedestal of polished green marble at the right of the Speaker's desk. From the moment the Speaker raps for order it begins to play a silent but important part in the day's proceedings. While the House itself remains in session the mace is kept in position at the Speaker's right, but is removed to a lower pedestal by the desk of the Sergeant at Arms when the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole. Members can thus tell by a glance at the position of the mace whether the House is in session or in committee. This is significant because it requires 218 Members to constitute a quorum for business in the House and only 100 when the House is sitting as a Committee of the Whole.

The cost of the mace was very small, considering its intrinsic and historic value. An interesting item in the statement of the expenditure of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives from December 1, 1841, to December 1, 1842, reads, "William Adams, a mace for hall, H. R., $400." Today its value, real and sentimental, far exceeds that figure.

It was originally proposed following English parliamentary usage, that the mace should be placed on the Clerk's table during sittings of the House and under it when the House should be in Committee of the Whole. The proposal however, was rejected by the House, which adopted the present far more impressive practice, under which the great symbol is kept always in view of Members on the floor of the Chamber and of the ever-changing groups of visitors in the galleries.

OF ANCIENT ORIGIN

The mace is of ancient origin, deriving from the fasces of Roman antiquity. When the first empire was overthrown and the Roman Republic was established, the fasces assumed a new civic dignity.

MACE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

The mace now borne before the Speaker in the House of Commons was made in 1649 by Thomas Maundy for the Commonwealth Government of Oliver Cromwell, altered, however, in insignia. What became of the mace used prior to the Cromwell period is not recorded.

In 1880 the Speaker undertook to quell an incipient fight between two Representatives, William A. J. Sparks, of Illinois, and J. B. Weaver, of Iowa, when they used such menacing words and threatening actions toward each other that many Members rose to separate them. Whereupon the Sergeant at Arms moved about the House with his mace of office and order was restored.

HISTORIC MACES

There are two historic maces in America which antedate the mace of the House of Representatives, indeed antedate the organization of the Federal Government. The older of these, an ornate specimen, was presented to the Corporation of Norfolk, Va., in 1753. The other is still in honorable service in the House of Representatives of South Carolina and was made in London in 1756 at a cost of 90 guineas.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not herein name or identify or place each of the great seals of each of the States of the United States which surround the lower ceiling of the House, I do state that the great seal of the United States of America is in position almost directly above you as you stand facing the Members, while to the left and right thereof are the seals of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and then extending further to the left and the right respectfully the beautiful seals of the States themselves.

Following is the identification of the relief portraits referred to: To the east of the Speaker's rostrum as the Speaker faces the membership: First, Jefferson; second, Napoleon; third, Blackstone; fourth, Grotius; fifth, Simon de Montfort; sixth, Innocent III; seventh, Suleiman; eighth, Maimonides; ninth, Gaius; tenth, Papinian; and eleventh, Solon.

To the west of the Speaker's rostrum as the Speaker faces the membership of the House: First, Mason; second, Pothier; third, Colbert; fourth, Edward I; fifth, Alphonso I; sixth, Gregory IX; seventh, St. Louis; eighth, Justinian; ninth; Tribonian; tenth, Lycurgus; and eleventh, Hammurabi. In the center of the north wall is Moses.

A brief biographical sketch of each of the relief portraits is as follows:

RELIEF PORTRAITS IN THE REDECORATED CHAMBER OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The redecorated Chamber of the United States House of Representatives features a series of medallions portraying 23 historic characters. These individuals were chosen as representative of the great lawgivers of the world who contributed to the American law system. An inscription that accompanies them, appearing high above and behind the Speaker's desk, reads:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day may not accomplish something worthy to be remembered."—Daniel Webster.

This is the only quotation or verse or saying on the walls of the House.

The subjects of these relief portraits were selected by the Architect of the Capitol, after consultation with many authorities and approval by the Special House Roof and Chamber Committee. A biographic sketch of each of these great men is attached hereto.

The statements given above and the list of subjects have been provided by the office of the Architect of the Capitol. The sketches summarize salient—and apropos—material found in the Encyclopedia Britannica (1942 edition) and the first and second editions of the Columbia Encyclopedia. Articles in these sources were found to complement one another and material from both sources was used in every sketch, with the exception of that of Pothier, who is not listed in the Columbia Encyclopedia.

The Architect of the Capitol has released a statement that serves to explain why each man was chosen for inclusion in this group. It is attached as an appendix to this report. Some of the material therein does not appear in the following biographical sketches because it does not appear in the sources used in their preparation.

HAMMURABI—FLOURISHED CIRCA 2100 B. C.

Hammurabi was a great king of Babylonia. His military and political achievement of establishing a central and efficient Government at Babylon is regarded as one of the most far-reaching events in ancient history. Henceforth Babylon was to be the political and intellectual center of West Asiatic history right down to the Christian era.

Hammurabi's name is particularly associated with the great law code which he was declared to have received from the sun god, Shamash. This is one of the greatest of ancient codes. Promulgated for the use of the courts throughout the empire, it is particularly strong in its prohibition of defrauding the helpless. It is genuinely humanitarian, although one savage feature is the retributive nature of punishment, which follows "an eye for an eye" literally.

MOSES—FLOURISHED CIRCA 1400 B. C.

The lawgiver of Israel and the founder of her nationality and religion, Moses stands out as one of the greatest figures in history.

From his infancy, according to Exodus, there were constant signs of God's selection of Moses to lead His people. His leadership in the Exodus and his prominence in the great covenant at Sinai are well known and documented. It was he who welded into one people the various kindred tribes under his leadership. But further details must be a matter of conjecture.

Not only the Ten Commandments, but the whole Mosiac Law as found in Leviticus, Exodus, and Deuteronomy are ascribed to Moses. However, close study of the Bible makes it difficult if not impossible to accept the tradition which accredits to him every detail of Israel's legal and cultural institutions. Even the earliest code of laws in the Bible (Ex. xxi–xxiii) is simply a local and national form of the civil law common to Babylonia, Assyria and the Hittites and was probably adopted by Israel after the settlement in Canaan.

LYCURGUS—FLOURISHED 7TH-9TH CENTURY B. C.

Lycurgus is the reputed founder of the Spartan Constitution. According to a standand hypothesis he lived in the seventh century B. C. He may be a mythical figure.

Tradition represents Lycurgus as finding Sparta the prey of disunion, weakness and lawlessness, and leaving her united, strong and subject to the most stable government which the Greek world had ever seen. To him we may attribute the unification of the several component parts of the State, the strict military organization and training which soon made the Spartan hoplite the best soldier in Greece, and above all the elaborate and rigid system of education.

His subordination of the individual citizen to the all-powerful state has been the model of subsequent police states, but it has yet no parallel in the history of the world.

SOLON—CIRCA 635–559 B. C.

Solon was an Athenian statesman and lawgiver. His amatory poems and patriotic and didactic verse won him inclusion among the Seven Sages. He led the Athenians in a victorious military campaign. But his enduring renown rests on his economic and constitutional reforms.

Solon was elected archon at a time when the nobles held unchecked all the governing power of Athens and the new capitalists virtually owned the entire peasant class. Receiving the unlimited powers of a dictator, he annulled all mortgages and debts, put narrow limits on the amount of land anyone could add to his holdings, outlawed contracts in which a person's liberty was pledged, and put limits on the amount one might spend on various functions, such as funerals. Other state controls included those over exports, education, the use and sinking of wells, bee-farming, the planting of olives and figs, and the cutting down of olive trees.

Solon's new constitution laid the foundations of the Athenian democracy and paved the way for its later developments. The assembly was thrown open to all freemen. He erected a whole new law code that tends toward democratization. His reforms were characterized everywhere by a moderation that made him the model of Greek statesmen.

GAIUS—CIRCA 110–180 A. D.

Gaius was a celebrated Roman jurist of the second century A. D. Of his personal history very little is known. Indeed, it is impossible to discover even his full name, Gaius being merely the given name.

Gaius is remembered for his institutes, which contributed materially to our knowledge of early Roman law, and on which much of Justinian's work is based. The Emperor Valentinian named him, along with Papinian, Ulpian, Modestinus, and Paulus, as one of the five jurists whose opinions were to be followed by judicial officers in deciding cases.

Besides the institutes, which are a complete exposition of the elements of Roman law, Gaius was the author of several other works. His interest in the antiquities of Roman law makes his work valuable to the historian of early institutions.

PAPINIAN—DIED A. D. 212

Papinian (Aemilius Papinianus) is generally considered to be the greatest of Roman jurists. He was magister libellorum and afterwards Praetorian perfect under the emperor Septimius Severus. An intimate friend of the emperior, Papinian accompanied him to Britain and became the guardian of his two sons. In 212, one of these brothers, after committing fratricide, had Papinian put to death.

Papinian was noted not only as a jurist of wide learning and great comprehension, but as a stern moralist. His works are known to us through the numerous quotations of them in the Theodosian Code and in the Digest of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian). The constitution of Theodosius II and Valentinian named him the principal of 5 jurists set up as authorities to be cited in future decisions of the courts (see Gaius).

JUSTINIAN—A. D. 483–565

Justinian I (Flavius Anicius Justinianus), surnamed The Great, is the most famous of all emperors of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. He recovered Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the Ostrogoths, but met with less success in fighting Persia. He insisted upon the supremacy of the emperor over the Church, not only in matters of organization, but also in matters of dogma. He engaged in various important controversies about dogma, but never succeeded in creating unity.

It is as a legislator and organizer of the law that Justinian's name is most familiar to the modern world. His greatest accomplishment was the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, which has influenced all subsequent legal history. Finding the law of the Roman empire in great confusion, he ordered the preparation of this work—consisting of the Codex Constitutionum (a collection and revision of the imperial constitutions from the time of Hadrian), the Digesta or Pandectae (a revision, abridgment and rearrangement of the classical jurists), the Institutiones (a handbook for students), and the Novellae (the new laws instituted by Justinian). The Corpus was not a codification but a consolidation. Thus regarded, Justinian's work may appear to entitle him and Tribonian to much less credit than they have received.

TRIBONIAN—DIED A. D. 545

Tribonian (Tribonianus) was a famous jurist and chief legal minister to the emperor Justinian. Under the command of Justinian, he directed the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, the most important collection of Roman law and the basic document of modern civil law.

It is not possible to determine exactly what Tribonian himself contributed to the Corpus Juris Civilis. In all likelihood he wrote a large part out of his encyclopedic knowledge of Roman law. Of the four parts of the Corpus, he was the most important editor of the Digest, Institutes, and Codex. Of the Novels (the new laws) he must have been a principal author, as chief legal minister. Tribonian was probably not a juridical thinker, like the great five jurists (see Gaius), but his knowledge of Roman law and his somewhat pedantic erudition was absolutely essential to the great project that he directed.

MAIMONIDES—A. D. 1135–1204

Maimonides (Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon, or Rambam) was born in Spain and migrated to Cairo, Egypt, where he became the greatest of all medieval Jewish scholars. He produced a great commentary on the six orders of Mishna[1] (where he was the first to enumerate the fundamental dogmas of Judaism), a collection of discourses, a work on logic, a treatise on the calendar, several medical books—including an important work on hygiene—and the great philosophical work, Moreh Nebukim (Guide for the Perplexed). In the latter work he explains the esoteric ideas in the Bible, formulates a proof of the existence of God, expounds the principle of creation, and elucidates baffling metaphysical and religious problems. The work has dominated Jewish thought and exerted a profound influence upon Christian and Arabian thinkers.

[1] The Mishna is the text of the oral law, in contradistinction to the scriptural, or written, law of the Jews.

The greatest scholastic work of this savant-Physician-Philosopher was the Mishna Torah, a classified compendium of the Jewish law. This attempt to organize and systematize the vast mass of Jewish oral law became a reference book for laymen as well as rabbis and judges.

GREGORY IX—A. D. 1145–1241

The papacy of Gregory IX (Ungolino Conti de Segni) was largely devoted to hostilities against Frederick II, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Gregory systematized the Medieval Inquisition. His zeal for the entirpation of heresy made him generally disliked. The people of Rome, disapproving his temporal power, exiled him for a part of his reign. He died as Frederick was invading the Papal States.

Gregory ordered the condensing of five compilations of decretals[2] into a single collection. The editor, Raymond of Pennaforte, did not attempt any original work and the Pope had no idea of codifying the whole of canon law. However, the collection was an important step toward codifying canon law.

INNOCENT III—CIRCA A. D. 1161–1216

Innocent III (Lotario de' Conti de Segni) was elected Pope at the age of 37. The effective assertion of world power is the characteristic feature of his pontificate. Working from a theory that since things of the spirit take preeminence over things of the body, and since the church rules the spirit and earthly monarchs rule the body, earthly monarchs must be in all things in subjection to the church. Innocent effectively exercised his ideal that the Pope is the political ruler of the world.

Innocent's exalted ambitions were eventually their own undoing, and had the effect of setting almost every resolute Christian prince automatically against the church. The triumph of his pontificate was the fourth Lateran council (1215), a great assembly of States that did little more than listen to and endorse the decretals read by the Pope.

The Pope's interest in law was active: he constantly held court, with a good name for impartiality. He instituted ecclesiastical reforms, centralizing the administration at Rome and his authority within the church exceeded that of his predecessors. Innocent is remembered for his abrogation of the Magna Carta. Supporting King John, against the barons who demanded the great document, Innocent declared it null as a forcibly exacted promise.

SIMON DE MONTFORT—CIRCA A. D. 1200–1265

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, spent the most active part of his life giving skillful and ruthless support to, then leading revolts against, Henry III of England. At the "Mad Parliament" of Oxford he headed the opposition. In civil war he became master of England, which was placed under a constitutional government. De Montfort was practically dictator after his victory on the battlefield at Lewes, in May 1264. However, he promulgated a scheme for establishing a thorough parliamentary control over the executive. He was killed in a resurgence of civil war.

Simon is an important figure in the history of legislative bodies because the great Parliament which he summoned in 1265 was a revolutionary assembly that established an important precedent—it contained not only knights from each shire to represent the rural nobility, but also representatives from the towns and boroughs. He left a heritage in the precedent he had established in championing the cause of the nobles and the people against the king and in calling the parliament of 1265. For years after his death he was revered by the commons as a martyr.

[2] The decretals are papal decisions and decrees to be considered authoritative and binding in future decisions.

LOUIS IX—A. D. 1214–1270

Saint Louis, or Louis IX, king of France, was an accomplished knight, physically strong, fearless in battle, heroic in adversity, of imperious temperament, unyielding when convinced of the justness of his cause, energetic and firm. He stands in history as the ideal kind of the middle ages. Here was an ascetic who gave charity to over a hundred beggars daily, yet safeguarded the royal dignity by bringing them in at the back door—and by a courtly display greater than ever before in France. He made presents of haircloth shirts to his friends and went on two crusades. He was canonized in 1297. His reign was comparatively uneventful.

Louis was active in arbitration, adjusting territorial claims, imposing peace upon warring factions of his nobility, and setting succession disputes in neighboring countries. He simplified administration, improved the distribution of taxes, abolished the judicial duel, and sought to introduce uniform Roman law. The English barons (see Simon de Montfort) submitted their quarrels with Henry III to him, but his judgment in favor of the king led to civil war and the victory of Simon at Lewes. This judgment, known as the Mise of Amiens, was a flat denial of the parliamentary reforms known as the Provisions of Oxford. However, it expressly declared that the decision was not to invalidate the privileges and liberties of the realm of England, which had existed before the time of these provisions.

ALPHONSO X—A. D. 1221–1284

Alphonso the Wise, or Alfonso X, king of Castile and Leon, ruled from 1252 until he was deposed by the Cortes in 1282. He is perhaps the most interesting—though he was far from being the most capable—of the Spanish kings of the middle ages. As a ruler he was weak, unstable and obstinate and he ruined the economy of his lands while endeavoring to secure his election as emperor of the Holy Roman empire.

El Sabio (the Sage) is called the father of Castilian prose. Under his patronage and editorship a number of vast works were undertaken, including Las Siete partidas, the earliest known Spanish-vernacular chronicle, valuable compilations from Arabic sources such as the Alfonsine Tables in astronomy, an illustrated book of games, and one of the greatest collections of mediaeval poetry and music. Under his patronage the flow of Oriental culture into Western Europe was greatly accelerated.

Alphonso showed legislative capacity and a very commendable wish to provide his kingdoms with a code of laws and a consistent judicial system. He was largely responsible for the Siete partidas, a compilation of Roman and canon law which was promulgated by his grandson, and other codes: The Fuero de las leyes or Fuero Real and an Espejo de Fueros.

EDWARD I—A. D. 1239–1307

Edward I, King of England, failed in the chief ambition of his life, the conquest of Scotland. (He did humiliate Scotland by removing the coronation stone of Scone to Westminster.) Yet, his conquest of Wales, his legislation, and his triumph over his barons, his ecclesiastics, and the greatest of French medieval kings indicates the strength and permanence of his work.

Edward is remembered for the developments in law and constitution that have caused him to be called the English Justinian. Before he became king he appropriated some of Simon de Montfort's ideals. The general effect of his work was to eliminate feudalism from public life. The Statutes of Westminster I and II formulated much unwritten law. The Statute of Mortmain was a landmark in his struggle with the church, resulting from his dislike of authority not emanating from himself. The Statute of Winchester established police and militia regulations. Westminster III, also called Quia emptores, prohibited subinfeudation.

Thus Edward brought within the formulated law the gains of a century of common law, supplementing them. He gave a tremendous impetus to the development of law and courts, and built up the central administration.

Some important developments were wrung from Edward against his will. The parliamentary constitution of England was established as the result of his convocation of the Model Parliament of 1295. "What touches all," ran Edward's writ of summons, "should be approved by all, and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common." This action marks a tremendous forward step in the development of a powerful representative body. Two years later, the rising hostility of his subjects, barons, merchants, and clergy forced Edward to issue the confirmation of the charters granted by John and Henry III, including the Magna Charta.

SULEIMAN—A. D. 1494–1566

Suleiman, the Magnificent, was the most fortunate of Ottoman sultans. He lived during the most glorious period in the history of Islam and ruled without a worthy rival. He inherited a well-organized country, a disciplined army, and a full treasury. Although his campaigns were not always wisely and prudently planned, they added great territories to his realm. In his days Turkey became a first-rate seapower and attained the culminating point of her glory. Suleiman is remembered for his encouragement of learning and the arts. He wrote verses and it is from his time that historians date the rise of the occult influence of the harem on Turkish political development.

In Turkey, Suleiman is known as the Lawgiver. His claims to renown as a legislator rest mainly on his organization of the Ulema, or clerical (religious) class, in its hierarchical order. The judges belonged to this class, but all executive and administrative power remained outside it, in the hands of the military. Suleiman's administration was, relatively, one of the best of his time. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame. However, his record of magnanimity was marred by the murder of his two sons, at the insistence of his favorite wife.

GROTIUS—A. D. 1583–1645

Hugo Grotius, or Huig van Groot, was a Dutch jurist and humanist. He strove vainly to reunite the Christian sects and the European countries. He wrote valuable works in theology, history and classical study, but his fame rests chiefly on the De jure belli et pacis, which he prepared in Paris after fleeing life imprisonment in his native country.

Concerning the law of war and peace, the De jure belli et pacis, is a systematic study of the bases and principles of positive natural law. Though not the first attempt in modern times to ascertain the principles of jurisprudence, it went far more fundamentally into the discussion than any one had done before. The work is startling in its originality and in the scope of its consideration of international law and international ethics. One of the great masterpieces of legal literature, it is usually considered to be the first definitive text on international law.

COLBERT—A. D. 1619–1683

Jean Baptiste Colbert was a statesman who did much for France. Nevertheless, his rule was a very bad example of overgovernment. He did not believe in popular liberty. The parlements and states-general received no support from him. The technicalities of justice he never allowed to interfere with his plans. He trafficked in public offices for profit.

Colbert became the chief power in the administration of Louis XIV, where he cleansed the financial administration ruthlessly. His ambitious scheme of encouragement of industry and trade involved subsidies, state planning and rigid control of every detail of production, including quality and price. Similar policies were applied to agriculture. His greatest and most lasting achievement was the establishment of the French Marine. (To supply oarsmen for his galleys, he required judges to sentence as many persons as possible; the convict, once chained to the bench, was seldom released at the expiration of his sentence. Colbert never thought of the long agony of those who filled his needs.) Colbert extended his scheme of paternalism to the arts and literature. His industry was colossal; he even found time for the improvement of the breed of horses.

Colbert reformed certain aspects of the legal administration and codified ordinances.

POTHIER—A. D. 1699–1772

Robert Joseph Pothier was a French judge and professor of law. He paid particular attention to the text of the Pandects, or Digests, of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian, Tribonium, etc.). His Pandectae Justinianae in novum ordinem digestae is a classic in the study of Roman law. He wrote many learned monographs on French law and much of his work was incorporated almost verbatim in the French Civil Code.

BLACKSTONE—A. D. 1723–80

The fame of Sir William Blackstone rests on his Commentaries on the Law of England. His career in Parliament, to which he was elected first in 1761, was somewhat inglorious, as he disliked attendance there. In the 10 years of his judgeship he administered the law satisfactorily but attained no special distinction. He inaugurated courses in English law at the British universities, which had previously confined themselves to Roman law.

The commentaries of Blackstone have been regarded as the most thorough treatment of the whole of English law ever produced by one man. Whether it is owing to its literary graces, or to its success in flattering the prejudices of the public to which it was addressed, the influence of the work has been extraordinary. It may be more correct to regard it as a handbook for laymen than as a legal treatise. Yet, it has been used as the standard textbook in English law for generations.

The fame of Blackstone is greatest in the United States, where the commentaries was, for many years, almost the only source of knowledge of English law.

MASON—A. D. 1725–92

George Mason exercised great influence in local and Virginia legislative bodies. As a member of the Virginia convention, he drafted the Virginia constitution and the famous Bill of Rights, a radically democratic document which had great influence on American political institutions. This great work was extensively copied by other American States and had some influence on the French Declaration of the Rights of Man.

Mason was a member of the Federal Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 and took an active part in drafting the Constitution. However, he objected to the large and indefinite powers given to Congress, the compromises on the tariff and slave-trade issues, and failure to include a bill of rights. He refused to sign the Constitution, and, with Patrick Henry, he led the fight in Virginia against its ratification. Failing in this, he suggested amendments, the substance of several of which was afterward embodied in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the American Constitution.

Mason believed that local government should be kept strong and central government weak; his democratic theories have had much influence in Southern and Western States.

NAPOLEON—A. D. 1769–1821

Napoleon I, Emperor of the French, was a spectacular military genius of unlimited ambition. One of the greatest conquerors history has ever known, he made France paramount in Europe, rearranged its map, and set his relatives upon its thrones.

In France, Napoleon consolidated the results of the Revolution and sought a new conservative balance by his reforms. He centralized the administration, established the Bank of France, inaugurated financial reforms, made peace with the church, and instituted legal reforms to pave the way for the Code Napoleon. His excessive centralization made the state supreme over the entire people—a system singularly favorable to statism.

The Code Napoleon, sometimes called the Code Civil, was the first code of French civil law. It embodies the private substantive law of France, fusing the preexisting Germanic and Roman civil law applied in France with additions resulting from the French Revolution. The code has been in force, as changed by legislative amendment, since it was first promulgated. Still in force in Belgium and Holland, it has served as a model for—and has exercised the greatest influence in—many other countries. The Spanish Civil Code was largely based on the Code Civil, as were the civil codes of most of the South American States, Quebec, and Louisiana.

JEFFERSON—A. D. 1743–1826

Thomas Jefferson is the outstanding apostle of American democracy and one of the greatest liberals of all time. He held a great range of public offices; he was prominent in many, and foremost member of several, of the most important deliberative and legislative bodies in American history. He is famous for many contributions to the American democratic system, as Governor of Virginia, member of the Continental Congresses, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President.

Jefferson was the chief inspirer and most ardent worker for reforms embodied in a revision of the laws of Virginia. These included the statute for religious freedom—the first law of its kind in Christendom—abolition of primogeniture, and the repeal of laws of entail. Here, he was the first American statesman to make education by the State a fundamental article of democratic faith. He gained his greatest fame as author of the Declaration of Independence. As Vice President and presiding officer of the Senate, he wrote the influential Manual of Parliamentary Practice, which is still used in both Houses of Congress.

In Jefferson the Nation had a great scholar and philosopher, who was at the same time one of her most competent political managers—a leader with unlimited faith in the people. The ideas he advocated have become the very foundations of our Government. His importance as a maker of modern America is unequalled; it can hardly be overstated.

APPENDIX

RELIEF PORTRAITS IN MARBLE OVER HOUSE GALLERY DOORS

The relief portraits on the upper walls of the House Chamber are of men noted in history for the part they have played in the evolution of what has become American law. There has grown a great body of judicial tradition and a mass of legislation embodying the rules and standards by which the American people, regardless of State lines, are content to guide their lives.

The Colonists brought to this country the common law of England, its concepts of property, liberty, and justice, but they took pains to make themselves free of governmental tyranny. But though our law is mainly derived from the British system it also owes something to French law, and both of these great systems derive from Roman law, and the laws of earlier peoples.

These great lawgivers, in chronological order, are:

Hammurabi, the first King of Babylonia, reigned about 2067–2025 B. C.

The great law code bearing his name is recognized in legal literature as, perhaps, the earliest surviving, naturally characterized by its primitiveness.

Moses—circa 1571–1451 B. C.: Hebrew prophet and lawgiver. Amongst all lawgivers, founders of states, and teachers of mankind, none has excelled Moses, who transformed a horde of slaves and wanderers into a nation, disciplined a race, and breathed into it its character. To him is attributed the delivery of the Ten Commandments.

Lycurgus—circa 900 B. C.: Legislator, traditional author of laws and institutions of Sparta (by present standards a harsh code).

Solon—circa 594 B. C.: The great Athenian lawgiver, author of constitutional and legal reforms.

Gaius—circa A. D. 110–180: A celebrated Roman jurist, probably a native of the eastern empire. He was the author of numerous works on the civil law, the most noted being The Institutes.

Papinian—circa A. D. 200: A Roman, remarkable not only for his juridical genius, for his independence of judgment, lucidity, and firmness, but for his sense of right and morality by which he frequently rose above the barriers of national prejudices, and merited the highest veneration of succeeding centuries.

Justinian—A. D. 483–565: One of the most important events of the reign of this Byzantine Emperor was the publication of the Justinian Code, the body of the Roman law compiled and annotated, the most important of all monuments of jurisprudence.

Tribonian—circa A. D. 500–547: A Byzantine jurist, he was head of the commission which codified the laws under Justinian.

Maimonides—A. D. 1135–1204: Jewish philosopher of Cordova; he compiled a systematic exposition of the whole of Jewish law as contained in the Pentateuch and in Talmudic literature.

Gregory IX—circa A. D. 1147–1241: Author of a compilation of decretals on canon law; during a critical period he accomplished much in maintaining the remnants of Roman law.

Innocent III—A. D. 1161–1216: A profound student of canon and civil law, his accomplishments during a dark and critical period of human history were much the same as those of Gregory IX, preservation of the remnants of Roman law.

Simon de Montfort—A. D. 1200–1265: Celebrated English statesman, he originated the first appearance of the House of Commons of England.

St. Louis—A. D. 1214–1270: King of France, author of the Mise of Amiens.

Alphonso X, the Wise—A. D. 1221–1284: King of Leon and Castile, he was the author of the code Las Siete Partidas, the basis of Spanish jurisprudence.

Edward I—A. D. 1239–1307: King of England, founder of the parliamentary constitution of England and eliminator of feudalism from political life. "What touches all should be approved by all, and common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common."

Suleiman—A. D. 1494–1566: "The lawgiver," Sultan of Turkey, reformer and improver of civil and military codes. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame.

Grotius—A. D. 1583–1645: Dutch statesman, advocate general of Holland and Zealand. Author of De Jure Belli et Pacis, first treatise on international law.

Colbert—A. D. 1619–1683: French statesman, codifier of the ordinances, reformer of the French legal system.

Pothier—A. D. 1699–1772: French jurist, author of Digest of the Pandects. He assembled and codified the remnants of Roman law and the prevalent French law.

Blackstone—A. D. 1723–1780: A celebrated English jurist, professor of common law at Oxford, his Commentaries on the Laws of England had considerable influence on the importation and adaptation of English common law in this country.

George Mason—A. D. 1726–1792: He drafted the Virginia Declaration of Rights, 1776, was a member of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, but led opposition to the ratification of the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was inserted in it.

Napoleon—A. D. 1769–1821: He appointed a commission which produced the Code Napoleon and saw that it was enforced. It is prevailing law even now in Louisiana, quite influential in Florida, New Mexico, and California.

Thomas Jefferson—A. D. 1743–1826: Third President of the United States, he was author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Statute of Virginia for religious freedom.

Men of Yesterday Don't Fit in the World of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Men of Yesterday Don't Fit In the World of Tomorrow," which appeared in the Reading Times of July 25.

MEN OF YESTERDAY DON'T FIT IN THE WORLD OF TOMORROW

The world of tomorrow with its electronically-operated homes, atom-powered transportation and regularly scheduled flights to the moon and from thence to the plants and outer space has long been the dream of imaginative children, the goal of trained scientists and the psychological escape mechanism of science fiction fans.

Prior to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, visionaries placed this utopia at a comfortable distance in the future, deriving a certain degree of satisfaction from tossing around such dates as A. D. 2000, the year 5000, or, drawing on the limits of literary license, 30,000 years from now.

Then the bomb fell.

With it, a new era was ushered in. Unlimited horizons appeared, but with them, new responsibilities for us as individuals, groups and nations.

For the past decade, scientists have been revising their original estimates of that time chart for the beginning of this utopia steadily downward. As it draws closer, many people are beginning to find their anticipation diluted with trepidation. For the world of tomorrow means change and change means adjustment. People fear adjustment.

This past week, scientists have set the target date for the onset of this nuclear revolution so close that most of us will live to see it—1960, to be exact. And, barring the possibility of war, atomic energy will be put to use not only in submarines and other instruments of destruction, but in inventions which will radically alter our industrial and domestic lives.

It is predicted that Mrs. Housewife will be introduced to the atom in the next 5 years, with meats, fruits, and vegetables treated by atomic rays to preserve their flavor and freshness for weeks, months, and perhaps years. And that's only a beginning. Within the next 50 years, atomic energy is expected to be running practically everything in the world.

So atomic energy, whether in the form of a bomb dropped on an American city or an automated factory will have a pronounced effect on our society.

All that means change and adjustment, yes, and that's where we come in. The world of tomorrow promises to be a wonderful place, providing it is not filled with men of yesterday.

Are we ready for and worthy of this world of tomorrow? Can we handle this Janus-like weapon for good rather than evil? Can we make the adjustments, both collectively and individually, to discard 19th century thinking in preparation for a 21st century world?

Those questions cannot be answered casually. Whenever social and political adjustments have been accelerated, society has undergone a growth spasm because most people are not ready for change.

Have we learned, for instance, that toying with the atomic bomb and its senior grade companies, the hydrogen and cobalt bombs, is no longer war, but mass suicide? The world's greatest political leaders met only last week to iron out kinks in international relations which could lead to the unleashing of this fury. How well they succeeded is a matter of public record through news releases.

But it isn't necessary to gage our preparation for this "brave new world" by thinking of the United States and Russia. What about the invisible lines of sectionalism, partyism, classism, and racialism here in this country? How well do you get along with your neighbor? How well do you get along with yourself?

It seems very futile, doesn't it, to be yearning for the world of tomorrow if you can't get along in the world of today.' It's more than a matter of gadgets and push-button living. Its' a matter of growing up, of becoming a man or woman mature enough to be worthy of this utopia.

Otherwise, we will remain slightly-veneered savages in a world of marvels—Alices in Wonderland.

An Authoritative Word on the Peaceful Use of the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD. D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to include a very timely editorial entitled "Where Atomic Secrecy Has No Place," which appeared in the June 15, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, which contains heartening words on the peaceful use of the atom uttered by the distinguished president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The article follows:

WHERE ATOMIC SECRECY HAS NO PLACE

Against the background of furitiveness, suspicion, and public misconceptions accompanying the scientific inquiry into nuclear energy, it was particularly good to hear the announcement made the other day by Dr. James R. Killian, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dt. Killian, talking to MIT alumni, announced plans for a new nuclear reactor which the institute will build. What we liked was the way Dr. Killian described it—"a tame and cool one, rather than a hot type," having "nothing to do with bombs." This reactor, he said, "will be nonsecret and dedicated to the unrestricted advancement of knowledge and the peaceful use of the atom."

Atomic science, if it is ever to give us the wonderful abundance that it promises, has got to be a cool business, tame, nonsecret, and unhampered by military characters with bombs on their minds who go around locking up discoveries as fast as the men in the laboratories make them.

The Outrage on General Taxpayers of Federal Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I dare say that the great majority of the Members of this House has no idea of the scandalous operations of the Bureau of Reclamation. They have been going on for 50 years. What is more, it appears that the Members from the central West and the East and South and some from the far West have been dead asleep. We hope this is not true of the present Members. While they slept in the past the Government took, mostly from their States, over $2,175,000,000 as of June 30, 1952. And they are now committed to at least $1,588,000,000 more, a total of at least $3,745,000,000, and maybe double that. No one can tell.

For example, a vast new project before Congress is called the upper Colorado storage project. Just to get started the Bureau wants an authorization of $1,093,000,000. To complete it will take 25 years or more. Goodness knows what the figure will be for our grandchildren to pay. No one can even guess that. The Bureau itself does not know and says so. Of course, Congress does not know. Yet by the logrolling, back-scratching game of politics the taxpayers have been committed for years and years to come.

The Hoover Commission task force pointed out that "the Federal Government has used water resources and power development projects, which should be undertaken exclusively for economic purposes, to accomplish indirect social and political ends. Instead of being undertaken and operated for the purposes stated, Federal water resource development projects have been used in some instances to promote collateral objectives." The Hoover task force "found that project costs are frequently under-

estimated, that benefits advanced by various Federal agencies as justification for projects are often exaggerated, that unsupported and unsupportable claims are made for indirect benefits. In some instances projects have been recommended and authorized without economic justification of any kind. Overestimation of irrigation benefits has reached a point where the Bureau of Reclamation has claimed justification for the expenditure of $1,000 to $2,000 an acre for the development of irrigated land which, on the basis of information available to the task force, would not be worth more than $200 an acre."

According to the Bureau of Reclamation reports, out of 34 irrigation projects, 31 would produce more hay and grass to produce more dairy products, viz, butter, cheese, and dried milk. Then more tax dollars will be required to buy them up and put them in storage. They may mold and waste away. Twenty-seven out of thirty-four projects would grow more grass and hay to grow more sheep to produce more surplus wool to put in storage at more taxpayer expense. The cost to the Nation's taxpayers will be as high as $5,000 an acre to bring water to the hay and grass fields. The land reclaimed would not be worth $200 per acre. No hay and grass fields are worth more than that. Yet, W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, represents to Congress and the taxpayers that these reclamation projects will not add to surplus agricultural products in his press release of May 13, 1955, when he says "most products of western irrigated farms are not under price support or acreage control and are not surplus."

This illustrates how characteristic and common misrepresentation is when bureaucrats engage in improper functions of government. And all this is an improper function of limited constitutional government. It becomes even ridiculous. For example, the Department of Agriculture calls for lower price supports for certain agricultural products we cannot use. It orders a decrease in acreage allotments so as to reduce unneeded production and the burden on taxpayers. Another bureau of Government, the Bureau of Reclamation, under Mr. Dexheimer, calls for spending billions of the same taxpayers' dollars for more Western mountainous desert acres which will grow more farm surplus prdoucts, viz, butter, milk, and wool, to buy up and put in storage. None of it makes any sense to taxpayers. But the taxpayers are unorganized. Besides they do not know about these things. Only those who get the benefits are organized and they trade their votes for these benefits. It is as bad as a shell game. It is worse because it is all so vast even Congresmen on the ground cannot fathom it.

When politicians support a project like the upper Colorado River boondoggle, they must be thinking of votes. Such a project means enormous gifts of money to a few persons; it means brief boom times for a few desert towns; it means that craftsmen and laborers must be transported at great public expense to remote areas of the mountain west; it means some wild spending; and most of all it means a successful raid on the Treasury of the United States. There is an unbroken record of "no returns" to the Federal taxpayers. The payments made by the few projects that have nearly paid out or are now paying on account are not paid back to reduce the advances by taxpayers but are paid out again for new projects. A Government that will wrongly take private property to do special favors for a group of voters in return for their votes will, of course, resort to misrepresentations and deceit to develop some more of the same. Not one of these irrigation projects started since 1902 has paid for itself.

The Bureau of Reclamation recently issued to the House Interior Committee a table purporting to show how much each State would receive back for services, materials, and equipment for the construction of the upper Colorado River project. For instance, my own State of New York, according to the Bureau, would benefit to the extent of $77,398,000 for possibly some machinery orders. How the Bureau guesses the amount of benefits does not appear. The phony part, the deceitful part, is the careful omission of the cost to my State and to all taxpayers in each State for the whole project. For instance, New York taxpayers in order to get back $77,398,000 in business orders would be assessed $493 million as their share of the $4 billion subsidy necessary to complete the project, according to the Council of State Chambers of Commerce bulletin No. 134, June 1955. Its net contribution to Rocky Mountain farmlands would be $416,202,000. How the other States would fare is as follows:

State	Amount Bureau says it will receive	Cost to taxpayers
Arizona	$37,036,000	$20,400,000
Alabama	7,025,000	46,000,000
Arkansas	2,145,000	27,200,000
California	125,248,000	372,800,000
Colorado	47,981,000	36,400,000
Connecticut	15,181,000	69,600,000
Delaware	1,429,000	14,800,000
District of Columbia	774,000	
Florida	2,797,000	67,600,000
Georgia	8,157,000	61,200,000
Idaho	5,963,000	13,600,000
Illinois	53,463,000	276,000,000
Indiana	23,815,000	102,400,000
Iowa	5,357,000	62,000,000
Kansas	10,270,000	52,400,000
Kentucky	5,953,000	50,800,000
Louisiana	5,536,000	53,600,000
Maine	3,452,000	18,800,000
Maryland	9,108,000	102,400,000
Massachusetts	26,970,000	127,600,000
Michigan	41,556,000	196,400,000
Minnesota	8,157,000	69,600,000
Mississippi	2,382,000	26,000,000
Missouri	12,980,000	100,000,000
Montana	4,275,000	16,000,000
Nebraska	6,547,000	34,000,000
Nevada	4,667,000	6,800,000
New Hampshire	2,441,000	12,000,000
New Jersey	33,400,000	144,000,000
New Mexico	17,006,000	15,200,000
New York	77,398,000	433,600,000
North Carolina	13,158,000	66,800,000
North Dakota	1,403,000	12,000,000
Ohio	50,844,000	236,000,000
Oklahoma	7,800,000	44,800,000
Oregon	9,847,000	44,000,000
Pennsylvania	55,549,000	277,600,000
Rhode Island	5,240,000	20,800,000
South Carolina	6,370,000	34,400,000
South Dakota	2,056,000	13,200,000
Tennessee	7,681,000	55,600,000
Texas	34,575,000	194,400,000
Utah	61,716,000	16,000,000
Vermont	$1,191,000	$7,600,000
Virginia	8,395,000	67,600,000
Washington	14,631,000	68,400,000
West Virginia	5,299,000	35,600,000
Wisconsin	18,100,000	88,000,000
Wyoming	10,719,000	8,000,000

When the Bureau gets through with this upper Colorado River project it has a list of 269 additional projects it hopes to build in the future. The Bureau regards itself as permanently in the business of "the investigation of water resources of the West is (as) a continuous process." It has no intention that the taxpayers will ever get their money back.

If the taxpayers are going to remain so dumb as to let their Government stay in this kind of business we must expect a repetition of the past. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation admitted that on the Colorado-Big Thompson project after they got the water canals all built the water froze up and would not run. The project had to be scrapped or else cement covers had to be put on miles of canals in the frozen mountains to keep the water from freezing. Congress could not be made to look ridiculous so it appropriated $4,150,000 to try to salvage the whole project from the ice. The additional cost not now contemplated for the Frying Pan-Arkansas project will be more than $64 million when this has to be done, according to engineers' testimony before the House Interior Committee. No one can expect the taxpayers to get back a cent from such crazy schemes. They have not done so in the last 50 years. There is less reason to expect it in the next 50.

To make the picture complete a maximum of only 6 million acres could possibly be irrigated and reclaimed in the desert country by the year 1975, according to the Bureau's program. According to the Department of Agriculture that would be a little over one-half of 1 percent of the present total land in farms now in use. To reclaim western arid lands costs from 20 to 50 times that of draining and clearing ordinary farmlands in the humid areas with plenty of annual water fall. There are 20 million acres of fine crop land available when needed. Besides that, they are located much nearer the big city markets.

Congress may commit a great asset—water for four States—to grow forage crops for dairy cows and wool on sheep's backs in the mountainous uplands of the Rockies. Former Governor Miller, of Wyoming, Chairman, Natural Resources Task Force, First Hoover Commission, stated that every thousand gallons of water in this area would grow 10 cents' worth of such crops:

> It could be used to produce $5 worth of industrial products.

And of course it should be preserved for that if not necessary for human consumption. Adm. Ben Moreel, Chairman of the Task Force on Water Resources and Power, said that our precious water resource "should be committed sparingly in order to retain the maximum de-

gree of flexibility in our rapidly changing future economy."

The answer to the reclamation business is too obvious. Yet a governor of a State and the Congressmen in that State may not be reelected unless they continue to whoop it up for more and more of the same old reclamation and electric power dam projects. The Governor of Wyoming wrote asking me and other Congressmen to support the upper Colorado River project. My reply follows:

JULY 8, 1955.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
Governor of Wyoming,
Executive Department,
Cheyenne, Wyo.

DEAR GOVERNOR SIMPSON: Your letter of June 10 to me indicates that the enclosed Denver Post editorial of May 10 adequately states the feelings of the majority of the people in Wyoming favoring the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. It may take more presently unascertainable billions from the taxpayers. But, Governor, the majority, whoever they are, now turn out to be dead wrong on nearly all reclamation projects for the last 50 years. Of the earlier irrigation projects a very few were economically feasible. The cost per acre was low, the land was fertile, the growing season long, and high-value crops such as melons, grapes, beans, celery, tomatoes, asparagus, etc., have been grown as in the Central Valley project of California.

But in this Colorado project the Congress is being asked to provide funds to irrigate lands in the mountainous uplands, at altitudes between 5,000 and 7,500 feet. At these altitudes, as you well know, the winters are long and cold and the summer growing season short. The crops are mostly grass and hay which is of very low value, and it frosts nearly the year round.

Upper Colorado project construction costs for the hydroelectric projects per kilowatt capacity are almost 5 times higher than Hoover Dam and 6 times that of the Grand Coulee. In terms of cost per kilowatt-hour, it ranges from 4 to 6 times that of the existing hydro-electric dams. It would be cheaper to generate the power from the greatest coal deposits in the world, located in the upper Colorado region including your own State. Surely the upper Colorado is the worst possible project for the development of hydroelectric power.

The Government estimates of cost for reclamation projects has been so uniformly wrong as to indicate a deliberate intent to deceive the Congress in these undertakings. According to their own testimony before the Subcommittee To Study Civil Works, 82d Congress, 2d session, House Committee print No. 21, page 17, the Bureau of Reclamation admitted that on the basis of its present authorized construction program, actual construction costs run about 106 percent above the estimated costs prepared.

The bills call for an expenditure of $1,658,460,000. The total interest charges that will have to be absorbed by the United States taxpayer will amount to $1,153 million according to Mr. C. W. Crosthwait, acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. Isn't it true, then, that the actual estimated cost at the moment is $2,811,460,000? But on the record of performance for the Federal agencies for over 50 years we must assume that estimates are deceptive and that the actual cost of the upper Colorado project will be 106 percent higher, making an ultimate cost of at least twice $2,811,460,000 or $5,622,920,000. That is $140 for every American family plus the deficits in operation plus the exemption of taxes on that capital which would otherwise be in private business which amounts to more billions the general taxpayers must pay because the upper Colorado projects are made tax exempt.

In the larger projects like this the deceptions are the most shocking. For example, the total estimated cost for the Missouri Basin project as originally proposed was $1,257,645,700. Some 10 years later, as set forth in the hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, 83d Congress, 2d session, "Interior Department Appropriations for 1955" the estimate of cost had risen to $5,449,827,000 which was an increase of $4,192,181,300 or 333 percent. Federal agencies repeat such mistakes so regularly that lack of plain honesty is the only conclusion possible. They fool one Congress, then a new project comes before a new Congress and the same type of deception is worked over and over again.

Such is the evidence of political irresponsibility, logrolling, and buying of votes is common to all Government projects that go beyond the legitimate functioning of government. Proper government must always be defensive or protective in character. Then it can be and generally is honest. When it goes beyond that it is always dishonest and corrupt in its purposes and its means of carrying it out. To illustrate, the Hoover Commission task force on water resources and power in its report, June 15, 1955, stated that it "has been forced to the rather depressing conclusion in view of the general competence and quality of performance of the Federal agencies, that most of the weaknesses revealed by its studies are inherent in bureaucracy."

The cost of the three projects in your State on a new lands basis, including the interest on the bonds, paid not by the people to be benefited but by the general taxpayers in far distant States, is as follows: Costs of irrigation for the LaBarge project is estimated at $472 per acre. Costs of irrigation for the Seedskadee and Lyman projects, respectively, is estimated at $861 and $1,755 per acre. Since the Department's record for deliberately underestimating costs is 106 percent for 50 years, you must more than double the estimates. So on the basis of experience the costs for irrigating the 3 projects will be nearer $944, $1,722, and $3,510 per acre, respectively. In view of this record, how can you logically ask me to support these projects for new land when our most valuable farmlands for hay, grass, and silage do not exceed $250 per acre?

Stack all this alongside of the mountains of surplus agricultural products we already have: the $8 billion taken from the people to pay growers of butter, milk, wool, corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, tobacco, etc., because there are too many acres under cultivation.

The ridiculous consequences of our own socialistic management of our economy now requires the Secretary of Agriculture to propose cuts of acreage of various crops by possibly 20 million acres. Wheat acreage has been cut from 78 to 55 million acres.

So when and if our needs for additional crop acreage increases in future years, this acreage and many other millions of unused acres can be brought into cultivation. Besides, according to the Department of Agriculture and the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, there are over 20 million acres of fertile wet or swampland nearer the markets that can be drained at less than $100 an acre without continuing annual charges for irrigation.

Surely the time has come to stop this uneconomic and immoral game of groups organizing to get theirs from the public feed trough because others are getting theirs. To do that the States legislatures must reassert the constitutional limitations on the Congress and limit its taxing and spending powers. Government must be reconfined to its true function of defending American life and property instead of managing them.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. GWINN.

New Jersey's Refugee Program Should Be Adopted by Other States, Says New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, and a 27-member refugee relief committee have formulated a program designed to enlist broad support in New Jersey.

The committee is taking a grassroots approach to the problems of refugees and to the equally important problem of stimulating interest in the local communities in work with refugees. Neighborhood churches, local organizations, and welfare agencies are being asked to obtain pledges of employment and support for prospective immigrants.

The New York Times of July 16, 1955, says editorially that—

Governor Meyner has described as "dismal" our national record thus far in bringing persons fleeing Red rule to the United States. The New Jersey undertaking will direct attention to this record on a local basis and give the people themselves an opportunity to aid in getting our refugee program moving more swiftly. We think that the plan has real merit and its adoption by other States could hasten the entrance of those who need and deserve our sanctuary.

As I have sponsored three important bills dealing with immigration in the present Congress I naturally have a very keen and direct interest in the success of the New Jersey plan. I commend this plan to my colleagues, and include the New York Times editorial, a list of the members of the committee, and the remarks of Governor Meyner at the swearing-in of the committee on refugee relief:

REMARKS OF GOV. ROBERT B. MEYNER, OF NEW JERSEY, AT SWEARING IN OF COMMITTEE ON REFUGEE RELIEF

The refugee relief program offers an unprecedented opportunity for New Jersey citizens to augment their sympathies with remedies for the Communist-oppressed peoples of the cold war.

The New York Times carried an account on April 26 which described the reverse repatriation now underway in Central Europe. Thousands of anti-Communist refugees, dejected by Western red tape and neglect, are being wooed by the Soviets—often successfully—into returning to their former homelands. Bitterness and anti-American sentiment are replacing the earlier high hopes for a future in the new world. According to this account, the time required for a person fleeing the Iron Curtain to obtain an American visa runs something like this: 3 months to a year for a German investigation; 1 year for a United States intelligence check; 6 to 9 months for investigating and processing by the consulate; and a year or 2—if ever—to receive a promise of employment and support from the United States.

The Justice Department released data indicating the extent of this bottleneck. The present law would permit 102,000 Soviet bloc refugees in Western Europe, NATO countries, and Iran to enter by the end of 1956. Since 1953, only 1,061 had entered as of April 8. Of the 214,000 homeless which

this act would admit, less than 17,000 have reached the United States from all parts of the world.

It is my firm intention that this committee and its crucial efforts shall remain aloof from meaningless harangues and petty excuses. Nothing will serve the needs of America's prestige abroad or the privations of those who have fled Red rule but honest concern and workable solutions.

Members of Advisory Committee on Refugee Relief: Anthony W. Belluscio, Chairman, 551 First Avenue, Elizabeth, N. J.; Mrs. Frank Fobert, Vice Chairman, R. F. D. 1, Childs Road, Basking Ridge, N. J.; Rev. Edward Dunbar, Flemington, N. J.; Rev. C. E. Krumbholz, Dunnellen, N. J.; Msgr. James S. Foley, Perth Amboy, N. J.; Rabbi Isaac J. Wasserman, Somerville, N. J.; Mr. Henry Reed Bowen, Newark, N. J.; Rt. Rev. Alfred L. Banyard, Trenton, N. J.; Rev. Andrew S. Layman, Merchantville, N. J.; Col. Jack B. Dunn, Westfield, N. J.; Mr. Louis J. Piencikowski, Highland Park, N. J.; Mr. J. S. DeRose, Mr. Stephen Dudiak, Clifton, N. J.; Mr. Richard Weber, Newark, N. J.; Mr. Morris Fuch, New Jersey; Mr. Joel Jacobson, Newark, N. J.; Mr. Julius Kisiak, Jersey City, N. J.; Rt. Rev. Zolton Beky, Trenton, N. J.; Hon. Carl Holderman, commissioner of labor and industry; Mr. John J. Yenick, director, division of employment security; Col. Joseph D. Rutter, superintendent, State police; Dr. Frederick M. Raubinger, commissioner of education; Dr. Daniel Bergsma, commisisoner of health; Mr. William C. Lynn, assistant secretary, department of agriculture; Dr. Joseph E. McLean, commissioner, department of conservation and economic development; Mr. Edwin C. B. Clark, executive secretary, division of veterans' services.

[From the New York Times of July 16, 1955]

NEW REFUGEE PROGRAM

New Jersey's Governor Meyner and a 27-member refugee relief committee have formulated a program designed to enlist community support in their State for speeding the immigration of refugees from Communist-controlled countries. The so-called New Jersey plan will take a grassroots approach to the problem of stimulating interest in the merits of the refugee project. Committee members will work with neighborhood churches, organizations, and welfare agencies to obtain local pledges of employment and support for prospective immigrants.

Governor Meyner has described as "dismal" our national record thus far in bringing persons fleeing Red rule to the United States. The New Jersey undertaking will direct attention to this record on a local basis and give the people themselves an opportunity to aid in getting our refugee program moving more swiftly. We think that the plan has real merit and its adoption by other States could hasten the entrance of those who need and deserve our sanctuary.

We Need Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the Congress to the urgent need for immediate consideration by the Committee on Agriculture of H. R. 1834 and other bills to exempt certain wheat producers from marketing-quota penalties under the Agricultural Act of 1938 in cases where all of the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm.

As you know, the Senate on March 28 passed S. 46, which is identical with H. R. 1834. It is my understanding that these measures, together with several other bills which seek to accomplish similar ends, have been referred to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

An intolerable situation is developing with respect to assessment of wheat-marketing-quota penalties. With certain exceptions, the farmers who market wheat in excess of their quotas are subject to marketing penalties currently set at $1.13 per bushel. Requests for suits to collect such penalties from wheatgrowers who exceeded their quotas on the 1954 wheat crop are being filed at an increasing rate. The Department of Agriculture estimates that there may be as many as 1,500 such cases this year, involving production of wheat in 1954. Unless action is taken to collect these penalties, it appears certain that there will be many more violations in 1956, which would normally come up for legal action a year hence.

In many cases farmers who seek to avoid penalties plead that their wheat was not sold in interstate commerce, that they did not want price support, and that all of the wheat was used for feed or seed on the farm. Under the holding in *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111 (1942)), the farmer is liable whether the wheat is fed or sold if he exceeds his acreage allotment unless the planted acreage of wheat does not exceed 15 acres or an acreage from which the normal production does not exceed 200 bushels.

Another unusual example which has come to our attention involves a monastery in Georgia. The monastery has followed the policy of producing the wheat necessary for food at the monastery. None of the wheat is sold. The amount required for 1954 was in excess of the marketing quota. The monastery now finds itself liable to the Government for a penalty of $1.13 per bushel on the excess.

Congress did not contemplate situations such as this arising under the penalty provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938.

The Las Vegas High School Rhythmettes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to pay tribute to an outstanding group of Nevada young people upon the occasion of their arrival in Washington.

The 22 lovely and talented ladies of the Las Vegas High School Rhythmettes are on a nationwide tour sponsored by the Nevada State Elks. The only group of this kind in the United States, the Rhythmettes set extremely high standards of behavior and character for young people throughout the State of Nevada.

Their repertoire includes brilliant military numbers, contemporay dance production numbers, precision dance routines, and novelty production numbers.

Since leaving Nevada on July 3 the Rhythmettes have appeared on the Toast of the Town television show in New York, the national convention of the Elks in Philadelphia, and at Brooklyn's Ebbets Field. Not only have they appeared before record-breaking audiences of the general public, but they have taken the time from their crowded schedules to do special shows in service and veterans' hospitals.

The founder and director of the Rhythmettes is Miss Evelyn Stuckey and the motto of the group is "Perfection in performance reflects perfection in living."

It is my feeling that the qualifications of the Rhythmettes are particularly noteworthy:

First. Moral and behavior standards of the highest character.

Second. Maintenance of good grades.

Third. Perfect sense of rhythm and timing.

Fourth. Ability to accept responsibility.

Fifth. A highly cooperative and friendly nature.

Sixth. Excellent general appearance.

Seventh. Keen interest in school and all school activities.

Eighth. Enthusiasm—sincere desire to attain perfection.

Ninth. Excellent health.

Tenth. Creativeness.

Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures and privileges of being a Member of the House of Representatives is being able to welcome such a fine group of young ladies to the Nation's Capital.

Joseph Kamp's Answer—Both Sides of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, because of certain articles placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 5089, 5090, and 5091, on May 10, 1955, I desire to call the attention of the House to a few facts. First, I am personally familiar with the charges carried in two indictments against Joseph Kamp and which resulted in his conviction for contempt to Congress.

On the first charge, Joseph Kamp was sentenced for a 4-month term, which, less good time, he served. On the second charge—the one growing out of his refusal to give testimony to the so-called

Buchanan committee—he was convicted, but the charge was later dismissed.

The principles of law in this case were the same as those involved in the first case against Kamp and in the case against Edward Rumely, who was also convicted but whose conviction was set aside by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals which decision was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court. Had an appeal been properly taken, the first charge against Kamp would also have been dismissed.

The official record demonstrates beyond any argument that it was Congress which was in error, not Kamp. In view of the decision in the Rumely case—Case No. 87, October term, 1952, March 9, 1953—in neither case was Kamp guilty of contempt nor of any other offense.

Certain correspondence with Kamp reads as follows:

HEADLINES,
New York, N. Y., July 15, 1955.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: I am writing you with the hope that in the interest of justice and fair play you will find it possible to place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that your colleagues in Congress and other readers will have the facts regarding certain derogatory statements about me which appeared in the RECORD some weeks ago. Your courtesy and consideration in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

On May 10, 1955, Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in an extension of his remarks, inserted into the RECORD 2 newspaper articles which made false charges against me. As soon as this came to my attention, I wrote Congressman MULTER and called to his notice just a few of the more glaring inaccuracies. I also advised him that, no doubt unwittingly, he had based some of his own remarks on misinformation, and I cited the facts in support of my position. I asked, in all fairness, that he insert my letter into the RECORD.

In his response he ignored both my request and the specific refutations contained in my letter. I then wrote him again, pointing out that he had been misinformed regarding the contents of the publications he cited in justification of his allegations, and I renewed my request that he insert copies of our correspondence into the RECORD.

It is now almost a month since I wrote him last. I have had no answer, and it is obvious that Congressman MULTER does not intend to present my side of the story to his colleagues and other readers of his extended remarks.

I feel that I am entitled to have my answer to these unfair charges given equal notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am, therefore, taking the liberty of quoting from my letters to him.

On May 18, 1955, I wrote Representative MULTER:

"I have just read your references to me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10 and I am amazed that any Member of Congress could be so wrong. I hesitate to believe that any man in a position of public trust would deliberately attempt to deceive his colleagues and so I am forced to the conclusion that you have been grossly misinformed regarding me and my activities.

"Let me give you an example. You charge that 'such great Americans as Chief Justice Warren have been the targets of his vilification and his abuse.'

"I have mentioned Chief Justice Warren just three times in my writings. In the March 15, 1952 issue of Headlines I gave the results of a Presidential straw poll taken by Overseas Weekly among American soldiers in Germany: 'Taft won 56 percent of the Republican ballots. Eisenhower and Earl Warren tied for second place with 22 percent each.'

"In the June 25, 1952 issue I wrote: 'Robert W. Kenny will be remembered as the man who was soundly beaten by Governor Warren for the Democratic nomination for governor in 1946.'

"In the August 2, 1952 issue I reported that Senator Jack Tenney had been reelected to the California State Senate in 1950 'by better than a million and a quarter votes, running ahead of both Governor Warren and Senator KNOWLAND.'

"Just how these references could constitute 'vilification and abuse' of Chief Justice Warren is beyond my understanding."

I then told Congressman MULTER that it was just such misinformation that had mislead him to charge that: "Kamp has long been one of the Nation's leading hatemongers."

Continuing, I wrote: "In your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you say: 'As far back as the midthirties, he (Kamp) won the commendation of the Nazis for his pro-Fascist sympathies.'

"Not only have the Nazis never 'commended' me, nor have I ever had any 'pro-Fascist sympathies,' but in the midthirties, on April 15, 1935, in my national newspaper the Awakener, I called on Congress to investigate all un-American movements and listed specifically: '(A) Nazi movements inspired by or subsidized by the Hitler Government of Germany * * * (B) Fascist movements inspired by or subsidized by the Italian Government * * * (C) Also any native American Fascist movements which can be charged with designs to subvert our form of government by the use of unconstitutional methods.'

"To bolster your own charges you put into the RECORD the concluding chapter of Jack Steele's phony series on 'Peddlers of Hate' which began with the false statement: 'Organized bigotry is on the upswing in the United States.'

"In this chapter Mr. Steele's theme is that 'In efforts to infiltrate right-wing groups, the forces of bigotry have adopted the fifth-column tactics of the Communists. They readily take over and preach the doctrines of the particular group they want to penetrate.'

"Significantly, Mr. Steele does not name a single group that any 'bigot' is trying to penetrate. Nevertheless, he cites my 'case history' as evidence of this tactic.

"As 'proof' of my contribution to this alleged current 'upswing' of 'bigotry' and my present effort 'to infiltrate right-wing groups.' Mr. Steele cites two issues of Headlines published in 1952, and a pamphlet published in July of last year in which I exposed the Red background of the author of a smear series attacking Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

"Specifically he writes: 'Kamp's most recent pamphlets have attacked tax-exempt foundations.' These 'most recent' pamphlets could only refer to a booklet exposing the Ford Foundation's attempt to smear Congressional committees investigating Communist infiltration and subversion which was published in April, 1954—more than a year ago—and an issue of Headlines setting forth details of the support given to Red activity by various tax-free foundations which was published in February 1951 (more than 4 years ago). The only thing 'recent' in connection with my pamphlets is the fact that the charges I made in 1951 were fully verified in the Reece committee report released early this year.

"Just how any of the foregoing publications could possibly be used to 'infiltrate right-wing groups', Mr. Steele does not attempt to say.

"As for the second smear article which you placed in the RECORD in an attempt to give weight to your charges, let me point out that the author, the late Bert Andrews, also smeared the FBI and wrote a book criticizing the Government's loyalty program.

"Mr. Andrews merely repeats charges which have repeatedly been proven false, or which are so ludicrous as to insult the intelligence of the reading public. This piece which you endorse says, for instance, that I 'was a member of the committee which gave a testimonial dinner for Maj. Gen. George Van Horn Moseley, retired, in 1938 when General Moseley was so far to the right that he was almost all by himself.'

"The fact is that on the day in question General Moseley was honored at a public luncheon given by the New York Board of Trade, which was attended by hundreds of prominent businessmen. I had nothing to with the luncheon, but on that same evening General Moseley, who had just retired as Deputy Chief of Staff, was good enough to speak at a small meeting of which I was one of the sponsors. If General Moseley was highly enough regarded by the President of the United States be placed in the second highest position in the Army, and if he was important enough to be honored by the outstanding business leaders of New York, it is rather difficult to understand just how my sponsorship of a meeting at which he was a speaker can be construed as 'proof' that I am a 'hatemonger.'

"Both of the articles which you have placed in the RECORD are replete with scurrilous and viciously untrue charges. I am quite sure that if you had known this you would not have made yourself a party to this indefensible smearing of a fellow citizen.

"In your remarks you have called your colleagues attention to the fact that I have twice been cited for contempt of Congress and that I have served time in jail for contempt. If you will investigate the circumstances and consider them in all fairness and honesty I think you will conclude that instead of reflecting on me, it is just the other way around—this is a reflection on Congress for having permitted subversive outsiders to meddle in the affairs of its committees, in spite of my warnings.

"If you will just read the record you will discover that I was not cited for having defied Congress but rather for having refused to comply with a demand instigated by the head of the Communist spy ring in the Government, John Abt.

"You will find, too, that I went to jail on my own insistence; that I refused probation, because I said, I wanted justice, not mercy.

"You will also discover that the Courts have held that Congress was wrong when it cited me a second time.

"Now you change that my April issue of Headlines 'is a contempt of Congress.' You further charge that it contains 'a scurrilous and viciously untrue attack on leading national Jewish organizations and the House Committee on Un-American Activities for issuing its report on neo-Fascist and hate groups.'

"If you had read this issue of Headlines you would know that I make no attack on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I contend that its 'Preliminary Report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups' is a fraud and a hoax, but I put the blame where it belongs. I charge that the report is based on malicious misinformation foisted on the Committee by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee.

"I make other serious charges against the 'hate racketeers' who are in the leadership of these two organizations.

"You allege that my charges are false.

"I know they are true.

"I do not question your honesty or sincerity, but we can't both be right. I would like to think that you would want the Congress and the public to know the truth.

"Will you join me then, in the interest of decency and fair play, in requesting the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate my charges against the professional leaders of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, as well as the charges you have made against me?"

"I will welcome an investigation of my career as an opponent of un-American activities, including Nazism and Fascism. I am proud of the fact that I have been actively fighting communism longer than anyone else in the United States.

"If you believe that the 'attack' I have made 'on leading national Jewish organizations'—meaning the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League—is 'untrue' then I am sure you will welcome an investigation of my charges.

"In particular, I would like to have the Committee on Un-American Activities investigate the latest 'report' on Joseph Peter Kamp which alleges that I am 'a secret and deadly enemy of all genuine patriots' because I 'support and praise various Jews and Jewish organizations.' In 'proof' of this it is alleged that I am 'in close contact with false anti-Communists,' among whom is mentioned 'Representative ABE MULTER, who eulogized Vito Marcantonio and who alone opposed the Communist Control Act of 1954 to outlaw the Communist Party.'

"For some 20 years the Anti-Defamation League-American Jewish Committee spy and smear network has been trying unsuccessfully to prove that I am 'anti-Semitic.' Now, this 'report' which was circulated just last week by Jacob Spolansky, a long-time ADL-AJC 'investigator,' alleges that I am an agent of 'Jews and Jewish organizations.'

"Under the circumstances, if you actually believe what you told your colleagues about me, I am sure you will want the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate and clear you of any connection with Joseph Peter Kamp, whom you consider to be 'one of the Nation's leading hatemongers.'

"Therefore, I urge you to introduce a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for a thorough investigation of the activities of Joseph P. Kamp, the Anti-Defamation League, and the American Jewish Committee."

In my concluding paragraph I said that inasmuch as Congressman MULTER had placed his charges against me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "I respectfully request that you do the fair and honorable thing and place this letter in the RECORD, too."

On June 3, 1955, Congressman MULTER answered my letter with a single paragraph that was not at all responsive, and which completely ignored the request that my letter be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Accordingly, I wrote him another letter on June 20, in which I said:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: Your response to my letter of May 18 not only confirms my statement that you 'have been grossly misinformed regarding me and my activities,' but it convinces me that you continue to have confidence in a source that now is making you appear either as dishonest or stupid. I feel sure that you are neither. I am still willing to believe that you are a man of intelligence and integrity who has unwittingly been imposed upon, and so I will make clear to you how ridiculous your answer is in the face of the facts.

"In my letter to you I pointed out that you were in error when you declared that 'such great Americans as * * * Chief Justice Warren have been the targets of his villification and his abuse,' and I quoted every reference in my writings that I have ever made about Chief Justice Warren, none of which were critical in any sense."

"In the next paragraph I referred to his charge that: "As far back as the mid-thirties, he (Kamp) won the commendation of the Nazis for his pro-Fascist sympathies." I then recalled what I had said in my previous letter: "To demonstrate that I have never had any pro-Fascist or pro-Nazi sympathies I quoted my own demand for a congressional investigation of Nazi, Fascist and native Fascist activities in the United States, published in 1935, which you could have verified at the Library of Congress."

"Your evasive and specious answer to these two explicit refutations reads: 'Your pamphlet of March 15, 1952, the New York World-Telegram of June 23, 1952, Time magazine of May 5, 1952, and other documents mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in my opinion, sustain the statements that I made.'

"It is very evident that you have not read my pamphlet of March 15, 1952. If you will read it you will find, as I said before, that my only reference to Chief Justice Warren in this issue relates to the results of a presidential straw poll taken by Overseas Weekly, among American soldiers in Germany, and that it reads: 'Taft won 56 percent of the Republican ballots. Eisenhower and Earl Warren tied for second place with 22 percent each.'

"I am certain, too, that you did not read the article in the World Telegram of June 23, 1952, which you cite as justification for your charge that Chief Justice Warren was a target of my 'vilification' and 'abuse.' If you will read the article, you will find that it says only that some persons used smearing tactics against California's Gov. Earl Warren, and you will discover that this charge was not made against me. Whoever prepared your answer or supplied your data was either extremely careless or deliberately dishonest.

"I am also positive that you did not read the reference to me in Time magazine of May 5, 1952, which you offer to sustain your statement that I won the commendation of the Nazis for my pro-Fascist sympathies. Nowhere in this Time article is there a reference to any commendation, from anybody, nor is there any mention of my alleged pro-Fascist sympathies.

"In identifying me, Time magazine did make the gratuitous observation that I edited the Awakener—well loved by the Nazis, without attempting to cite a reason for its vicious slur. As a lawyer, I am sure you would not consider this competent evidence to sustain your charge that I won the commendation of the Nazis or that I have had pro-Fascist sympathies. Also, it should be clear to you that from a commonsense point of view, it would be impossible for Time magazine to explain how the Nazis could love a publication that was urging a congressional investigation of Nazi activities.

"Furthermore, there are no other documents mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which do or can sustain the statements that you have made.

"The only possible explanation is that your original remarks about me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, and your inept attempt to justify them in your letter of June 3, were based upon malicious misinformation foisted upon you by thoroughly irresponsible people. Since you are a member of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and such vilification and abuse is the stock in trade of the ADL, I am convinced that this was (your) source.

"Because you yourself have been victimized, and because you have done me a grave injustice, you should be anxious, and consider it your duty as a man of integrity, to see to it that the full truth is made available to your colleagues in Congress, to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to the American people.

"I therefore repeat my previous recommendation that you ask the House Committee on Un-American Activities to make a full investigation of my pro-American endeavors, as well as the un-American activities of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

"You are also hereby again requested, in the interest of honesty, decency and fair play, to insert copies of our correspondence into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without further delay.

"I am sure that you will be glad to respond to these requests because you have often expressed yourself publicly against bigoted and intolerant attacks against minorities. You know that an unfair attack is a mean thing, and that even more demeaning is the denial of a defense. Your strictures against me have already been given wide public notice. I am hopeful that you will give my answer refuting your charges equal notice, and that you will not allow me to be discriminated against merely because I speak out for a minority, a little pro-American minority.

"Respectfully yours,"

Because of space limitations, the foregoing correspondence does not cover every charge made against me in Congressman MULTER's remarks nor in the articles which he inserted in the RECORD. However, each and every charge can be refuted, and I would welcome the opportunity to set the record straight. For this reason I am hopeful that the House Committee on Un-American Activities can be prevailed upon to investigate these charges and the un-American elements originally responsible for their dissemination—the professional hatemongers in the leadership of the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee.

With many thanks for your anticipated cooperation, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. KAMP,
Editor and Publisher.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Henry M. Jackson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], delivered an address before the annual fellowship dinner of the Grand Lodge of Masons of the State of Washington at Olympia, Wash., on Tuesday, June 21, 1955. There is so much meat in the address, and so much to think about, that I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. HENRY M. JACKSON, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP DINNER OF THE GRAND LODGE OF MASONS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AT OLYMPIA, WASH., JUNE 21, 1955

In the past 3 months, Soviet foreign policy has made the most striking series of shifts since the beginning of the cold war in 1946. In no less than nine different cases, the iron fist of Stalin has been supplanted by the disarming diplomacy of Moscow and Peiping.

To underline this change, let us review these unexpected reversals of the Communist position.

In the Far East, Communist China has concurred in a de facto cease fire in the Formosa region and indicated a willingness to discuss a settlement. Four American fliers held in Chinese prisons for more than 2 years have been released. Russia, having refused to sign the original Treaty of Peace With Japan, is now discussing a bilateral agreement. The Kremlin has begun a concerted campaign to win favor with Nehru—the leader of the neutralist bloc.

In Europe, an effort is being made to heal the breach with Tito, who not long ago was being denounced from Moscow as a heretic. Concessions to the West's position on the reduction of conventional armaments have been indicated. Chancellor Adenauer has been invited to discuss resuming diplomatic relations after Russia's initial refusal to recognize Bonn. And following 7 years of obstruction, the Soviet signature has been placed on the Austrian Treaty.

On top of these events must be added the Russian agreement to join a four-power conference at Geneva next month.

The American people would be less than human if they did not take heart at this turn of events.

As always, however, there is another side to the coin. I am frank to question whether the current optimism can be justified by the realities of the situation.

The simple fact is that with Stalin's death there has come to power in Russia a group that is subtle, clever, and flexible—as opposed to the bluntness, rigidity, sometimes stupidity of the Stalin regime. Where Stalin was obvious, Khrushchev is devious.

Most of Stalin's failures stemmed from the clarity of the threat he posed to the free world. Recall for a moment our reactions at home to Soviet moves in Iran, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Berlin, and Korea. It was these threats that pushed us into a program of alliances, a military buildup, and a determined attempt to shore up the defenses of the free world.

The Russians' "good neighbor" policy of recent weeks, by apparently diminishing this threat, has placed us in a difficult position. On the surface, we are faced with a new, disarming and conciliatory Communist approach. Behind this front the basic aims of communism remain unchanged.

It is a front because the Khrushchev regime is building the greatest military machine in Soviet history. As they talk peace, their preparations for war exceed our greatest estimates of their military capabilities. Never, in fact, has any country boasted of peaceful intentions with such a large portion of its economy dedicated to armaments.

Let me document this point with a brief look at recent history. Six years ago, in the spring of 1949, our conventional forces were vastly outnumbered by those of the Communist world. As a matter of fact, they still are. But as against this, in 1949, our air-atomic power was incontestable. We possessed the B–36, then the world's only true long-range bomber. We had already flight-tested the B–47, the world's first strategic jet bomber. And above all—6 years ago—we had a monopoly of atomic weapons.

Intelligence reports told us then that our atomic monopoly would be long-lived. Some responsible officials declared that 10 or 20 years might pass before the Soviets mastered the riddle of atomic energy. The matter of stockpiling nuclear weapons in large numbers was even more remote. As for delivery aircraft, we were informed that Soviet jet bombers were many years in the future. In short, most of us believed in the spring of 1949 that America's trump card—our industrial and scientific supremacy—would indefinitely cancel out Moscow's superiority in conventional forces.

Today we know, or should know, otherwise. Far from requiring decades to split the atom, the Soviets achieved their first atomic bomb in 1949—years before the expected date. Their first hydrogen explosion occurred in the summer of 1953—only 9 months after our own first full-scale hydrogen test.

Had we been realistic, we should have assumed that a nation capable of mastering atomic energy so quickly would also soon have air fleets with long range jet bombers. Yet even after the Soviet hydrogen test confident officials soothingly declared that nuclear bombs were of no use unless they could be delivered against targets. As far as ability to deliver these bombs went, they said, our lead was clear and permanent.

Then came the Russians' air demonstration of May Day 1954. This revealed the existence of Soviet jet bombers comparable to our own medium-range B–47 and our long-range B–52. The intelligence communities of the free world were shocked. The Russian planes had been flown well before the expected date. In certain important respects—in the size of their jet engines, for instance—they were more advanced than our own bombers.

Despite these facts, the soothing voices were heard again. They said the Soviet planes were doubtless hand-tooled prototypes. They predicted that years would elapse before these first models could be mass-produced. The implication was clear that mass production was unique to the United States.

Six weeks ago we learned the truth. In their 1955 practice May Day displays the Soviets flew both their medium and long range jet bombers in operational numbers. Furthermore, they flew large numbers of a new day fighter. Performancewise, this is a better plane than any we ourselves are now flying in other than limited flight tests. In addition, they flew operational numbers of all-weather interceptors which are superior to any plane we ourselves have in combat units today.

Again, our defense planners were caught by surprise—just as they were surprised when thousands of MIG's flew in Korea at a time when the Soviets theoretically could not mass-produce fighters.

The American people are now being told that, as of today, we are still superior to the Soviets in long-range airpower. Those who issue these statements, however, do not say how we stand in relation to the Soviets in fighter aircraft. Neither do they say how we will stand in strategic airpower a few years from now.

Speaking as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my own estimate of the present balance of airpower is this:

Long-range jet bombers. We are now in a neck-and-neck race with the Soviets. They may well be ahead of us.

Medium-range jet bombers. As of now, it is likely that we have more medium-range jet bombers than the Soviets possess. But they may well overtake and surpass us in a year or two.

Fighter aircraft. We are now vastly inferior to the Soviets in terms of numbers of high-performance fighters. As a matter of fact they are thousands ahead of us. Qualitatively, the latest Soviet fighters are at least the equal of our best planes—and they may be better.

The intercontinental ballistic missile. The race for this absolute weapon is now nip and tuck. We should not be surprised if the Soviets get it first.

What a shocking distance the Russians have traveled in 6 years. In 1949 our airpower lead was incontestable. Today, our only comfort lies in the fact that—in certain types of planes—we still appear to be ahead of the Russians. To put it bluntly, we find ourselves for the first time simply trying to keep up with Soviet progress in delivery vehicles—rather than being decisively ahead.

Nor is this all. All the evidence indicates that the Russians have been able to move from the design of prototype aircraft to mass-production models more quickly than we have. In other words, they now appear to be our superiors in the very techniques for which America has always been famous—quickly tooling up for mass production.

To cite an example. Our work on the B–52 bomber began in 1948. It was first tested in 1952. First production started in the spring of 1954. The comparable Soviet plane—the type 37—was apparently designed in 1950. It was tested in 1953 and produced in quantity in 1954. Although the United States had production facilities for a jet

bomber that the Soviet lacked, they gained at least 2 years on us in this race.

The growth of Soviet technology is documented in a recent speech by Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. "Military needs dominate their research programs," he said. And he added: "We who are in intelligence work have learned by now that it is rarely safe to assume that the Soviets do not have the basic skill, both theoretical and technical, to do in these fields what we can do." As an ominous footnote, Mr. Dulles reported that the Russians would graduate 1.2 million in the sciences in the decade from 1950 to 1960 compared to only 900,000 in the United States.

The meaning of these facts for the future is clear. What is past is prolog. In 1949 we led decisivley in the contest for air-atomic supremacy. Today, this same contest hangs in the balance. If the present trend continues, I put it to you as a fact that by 1960 the Soviets will be unquestionably ahead of us in airpower. When that day arrives—as it surely will if we do not change course—our historic trump card of technological supremacy will be nullified. To their present superiority in conventional forces our enemies will add superiority in advanced weapons systems—with fateful consequences for the future of the world.

What are we going to do about this challenge?

Certain things seem clear. We are now engaged in a struggle for our national survival. In this struggle, our foes are working around the clock. We cannot hope to win this contest if we ourselves work 1 shift on a 5-day basis.

More specifically, I propose the following six-point program:

First, I propose that our production of jet bombers and fighters be placed on a crash basis at once—on a wartime footing.

Second, I propose that there be an expansion of our present aircraft industrial capacity. Existing aircraft plants should now operate around the clock, 7 days a week.

Third, I propose that we immediately convene a board of top industrial experts to determine why are are now slower than the Soviets in tooling up for the mass production of aircraft. We cannot prevent wars with models sketched on drawing boards.

Fourth, I propose that we immediately assign supreme and overriding importance in our defense effort to the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. This project must be tackled with the resources, the skills, the moneys, the urgency, and the priority given our war-time atomic effort. The question of war or peace may depend on our getting this ultimate weapon first.

Fifth, I propose that, as an absolute minimum, our ground forces be kept at their present level. Proposed cuts could be disastrous.

Sixth, I propose that we immediately undertake to expand our atomic weapons program.

The Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is now completing an extended 3-month series of secret hearings on the general subject of our atomic preparedness. During these meetings, we have heard from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the three services, from the Strategic Air Command, the Continental Air Defense Command, the Commander of NATO and from ranking scientists.

These hearings have made it clear to me that our existing and planned atomic production facilities will be inadequate to meet the real needs of our Armed Forces for nuclear weapons. This is particularly the case with small weapons of relatively low destructive power which could be used for anti-aircraft defense and against troops in the field. Accordingly it is my earnest hope that the members of the joint committee will soon see fit to recommend to the President a major step-up in our atomic weapons output.

Yet atomic weapons in themselves can furnish us with no military protection unless we can deliver them against enemy targets. In all sincerity, I regard the recently announced acceleration of 35 percent in our B–52 production schedules as completely inadequate. I believe these schedules must be revised drastically upward. It is my fervent hope that we will not need another Russian May Day demonstration to jolt us into stepping up our military programs along the lines I have suggested, which surely represents the minimum price of national survival.

Will larger military budgets be required to strengthen our Air Force and to expand our atomic production? Of course they will. But defense in this atomic age cannot be purchased in bargain basements. Any peacetime military budget is small, and bearable, when compared with the incalculable cost and horror of the atomic war which may well befall us if our preparations are so weak as to invite attack. Our military preparations cannot and must not be budget limited. Instead, they must be based upon the needs of our Armed Forces and the requirements of our national survival.

Our top military leaders, testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, have made it clear that we could not begin to mobilize our resources and step up arms production after an all-out atomic war had started. In such a war, our entire economy could be prostrated in a few days. This fact represents an historic change in our Nation's military position. In previous wars, we have been spared direct attack. With the impetus of a Pearl Harbor, we have had a period of grace to mobilize and produce the goods of war. Today, however, our industries are only a few hours away from the fields of the long-range Russian air force. The period of grace is a thing of the past. As a result we must now build up our armed strength to wartime footing in time of peace.

Some of you may feel that what I have said tonight is too much in the realm of saber-rattling. I have made this speech for the purpose of letting people know the military steps which must be taken to prevent war. In our present peacetime situation, the only rallying force we can use to speed our production and defense buildup is the device of honest information conveyed to the American people by their elected and appointed officials. I believe that an American public fully informed of the clear and present danger to our security will support an effective defense program now with the same vigor they showed in our mobilization effort after Pearl Harbor.

I should add that this is not a partisan speech or a partisan issue. Both the present administration and its Democratic predecessor have underestimated the strength and potential of the Soviets. This national shortcoming can be remedied only through national support for a new and vigorous defense program.

In light of this critical Russian threat, what can we expect from the forthcoming four-power conference? I hope you will agree that the Soviet military buildup dwarfs in significance the recent shifts in Soviet foreign policy. The real issue at this conference, and in the months of discussions ahead, is whether or not the Russians are prepared to show good faith in their dealings with the free world. The American people will not put much stock in Russian signatures on agreements. But assurance that Russia was genuinely interested in living up to commitments would be warmly received.

What could we regard in days ahead then as a show of good faith from the Soviets—a genuine change of heart? Three things, I suggest, Russia must do to reestablish her credit with the free world.

First, she must lift the Iron Curtain to allow the free flow of people and ideas between Russia and the non-Communist nations.

Second, she must withdraw her troops from the satellite countries occupied at the end of World War II.

Third, she must stop the activities of the Cominform—the agency devoted to the spread of international communism.

Unless the Russian attitude on these questions is changed, we cannot assume that the basic aims of the Kremlin are directed toward a real solution to the cold-war conflict. When the Kremlin moves to lift the Iron Curtain, free the satellites and abandon the Cominform, this will be the essential demonstration of good faith.

Until this time, we must remain hopeful but pessimistic as to Soviet intentions. And we must move promptly to meet the ominous challenge of the Russian military buildup.

The Late Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the late Cordell Hull was one of the giants of our age. His record of accomplishments in the long fight to achieve peace in the world will grow in stature in the long prospective of history. His career can be an inspiration to all Americans.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal eulogizing Judge Hull:

HE HAD LIFTED UP HIS EYES

Cordell Hull's death leaves a State, a Nation and the decent peoples of the world bereaved.

He was one of Tennessee's historic sons. He was one of the greatest of contemporary Americans. He was a true world citizen who labored indefatigably on behalf of international amity and the betterment of humanity.

All peoples whose hearts yearn for peace will mourn him. All nations having respect for their pledged word will do him homage. This Nation will honor him as befits a first citizen in a democracy.

This State will pridefully grieve the passing of one whose vision was loftier than the peaks of the "Smokies," whose character was as rugged as the hill country which bore him, and whose courage was as indomitable as that of the pioneers who came through its gaps to build an American empire westward.

Most of all, Tennessee will mourn him because high honors, vast achievement and the plaudits of the crowd left him unspoiled and unspoiling—a simple man, a homespun man—a kinsman of the cove country over to the east.

Prophetically, characteristically he left a last message for the world's peoples and the statesmen upon whom their fates depend. Because he was Cordell Hull, it was a plea in behalf of reason. He has left behind many monuments to his building—ports open where they had been closed; free trade where there had been prohibitive, danger-creating

tariff walls; covenants of mutual good will where there had been trigger-itching distrust. None are more meaningful than this injunction written and given to the world at the closing of his life's busy day:

"Unity and cooperation must continue to be the predominant duty of statesmanship. No matter how laborious the task, if the large nations can agree and act together to that end, then there is hope that our military victories of a year ago will be turned into enduring peace."

Incalculable disaster would besult if these nations should become irreconcilably divided, either within or among themselves.

There is an overwhelming need today for every one of the United Nations to keep faith with those ideals of a brotherhood of peace, justice and freedom * * * to insure unity among us.

A rapier-keen mind had pierced the veil between present and future when that last clarion appeal was made to sanity and goodness.

God wills it that way, sometimes, to the great in spirit and the humble of heart.

He will be eulogized as the father of the United Nations; as one selected most worthy to have bestowed on him the Nobel prize for peace; as a founder of true hemispheric solidarity and pan-American friendship; as a foe of dangerous isolation; as a stanch defender of constitutional government. He was all of those things—successfully.

He will deserve every word spoken and written in his praise.

In a calmer day some impartial historian will evaluate the political personages of the Roosevelt years and assay the Hull accomplishments in measure of high importance.

To Tennessee he will, in memory, always be Judge Hull. Oldsters will recall the days when he served in the legislature and later on the circuit bench. They will tell colorful stories of his wit, wisdom, and native and unvarying personality. They will leave the eulogies on his statescraft to those who knew the statesman but didn't know the Judge.

They will talk of him in terms of "Maxwell House politics." That's what he liked to talk about and many an Ambassador cooled his heels in the State Department Building while Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, talked just that.

He never really got away from Tennessee and his desire to have intimates tell him what was going on back home was an accurate clue to his honest simplicity.

Cordell Hull had lifted his eyes up unto the hills when he was a child of Tennessee. He kept them lifted up throughout his long and splendidly useful life. He was of and part of them, and they gave him the strength of which the Psalmist sang.

They gave him strength to be in all things and to all men an American whose death will cause all America, its neighbors, and its friends, to grieve.

Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is nearing adjournment, and its stamp has been impressed upon many vital phases of our life. It is advisable to pause and reflect upon the accomplishments of the first session of the 84th Congress. I have always followed this plan at the close of each session of Congress.

The Fourth Congressional District is one of the finest districts in the United States. The people are considerate, understanding, and 100 percent Americans. It has been my privilege for the past 13 years to serve the people who live in these 38 counties in central and western Nebraska as their Representative in the most important and powerful legislative body in the world. I have at at all times tried to be a conscientious elected servant to all of my constituents, regardless of their political affiliation. I am elected to represent all residents of the Fourth District. In making this report, I want the people to know how I have voted on legislation. I want them to know my philosophy of government, and I want them to know how I feel about the problems facing our Nation and the world.

It is incumbent upon all of us in the Congress to keep in touch with the citizens as closely as possible, and it is our duty to keep them informed because the intelligent citizen and the voter is the one who is the best advised. In this interest, I write a weekly newsletter that goes to 84 newspapers, 13 radio stations, and about 900 friends in the Fourth Congressional District. For 13 years I have recorded a weekly radio program entitled "What's Happening in the Nation's Capital," which is now broadcast by the following radio stations: KMMJ and KRGI, Grand Island; KODY and KNBR, North Platte; KGFW, Kearney; KNEB and KOLT, Scottsbluff; KCOW, Alliance; KCNI, Broken Bow; KRVN, Lexington; KSID, Sidney; KCSR, Chadron, and KOGA, Ogallala. We try to make these programs as informative as possible, and have been privileged to interview as our guests many Nebraskans visiting or working in Washington.

GOVERNMENT CLINICS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

In the off-election years I conduct "government clinics" at each of the 38 county seats in the Fourth Congressional District. The first hour is a "Youth Wants To Know" program. The last hour is for interested citizens who may attend. I am not there to make a speech but to render an account of my stewardship in the Congress and to answer any questions by the audience relative to our Government in Washington. The people may not always agree with my views or the way I have voted on the many bills in Congress; they may be right, and I may be wrong, but I do believe they are entitled to know how and why I have voted on the issues. The questions asked at these clinics—averaging about 50 in each 2-hour session—have been most helpful to me.

Every 2 years I prepare questionnaires dealing with many of the important current problems, and mail them to the 84,000 boxholders in the Fourth District. In alternate years I also send out farmers' bulletins. The response has been most encouraging and helpful.

It has been my practice for many years to attend a large number of county fairs and fall festivals, or other similar celebrations, so that I may have a chance to meet and talk more closely with the people I represent. I also try to keep as many speaking engagements as possible, before civic, farm and church groups in the district, when the Congress is not in session.

When we are in session, I seldom leave Washington, and have had to turn down many kind invitations to appear at various functions in Nebraska. The folks at home elected me to represent them as their Congressman, and if I am to do a good job, I must answer the rollcalls, attend the sessions and the meetings of my committees. The record will show that I have attended nearly every meeting of the House and my committees, and have missed few if any rollcalls.

WORLD PEACE

Mr. Speaker, I view the events of the past 6 months with mixed emotions. There are many things I believe we can enter on the plus side of the ledger. Here are some of them: First, and for this the whole world should give thanks, there is peace all over the face of the earth for the first time in many, many years. This is due, in great part, to the magnificent leadership of President Eisenhower. The Korean war was stopped shortly after President Eisenhower took office, and the battle fires that threatened Indonesia, China, Formosa, and the offshore islands, flickered briefly and died. It was reassuring that the President asked Congress for its advice by endorsement of the Formosa defense policy, showing a mutual confidence that has not existed for many years.

By taking the initiative in foreign affairs, the President arranged and attended meetings "at the summit" with the leaders of Russia, France, and Great Britain, to explore ways and means for nations to live together in peace. He has kept the people informed. There will be no secret deals as at Yalta or Potsdam out of these top meetings.

PROSPERITY

With peace, we now have a prosperity that has never been equaled. The value of the dollar has been stabilized, and has varied only a fractional percentage point in the past 2 years. Wages have reached record heights and continue on a steady incline. We are producing and selling more goods than ever before, with the highest national income in our history.

Great advancement has been made in the development of the atom for peaceful purposes. What was once the greatest destructive force the world has ever known will soon become an equally great tool for man's preservation. All this has been made possible because our scientists have been able to concentrate more and more on the peaceful application of their tremendous knowledge. Much credit should go to the President and his administration for their part in encouraging peacetime uses of atomic products.

Work stoppage, and production and income loss through strikes is at an all-time low. In all our history employment has never been higher, and unemployment lower, than now. College graduates, particularly those with technical skills have never before faced such a bright future.

All young men and women can look forward to better economic rewards and a higher standard of living than at any other previous time.

LOYAL GOVERNMENT

We can also be proud of the Government house-cleaning job that has been accomplished by the Eisenhower administration. Many thousands of unnecessary Government jobs have been eliminated. Security risks have been rooted out by the hundreds. By the end of June 1955, a total of 59 top Communists have been convicted in the Federal courts since this administration took over approximately 2 years ago, compared with 31 during the period 1948 to 1952, and none during the 1940 to 1948 period. This is not a "government by crony." The influence peddlers and 5-percenters have left Washington for greener pastures; there is no longer a market for their services in the Nation's Capital. Many significant income tax fraud cases, hushed up by previous administrations, have been brought to light and prosecuted. Honesty and confidence in government have been restored. Wrong doing is not tolerated by the President.

TAX CUT

Last year's Republican-controlled 83d Congress gave the people a $7.5 billion tax cut—the first in many years, and the largest ever. I am confident that, if President Eisenhower's program can be adopted and carried out, another tax cut will be forthcoming in 1956.

BALANCED BUDGET

This administration, in 2½ years, has come a long way toward balancing the budget. In the 1952 election campaign, Mr. Eisenhower publicly promised to cut Government spending and to bring our fiscal policies back to sanity. The deficit has been cut from the inherited $9.5 billion to an estimated $3.4 billion. The Secretary of the Treasury states further that if revenues continue at the present rate, and if economy moves proposed to the Congress can be carried out, this deficit will be wiped out and we will finish fiscal 1956 with a balanced budget.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Government spending has been reduced. In 1952 the Government spent more than $80 billion. We are now presenting an improved, more efficient Government, with more service to the people, for approximately $20 billion less. Even with the high requirements of the defense program, increased veterans' benefits, accumulated interest on the national debt, extended social-security benefits, enlarged atomic research and development programs and many innovations of the Eisenhower administration, during each year since 1952, the Government has spent less and less money. We are doing so by increased efficiency, less waste, and a forceful businesslike approach to this business of government. This was long overdue.

POLITICS

The work of the 84th Congress presents an interesting picture. The executive branch is controlled by the Republican Party, the Congress by the Democrats.

With presidential and congressional elections coming up in 1956, it is somewhat a time-honored tradition that much of the legislation and maneuvering will be aimed at these 1956 campaigns, and that the party out of control of the executive branch will devote a great part of its time to creating political issues. Throughout the session the Democratic leadership was trying desperately to find some issues on which to obtain public support and discredit the Eisenhower administration. These efforts ranged from squirrels, golf, the President's churchgoing, and Mrs. Eisenhower's health. The Democrats are attempting by this method to confuse and frustrate the President' efforts, because they have no real issues. It is hard to fight prosperity and peace. The Democratic controlled committees have kept their eyes on the political barometer. Other politically filled issues: the $20-tax cut, the postal pay raise, the highway bill, and much legislation originally suggested by the administration, but changed to give it a Democratic flavor.

AGRICULTURE

One of the dark spots on the picture comes from the trouble farmers are having in meeting rising costs with falling income. The Government storehouses are bulging with approximately an $8 billion surplus of many crops supported and urged during wartime. In wartimes these surpluses are not even called surpluses; they are blessed reserves. But in times of peace, they can sometime become a problem. We are doing everything we can to help the farmers share in the prosperity, through improved research, increased markets, assistance programs, and other plans that are being explored by the Congress and various departments of the Government. I have great confidence, too, in the ability of the farmers to solve many of their own problems. I believe agriculture is over the hump and better days are ahead.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The social-security law was broadened to include most of the professions, excluding medical doctors. Women are now eligible for retirement benefits at age 62 instead of 65. Disabled persons may draw social-security payments beginning at age 50; and the tax will be increased from 4 percent to 5 percent beginning January 1, 1956, if the House bill is approved.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

I have sponsored five bills in this session of the Congress dealing with and directly affecting irrigation, reclamation, and flood-control projects in Nebraska. One provides for Federal-local partnerships in small irrigation projects, similar to the bill I introduced in the 83d Congress.

A second would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to begin construction of the Ainsworth irrigation project, which was included in the Missouri River Basin project by an earlier law.

A third would create a partnership between the Federal Government and the Midstate Reclamation District in Hall, Buffalo, and Merrick Counties, for irrigation and power on the Platte River.

A fourth provides for construction of the Farwell irrigation unit on the Middle Loup River, another facet of the Missouri River Basin project.

A fifth bill would authorize the Corps of Engineers to build several small flood control and conservation dams in the Gering Valley on the North Platte River. The need for such a project was recently emphasized by the heavy rains and resulting flood damage in that area.

It is my belief that the Congress must continue to cooperate in the planning and construction of irrigation and reclamation projects so long as they are sound and will pass the rigid tests of physical and economic feasibility. Money spent for irrigation and reclamation projects is a wise investment in the future of America. Water on good land at the right time produces crops and brings security and new wealth to a community.

ADJOURNMENT PLANS

I plan to return to Nebraska just as soon as the Congress adjourns, and I am looking forward to meeting and talking with as many of my friends in the Fourth District as time permits. I will attend many of the county fairs, rodeos, and other celebrations, and visit with as many service clubs and church groups as possible. I will hold Government clinics in each of the 38 counties in my district, beginning around the latter part of Septemebr and ending about a month later. Complete schedules will be sent out later. I hope the schools and public will again take an active part in these public forums. It is always good to get home.

Criminal Jurisdiction Over American Servicemen Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Tablet has long been recognized as one of America's outstanding newspapers and a vigorous exponent of constitutional Americanism. I am pleased to offer for the RECORD the Tablet's excellent coverage of our efforts to modify or eliminate criminal jurisdiction over American servicemen in foreign lands:

SEEKS TO RESTORE AMERICAN RIGHTS TO SERVICEMEN—CONGRESS BILL AIMS TO SAVE CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGES OF YOUTHS SERVING ABROAD—HEARINGS BEING HELD—REPRESENTATIVE BOW, OF OHIO, CRITICIZES STATUS OF FORCES TREATY, ASKS PROTECTION FOR BOYS

WASHINGTON.—"Treaties denying American servicemen their constitutional rights when overseas are a tragic abdication of national sovereignty that should be repudiated at the earliest possible date," Representative FRANK T. Bow, of Ohio, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representative Bow was the first witness in hearings on his resolution (H. J. Res. 309) which would require the President to renegotiate or denounce treaty provisions that

give foreign nations legal jurisdiction over American military personnel and their dependents.

In a prepared statement he presented precedent and documentation to support his resolution.

Principal target of the resolution is the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, ratified by a 72–15 vote by the United States Senate July 15, 1953. It had been negotiated in 1951, when Dean Acheson was Secretary of State, and was signed in London June 19, 1951.

Representative Bow said over 1,400 Americans were subjected to trial in foreign courts last year and 58 are serving sentences at last reports.

PRECEDENTS ARE CITED

"These 58 servicemen deprived of their constitutional rights, sentenced and convicted under foreign laws, are now confined virtually incommunicado in filthy, unheated, foreign prisons without proper food or medical care," he said. "They are martyrs to internationalism."

"Constitutional, moral and practical considerations dictate that the United States should never surrender to any foreign sovereign its right to protect and control the personnel of our Armed Forces," he declared.

He cited historical precedent under which he said "jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visiting armed force is by consent quartered or in passage remains in the visiting sovereign."

This principle of international law is recognized and quoted in the Manual for Courts-Martial of the United States.

"Our enlisted men take an oath to abide by the Uniform Code of Military Justice upon which the Courts-Martial Manual is based," he said.

"In fact, they find the Status of Forces Agreement completely contradicts the Uniform Code and the Manual and they do not have the protection it purports to give them."

The Ohio Congressman cited reports on French and Japanese prisons prepared by experts in those nations, both showing that prisons were unheated, infested with vermin, and without sanitary provisions to which Americans are accustomed. He said authorities of both nations admitted prisoners received inadequate food and medical care.

GUARANTIES ARE LOST

Representative Bow also read reports on French and German judicial procedures showing that the burden of proving his innocence rests upon the accused, that trial by jury is not guaranteed, and that conviction can be had on a majority vote.

"The American who unwittingly runs afoul of unknown or strange foreign law finds himself subjected to a judicial system he cannot understand, without American counsel and stripped of all the familiar guaranties contained in our Bill of Rights," he charged.

He said he has no complete list of nations with which agreements on criminal jurisdiction exist and that the State Department reported some nations were covered by arrangements "which in the national interest are classified." He said he could not understand the need for secrecy on such treaties.

"One may wonder if Russia or Communist China, in their disregard for the right of our American airmen, enjoy the protection of some international agreement," Representative Bow said.

SAYS IT CAN BE REVISED

Representative Bow continued:

"By the terms of the treaty its provisions can be denounced at the expiration of a period of 4 years from the date on which it became effective, which period would expire on July 24, 1957.

"It is for this reason that House Joint Resolution 309 directs the President to request the North Atlantic Council for a revision of article VIII of the agreement, acting under the provision of article XXII thereof; and as an alternative, if such revision cannot be brought about, that the President shall then denounce such agreement at the earliest date permitted.

"There are several methods by which action by the President to secure revision of article VII of the treaty might be directed and there is ample precedent to support a joint resolution as one of the methods.

"It is conceivable that supporters of the Status of Forces Agreement may contend that action by the House is not necessary, and also a possibility that the President may seek to ignore the resolution even though adopted; but in spite of these contingencies we owe it to our Armed Forces to let the world know that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of this country is against depriving our forces of the protection of our Constitution.

"Certainly we have every right to initiate a request for revocation forthwith of all secret agreements made by the executive department which gives criminal jurisdiction over our soldiers to foreign powers."

READS ADMINISTRATION STAND

Administration spokesmen strongly opposed the resolution. Bypassing Representative Bow's chief argument, that men serving overseas have lost their constitutional rights, they said the servicemen fare better in foreign trials than they would at courts-martial.

Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, told the committee that the American people are generally unaware that American boys serving overseas are under foreign jurisdiction and are not protected by the Constitution. He recommended that service personnel should be informed that they are to be subject to foreign courts before they leave this country.

Representative GROSS said that he had received a letter from Bryce N. Harlow, administrative assistant to President Eisenhower, in which the latter stated the treaty provides "safeguards for a safe trial" and has been "working well in practice."

Mr. Harlow said that the treaty represented the maximum concessions obtainable from other governments and that there is "no reason evident why this matter should be reopened."

Committee members, recalling that President Theodore Roosevelt had sent armed forces to rescue American citizens in foreign lands, commented that the United States would have won the respect of the world by insisting on jurisdiction over its own men.

BROAD MIND TO FLAT HEAD

Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton wrote the committee that if the Bow resolution were passed, the United States might be compelled to withdraw its troops from abroad, thereby pleasing the Communists.

Representative MARGUERITE CHURCH, of Illinois, whose two sons served in World War II, demanded that the agencies of Government concerned inform the Congress of all secret agreements made with foreign governments with reference to foreign court jurisdiction over American servicemen.

Representative THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, declared the Status of Forces Treaty was the product of fuzzy, flatheaded thinking." He added: "We're so broadminded we're getting flatheaded."

Both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars urged repeal of the Status of Forces Treaty. Bruce P. Henderson, head of the Legion's national security commission, stressed basic differences in concepts of freedom and liberty here and abroad. For example, he said, "in the United States we take the position that a man is innocent until proved guilty. Abroad he is guilty until proved innocent."

A. M. Downer, legislative counsel of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said no American soldier could get in a foreign court the trial which the Constitution guarantees him.

Philanthropic Giving by One American Corporation—Polish National Alliance Has Benefited American Education in the Amount of Over $4,250,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of the Alliance College in Cambridge Springs, Pa., to which I owe a debt of gratitude for my education and early training, I am extremely happy to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following report of a distinguished American educator and president of the Alliance College, Dr. Arthur P. Coleman.

The report follows:

In connection with the recent interest on the part of many American corporations in supporting independent higher education I take pleasure in calling attention to the record of the Polish National Alliance, a fraternal benefit insurance corporation doing business in 32 States and the District of Columbia. Founded in 1880 in historic Philadelphia, this great American institution is this year celebrating its diamond jubilee in many communities throughout the United States.

Up to 1929 the Polish National Alliance (headquarters now in Chicago) had given to education the considerable sum of $1,595,190.58. Annual gifts thereafter have amounted to—

1930	$119,985.73
1931	124,496.28
1932	124,377.04
1933	116,149.70
1934	116,995.60
1935	110,946.34
1936	133,449.21
1937	126,229.58
1938	129,032.77
1939	122,814.03
1940	82,240.37
1941	76,497.72
1942	76,143.68
1943	80,511.33
1944	81,486.23
1945	83,894.03
1946	85,588.14
1947	83,816.48
1948	135,208.75
1949	78,650.07
1950	80,515.73
1951	92,249.08
1952	123,079.46
1953	119,069.70
1954	119,161.12
1955 through 11/12 of year	105,747.92
Total from 1912 through May 31, 1955	4,323,526.82

This makes a grand total of over $4,250,000 already given to American education by this one American corporation, composed largely of the sons and daughters of immigrants from Poland, a land now suffering under a dreadful communistic dictatorship.

Alliance College, the benefactor of this generosity, is naturally grateful, but I submit

that the general American business community should be proud of the pioneer efforts on behalf of American education by this single corporation owned by some 360,000 Americans of Polish or Slavic extraction. With the Polish National Alliance corporate aid to education is not something new, rather it has been practiced for many years.

In this diamond jubilee year for the Polish National Alliance I should like, as an American educator, to express my admiration and gratitude for this distinguished pioneer example of wise and long-range aid to independent American education.

I believe Americans of older stock will agree with me that if independent higher education is to survive, we need many more such corporations.

Dr. ARTHUR P. COLEMAN,
President, Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa.
JULY 4, 1955.

New York City Loses a Good Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American of Monday, July 25, 1955. New York City has lost a great police commissioner and a fine public servant who will be hard to replace. Commissioner Adams made splendid progress toward decreasing the crime rate in New York City and made many improvements in the department. I join with his many friends in wishing him well upon his return to private law practice.

The editorial follows:

CITY LOSES A GOOD MAN

The resignation of Police Commissioner Adams will take from the city one of the best commissioners it has ever had.

He has shown courage and fairness in dealing with his men and for his men, and integrity toward the millions of citizens he served.

In his speech to New Yorkers yesterday the commissioner had reason to point with pride. Major crime decreased 13 percent in the first 6 months of this year as against a 9 percent jump in the similar period in 1954. Of major crimes reported, many more are being solved.

The chief reason for this encouraging news, Mr. Adams says, is that more police are on the streets and for that credit goes almost entirely to him. He eliminated frills, took cops from desk jobs and other soft touches and managed to put 1,500 more on patrol.

He has fought hard, too, for more men and more pay for his men and has managed little by little to get a measure of both. And he demonstrated by his saturation technique of a section of Harlem how a festering area of crime can be effectively attacked.

In his regime Mr. Adams has received a free hand from Mayor Wagner. Without this he would have been able to accomplish much less than he did.

The city will miss the services of Mr. Adams. We wish him well in his return to law. And we hope the mayor will be able to find a worthy successor.

My 6 Years in Red China—Bishop F. A. Donaghy, M. M., Gives an Eyewitness View of Life Behind the Bamboo Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Bishop Frederick A. Donaghy has authored one of the best articles on Red China that I have seen. His story written for the International News Service appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, July 24, 1955. This distinguished prelate of the Catholic church speaks with authority, knowledge, and experience. He has seen with his own eyes the viciousness of the system that is being foisted upon the people of China. He has felt the brutality of its leaders. He has heard the phony promises made to the poor, gullible peasant who is powerless to resist. Because of all this, Mr. Speaker, Bishop Donaghy's opinions and conclusions are worth considerable weight.

Bishop Donaghy went to China in 1928 as a Roman Catholic Maryknoll missioner. He was head of the diocese at Wuchow in south China 20 years later when the Communists took over the country. He spent 5 months in a Red jail and lived under the Red China regime until he was tried and expelled by the Communists in June.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the fact that Bishop Donaghy is a son of Massachusetts and a native of New Bedford:

MY 6 YEARS IN RED CHINA

(By Bishop F. A. Donaghy, M. M.)

Wuchow is an old Chinese city of close to a quarter of a million people, located at the confluence of the Fu and West Rivers in south China. It is the headquarters for the Maryknoll Wuchow mission, embracing a large area of Kwangsi Province.

The year 1949 was a year that we lived under the threat of Communist invasion. There was only a token defense of the south when the "Liberation Army" arrived in Wuchow late that year.

The political arm of the new government went into power as soon as the armies had passed through the city. At first they were benign. They made big promises. They told the people that they had been given their freedom. There were to be no restrictions on the foreigners or on the church.

Actually, the Reds were following a blueprint. They had benefited by the experience of Russia, and by the mistakes they had made in north China. The blueprint called for complete entrenchment of the government before harsher measures yoked the people to Communist slavery.

Indoctrination in the new theories began within a few weeks. It was obligatory on everyone. Groups were brought to Wuchow for instruction from outlying villages. They were then sent home to act as instructors, and other groups were brought in. Communists from the north guided the courses of instruction and indoctrination.

Gradually the power of communism began to be felt. The once carefree Chinese were not free to come and go as they wished. Like creeping paralysis, the new thinking made over the lives of the Chinese. The change was as slow as it was deliberate.

The teachers, for example, were won over by being promised twice as much pay. Actually, when control was secured the teachers found their salary was reduced by two-thirds. Disillusionment set in, but it was too late.

If the Nationalists returned to China today, they would find wholehearted cooperation from the teaching group and many other classes. Government workers are particularly disillusioned in the matter of salary. Besides being fed up with constant indoctrination.

The soldiers, however, seem well fed, well clothed and well taken care of. They strut around with new power. Even here, though, I am not sure if some disillusionment may not have set in.

After 5 years of communism, the people have no illusions left. There is a certain amount of despair now, and they hope for another liberating army to come to save them. This hope is very strong. They realize they are prisoners.

Within a year, the Communists had built up their strength and gained complete control. A second military campaign was necessary to wipe out dissidents who had taken to the hill country. It was thorough and brutal. At the same time, the Communists systematically registered every individual and family—a momentous task. The Reds likewise proscribed by law the possession of any type of weapon by the people. Imprisonment and even death was the punishment.

The land reform was initiated in South China about a year after the indoctrination was put into effect. More than any other program, the redistribution of fields put the country under the yoke of communism.

To win the sympathies of the poorer people, the Reds first called for a drastic rent reduction. If this didn't induce the people to attend the nightly indoctrination courses, threats did.

The Communists called it "a preparatory stage of the land reform." Whipping the people to a fanatical and blind hatred of the "landlord" was termed "the political enlightenment of the peasant."

It became clear that the aim of this grandiose scheme was not to help the people, but to accustom the Chinese to a black, implacable hatred of any "enemy" who was so named by the state.

Class hatred was stirred up in groups where no one was actually "wealthy." Only after it was whipped to a fever pitch did a trial distribution of land begin. Often, Chinese wanted to reapportion the fields without the violence and bloodshed. The landed gentry were not universally hard on their tenants, and were not uniformly hated.

The Reds, however, prohibited the "land reform" without the blood bath preliminary. The poor duped peasants were guided on to be the executioners of their own neighbors. The landholder was taken into custody and long lists of charges preferred against him. All of his possessions were distributed to the poor.

Then the landholders were subjected to public trials. They were obliged to kneel on broken glass and stones, and the people were urged to beat them. Many died.

What benefits the land reform might have given to the poor were wiped out by the Communist system of taxation.

People who owned nothing were given 2 or 3 acres to cultivate. For them it was a dream fulfilled. But when their first crop was cut, the snake in the rice field became evident. Taxation was much higher than it had ever been. It has been getting progressively worse.

About a year ago, the farmers were urged to sell their surplus rice to the Government. The Government soon set up quotas, and the farmers were forced to sell even their food

rice. Then, when they asked for help, the Government refused to sell them rice.

A man-made famine resulted. In the last 6 months, conditions in south China have become really critical.

After almost 6 years of this kind of life, it is no wonder that the people have become disillusioned. There is no more land to work, because there are no more landlords. Each farmer has his own 2 or 3 acres, from which he can produce just about enough to live. Moreover, he must pay upwards of 30 percent in taxes.

All over China the farmers are disillusioned. They were duped and they know it.

In November 1950, I felt that the time of pressure upon the church was fast approaching.

By now the Reds had torn down the placards proclaiming religious freedom and protection for the foreigner. One of our priests had already been arrested. They claimed he was a spy who had been parachuted into the country by the Americans.

Some of the churches were guarded by soldiers to bar the entry of Catholics. Christianity was a frequent subject of the indoctrination classes. It was denounced as an arm of foreign invasion, and the missioners were assailed as espionage agents of China's capitalistic enemies.

In December, I began noticing people about the church property who didn't belong there.

On December 18, I received a telegram announcing that Father George Gilligan, of Brooklyn, had been arrested. Two members of the security police came to the house the next day, while I was in church. They sent for me. They said they had come to search the house, and led me straight to the bedroom where they had already been.

I went to a wardrobe to open it, suspecting there would be something inside it that I had never put there. The policeman pushed me aside, opened it, and gasped in indignation. There he had found a .45 revolver. He shouted and yelled and tried to make me admit ownership.

Meanwhile, the other policeman had opened a small drawer. He feigned great surprise at finding a package of raw opium—the first raw opium I had seen in all my years in China.

They arrested me and bound my arms. Then they arrested Father Justin Kennedy, of West Shokan, N. Y., who was in Wuchow to buy books for his Maryknoll School. In order to make the arrest official, they dropped some bullets in his luggage. He spent the same time in jail as I did.

We were taken to a house of detention. Throughout the day, others were brought in—among them Dr. William Wallace, an old friend from the Southern Baptist Hospital, and Sister Rosalia, one of the Maryknoll sisters.

We were moved across the Fu River to the Kwangsi jail. It had been built to hold 1,000 prisoners but the Communists crowded in a great many more than that.

The normal cell holds 16 prisoners, and has two-decker wooden beds. Each prisoner had enough room to stretch out but little more. Only one prisoner could walk up and down at a time.

The prison is surrounded by a high wall topped by barbed wire, which was said to be electrified. There were hundreds of soldiers there and it was absolutely impossible to escape.

The food in the prison was very meager—12 ounces of rice and one vegetable. We were given a small cup of water in the morning and another in the afternoon. This had to serve for drinking and washing. During my 5 months in jail I was allowed to go in the yard and take two baths in a small wooden basin. The second time I went out I became dizzy from the fresh air.

It was a distinct shock to the Chinese when the beloved Dr. William Wallace, probably the most outstanding citizen in Wuchow, was arrested. He was admired by everyone. He had a wonderful reputation for his fine surgical and medical work but he was loved for his kindness and devotion to the sick and the poor.

But the government declared him to be an outstanding spy. Teachers were instructed to tell how he deceived the people.

It was obvious that his arrest on planted evidence was a severe shock to him. He loved the Chinese people so much that he could not imagine this treatment in return. I tried to talk to him but he seemed to have no interest in what I said. He appeared dazed.

Then one morning (February 10) as the boy was dispensing water, he looked in Dr. Wallace's cell. He came running back shouting that the doctor was hanging in his cell. The guards hurried up, looked in, and then opened our cell. They insisted that Father Kennedy and I cut him down. Artificial respiration attempts were hopeless.

In the house of detention, the Reds had installed a loud speaker system. This was turned on and a tremendous tirade was delivered to stir up the people against Americans. Other loud speakers throughout the city carried out the same harangue.

I soon concluded that—as far as the adults were concerned—the effects of communism were rather superficial. In the schools the propaganda was more effective. There everything is interpreted on a patriotic basis. Love of country and love of Mao Tse-tung has an appeal to the youngsters. But those over 25 years of age seem reluctant to accept propaganda.

After 5 months in prison, I was suddenly released and allowed to return to my house.

During the past 3 years I lived alone with a Chinese priest. One by one, the Maryknoll missioners were arrested or put under detention. House arrest was often more wearing on them than being carted off to prison. Imprisonment ended the long uncertainty of what was going to happen.

The expulsion of priests and sisters from China got underway in January 1951. As the months passed, the stream of missioners escorted to the Chinese Hong Kong border swelled.

On the eve of the Communist invasion of South China there were 5,380 foreign priests, brothers and sisters working on the mainland. By the end of 1951, only 3,450 remained During the next 12-month period, an additional 1,612 were forced to leave. At the end of 1953, a mere 323 were still in the country. Many of these were in jails.

One by one, the churches were turned into granaries, schools, and public offices.

The Reds allowed me to live in my own house under a sort of semiofficial arrest. I was questioned several times about my daily walk to town, but it was never forbidden. A member of the secret police followed me, so I had to be very circumspect.

The sisters were not allowed to teach religion, had to dress in Chinese clothes, and were restricted to the city. They did wear, however, little medals on their jackets, so everyone in town knew who they were.

Our large Sacred Heart School in Wuchow, along with other schools, was taken over by the government. The Sacred Heart School is now known as Wuchow School No. 3. The prime purpose of the school in China today is to indoctrinate the young in communism.

I recall one day looking into a classroom. The woman teacher of the third grade was instructing the children to report to school authorities anything said at home by parents or relatives that was against the government or the Communist Party.

By reporting such talk they would prove their love of their country. Also, the teachers ridiculed the Christian students because of their belief in God.

The Catholic people stood very firm in the face of Communist threats. When the Reds tried to force them to join an independent Catholic Church, they gave no response.

All in all, I doubt if the Reds will have any success in eradicating the faith of the people who already have it. The Chinese Christians, of course, will suffer much for their beliefs. Many Christians are in forced-labor camps because they would not compromise.

The church has won great "face" in China. It is respected by the people as never before. This is because it has stood stanch and firm in the face of Communist attack.

After the Geneva Conference in 1954, a number of American priests were expelled from China; then for months the Communists seemed to forget the foreigners.

When suddenly last month I was summoned to the Security Police Bureau, I had no idea of expulsion. I thought I was going back to jail.

For 3 days I had to report to the Security Police Bureau, appearing before a panel of officials. The judge told me that they had four main accusations against me:

1. After the liberation, I had refused to allow a young Catholic to serve on a government committee to represent the Catholic Church. Therefore, I used my power against the people.

2. I had forbidden a young man to join a Communist youth organization. I was therefore reactionary.

3. I had threatened with excommunication anyone who signed a petition condemning Archbishop Riberi, the Holy Father's personal representative to China. I was a tool of foreign imperialism.

4. I had established the Legion of Mary throughout the diocese, and this was a reactionary organization.

There was no mention of the charges that had earlier put me in jail—the planted revolver and the raw opium.

I admitted the charges, saying that I had acted within my rights and that I did what was my duty. I denied that the Legion of Mary was reactionary.

I was a little angry at the injustice of the whole thing. A frameup was being staged to get rid of me. On the third day, the head judge read the sentence that I was to be banned forever from China. "This is to be put in effect immediately," he added.

I found out later that they had held the Canton boat at the customhouse waiting for me to join it.

One cannot shake off his thoughts of China merely by coming into the free territory of Hong Kong. All of us in the free world must be alerted to communism, recognizing it for what it is.

It is evil.

The Communist's hatred of religion should make us reexamine the part religion plays in our own lives. It should make this treasure more precious to us. It is the lack of religious conviction in the lives of free men that gives communism power. Without this conviction, the siren song of Communist propaganda can easily deceive us.

Since my return to the free world, I have often been asked whether or not we can have peaceful coexistence with the Communist nations.

In my opinion, our objectives are so diametrically opposed that I can see no hope of attaining peaceful coexistence. In fact, I do not think that there will even be a long coexistence between Russia and China. I know that adult Chinese are not keen to look upon the Russian people as their great Russian brothers. The Chinese people as a whole have an ingrained xenophobia. They do not want to be under a foreign power even in a secondary position.

It is wrong to say that the Chinese people have accepted communism. There are two strengths in China today. The strength of the bully which is communism exercising control through the army, and the strength and unity of suffering which is the vast mass of people.

The Communists know they do not have the people behind them. Given the opportunity, the people would rise against them, and the Reds know it. When I left China, people were openly talking about rebellion. The Chinese no longer believe Communist propaganda. The high standard of living of the Russians, the production which exceeds the production of all other nations, is played up in the press.

But the people in Wuchow know that there is not one single Russian item in any store for sale. There is still American merchandise, and the people are anxious to buy that.

The Chinese are of a religious nature. Now religion is derided and limited. One cannot take away fundamental liberties and not expect a tremendous reaction. This is as true for the Chinese people as it is for Americans.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recently I stopped at a gasoline station in Watertown, Mass., and while a young man was refueling my car, I said to him: "Who is the Congressman from this district?" He beamed as he replied: "She's a lady and her name is EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. She's the salt of the earth and everybody's for her because she is always doing things for folks most in need."

It developed in our brief conversation that the young man was a World War II veteran whom Mrs. ROGERS had helped in some relationship with the Veterans' Administration.

Circulating through the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts, I picked up much additional evidence bearing on the affection that the voters, both Republican and Democrat, have for "the gentle lady from Massachusetts." They are all for her because she is all for them and her every-day dedication to their best interests is a favorite topic of the area.

I regret I was not present some weeks back when our distinguished colleague was accorded many richly deserved encomiums on the anniversary of her 30th year as a Representative in Congress. Mrs. ROGERS has been most kind to me during my congressional service and I know something of her love of country and her intense devotion to those who have rendered service in our Armed Forces, particularly those who bear the scars of conflict. These have never had a better friend and I feel certain that this is realized throughout the Nation.

It was through Mrs. ROGERS that I first learned of the remarkable work being done by those dedicated men and women out at the Prosthetic Laboratory at Forest Glen in Maryland. Our veteran amputees look forward so much to her daily visits.

The New York Herald Tribune of last Sunday, July 24, 1955, under the caption "Mrs. ROGERS Has World's Record" said:

One of the things not discussed in laudatory congratulations to Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS on her recent observance of 30 years service in the House was that this tenure established a world's record. She has served longer than any other woman in history continuously in a national legislative assembly.

The "Lady from Lowell," Mass., has served in Congress since June 30, 1925, when she was chosen to succeed her deceased husband, has held a major chairmanship, something no Republican woman representative ever did previously.

Every Member of the House knows Mrs. ROGERS as an untiring crusader for the causes in which she believes and following her in just one day's routine makes it easy for one to understand why the young attendant at that Watertown, Mass. gasoline station called her "the salt of the earth."

Farmers Penalized in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there has been wide discussion of the breakdown in transportation of wheat to storage and markets through lack of the usual railroad facilities and the utilization of freight cars, usually allocated to meet this need at the peak of harvest, to other and less urgent purposes.

This week's issue of the Missouri Farmer carries an illuminating article on the subject by President F. V. Heinkel, of the Missouri Farmers Association, throwing light on the subject. As Mr. Heinkel points out our farmers are already laboring under the handicap of low prices and high costs of production, and this unnecessary situation should have prompt and effective attention.

Mr. Heinkel explains:

WHY DID CCC TIE UP CARS AT HARVESTTIME?

(By F. V. Heinkel, president, Missouri Farmers Association)

Every summer there is invariably a shortage of boxcars for the grain harvest. The railroads seem to always be short on cars when the need is greatest, even though their officials can't help knowing that there is a grain crop coming on every year.

The situation was the worst this year that it has ever been. But this time it was not the fault of the railroads. Every railroad serving Missouri told us that they had the cars ready, but just as our harvest began the Commodity Credit Corporation ordered thousands of carloads of stored wheat moved to ports on the gulf and the Great Lakes and to other points. CCC had 6,000 carloads of the stored grain shipped from Kansas City alone. They even moved corn out of the State of Illinois right at wheat harvesttime.

This tying up of cars for moving storage grains, just when they were needed for new wheat, created real havoc throughout the State. Wheat soon filled the local elevators, and at many points it had to be piled in the streets. In most communities combines had to be stopped. New wheat began to heat in local elevators and in piles, and farmers took great risks of weather damage to grain they were forced to let stand overlong in their fields.

In order that the railroads would have ample time to have boxcars available when the wheat was harvested, I have for the past several years asked the MFA Traffic Department to make a survey of MFA elevators and exchanges early in the spring and get estimates of their needs for grain cars throughout the summer season.

This year the estimates were forwarded to the railroads well ahead of harvest, and their response seemed to be better than usual. But by the time the harvest got underway in central Missouri hardly any grain cars were to be had.

We made scores of long distance telephone calls to various railroad officials, ranging from local train dispatchers to railroad presidents. Almost without exception, they told the same story—CCC had used nearly all of the available cars. Evidently the railroads have done the best they could under the circumstances.

This action by a branch of the United States Department of Agriculture cost Missouri farmers many thousands of dollars, and this at a time of low farm prices when they could ill afford to lose money. Doubtless, farmers in other States suffered severe losses from the same cause.

Why wasn't this stored grain moved before harvest time? Surely officials of USDA, and especially those of CCC whose business it is to deal with grain, knew another harvest was coming up, and when it was coming.

This movement of storage grain, if not timed deliberately by some one in the USDA in order to discredit the Federal farm program, was nothing short of criminal negligence. Secretary Benson, if he does his duty, will seek out those responsible and turn them out to grass. Also, Congress should look into it and make sure that it doesn't happen again this fall when soybeans and corn begin to move.

Farmers who have been squeezed between high costs and low prices cannot afford such losses, and should not be expected to stand for them when they are so unnecessary.

Meanwhile, though the service of the railroads has been improving in recent years, there is room for further improvement. Many of them still have an exasperating way of sending solicitors out looking for new business while the business that has come to them unsolicited is not being properly taken care of.

Whose Giveaway of Public Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the accusation many times that the Republican administration is "antipublic power—is giving away power to private industry," or is "violating the preference and withdrawal clauses." The Democrats groping for issues have seized upon these accusations with all the vigor of a minister denouncing sin.

However, let us look at the record. Whose giveaway is it? Who is violating the preference and withdrawal clauses? Who is really antipublic power?

Here is what the record shows. The Democrats controlled the legislative and executive branches of the Government for the greater part of 20 years, and were responsible for the power policy that developed from 1933 to 1953. When they came into office in 1933, they inherited a sound, constructive, and wholesome Republican program for development of the country's natural resources, fostered by the Reclamation Act of 1902, the Reclamation Act of 1906, and the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928. These acts, passed by Republican Congresses under Republican administrations, authorized utilization of water for irrigation and power development, and laid down the policy for the use and sale of these resources. Under the 1906 act it was provided that when the power was sold preference should be given to public and municipal uses, and a comparable provision appeared in the act of 1928 creating the magnificent Boulder Canyon project.

The Democrats, with their usual capacity for adopting Republican programs and converting them to their own use, injected a new philosophy into the field of public power with the passage of the Bonneville Act of 1937. The "preference clause," which previously applied to marketing agencies devoted to "public use," was extended to public bodies and cooperatives, without reference to the use of the power.

Now, how well have the Democrats carried on the public power program? How well have they protected the investment of the taxpayers in the many huge Federal power projects in the country? How much power did they give away to private industry? How well have they observed the preference and withdrawal policies?

As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." What does it show? The record shows that during the period of 1945–52 the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and other Federal power groups, under Democratic control entered into a total of 176 contracts with privately owned utilities demanding an energy delivery of 44,599,725 kilowatt-hours in 1952. Only 14 of the 176 contracts carried the preference or withdrawal clause. The record shows that these contracts were made with privately owned groups and were contracts for Federal power, at a time when a serious power shortage in several public power areas in the country was apparent. Some of these contracts, in the opinion of experts, were made at less than the cost of production. The contracts prices ranged from 1.5 mills to 3 mills. One contract was for nearly a million kilowatt-hours, made to a New Deal pet, the Kaiser Aluminum Co. It is still in effect and the price is less than the cost of production.

During this period more than 13 percent of the electrical power produced and marketed by the Federal Government was sold to privately owned utilities under contracts that did not provide for withdrawal, when the power was needed by preference customers. And much of it was sold at prices below the actual cost of production.

Who has benefited by the Democrat public power policy?

April 24, 1939: Arizona Public Service Co., contracted for 30,000 kilowatts of firm power.

March 16, 1940: El Paso Electric Co., contracted for 15,000 kilowatts of firm power.

July 15, 1940: Public Service Co. of New Mexico, contracted for 2,500 kilowatts.

May 29, 1941: South California Edison Co., contracted for 7.05 percent of the firm power at Hoover Dam.

April 11, 1945: Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., 5,000 kilowatts.

June 1, 1945: Community Public Service Co., region 5, 2,500 kilowatts.

July 1, 1945: Riverside Electric Co., Ltd., region 1, 7,541 kilowatts.

December 1, 1950: Community Public Service Co., region 5, 3,000 kilowatts.

December 15, 1950: Idaho Power Co., region 1, 2,000 kilowatts.

Here is the total record of such contracts from 1945 to 1952, made by the Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and Southeastern Power Administration:

Contractor with the privately owned utilities	Number of contracts nonwithdrawable	1952 contract demand (kilowatt-hours)	1952 energy delivered (kilowatt-hours)
Bureau of Reclamation	33	32,720	2,733,815
Bonneville Power Administration	92	587,000	3,254,203
Southwestern Power Administration	36	149,000	237,018,525
Southeastern Power Administration	1	60,000	12,065,952
Total	162	828,720	255,072,495

The entire Democratic power philosophy seems to be that the savings in power costs, if any, at projects built at Government expense, should be passed on to those marketing agencies of a public nature, regardless of whether they use the power for public purposes or for resale to private users. In other words, the Federal Government should build all projects, sell the power to all comers, at cost or below, and then pass the cost back to the taxpayer. This is well illustrated by a memo by Harold Ickes on January 3, 1946, in which he stated:

> Active assistance, from the very beginning of the planning and authorization of a project, shall be given to the organization of public agencies and cooperatives for the distribution of power in each project area.
>
> The statutory objectives are not attained by merely waiting for a preferred customer to come forward and offer to purchase the power.

We Republicans do not understand public power in this sense. We understand it in the historical sense, that power, as all other resources, should be used for the benefit of the public. Preference must be given to those customers, whether State, local or private in organization, who devote this resource to the public good. This is the policy that went into the original reclamation acts and the Boulder Canyon Act, and it is the policy we are following today.

If the Democrats wish to draw the battleline upon the issues of irrigation, reclamation, and power, let them do so. If they wish to talk about public power and private power, let them do so. If they wish to talk about giveaway, let them do so. But let us find out whose giveaway it is. It is clearly shown by all records that the Democrats have violated over and over the preference clause in the sale of Federal power. Long-term contracts have been entered into which never would have been tolerated under the Republican policy of protecting preference customers.

Address by the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, at the Dedication Exercises of the National Shrine for the Jewish Dead, Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc., May 22, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address made by Vice President NIXON before the members of the national executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans at the dedication exercises of the National Shrine for the Jewish Dead, on May 22, 1955:

Commander Dorfman, Commander Barr, Rabbi Goldberg, distinguished guests on the platform, and ladies and gentlemen, I want you to know that I consider it a privilege to have been able to rearrange my schedule, as Commander Dorfman has indicated, to be with you today to participate in these very solemn ceremonies.

It is true that the Vice President of the United States does have a number of official functions to perform during a week or during any particular day but I can assure you that there is not any one of them that I consider a greater honor or a greater privilege to perform than to be with you today.

This shrine which we are dedicating is one which I think can mean and will mean in the years ahead a number of things. Might I suggest just three things I think it would mean to me and, perhaps, to you and the American people.

First of all, it is a shrine which will be a reminder of the splendid contribution made to American life by the organization which has been responsible for its erection, the Jewish War Veterans. I think we all are appreciative of what has been done by Commander Barr and others who conceived the

idea of the shrine and then worked through the years until finally the idea has reached fruition. And then, second, this shrine will be a reminder for all Americans of the tremendous sacrifices and the great contribution made to America by Americans of Jewish faith in the wars in which this country has been engaged.

There are men like the Congressional Medal of Honor winner who was introduced just a few moments ago, Ben Kaufman; a man who was honored for his gallantry by nine Allied Governments in addition to our own, and a man who proved his greatness by refusing a commission so that he could stay in the ranks with the men with whom he had fought and for whom he had done so much.

He was a World War I Congressional Medal of Honor winner. Then, in World War II, there were other Congressional Medal of Honor winners of Jewish faith. Isidore Jackman, for example, was one man who made a great contribution—a paratrooper who because of his bravery was able to save the lives of perhaps a whole company to which he was attached.

And then, in addition to these men who have made such great sacrifices and whose contributions have been recognized by the government of their country, there are the thousands of others who had to do their routine jobs—routine jobs which had very little glamor but necessarily had to be done in order for the victory to be won. This shrine will be a reminder of the contributions they made as well as the contributions that were made by those whose exploits won the applause of the whole Nation and of the Congress of the United States through the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

And I was thinking, too, that this shrine might be a reminder of men of Jewish faith who have made contributions during our wars and have not even been members of the armed services but whose contributions, nevertheless, were perhaps as great.

In studying the history of the Revolutionary War, certainly there was no greater hero than Haym Salomon, the man who, time after time, came to Washington with the funds to pay the troops, to take care of the rations, and to provide the necessary equipment to assure victory.

His contribution, it has been estimated, would be $4 million in terms of money as we know it today. And the extent of his contribution is measured by the fact that he died penniless at the age of 45.

And so this shrine will be a reminder of the contributions made by the heroes, by the men in the ranks, and by those who have contributed in other ways than military service to defending this country. But I think it is more than that. I think we should have in mind, as American citizens, that this shrine, in a sense, is symbolic of the greatness of America.

I like to think of America's because no nation has had in modern times a greater history than ours. It is rather difficult to realize that it was only 160 years ago that there were only 3 million people in this country and that today there are 160 million. But 160 years ago there were only 13 colonies joined together on the Atlantic seaboard. Now we have a great continental power of 48 States, with Territories in other parts of the world as well.

It is hard to realize that that small, weak agricultural economy has grown to the point that today the United States produces over one-half the world's goods. It is hard to realize that a country that was despised by the rulers of the world as being too weak because it gave men too much power and gave governments too little today is recognized as the most powerful nation on the face of the globe.

Now how did it happen? You can give a lot of reasons if you ask different people people why America has progressed as it has. I know some will say that America has become great because it has had great natural resources. That is part of the reason, but not all, because other nations have had resources as great as ours and they have not progressed as we have in that period of time.

Then there are others who will give the answer that America has become great because we Americans have been and are a great people; but who are the American people? This is no master race. Americans came from all the continents, from all the countries of the world. All races, all creeds, all religions are here. It is inscribed in the immortal words of Emma Lazarus on the Statue of Liberty: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." And so they came to America and, in the climate of freedom that men and women found here, their energies were released and they made contributions to progress greater than men and women had ever made to a civilization in the history of mankind.

And so, as we analyze America's greatness and the reasons for it, I think that we are a great Nation because we have recognized some fundamental truths.

We have differences in our country, differences in customs, traditions, and religions, but we have also recognized that if we have respect for our differences and if we have common beliefs in great principles of freedom, equality, and justice for all, we can transcend those differences, we can thereby create a united people whose power will be as great or greater than any people on the face of the earth. That is the American's creed. It is what America stands for. It has been and today is the hope of the world.

And so, as we dedicate this shrine, I say let us think not only of the organization which made it possible. Let us think not only of the men who have made sacrifices to whom this shrine is specifically dedicated, but let us also think of the country, the Nation, our Nation, which this shrine symbolizes.

And let us never forget that men in the past in the wars in which America has engaged have been willing to make the supreme sacrifice to defend our principles and our freedom, and that, in the future, the responsibility of military service which falls upon our young people is not one which should be shirked.

It is not one which should be complained about, but it is one that should be accepted as a privilege, a privilege to give our services in maintaining and perpetuating our great Nation in which we are privileged to live.

It has been an honor to be with you. And I trust that through the years this shrine will be a reminder of the principles which have made America and our people the great Nation and the great people we are.

Restore the Bill of Rights to Our Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the plight of our soldiers under the Status of Forces Treaty is receiving attention from some of the Nation's most distinguished commentators on public affairs. Under leave to extend, I offer for the RECORD the following recent broadcast on this subject by Dr. Clarence E. Manion, a noted authority:

RESTORE THE BILL OF RIGHTS TO OUR SERVICEMEN

For the past several months Congress has been wrangling over provisions for military conscription in the new Army Reserve bill. During heated discussion in the House of Representatives last May 18, the House voted on a significant amendment proposed by the Honorable FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio.

The Bow amendment was short and to the point. In substance, it provided that hereafter no American military serviceman could be stationed in any foreign country to which the United States has surrendered criminal jurisdiction over American military personnel.

The fact is that the United States has surrendered such criminal jurisdiction to practically all countries in which American troops are now stationed abroad. This amendment would thus require drastic but wholesome changes in our entire military policy. To the surprise and shock of the Pentagon and the State Department, the Bow amendment was overwhelmingly adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of more than 3 to 1 (175 to 56).

Since the administration refused to accept the critical amendment, the Reserve bill was subsequently withdrawn. Representative Bow and other House Members then introduced resolutions calling upon the President to denounce the infamous Status of Forces Treaty at which the Bow amendment had been directed. These resolutions are now before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. Eventually they will be voted upon by Congress. It is obvious that a large majority of the House of Representatives is in favor of these resolutions, but without prompt, loud, and persistent popular support, the chances for their passage are very, very slim.

Here again, as is the case with so many patriotic enterprises, the big difficulty is popular apathy, plus a carefully cultivated area of calculated misunderstanding. Internationalists who are perpetually anxious to appease foreign nations by the continuous surrender of our cash and national sovereignty are always ready with slick, plausible defenses for the Status of Forces Treaty. As a matter of fact, however, and as the House vote on the Bow amendment indicates, this Status of Forces agreement is the most perfidious piece of bipartisan chicanery that our befuddled post-war diplomacy has produced.

This surrender idea was hatched in guarded secrecy by the Acheson State Department after the close of World War II. The Eisenhower administration found these disgraceful arrangements governing our servicemen in many parts of the world. The Bricker amendment would have outlawed these wicked arrangements, but in opposing the Bricker amendment, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles repeatedly disclaimed any intention to destroy the constitutional rights of any American by an international agreement.

This being so, these secret arrangements by Mr. Acheson should have been promptly and emphatically repudiated. Instead, Mr. Dulles and President Eisenhower requested that the surrender arrangements be made uniform by a treaty with all NATO countries. As a result of administration pressure and over the courageous and strenuous objections of 15 patriotic United States Senators (Bricker, Dirksen, Dworshak, Jenner, McCarthy, Malone, Schoeppel, Welker, Williams (Delaware), Frear, Johnston, Long, McCarran, Russell and Smathers), this so-called NATO Status of Forces Treaty was finally ratified by the Senate on July 15, 1953.

This infamous treaty changed military law that had been effective for United States

troops ever since the first inauguration of President George Washington. It took basic constitutional protections from 1 million American military servicemen along with those of their wives and dependents who are now stationed in more than 40 foreign countries.

Under the Constitution, as under the hitherto unbroken precedents of international law, the troops of friendly nations stationed in foreign countries are subject to the criminal laws and procedures of their home governments. Our soldiers, sailors and marines have fought all over the world in two world wars under this time-honored rule of law without trouble or serious objection from any of our Allies. In the interest of gratuitous post-war appeasement, however, the Status of Forces Treaty changed this basic rule and thus subjected all American military personnell to the criminal laws, courts, prosecutions and peculiar procedures in the foreign languages of the foreign countries to which our servicemen have been sent to defend.

The United States Constitution provides that Congress shall "make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces" of the United States. (Art. 1, sec. 8, No. 14.) Pursuant to this authority, Congress has established a uniform code of procedure for the trial of American military personnel both here and abroad. When he is tried under that code for offenses alleged to have been committed off duty, the accused serviceman is assured of all of our traditional constitutional safeguards. Among other things, he will be presumed to be innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

He may confront the witnesses against him. He can have a jury trial and the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus. He cannot be tried twice for the same offense, or be required to give testimony against himself. Finally, if convicted he can appeal to the President for pardon. These are some of the constitutional rights which the Status of Forces took away from the 1 million American servicemen now stationed in foreign lands where none of these protections are available.

What difference has that made in the life of these American boys stationed abroad since the Status of Forces Treaty took the Bill of Rights away from them 2 years ago? Some part of a million people, soldiers or civilians, anywhere, any time, will commit or be accused of committing many criminal offenses—major, minor, and in between.

Let us suppose that your son has been drafted into the Army and sent to one of the more highly civilized places where American troops are now stationed. Let us suppose that he was sent to France. After a few drinks at a sidewalk cafe, he begins to denounce communism—the evil thing which after all is the very reason why he is where he is. Remember that 1 out of every 4 voters in France is a Communist. This particular cafe may well be a Communist rendezvous. In the resulting brawl, the GI's get the worst of it.

Your son is accused, arrested, and hauled before a French judge. Here is the sixty-four dollar question proposed to Senator JOHN BRICKER in a letter from an American Air Force officer stationed in France: "How long do you think a French judge of a police court would last if he disregarded the testimony of a Communist policeman and accepted the testimony of a GI?" That is the question.

Does it make you feel any more complacent about that boy of yours, who may even now be talking through an interpreter to a judge in France, Italy, Turkey, Japan, or wherever he is tonight? Yet, the internationalists will assure you that treaties cannot take constitutional rights away from anybody. From bitter experience, thousands of our servicemen now know better.

Before Mr. Acheson hatched his secret surrender agreement, later confirmed by President Eisenhower in the Status of Forces Treaty, this American GI woud not have had to face that French judge. He would have been turned over to United States military authorities, who would have tried him in the English language before an American court, according to the Bill of Rights.

When Persident Eisenhower was urging the United States Senate to ratify the Status of Forces Treaty, he wrote that he was convinced "that our friends abroad will continue to cooperate as they have in the past, in turning over those charged with offenses against their laws, to our own military courts for trial." In other words, the President anticipated that although the Status of Forces Treaty would surrender our troops to these foreigners, the foreign governments would then generously hand our soldiers back, thus reducing the treaty to nothing more than a gracious American gesture. Unfortunately, it hasn't worked out as the President expected. For that reason, he should welcome the language of the Bow resolution and immediately reestablish the constitutional rights of our soldiers which he surrendered by overconfidence in the generosity of our allies.

The Pentagon is reluctant to release facts and figures concerning prosecutions by foreign governments under the status of forces surrender agreements. Wives and children of the convicted servicemen learn about it when their Army allotments are cut off, but beyond the fact of his conviction, it is often difficult to find out the nature of the soldier's offense. The Defense Department recently revealed that 178 American servicemen were sentenced to confinement by foreign courts during the first 11 months of 1954, and that as of February 10, 1955, 58 American servicemen were in foreign jails.

Some few details have broken through the censorship. We heard about the two soldiers who were sentenced to 5 years in solitary confinement for taking over a taxicab in France. Then there was the Air Force officer in Bermuda who was jailed for driving a car without the prescribed kind of insurance. Two American servicemen have been held without a trial in a Japanese jail for 9 months. There is no habeas corpus in Japan, where the wife of a serviceman was indicted because the house she rented accidentally caught fire. Even more serious is the status of American serviceman Jose Montijo, of Phoenix, Ariz., now held for the murder of a Frenchman in Paris. The accused denies his guilt, but the French newspapers want the American soldier to get the guillotine. American military authorities will not discuss the case.

The Status of Forces Treaty was being debated in the United States Senate just 2 years ago this month. In opposing its passage, Senator BRICKER said to the Senate: "Some day we can expect to witness an American soldier convicted and sentenced to die by a foreign court."

Jose Montijo is stripped of the Bill of Rights in Paris tonight, but an unnaturalized foreigner, caught redhanded in the United States, can plead the fifth amendment and every other provision of our Constitution. This brings up the internationalists' defense of the NATO Forces Surrender Treaty. Internationalists point out that the treaty is reciprocal; foreign governments get jurisdiction over American GI's, to be sure, but in return we are allowed to apply American law to foreign soldiers in this country.

How fortunate for the foreign soldier who gets the presumption of innocence here, instead of the presumption of guilt at home. How convenient for the foreign soldier who gets here in America the full protection of the Bill of Rights in exchange for the denial of the Bill of Rights to American soldiers all over the world.

This is a typical example of what our State Department regards as reciprocity between the United States and foreign nations. It is a principle which the State Department has generously declined to apply to its own employees in foreign countries. State Department agents are not subject to foreign jurisdictions. A separate treaty takes care of that. If Jose Montijo had been working for the State Department, wearing striped pants instead of the American Army uniform, he would not now be in danger of the guillotine.

Congressman Bow tells me that he does not know the number of countries to which the Status of Forces Agreement now applies. The State Department will not reveal the complete list. He says: "I can see no justification for secrecy with regard to any agreement of this type. The whole world knows that we have men now stationed in upwards of 40 countries around the globe. The American people and American servicemen have a right to know how many of these nations exercise the power of life or death over hapless American who may run afoul of strange and unknown foreign law. In view of the fact that we seem to be unable to secure release of our airmen jailed in Red China, the State Department's secrecy leaves us free to wonder whether one of the classified agreements may have been made with Red China or the U. S. S. R."

While we are wondering about that, we can plug for Congressman Bow's resolution. Our servicemen are the last people on earth from whom we should remove the protection of the Constitution. Yet, that is precisely what has been done in the disgraceful Status of Forces Agreements. Tell your Congressman that you want the rights of our soldiers restored, and at once.

The Criminal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, exemption from marketing penalties of wheat grown for use as feed or seed on the farm where it is grown has now been recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I think this is sound and necessary legislation, and it is something I have advocated for many months. I believe it is embodied in legislation introduced some time ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. I hope that the Agriculture Committee may see fit to act without delay so that this correction may be made in the law in time to be of benefit to farmers with regard to the 1955 crop.

The advantages are many. It will mean that dairy and poultry farmers who grow wheat for feed will be relieved of all of the unnecesary and unreasonable penalties that they may now suffer if in growing sufficient for their needs they exceed the allotment for their farms. It will relieve the Government of the expensive burden of administering controls for these farms, and of the necessity, now a matter of law, of prosecuting farmers who violate the present restrictions.

This is a deadly serious matter to hundreds of farmers who are now in

difficulty with the Government because of violations. I think it is very well handled, however, in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal which shows how ridiculous this kind of control can become:

THE CRIMINAL

Farmers have paid some $5 million in fines to the Federal Government for growing more than the law allows.

So the black robed judge mounts his bench of a morning and calls the case of John Doe.

JUDGE. "What is the charge against this man?"

DISTRICT ATTORNEY. "He has been growing wheat, Your Honor."

JUDGE. "Growing wheat, eh. Let's see, Doe, haven't you been up here on the same charge before?"

DOE. "Twice, Your Honor. You see, I have a flock of chickens and I grow wheat to feed them. My father did the same thing for years and when we grow our own feed we produce chickens and eggs cheaper than when we have to buy feed. I know they say that is against the law but I just can't believe it."

JUDGE. "Well, you better believe it. You are a third offender and you come up here citing your father. Now there's your neighbor, Richard Roe. He used to grow wheat but he stopped."

DOE. "Yes, I know, Your Honor, but Roe lost his farm and had to go on relief. That was another thing father taught us—never to rely on other people for our living."

JUDGE. "Your father again. He had an old-fashioned point of view. I hope you are bringing your own children up in better fashion. There is enough juvenile delinquency now."

DISTRICT ATTORNEY. "I wish to correct the record. Richard Roe is not on relief. He is now a Government inspector. In fact he was the one who ferreted out what Mr. Doe was doing."

DOE (mumbling). "Father always said they were a bad lot."

JUDGE. "This man keeps talking about his father. It seems almost a mania."

DOE. "Well, someone is crazy."

JUDGE. "Doe, you are fined $100 for growing wheat and $1,000 for contempt of court."

Schenck To Confer With Residents of His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my high honor and great privilege to represent the very important Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. I am humbly grateful for this opportunity to be of service and it is my constant aim to represent all of the people of my district in the very best and most sincere manner possible. It has also, Mr. Speaker, been my constant policy to keep in close personal contact with all of the people of the Third District so that I may know their opinions and feelings in the vital and challenging problems with which we are faced here in the Congress.

Our Third District, Mr. Speaker, is located in the great and beautiful Miami Valley of Ohio. The people of this area have made many outstanding contributions to the health, welfare, and progress of our Nation and the world. Not only is it the birthplace and cradle of aviation but many of its other inventions and products are serving people all over the world. Our people are skilled in many ways and we have developed scientific projects, manufacturing, and agriculture to an unusually high degree.

It has been my constant aim, Mr. Speaker, to not only keep well informed as to the opinions of my constituents but also to be the greatest possible and proper service to each and every person in the third district who has a personal problem with some department or agency of our Federal Government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I initiated the idea of holding "grassroots conferences" throughout the district 4 years ago and have continued to hold them each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also have a full time congressional service office at 314–315 United States Post Office Building in Dayton, where I can meet with people personally at such times as my official duties permit me to return to the district. During the times when my legislative and official duties require me to be in Washington, a competent secretary is in charge of my district congressional service office to assist anyone and to prepare reports and requests for me to properly help them in their problems involving some Federal department or agency. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have sincerely tried to not only keep well informed as to the personal opinions of my constituents but I have also continuously and sincerely tried to be of every proper service to them.

Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, are constantly called upon to carefully and earnestly consider legislation in connection with many complex national and international problems. Such decisions often affect the lives and living of every citizen to an unbelievable extent. These personal, face-to-face conference, therefore, help me to serve them in a much more effective manner.

Again this year, Mr. Speaker, I will take time during the period of our official congressional recess to hold these "grassroots conferences" in the courthouses and city buildings of a number of our communities. Facilities for these conferences have been made available through the fine cooperation of many officials who agree with me on the value of this service to all our people.

This is the schedule I have arranged:

Hamilton, courthouse, September 6 and 7; 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Miamisburg, city building, September 8; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Germantown, city building, September 9; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Brookville, city building, September 10; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Dayton, Federal building, September 12 and 13; 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Middletown, American Legion, September 14 and 15; 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Oxford, municipal building, September 16; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Fairfield Village, town hall, September 17; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

It is surprising, Mr. Speaker, and highly gratifying to see how much can really be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down face to face and talk over national and personal problems. The growing number of people each year attending these conferences is most encouraging. No special time appointments are necessary. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that any individual or group meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. With the knowledge obtained from these "grassroots conferences," Mr. Speaker, I am enabled to render better legislative and personal service to all of the people of the important Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States.

Address by Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior, Before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., May 31, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

Mr. Chairman, I feel honored indeed to be invited to participate in the very distinguished program which you have assembled for the 42d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The subject of this address, however, as printed in your program is the occasion of some little embarrassment.

The President used his address to your convention last year as the occasion for announcing the appointment of a committee to study national water resources and policies. That committee consisted of the Secretaries of the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and Interior, with several other Departments and Agencies also participating.

I am sure it is proper for me to say to you that that committee has been meeting consistently during the last 12 months, exploring not only the numerous Federal activities relating to water resources, but also the entire problem of water.

The committee has not yet presented its report, and I am sure you will understand, therefore, that I shall not discuss it. However, I am sure it will not be amiss if I discuss with you for a few moments some of the various problems which arise in a survey of the water resources of the United States.

The thing I should like to most impress upon your minds is the fact that there is no single water problem in the United States; that there are a multitude of problems; that they are nationwide in scope; but they are not necessarily national.

I suspect that all of our minds tend to emphasize different aspects of the water problem according to our various backgrounds and our various local interests. This organization in its very nature has been primarily interested in rivers and harbors, in navigation and flood control. These are im-

portant segments of the water problem, but they are only segments.

Those of us from the West envisage the water problem as primarily one of the storage of water and its application to land—irrigation, the reclamation of arid lands, and the building of the agricultural economy of the Western States.

But that, too, is only another segment of the water problem.

In other and older parts of the country water and stream pollution are beginning to loom as major segments of the water problem.

Throughout the country there is a growing and insistent demand that more consideration be given to the preservation or enlargement of the fish and wildlife opportunities and the opportunities for public recreation.

In many places water supplies heretofore thought inexhaustible have begun to show signs of depletion, and the problem of adequate supply confronts areas and individual communities.

Let us bear in mind that we have pretty much taken water for granted in most of the United States. We have not looked upon it as a really vital matter. We have never been under the necessity of paying very much, if anything, for water, and consequently, we have neglected to find many of the facts about water, its availability, and its necessary uses.

The consumption of water in the United States has increased so tremendously even in the last 25 years, that it staggers the imagination. The industrial uses of water are almost beyond our comprehension, and as new industrial processes develop and new uses, such as air conditioning, increase and supplemental irrigation is expanded into new areas where heretofore it was not thought necessary, we are intensifying the burden that we put upon the Nation's water supply.

There is sufficient water to meet these tremendous needs, but the task of husbanding our resources will require the best efforts of us all.

Many of the things we do not know are fully as important as the things we do know. In some areas of the United States water is being withdrawn from the ground at a rate of thirty times the rate of water replenishment. In some coastal areas we have drawn down the water table to the point where the salt water of the sea has intruded under the land surface. I assume we have all noted that in the areas of both Virginia and Maryland adjacent to the District serious water problems are developing.

It is not too difficult to foresee in many regions that in the course of time water may be more valuable and more of an asset than any of the other natural resources.

I think I can foresee some future conflicts of a very basic nature.

It is obvious that domestic supplies and uses of water must be maintained in the first priority of use, and yet it is not difficult to visualize developments where providing an adequate domestic supply will cut into and curtail the industrial or agricultural use of water.

We have areas in the United States already in which the supply of water may become a limiting factor in the population growth of the area and present tremendous conflict of interest between vested uses of water and the growing demands of an expanding population.

The amounts of money involved in these problems are tremendous, and even in this day of budgets computed in billions, they are still of a magnitude worthy of careful attention. For instance, it is estimated by one of our departments that an annual expenditure of $750 million a year is necessary to merely keep abreast of the problem of stream pollution. Most of this, if not all of it, will be borne by municipalities and the industries contributing to that pollution.

It is estimated by both the public and private agencies that the capital requirements necessary to keep abreast of the hydroelectric and irrigation developments in the Pacific Northwest will require consistently some $300 million a year. I believe the last report of the Tennessee Valley Authority indicated an investment need there of some $150 million a year. And, yet, these are only small areas compared to the total national requirements.

These amounts are not only approximately double the amounts of the average appropriations to these areas during the last 10 years, but if anything like that proportion of appropriations were maintained for other sections of the country, we reach almost astronomical figures.

It seems to me we may, therefore, appropriately ask, Whose water problem? And it seems to me the necessary answer is that it is everybody's problem—Federal, State, local, and individual.

For that reason there must be the closest cooperation and coordination of the various Federal agencies entrusted with particular programs and with the States and the local interests working in this field.

The Corps of Engineers' program of work with rivers, flood control, and navigation must be coordinated with the Bureau of Reclamation's program of water storage for reclamation and irrigation, and the program of agriculture, now nationwide, with its multitude of developments of small watershed controls, including water storage, which is just in its infancy, must be coordinated with both if we are to avoid conflicts in policies and interagency rivalries, not to mention inadequate participation of States and local interests, many of which are fully able to carry a substantial proportion of the burden.

There are conflicts of interest in the very nature of the program. It is not always possible to serve the conflicting interests in water resources development. It is not possible to build a dam across a canyon and impound large amounts of water for the irrigation of land, the improvement of the economy of a region, the enhancement of the fish and wildlife resources, and the improvement of recreational facilities without at the same time altering the natural beauties of nature and the isolated, solitary aspects which many people wish to see preserved.

As our population increases and our economy develops, I suspect these conflicts will become more apparent. What will happen when increasing domestic uses of available water supplies begin to curtail agricultural development and perhaps curtail industrial uses? How will we solve the great problems that arise with relation to the diversion of water from its natural courses to other uses?

We are in the midst of serious conflicts involving profound constitutional questions of the legal rights of the Federal Government and the States and individuals with reference to the ownership and control of inland waters.

We have inherent conflicts between the water appropriation laws of the West by which the right to use water has long been considered a property right under the laws of the States where all our property rights originate and the powers of the Congress under the commerce and defense clauses.

In some areas of the country there appear to be vast reservoirs of underground water, adequate for all foreseeable uses of the overlying land, and possibly providing surpluses. In other areas limited underground waters are available, but in some of these areas we are pulling water out of the ground much faster than nature is replenishing it. This means, of course, that sooner or later such areas are not only headed toward a water storage, but perhaps such a failure of supply as will render agriculture in the areas impossible and may seriously handicap the region.

We need much more intelligent study and much more intelligent regulation by the States with reference to the use of underground waters, yet most of the States have been reluctant to invade this field, and in many cases there is not adequate information available by which it can be intelligently invaded.

A second potentiality in which Interior is engaged is a study of the problem of saline-water conversion. The Congress has made approximately $400,000 a year available for that purpose, and the method of handling has been to make research grants to colleges, scientific and industrial organizations to attract to this problem the finest minds of the country to discover, if possible, a cheap and practical process.

I am glad to report to you that a great deal of progress has been made. While the costs are still much in excess of the amounts which you and I would like to pay and are still too high for uses in a competitive industry, they are at a point where the burden of cost could be borne for strictly limited domestic uses. All of the processes involve the use of energy, however it may be obtained. The amounts required are great. But the scientists are continuing on their way. Perhaps solar energy in areas where sunshine can be depended upon, perhaps windpower and geothermal energy offer possiblities. All these sources are being explored.

If any cheap process for desalting water could be devised, the benefits can only be measured by the scope of our imagination. There are millions of acres of land in the world, readily irrigable with only slight lifts from the oceans, if that water could be made available. Fresh water would produce the food supplies, improve the living conditions and alter the economy of large regions of the world. Such a process might work almost as great a change in the economic conditions and the standards of living of a large part of the world as will the development of atomic energy.

A third fascinating possibility is that of weather control, where exploration is still in its infancy, and our scientists are most reluctant to express opinions.

This is a thumbnail sketch of some of the water problems as I see them. It is apparent that they go far beyond any possibility of exclusive Federal action. They must be met by unified effort in a spirit of cooperation between all of the Federal agencies, the States and local interests.

While they have an effect upon the national economy, the direct benefits of most of these resource development projects are primarily local. For that reason, it would seem there should be substantial contributions by the beneficiaries, regardless of the agency constructing the project, whether it be Federal or non-Federal.

Just as all must assume some share of the responsibility, so it would seem to me that all should share the costs.

There are many auspicious signs of a general awakening of States and local interests, public and private, toward assuming responsibility in the resource field. The deauthorization of some Federal projects to permit local interests to proceed and the large number of projects in the planning and financing stages by States, public agencies, municipalities, public power districts, irrigation districts, drainage districts, and private interests are evidence of a general public awareness of their responsibilities for large parts of the program.

To many of them capital is readily available, as are the skills and technicians that are necessary. The task is great enough for all. The needs are pressing. May we all be given the vision to view these problems in their nationwide aspect, free from any personal or sectional views. May we do our part and help others to do theirs that this great and necessary program can go forward.

National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955

SPEECH
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that insofar as our utility laws are concerned under which we are operating at the present time, the Federal Government does reimburse the States where the States reimburse the utility companies up to 50 percent of their moving charges. In other words, if the State pays 50 percent, the Federal Government will pay the other 50 percent on moving the utilities. Most of the States are doing that at the present time on an optional and hardship basis. There are three States in the United States that are reimbursing the utilities at the rate of 100 percent. Michigan happens to be one of those States at the present time. In my judgment I do not think this Congress should upset or change the operation of the Federal bureau as it has been doing in the past, because I am sure it is fair to the REA and the small telephone lines, because the Federal Government reimburses them, where they, the States, will share 50 percent, where it is determined it is a hardship, and the States pay the other 50 percent on moving cost. I just give that information to the House.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is now referring to the Fallon bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I am referring to the law as it exists at the present time. The Fallon bill goes farther than that and says that they may, which infers, where the State reimburses none at all, they can get 50 percent Federal money if they apply and the State government O. K.'s it.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Here we have a small town, a municipality, and they have sewers, water, telephone, and electric power lines, and we run a highway through that town and they have to move all of those utilities. Now, many of those small towns own their own utilities. Can the gentleman tell me how those small towns are going to pay this bill?

Mr. GEORGE. In our State that is part of the construction cost. And if they are on the streets and outside of the sidewalk line, as nearly all of them are, it is part of the construction cost and there is total reimbursement.

Mr. JENSEN. Reimbursement by whom?

Mr. GEORGE. By the State and Federal governments. If it is 50–50 money, they divide the cost 50–50. But if we pass this bill now with a provision for 90 percent Federal money and 10 percent State money, we leave the existing law alone. If we change it to 50 percent Federal money and say that the State "may," that means that the State can pay 50 percent Federal money but they do not have to put up any money of their own at all.

So what is going on at the present time is that 50 percent Federal money and 50 percent State money goes into the cost of moving utilities where the State determines that they owe an obligation so far as construction of the highway is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman say that that law is effective in every State except three?

Mr. GEORGE. Except three. And in those States they follow the policy of reimbursing 100 percent, regardless of where the utility is or what size it is.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

A Fitting Tribute to a War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to proudly state that one of the gallant war heroes who resided in the city of Norwalk, in my congressional district of Connecticut, a posthumous winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor, will be fittingly honored next month when the 10th Infantry Division will dedicate an athletic field in Fort Riley, Kans., to his memory.

The late Pfc. John D. Magrath will go down in the annals of American history as one who made the supreme sacrifice for freedom's cause. He met death in the successful struggle against totalitarianism so that those who lived would live in freedom.

It is a fine thing the 10th Infantry Division has chosen to do. It is a fitting tribute to the memory of an exemplary young man to whom we are all indebted.

The following news story from the Norwalk Hour of July 22, tells this wonderful story in detail. Also included is the text of the Medal of Honor citation posthumously awarded to Private First Class Magrath:

The 10th Infantry Division will dedicate an athletic field at Fort Riley, Kans., the week of August 15 to the memory of one of its most intrepid members, the late Pfc. John D. Magrath of Norwalk, posthumous winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor in World War II for bravery against the Germans fighting in Italy.

Garry C. Magrath, of 17 Wallace Avenue, the hero's father, said today he would accept an invitation of Maj. Gen. George E. Martin, commanding general of the 10th Infantry Division, and Col. Milburn N. Huston, commanding officer of the 85th Infantry Regiment, expected to be present at the ceremonies, to be held on August 17. He will be accompanied by Mrs. Magrath.

TO FLY OUT

Mr. and Mrs. Magrath will fly to Kansas on either a United States Air Force or commercial plane. The tentative schedule calls for the local couple to leave on Monday, August 15. The ceremonies will take place August 17 and Mr. and Mrs. Magrath will return the following day.

ANNOUNCEMENT SURPRISE

The announcement of the tribute planned for Private, first class Magrath, son of Mr. Magrath and the late Mrs. Anna Magrath, came as a surprise this morning. The information was contained in a letter to the editor of the Norwalk Hour from Maj. Donald E. Zieg, public information office at Fort Riley, who requested the local newspaper to represent the Army in acquainting the Magraths with the plans.

DIED IN ITALY

Private, first class Magrath paid the supreme sacrifice on a mountainside in Italy in 1945 when he killed many Germans by seizing one of the enemy's machineguns and alerted his company comrades to the danger of ambush set up by the defending forces. Private, first class Magrath then went on to collect information for his unit and while blazing away at the enemy was killed as the Germans increased their mortar and artillery fire.

TO ISSUE INVITATION

The Fifth Army Headquarters will issue the orders containing the invitation to Mr. and Mrs. Magrath.

COMPLETE FACILITIES

The ceremonies are to include the unveiling of a bronze memorial on the site of the athletic installation at Camp Funston, which is the 10th Division area of Fort Riley. The area consists of an outdoor swimming pool, lighted softball, baseball, and football fields, horseshoe courts, and a fieldhouse containing a gymnasium, basketball courts, boxing ring, bowling alleys, etc.

OIL PORTRAIT PLANNED

During the exercises an oil portrait of Pfc Magrath will be presented to the commanding officer of Company G, 85th Infantry, the unit to which Magrath belonged at the time he won the medal.

On a mountainside in Italy, Pfc John D. Magrath won his Congressional Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest wartime tribute, while giving up his life to save a company of fellow infantrymen.

Serving with Company G of the 85th Infantry Regiment, 10th Mountain Division, Pfc Magrath on April 14, 1945, penetrated enemy territory, armed only with a rifle, and shot it out with a machinegun nest, killing the German soldiers defending the position. Taking the machinegun into his own arms, he wiped out three additional machinegun batteries, and warned his company of the German ambush ahead.

He volunteered a second time to scout enemy positions and despite heavy enemy gunfire, infiltrated deep into enemy territory, obtaining valuable information for his outfit, until he was killed during a mortar barrage.

Norwalk paid official tribute to its outstanding World War II hero when Gen. James J. Van Fleet, then deputy commander of the First Army, on September 9, 1946, dedicated a flagpole at memorial services in Veterans' Memorial Park.

This took place on the official welcome home ceremonies to Norwalk World War II veterans, a block party at Veterans' Memorial Park.

The body of Pfc Magrath arrived home on November 12, 1948, from an Italian cemetery. It was met at the railroad station

by veterans' leaders and escorted to the Raymond Funeral Home.

Religious services were held at Christ Episcopal Church and the remains interred in Riverside Cemetery.

Pfc Magrath was an Eagle Boy Scout and assistant scoutmaster. He had earned 21 merit badges and was active in Troop 16 which met at Christ Episcopal Church.

MEDAL OF HONOR CITATION (POSTHUMOUS)

Pfc. John D. Magrath, service No. 31326858, radio operator, company G, 85th Infantry, on April 14, 1945, displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty when his company was pinned down by heavy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire, near Castel d'Aiano, Italy. Volunteering to act as a scout, armed with only a rifle, he charged headlong into withering fire, killing 2 Germans and wounding 3 in order to capture a machinegun. Carrying this enemy weapon across an open field through heavy fire, he neutralized 2 more machinegun nests; he then circled behind 4 other Germans, killing them with a burst as they were firing on his company. Spotting another dangerous enemy position to his right, he kneeled with the machinegun in his arms and exchanged fire with the Germans until he had killed 2 and wounded 3. The enemy now poured increased mortar and artillery fire on the company's newly won position. Private Magrath fearlessly volunteered again to brave the shelling in order to collect a report of casualties. Heroically carrying out this task, he made the supreme sacrifice—a climax to the valor and courage that are in keeping with highest traditions of the military service.

The Dr. Jonas E. Salk Gold Medal

SPEECH
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved and gratified by the unanimous action of the House in approving the bill which I introduced to present a gold medal to Dr. Jonas E. Salk. In authorizing the coining of this special medal we recognize the accomplishment which he has made. This young doctor has opened the door to the conquest of infantile paralysis. As a result of his great work, made possible by the contributions of all Americans to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis March of Dimes campaigns, many lives will be saved; many children, our most precious national resource, will be spared untold agony. The parents of America and the world will no longer live in fear of this dread crippling disease.

During the last 16 years the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has expended a total of $25,541,662.14 for direct research for the development of a poliomyelitis vaccine. The annual March of Dimes campaign, conducted by the national foundation, received the support of the entire Nation. The money so generously contributed by the people made it possible for scientists to intensively study the problem. Dr. Jonas E. Salk first entered the fight against polio in 1942 when he joined the staff of the University of Michigan as the recipient of a National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis fellowship. In 1951 he began his direct research at the virus research laboratories of the University of Pittsburgh on the vaccine now being used.

The Salk vaccine is the result of a painstaking and intensive research program in which live polio virus is treated by chemicals so that a delicate balance is struck in which the ability of the virus to cause disease is eliminated by meticulously calculated chemical additions but still leaving the virus with sufficient potency to stimulate antibody production. Dr. Salk, as the name of the vaccine indicates, was able to develop this vaccine. In his tests at Pittsburgh he proved that the vaccine which he produced was able to raise the antibody level. In the nationwide field trial held by the National Foundation last year Dr. Salk's vaccine was proved highly effective in preventing paralysis. Over 1,830,000 children throughout the United States took part in this massive trial. During the last 2 years Dr. Salk wrote and pulished over 12 medical papers concerning immunization against poliomyelitis.

Dr Salk is a modest man; his parents, too, have with pardonable parental pride, shown great humility. I do not think I exaggerate, however, when I say that the people of the entire Nation and of New York, particularly those who live in my district, Manhattan's west side, take great pride, as I do, in Dr. Salk's achievement. We are proud of him and of the training which he received from his parents and the New York City school system which helped mold the great scientist we know today.

I think it fitting that we express our thanks and appreciation to Dr. Salk. This modest recognition of his work and that of his fellow scientists is the very least that a grateful Nation can do.

Reform of Immigration and Citizenship Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on July 2, the Boston Pilot, the organ of the Boston diocese of the Catholic Church, published the text of a moving speech delivered by his excellency, Archbishop Cushing, of the 50th anniversary of the death of Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini, founder of the Pious Society of the Missionaries of St. Charles.

This speech has been called to my attention because of the references Archbishop Cushing made to the subject of immigration, which was, in fact, one of the themes of the life of Bishop Scalabrini.

Archbishop Cushing, an outstanding humanitarian and long an advocate of essential reforms in our immigration and citizenship laws, makes clear his view that our immigration laws need to be thoroughly revised and made consistent with humanitarian principles, which Archbishop Cushing calls the "Law of God."

I ask unanimous consent that the highlights of Archbishop Cushing's speech, as reported by the Boston Pilot, together with the text of the speech, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the highlights and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP CALLS FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW

Archbishop Cushing, speaking at a dinner on the 50th anniversary of the death of a noted Italian missionary prelate, urged a reevaluation of the status of existing immigration laws and quotas. He spoke at a gathering in the Hotel Somerset on Thursday evening, June 30, on the anniversary of the death of Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini, founder of the Missionaries of St. Charles.

The question must be posed "whether we make sufficiently possible that emigration, from other lands to our own which would seem to be indicated by the law of God," the archbishop said.

The archbishop also scored the trend of thinking which has made the United States a home for "the well born." How shall we be able to justify * * * the self-righteousness that has led us to make of America an exclusive preserve for the well born?"

BELOVED ITALIAN PRELATE-FOUNDER HAILED AS FRIEND OF IMMIGRANTS

(EDITORS NOTE.—The following is the complete text of an address by Archbishop Cushing on the 50th anniversary of the death of Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini, founder of the Pious Society of the Missionaries of St. Charles.)

The commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the death of John Baptist Scalabrini, founder of the Pious Society of St. Charles, is most timely. It comes at a moment in history that confirms the religious, social, and political ideals of this outstanding churchman.

As we read the bishop's life and study his achievements, we come in contact with a prelate of burning zeal who made the influence of his faith felt in every field of human endeavor. Everywhere and always he was a courageous and genial pioneer.

FAR AHEAD

His life story began at Fino Mornasco, Como, where he was born on July 8, 1839. It ended on June 1, 1905, at Piacenza. It is the story of a never-ending outburst of new initiatives, studied, prepared, and executed in perfect harmony against great opposition and any doubts which might arise among individuals or among groups more or less conservative or reactionary.

Even as a young student he showed his inveterate, independent personality. During these years he lifted up his voice openly in praise of religion and gave of his time to the teaching of the Catechism, while others boasted of their anticlericalism and gloried in calling themselves free-thinkers. He went further and decided to join the ranks of the priesthood, which was not a very popular vocation in his day.

As parish priest, as rector of a seminary and bishop, he proved himself a servant of God with great vision and courage who brought forth a constructive program against the enemies of the church and in behalf of

the education and sanctity of the people. He was far ahead of his time. His works were many, heroic, amazing. No field of activity was neglected by him and no work was too small or too great for his extraordinary talents.

He conducted catechism classes and reformed this all-important work of religious instruction; he write textbooks for the education of the youth; he trained teachers, edited a magazine; he organized national catechetical congresses, and he encouraged men of strong faith and great integrity to enter the political arena.

IMMIGRANT AID

The most outstanding among the social and religious accomplishments of this dynamic bishop was his work in behalf of the Italian immigrants.

With a truly apostolic mind and heart he soon saw that his mission was not only to the people of his diocese but to those who were leaving his diocese and every diocese in Italy to cross the seas for the betterment of their economic condition. He perhaps more than any other figure must stand as the symbol of the concern and solicitude of the church in the mother country for her children scattered throughout the world.

Today the missionaries of Bishop Scalabrini work among the Italians in North and South America, Australia, and in almost all the countries of western Europe. In their seminaries of Italy, the United States and Brazil, more than 1,000 students are now preparing themselves for the religious and social assistance of tomorrow's immigrants.

Added to all of these efforts, Bishop Scalabrini, more than any other person, was the man who was finally successful in persuading St. Frances Cabrini to go to America, there to give courage to the Italian immigrants who had been neglected for many years. It was Bishop Scalabrini who begged Mother Cabrini to rush to the assistance of his missionaries working in New York; it was he who asked for and obtained Archbishop Corrigan's invitation to her to go to New York. Finally, it was he who begged Leo XIII to order her to go west and not east as she had wished.

But this saintly bishop was not content to send his priests and his sisters out among the immigrants. He himself followed them to America. In 1901 he sailed for the United States, where he visited all of the Italian colonies and where he was welcomed in triumph. He discussed the immigration problem with local bishops and also with the President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, who received him in private conference at the White House. In 1904 he again set out from Italy. This time he went to Brazil and to the Argentine. The hardships of this last trip, where he traveled for miles on horseback shortened his life.

JOURNEY'S END

On his return to Italy, he barely had the time to prepare a lengthy report of his visits to the Americas for St. Pius X who had requested it.

He had come to the end of his laborious journey. On June 1, 1905, Ascension Day, God called this servant home. The servant of God could well say that he had personally fulfilled the mandate he had given his missionaries, "wherever there be an Italian immigrant, take to him the comfort of the faith and the smile of his native land."

I have often spoken of the spiritual empire which under God's providence was carved out by the emigrants of Irish descent in the English-speaking world. With the great barrier of language as a hurdle, the Italians have carved out for themselves a similar empire of the spirit in North and South America and in distant Australia. It is well that we should pause to pay special tribute to this phase of the life of Bishop Scalabrini and to the Italian emigrants today.

The beginning years of this century saw what had been previously a relatively small trickle turn into the full tide of Italian emigration. Where before there had been thousands, there were now tens and hundreds of thousands who each year left the Italian homeland to make for themselves new careers in the lands of promise. It was at this time in 1905, a half-century ago, when the work of Bishop Scalabrini was finding its complete justification and its plans were beginning to find their ripe fruition, that God in His all-wise Providence brought him back home for eternal rest. We meet today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of his passing not in terms of the grief that must have overtaken the members of his religious family and indeed the Church universal 50 years ago. We meet rather in thanksgiving to Almighty God that Bishop Scalabrini's works have followed him so that he lives today with the souls of a myriad of Italian immigrants, who fare from their native Italy were nonetheless aided to preserve and strengthen their faith by the work of the Pious Society of St. Charles, the priestly sons of Bishop Scalabrini.

MOST PRECIOUS POSSESSION

Almost from the beginning of what we know as the history of the West, Italy has sent to the far corners of the world her most precious possession, her children. The roads which in their vast network interlaced all the lands about the Mediterranean and united them in that unity which made it possible for the Romans to think of the Mediterranean as their sea, bore upon them not alone the legionaries of Caesar's conquests. They were the means of travel, too, for hundreds of thousands of Roman citizens who took up their life and work in France, Portugal, Spain and Britain and so many other places which today have as their common bond the fact that they were members of the Roman empire and heard together the gospel preached to them by the See of Rome.

In every age Italy has parted with her children because the azure sky and the turquoise blue of the Mediterranean and the stark grandeur of the Apennines have not sufficed to make up her lack of material resources. As they left Italy, they brought to each new land from the land of their origins some precious gift. In more ancient times it was the Roman sense of the majesty of law, which was the ordered understanding of the duties of man to himself and society codified by the great Roman jurists. In later days it was, together with the law, the message and faith of Christ brought to Rome by St. Peter and St. Paul and professed by countless witnesses whose names are written in the book of life.

In this land of ours before the First World War the magnificent words of Emma Lazarus at the base of the Statue of Liberty were taken in their fullest meaning by the people of this country and we could truly say:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free
* * * * *
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

In these days Italy sent us in abundance her children who have enriched the life of this Nation beyond measure. They came in tremendous numbers to a land which gave them at best a grudging welcome. They came, moreover, with their thrift, their industry, and their sense of destiny which has always inspired Italian colonization throughout the centuries. In particular, they were prepared to see themselves grow rich and successful and esteemed in their children rather than in themselves. For their children they were prepared to make every sacrifice, and the warm sense of family that the Italian people brought to us constitutes a debt that we shall not soon repay.

In this emigration and with it and in planning far ahead of it stood the priests of the Pious Society of St. Charles, called affectionately from the name of their founder, the Scalabrini Fathers. To no group do the Italo-Americans, today so successful, today so completely accepted by their fellow citizens, owe more than to this dedicated band whose post is always in the forefront of emigration from Italy. They have kept the Italian people close to Almighty God and His altar, and they have kept them close to the sweet patronage of the dear Mother of God, who has been to them in time of tribulation such a source of strength and help.

EMIGRATION CRISIS

It is well for us as we commemorate this anniversary to ask ourselves whether we still make sufficiently possible that emigration from other lands to our own which would seem to be indicated by the law of God. There is a fruitful cross-pollination of culture which takes place whenever the strain of a vigorous people is added to the life of America.

I think that all too little noticed was a pastoral letter issued 2 years ago by the bishops of Australia in which they set forth that the earth had been made by God for all His children, and that if Australia were not prepared to bring in the numbers that could profit by the vacant land available, it should be thrown open without any discrimination to settlement by the teeming masses of Asia, the land-poor, the hungry and dispossessed of mankind.

This may well have seemed a radical note to strike. Yet it was the only thing that could be said that would be in keeping with the Christian Gospel. I was happy to note that shortly afterward the non-Catholic Christian leaders of Australia identified themselves with the stand of the Catholic bishops. They, too, agreed that since the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, and He has made it for man's use, man cannot in any given century, for whatever reason, narrow or restrict the use of the earth's abundance to a selected few.

Even if my voice be a lone one, I feel that I must ask how in Christian conscience we shall be able to justify before the Lord of heaven and earth the self-righteousness that has led us to make of American an exclusive preserve for those whom we esteem to be the well-born. This has been called, and with more than a little reason, a people's century. The accusation of the uprooted peoples of the world will forever condemn us, if we are not prepared to extend once more what was the glory of America's past, the torch of liberty enlightening the world and the sincere handclasp of welcome to the stranger at our gates.

SCALABRINI FATHERS

You who are familiar with the work of the Scalabrini Fathers know how quickly and easily Italian people have become assimilated to the main stream of American life, while at the same time preserving all the best features of their specifically Italian culture. The same is true of all the peoples whose cultural diversity could be the greatest asset of the land we love. Bishop Scalabrini was not given by Almighty God length of years to see the fulfillment of his hopes in the establishment of the Pious Society of St. Charles and the Missionary Sisters of St. Charles, but we have seen it and rejoiced in it. Now, if we are to follow in his tradition, we must dream our dreams of what can be done to make his dreams come to greater utilization.

Today in many parts of the world the Scalabrini Fathers are carrying on the work foreseen for them by their great founder. In Latin America there is hardly a nation which has not opened the doors of its hospitality to Italian immigrants and by so do-

ing has invited the presence and the labors of these devoted men of God. In human affairs we often hear the expression that any great institution is only the lengthened shadow of one great man. This we cannot say about the work of God because in all of those who do His work He seeks only instruments for the fulfillment of His Providence.

May we not say, however, that the times and the circumstances called out for that vision which Bishop Scalabrini possessed, in which he foresaw the needs of immigrants, the most important of these being the preservation of their spiritual inheritance. "Where there is no vision the people perish." The preservation of the faith of those who came to the New World from the Old is perhaps the most important labor undertaken in this century.

There is so much of a natural tendency to concentrate on material success, that there must be voices which speak clearly and surely of the things of eternity, the values which are not measured by any yardstick of time. The greatest force in the world is an idea, and the greatest idea that the world has known is the word of God that made man for our salvation. To keep this idea always to the forefront, with soft insistence, in season and out of season, in all patience and doctrine, has been the task of apostolic souls since the day of Pentecost. It is a work that will always be needed so long as the world finds in Christ and His cross contradiction and not salvation.

BROTHERS IN CHRIST

How we could wish that there were a hundred apostles like Bishop Scalabrini. How many have come to this land from Catholic Europe and fallen into a laxness and indifference which might have been avoided if someone were at hand to say the word of truth and light. They have need to know, those who come to our shores, that there is one God here as there and that His law is universal. It is not changed or mitigated by prosperity. It does not shift with the worldly success of those who have once known God and His truth. There is but one God of all, rich to all those who call upon Him.

Those whom we welcome to America today have been tried in the crucible of suffering and persecution and want. They are the strangers to whom now God wishes us to give the best of welcomes and a share in our hearts' love. Their children and ours will walk together as those born free, but they will walk more surely and unitedly as they have the remembrance that, when their parents of this generation met, they met as friends and brothers in Christ.

It is not easy for a nation or a people to bid farewell to so many of the best of its children as perforce Italy has done and for the foreseeable future will have to do. If the farewell good wishes that they receive and the spiritual help that is theirs from the homeland is matched by our generous welcome and an invitation to union with us in prayer, we shall have built a bridge across the ocean which will be forever the sign of our unity in Christ by whom all walls of division have been broken down.

A Six-Point Plan for the Older Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Under Secretary of Labor Arthur Larson at the eighth annual conference on aging, University of Michigan, Michigan Union, at Ann Arbor, Mich., on June 28, 1955.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the speech is estimated to make approximately 2⅓ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $187.

I ask unanimous consent that, irrespective of the cost, the speech may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SIX-POINT PLAN FOR THE OLDER WORKER

(Address of Under Secretary of Labor Arthur Larson)

Three days from now we greet the opening of the new fiscal year. It will bring us in the Labor Department something we have never had before: a special departmental appropriation devoted to the older worker—enough to provide about 30 full-time jobs.

When I saw the theme of this conference, with its unmistakable deeds-not-words tone, I thought that this might be a good time to announce our designs for the year ahead, which are made possible by the understanding and insight of men like Senator POTTER and others on our Appropriations Committee who approved this request.

We have a six-point plan which we mean to carry through, and which we think will make a real dent in the stubborn problem of age barriers to employment.

I would like to sketch the outlines of this six-point plan for you briefly here tonight.

But first—as the television commercials always begin—but first, a word about how we analyze the problem itself for purposes of contriving our line of action. I shall simplify—indeed, oversimplify—the analysis for this introduction, in order to maintain a reputation for conciseness which I at least have in the mind of my son. He came around the other evening while I was working to ask me a question. I said, "Why don't you ask your mother?" He replied, "Oh, I don't want to know that much about it."

First, we divide the matter of aging into its two big parts:

1. Retirement, and the general field of geriatrics; these are the province principally of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

2. Employment of older workers, which is principally the concern of the Department of Labor.

The definition of "older" is necessarily different in the two areas. In the first area, it refers to people old enough to have to retire or to want to retire. In the second area, it refers to any point at which age is an obstacle to getting a job. This may be as young as 45 for a man, or 35 for a woman.

As to this distinction, we have a simple policy. We do not attempt to tell any person whether he should work or retire; we want to leave that to his free choice. Ideally, matters should be so arranged that those who want to retire can have the necessary security to permit retirement, while those who want to work can have the necessary job chances to permit employment. No one—least of all the General Government—is wise enough to make that choice for another person.

Second, having narrowed our subject to that of employment of older workers, we in the Department of Labor divide the occasion for action into two main heads:

1. From the individual person's point of view, we believe that our American traditions dictate that every worker should have an opportunity to do work commensurate with his abilities and potentialities.

2. From the economy's point of view, we believe that the Nation needs the skills and experience of all its workers, including the older workers, more than ever before, both to support the lively growth and change of American business enterprise, and to supply the strength which is expected of us in helping to keep the world free in time of international strain or emergency.

Here again we have a clean-cut policy, which is much broader than the older worker question. We believe that every person should have employment opportunities, and that the country needs the services and talents of every person, without senseless discriminations based on age, sex, race, or irrelevant physical handicaps. What we say about impediments to employment or training or advancement based on age is the exact counterpart of what we say about the same impediments encountered in some circumstances by women, or by minority groups, or by the physically handicapped. We hold, first, that they should be hired, trained, and promoted solely according to ability; and, second, that unless this course is followed the Nation will be gravely enervated at a time when the need for skills is crucial.

To recognize the duality of our motivation is to spare us the error of supposing that what we are doing is big heartedly lifting a social burden for reasons of compassion. Such an approach is both patronizing and unsound, and it certainly will not produce results.

The only promising approach is to recognize that it is good self-interested business for the employer to hire the older worker and good self-interested statesmanship for the Nation to grasp this valuable economic resource.

Having got this far, the matter is narrowed to two more questions: Are these older workers indeed willing and able to work, and are there suitable jobs available?

Willing? Clearly yes. Only about 5 percent retire voluntarily while in good health. We should be happy that this is so. It means much for our productivity. It means more personal satisfaction to the person. And it means a lightening of the social cost of pensions, which otherwise might rise by billions of dollars.

Able? Yes. Such knowledge as we have gained from the fragmentary studies that are available teaches us that arbitrary age barriers are no longer justified by experience or by physiological fact.

Are there suitable jobs at hand? Yes. We assume, of course, a healthy, vibrant, ever-growing business life in this country. And we must be alive to the fact that a change is going on in the nature of the demands made by current employment. Technological progress, including automation through use of electronic controls and the like, is doing two things at once: It is removing the features of employment, such as the requirement of muscular strength, which formerly put age at a disadvantage; and it is creating demands which put a premium upon those qualities associated with maturity—dependability, responsibility, judgment, breadth of experience.

Perhaps you saw the delightful cartoon in the last issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. It depicts a large modern plant, bearing the sign: "Engine-Block Division, Automation Plant." Finished engine blocks are pouring out the sides of the plant, breaking down the walls, and piling up into a mountainous heap outside. An agitated employee, driving up with a friend, exclaims: "Good God, I forgot to turn the factory off over the weekend."

(A mature worker would of course had the dependability to remember to turn off the plant.)

While the nature of jobs has been changing, the nature of the older worker has also been changing. He is physically a younger man than he used to be at the same age.

Perhaps you recall Victor Borge's account of an interview with his father. His father said, "How old are you, son?" "Nine." "Shame on you," said the father, "at your age I was 12."

This is precisely what has been happening from one generation to another lately. Dr. Joseph H. Sheldon, president of the International Association of Gerontology, said at a meeting in Chicago last month, "This century's medical and social advances mean that old age begins at 75 rather than 60."

A parallel change has been going on in the educational level of the people involved. Only 15 years ago, more than three-fourths of men in this country aged 55 to 64 had not gone beyond the eighth grade in school; less than one-fourth had had as much as 1 year of high school. Among the men who will form this 55-to-64 group 15 years from now, more than half have had at least 1 year of high school, and 1 to 6 have had some college. This is a development of profound importance at a time when industry is more and more demanding general educational background to meet the needs for flexibility and adaptability that go with current technological change.

All this drives us to a conclusion: The obstacles to employment of older workers are not inherent in either the nature of the work or the nature of the workers; the obstacles are man-made, and for the most part are based on obsolete misconception.

Now for our 6-point plan, which flows naturally from this analysis of the job to be done.

I. THE WORK QUALITIES OF OLDER WORKERS

The first thing we are going to do with our new appropriation is to make an analysis of the performance, productivity, absenteeism, accident record, dependability, attitudes, and faithfulness of older workers.

Businessmen are not going to hire older workers for sentimental reasons. They want to be shown that it is good business to hire the older worker. Evidently the various studies that have been made up till now have not sufficed to convince them.

Of course, we do not want to prejudge the results of this investigation. But you are all familiar, I am sure, with what some of the surveys have shown.

The University of Illinois studied over 3,000 workers over 60 in retailing, office, managerial, and manufacturing industries. Their supervisors rated them as follows:

Overall performance:	*Percent*
Excellent	14
Very good	28
Good	38
Fair	18
Poor	2

By comparison with younger workers, they were rated as follows on the various components of performance:

	Percent
Absenteeism:	
Less	66
Same	25
More	9
Dependability:	
More	51
Same	43
Less	6
Judgment:	
Better	33
Same	57
Poorer	10
Work quality:	
Better	34
Same	59
Poorer	7
Work volume:	
Higher	24
Same	56
Lower	20
Getting along with others:	
Better	32
Same	59
Less well	9

These results are generally confirmed by studies made by the National Association of Manufacturers, by the Bureau of Employment Security, by Jeanette E. Stanton in 1951 in a large midwestern department store, by the Industrial Conference Board, by the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Community Research which did a survey in Cleveland, by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in its analysis of absenteeism and injury experience in 1948, by the Federated Employment Service affiliated with the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, by the Cleveland Welfare Federation in its 1952 study of women clerical workers, and by various others.

What we are hoping is that we will be able to make a study of such scope and authority that, added to existing studies, it will carry real conviction. Of course, we cannot do a definitive nationwide job; and we are aware of the difficulties of trying to measure some of the things involved. Some are plainly intangible, like dependability, and must be a matter of opinion and judgment. Others, such as productivity, are almost impossible to segregate and measure person by person. But, by building upon the experience of others, and by mustering our best technical and analytical talent, we will try to produce a result which will go a long way toward settling the No. 1 question underlying this whole problem: Is the older worker a good worker?

II. ARE PENSION COSTS AN OBSTACLE?

When employers are polled on why they hesitate to hire older workers, the commonest reason is that older workers are not as good in some of the respects we have just been talking about.

Let us assume that we have got a satisfactory answer to this argument; there still remains the second and most commonly ascribed reason: The higher pension and insurance costs for older workers.

If the premium paid on each worker had to carry that worker's own pension cost, the relation between premiums under a plan would run something this:

Entry age:	*Annual premium*
30	$326
45	668
55	1,486

The real cost, then, for a 45-year-old entrant is double that of a 30-year-old, and for a 55-year-old it is 4 times as much.

Of course, I do not mean to assert that insurance companies directly assess employers at these rates on a man-for-man basis under a conventional plan; but when this much disparity in real cost exists, it would not be surprising if one way or another it had the effect of discouraging the hiring of workers in the higher age brackets.

I have listened to arguments for hours and hours on whether pension costs are a real deterrent, or whether they are a mere excuse. Question No. 1 in our investigation will be: How much of a roadblock is this really? Question No. 2 will be: If it is a roadblock, how can it be got round? Some of the things that have been mentioned include minimum service eligibility requirements, waivers of pension rights, early vesting and pooling of funds, and special fund provisions analogous to second-injury provisions in workmen's compensation.

Here, too, I hope that we will once and for all get to the bottom of a question which has plagued us for years, and which is being aggravated by the continued spread of private pension plans. It is a matter that must be disposed of; for nothing could be more paradoxically poignant than the prospect of a beneficent movement, designed to help the old, backfiring and actually hurting them by blocking their hiring opportunities.

III. COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING PROVISIONS

The next two parts of our enterprise consist of learning as much as we can from unions and employers about the success of their efforts to deal with age difficulties in employment.

First, as to unions: we are going to do two things. We will start by analyzing the provisions of about 5,000 collectively bargained contracts to see what measures have been adopted dealing with the subject of age in employment. We hope to keep this analysis up to date every year.

Then we will select a sample of companies and trade unions operating under agreements having interesting age provisions, and find out by actual visits how these provisions are working in day-to-day operations.

We know that some very direct measures have been tried. Among the best-known are the contract clauses adopted by some electrical workers, bricklayers, plasterers, plumbers, granite cutters, and carpenters in different localities, prohibiting age discrimination in various ways. For example, 1 bricklayers' contract requires that "the employer, when engaging bricklayers for work, shall employ 1 man of 55 years or over out of every 5 bricklayers hired." In electrical workers' contracts you can find ratios as high as 1 to every 3 journeymen and as low as 1 to every 8 journeymen. The age for which the ratio must be observed may be as low as 40 to 50 years, and as high as 55 or even 60 years.

There are many other kinds of clauses affecting the age question; these are merely the most straightforward. They are of particular interest because every so often someone comes forward with a suggestion for legislation which would apply this ratio principle to all employment by force of law. This may seem like a highly remote possibility; but if the problem continues to grow in acuteness, you may expect to hear it mentioned with increasing frequency, and the lessons learned from these contractual provisions will assume a central importance in the discussion.

IV. EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS AND PRACTICES

Here we intend to look systematically into the experience of employers in a representative sample of cities and industries. This will give us the facts, which we shall probably publish, on what management really thinks and does about the hiring, retention, and laying off of older workers, and the real reasons for these practices. But, most important of all, we shall be able to compile a casebook of good hiring and utilization practices. Many employers have expended a lot of thought and ingenuity on the older worker question, and have devised a variety of successful answers. If these tried and tested plans can be brought to the attention of employers everywhere, it is quite possible that among the assorted plans there can be found one to match the needs of most of the employers who are still searching for the right solution for their particular combination of facts. We mean to go into hiring practices, training practices, job modification practices, transfer practices, reserved job practices, and so on. The materials will be distributed to employers, unions, trade associations, employment security agencies, and anyone else who can use them either directly or for general employer education.

V. INDIVIDUALIZED PLACEMENT SERVICES FOR OLDER WORKERS

This involves a stepping-up of the pace of an activity already underway.

We learned, in a study of 3,688 job applicants over 45 in New York City, that special placement services could more than double the number of workers placed in jobs. There was a control group who received conventional treatment, and an experimental group who had individual counseling and more intensive job solicitation. We have since been working constantly on improving this kind of tailor-made service, and lately have been analyzing data received from employment service offices on the characteristics of older job applicants and the services provided to

them. We also have a particularly detailed pilot study in progress in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, following the entire hiring problem of older workers in relation to the employment service in all its stages.

For the future, we hope to improve and extend individualized placement services through the facilities of affiliated State employment services. To aid in this process, we would like to work up a job guide for older workers, addressed to older workers themselves, as well as counselors, placement interviewers, and industrial personnel workers. It would point up the occupations, industries, and kinds of work in which opportunities are most promising for older workers. It would go into advantages and disadvantages of the work, the training or retraining possibilities, and the prospects for using skills and abilities acquired in one field of work in other fields.

A much-needed guide, which we hope to provide, is an analysis of which jobs requiring less physical exertion are the most logical successors to earlier skills which were attended by heavy exertion. For example, when a telephone lineman is too old to scamper up and down poles, it would be very handy to have a guide to show the other occupations into which his skills can lead him with perhaps a little retraining, and with a minimum of downgrading.

At the same time, our Occupational Outlook handbook can be revised to give more special attention to guidance information for older people.

VI. MATURE WOMEN: MATCHING SKILLS AND SHORTAGES

To me, one of the most exciting and promising lines of endeavor is the set of projects, now getting underway, to tap the vast resources of mature women to meet some of the most pressing job shortages facing us today.

We have heard for years that there is a grave shortage of nurses in this country, and an equally acute shortage of teachers. Less well known is the fact that severe local shortages of secretarial service are appearing in different parts of the country, including Washington, D. C.

At the same time, I think each one of us could probably find among our immediate relatives and friends at least several women who were trained as professional nurses or teachers or secretaries, who got married, had a family, and lost touch with the labor market, and who now would like nothing more than to get back into the game again. I am not now talking about tearing married women away from their children at a time when they are needed at home. I am thinkthink of women whose children have grown to the point where the mother's constant presence at home is no longer necessary.

If you know such people—and I am sure you do—I think you will agree that most of them would give a lot to resume the status and prestige and personal satisfaction that go with doing a job well. At the same time, think what a splendid solution this offers for some of our most pressing needs. Far from being at a disadvantage, I should think it obvious that the woman who has raised a family has a great advantage—in knowledge of children, in acquaintanceship with human suffering, in the love for and understanding of fellow beings which a full life brings, and in the wisdom and judgment which come only with maturity.

The matching up of this demand and this supply is so brilliantly obvious that one wonders why it was not done long ago. At any rate, the Department of Labor's Women's Bureau is now vigorously at work in bringing this to reality. With the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Committee of New Teachers for the Nation's Classrooms has been formed, representing an impressive roster of educational and other associations. The emphasis is on community responsibility. Some communities are already in action. For example, in the Metropolitan Detroit area, Wayne University in consultation with school superintendents and the Michigan State Department of Public Instruction is offering a training course to college women 21 to 50 years of age as part of the regular curriculum. Candidates with a bachelor's degree can obtain the 20 credits, including practice teaching, needed to qualify them for a 5-year certificate to teach in elementary schools. Similar projects are also going in southern California and in Ohio, consisting of a year's supervised teaching, between semesters or summer sessions of professional training.

Even when a woman has had complete professional training, it may be desirable to have a refresher or retraining course after some years of absence from the profession in a world where everything is rapidly changing. For example, New York City offers a refresher course for registered professional nurses. Between June 1952 and September 1953 a total of 202 women participated in the 9 courses that were held. Of these, only 13 were under 35 years of age. Most were in their forties or fifties, with ages ranging up to the seventies. Over two-thirds of the graduates were placed in city hospitals. Most of the rest probably could have been placed, but were unable to return to nursing for personal reasons.

I have mentioned only a few occupations and examples to show what can be done. Within the next few weeks, there will appear a new bulletin of the Department of Labor's Women's Bureau entitled "Training Mature Women for Employment." It is an account of 23 training programs successfully carried on in different cities and in occupations as diverse as commercial sewing, institutional housekeeping, cosmetology, practical nursing, and electronics work. These projects clearly show that this kind of effort can succeed if the community wants to make it succeed and utilizes the facilities and experience that are available through the Women's Bureau and other organizations mentioned in the booklet.

These, then, are the six fronts on which we propose to advance during the coming year.

I have talked mostly about the Department of Labor's plans. But it goes without saying that this is only a fraction of the nationwide effort, public and private, that is being poured into the solution of this challenging difficulty. Other arms of the Federal Government are stepping up their activities. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will also receive an augmented appropriation for work in the field of the aging. We have assembled an interdepartmental task force; we are taking systematic inventory of what all the departments and agencies can do; and we are making plans that cut across the various departmental lines. State agencies are also redoubling their efforts. Private employers, unions, trade and professional associations, church groups, colleges and universities, social workers, consultant firms, and dedicated individuals are everywhere addressing themselves with renewed vigor to a problem which grows more disquieting daily.

I have outlined the specific directions which our exertions will take in the immediate future largely because I hope that those represented here before me in this powerful array of expertise will help us in these efforts with their advice, counsel, and encouragement. For our part, on behalf of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and the entire Department of Labor, I pledge to each of you all our support and all our resources in our mutual journey toward that day when our country gives full and free employment opportunity to all on the basis of ability alone, and is rewarded by finding it has tapped its richest vein of talent, skill, experience, and devotion.

Berea College Centennial Award to Hon. Earl C. Clements, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on July 1, 1955, Berea College, one of the outstanding educational institutions of Kentucky, conferred upon my colleague [Mr. CLEMENTS] the Berea College centennial award. On that occasion, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] delivered an outstanding address, and my colleague from Kentucky made some striking remarks in accepting the award. I ask unanimous consent that both these addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS, AT BEREA COLLEGE, BEREA, KY., JULY 1, 1955

I feel distinctly honored at being included in the ceremonies here at Berea tonight in honor both of the college and of my good friend, Senator CLEMENTS.

This is my first trip here. But like most Americans I have long known of Berea and have always admired you. You have done remarkable work in the span of a century. This institution with its buildings and grounds, in comparison with the one room schoolroom of 1855, is tangible proof of that. But far more compelling are the tens of thousands of your graduates and former students. They have lived far better and more interesting lives because they studied and worked here. They have been better farmers, artisans, professional folk, better husbands and wives, better father and mothers, better citizens and more truly religious men and women. Through them the good seed of Berea has taken root in innumerable communities and has reproduced itself a thousandfold.

What, we may ask, has been the secret? Why has the experiment been such a success? For if we once know this, not only can the good work continue here even more successfully, but the same principles can be applied elsewhere where the conditions are substantially similar.

I suggest that in the first place, Berea, through its faculty and supporters, has always had a deep concern for people and for its students. This college has, in the best sense of the word, had a religious concern. Students have felt a warm care and affection here which has made the world seem more friendly and which has helped to draw out their best. True religion has entered their lives more fully and has stayed with them.

Secondly, the subjects in the course of study have been well and thoroughly taught. Intellectual slovenliness has not been tolerated. Study has been respectable and insisted upon. The teaching staff has been, and is, competent. Men and women who have graduated from Berea have received a good education. The training in science has been close to the top.

In the third place, Berea has successfully combined learning and labor. European education in the past has been for the leisured class and for the professions. Students were not expected to earn or help earn their living, and their training was either for the professions or for general culture. This practice has been largely copied in this

country by colleges of liberal arts. I do not criticize this theory, but I think it is important to realize that it is not the only proper type of education. Such an education would have been ill-adapted to the Appalachian region which Berea has wisely chosen to serve. Berea has seen that education is not merely a preparation for life, but is primarily life itself. It has therefore organized the business of living so that students are largely self-supporting. Farm and forest, hotel and hospital, weaving, painting, and woodwork, as well as the housekeeping jobs needed to keep a community of 2,000 running, give young men and women a chance to work. This helps to pay their bills so that they earn their education. In working they learn the skills which women need for homemaking and men for farming, and many of the crafts. Work is democratized so that all share in the brotherhood of toil. At the same time there is ample leisure for study and for the spontaneous activities which bubble up out of social life. These are great achievements, and we salute Berea for them.

There is a further point. The founders of Berea took their Christianity seriously and believed that, as the seal of the college states, "God hath made of one blood all the nations of men." They took the Declaration of Independence seriously with its statement that all men were endowed by their creator with "certain unalienable rights" and that "among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

And so very quietly, but with conviction, they admitted Negro as well as white students and thereby tried to build better race relations. But half a century ago, the rising tide of intolerance caused the Kentucky Legislature in 1904 to pass the Day Act, prescribing segregation in both the private and public schools of the State. Berea contested the constitutionality of the statue under the equal protection of the law provisions of the 14th amendment, and carried the case to the Supreme Court. It is regrettable that the Supreme Court stood by its earlier decision of 1895 and upheld the constitutionality of the Day law. And in passing it is worthy of note that the one dissent to both decisions came from a sturdy Kentuckian, Justice John Marshall Harlan, who reminded his colleagues that the Constitution was colorblind.

Berea obeyed the law. It had to wait a long time before it was vindicated, but finally last year, a half century after the Day law, the Supreme Court reversed itself and by a unanimous opinion held that compulsory separate education is not really equal education since it tends to give an added inferiority complex to the children and members of the race with an inferior social position and thus handicaps them in the struggle of life.

After 50 years Berea was vindicated. All honor to the brave and noble men and women who stood for these principles when they were unpopular and who endured persecution for their devotion. All honor to this college for the way it has pioneered in human brotherhood.

And now may I say that Berea College honors itself tonight in honoring my friend, Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS. You in Kentucky know and love him. So do we in the Senate. Like Earl Warren and ALBEN BARKLEY, he is a man who has steadily grown in politics. Honest and efficient county official for two decades, competent State legislator, a good Congressman, a fine governor, and a splendid Senator, Senator CLEMENTS has risen to every new set of tasks and has carried them out, not only with ability, but also with great sympathy and human understanding.

Senator CLEMENTS is now the number two man on our side of the aisle in the Senate, and I can testify that his influence is greatly for the good. He works hard, he has a real sympathy for the underdog, he knows how to get things done, his feet are on the ground, but are never stationary. He is in fact like Berea. Rooted in reality, he is a practical idealist.

It is significant that Senator CLEMENTS as governor expanded educational opportunities for Negroes and promoted integration in the training of nurses and in some of the State's higher institutions of learning. It is reassuring that his long-time friend and associate, the present Governor of Kentucky, manfully announced after the Supreme Court decision that Kentucky would obey the law.

There is a final point upon which I should like to close. Kentucky is a border State. It was this very fact which made the war from 1861 to 1865 so bitter since it divided relatives, friends and sections against each other. The struggle between North and South tore Kentucky apart. But with time has come healing and understanding. Kentucky as a border State can do much good in helping both sections to work out a common program. She is already doing much and this is one of the great contributions of EARLE CLEMENTS and our beloved ALBEN BARKLEY. It is also one of the contributions of Berea.

Without sacrifice of principle and really in extension of the century tested practical idealism of its founders and participants, the second century of Berea should be even more successful than its first.

ADDRESS BY HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS, OF KENTUCKY, BEREA COLLEGE, BEREA, KY., JULY 1, 1955, ACCEPTING THE BEREA COLLEGE CENTENNIAL AWARD

I accept this centennial award as a symbol, not of my achievements, but of those whose work, whose prayers, whose ideals, whose citizenship, whose learning and whose courage made it possible for Berea to celebrate this 100th birthday.

There are times in every man's life when he sees—exactly at the moment something really fine happens to him—the three dimensions of his own life.

At such times, and they are rare, he sees with an awesome, sudden clarity himself as a yonng man working to build a productive life. And he thinks that he could have worked harder and better.

Then he sees himself in the present and he looks upon what he sees with the detached, objective eyes of a stranger. And he knows he doesn't deserve the honor of the moment.

And then, having glimpsed the past and the present, the third dimension of his life comes in focus and for an instant he watches himself in the future, a man grown old, a man whose only real riches are his memories.

This is such a time for me. Even as I accept the centennial award from Berea College, I am aware that in those days to come, when I am counting memories and not making plans, I shall withdraw, over and over again, this day and this moment from my storehouse of memories.

In the last century many ideas, many purposes, yes, many ideals, were born. And many died. But the ideals of Reverend Fee, founder of Berea, live on, tested by time and found imperishable.

I believe that the tragedy of this age is that there are so many goals in life to which so many men are blind.

There are all too few men and all two few institutions that teach us the goals of life that should challenge and inspire man. But your president, Mr. Francis S. Hutchins, as his illustrious father before him, is such a man. And your Berea College is such an institution.

Today we often hear of maladjusted youth. I believe that one reason for such maladjustment is that youth's capacities for good, its abilities to produce, to contribute, are not fully utilized. Youth demands tall goals and high personal challenges. Youth wants, most of all, for us to believe in its ability to meet those challenges.

Berea provides youth with proper challenges and believes in the ability of its students to meet them.

I have known many of your graduates. As Governor, I was privileged to have in the office a young lady from your school, and from your town, Bobby Coyle Crosswhite. In my office in Washington, the first person one sees is a Berea student from Beattyville, Rosemary Porter Rorick, who, likewise, proves the value of Berea training. Because of my association with these and other students from Berea, I hold these views of this great institution.

This institution, this Berea of ours, is, I believe, an outstanding example of the equality of opportunity that was in the minds of our Founding Fathers. Here men's minds, not their money, are made welcome. Here man's ability to do good work is welcome, not his talent to get someone else to do it.

In a few minutes we will see the production Wilderness Road, and I look forward to it, because at the time you were holding your baccalaureate services, Sunday, June 5, I "commenced" a journey to the Far East. In southeast Asia and in the western Pacific, I found another kind of wilderness road.

Not the kind we know, a wilderness of forests. No; the wilderness road I saw, stretching from Korea to Japan, to Formosa, to the Philippines, to that little island called Quemoy, to Indochina, to Thailand. This wilderness road was overgrown not with the vines of nature but with the problems of man.

It is a wilderness because peace is a stranger to it; it is a wilderness because hope is a rare and priceless thing; it is a wilderness because mankind has yet to learn by heart the motto of Berea: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men."

But I believe today and standing here, that just as your ideals and the purpose of this institution, to promote the cause of Christ and to contribute to the spiritual and material welfare of the mountain region of the South, conquered the wilderness, that one day man will conquer in the Far East and elsewhere the wilderness of his mind and discover and maintain peace.

You conquered your wilderness with ideals, with prayers, with work. Men can conquer his wilderness with the same three. I have faith he will.

The Proposed Memorial to Senator Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Oregon Daily Statesman of July 8, 1955. Its author is one of our State's noted editors, Charles Arthur Sprague, ex-Governor of Oregon and a former American delegate to the United Nations. He was governor from 1939 until 1943. Governor Sprague, a lifelong Republican, also has served on the board of many Presidential panels arbitrating labor disputes. Governor Sprague discusses the entire question of monuments, statues and memorials in the Nation's Capital.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

An association dedicated to perpetuate the memory of the late Senator Robert A. Taft has proposed the erection of a memorial on Capitol Hill near the Senate Office Building. It is to be a rectangular marble tower with a carillon of 25 bells housed at the top, to chime at regular intervals through the day.

The design is, indeed, very impressive; and will commemorate one of the great Americans of our time. I can't help wondering, however, if the friends of the late Senator are not overdoing it. It is not to depreciate the merits of Mr. Taft to question whether the proposed memorial is not on the extravagant side. His contemporaries remember Taft as a stalwart statesman, well grounded in political principles, forthright in his utterance, with courage to stand up against the popular tide on many of the great issues of his time. But in the scales of history, how will Taft be weighed? He failed of his great objective of winning the Presidency, though he never seemed a victim of his ambition. The principal act of legislation with which his name is connected, the Taft-Hartley bill, did not break new ground but sought to bring better balance in labor relations than the Wagner Act provided. He erred in his judgment on foreign affairs. His fame rests largely on his leadership of conservative Republicans, who opposed the New Deal on principle. He became "Mr. Republican" in person—but his party refused three times to make him its standard bearer.

There is danger that the admiration a generation may have for one of its leaders may not be sustained with the passing of time. Cities are full of memorials honoring those whose names are almost forgotten. I think I can illustrate my point by referring to the memorial honoring Oscar S. Straus which stands in the plaza on 14th Street NW., Washington. It is quite elaborate, with a fountain in the center and on each side of the paved circle around the fountain is a large bronze figure, reclining. I am old enough to recall who Oscar Straus was; but I wonder how many do who are under 30 years old. And how large a place will his name have in the history books a century hence? He was, indeed, a very distinguished American citizen, a diplomat, Secretary of Commerce and Labor in the Theodore Roosevelt administration, and author. He was a member of the Straus family which has been prominent in the field of business and public affairs, whose contributions to philanthropy and public service have been notable. The Oscar Straus memorial in Washngton was an expression of the warm affection in which he was held. Yet, as I looked over the memorial recently I felt that it had been overdone. And it is not quite 30 years since Oscar Straus died.

I am inclined to believe that the Taft memorial, if it is built, will stand as a monument to a lost cause. For its leading donors, it will express their respect for Bob Taft, and their deep and lasting regret that he did not win the Presidency. It will stand as a monument, also, to the defeats of the party conservatives who hated the New Deal, distrusted Franklin D. Roosevelt, made the balancing of the budget their shibboleth. Bob Taft was the chief spokesman in the Senate for the old American tradition with its emphasis on individual initiative, self-reliance, economic freedom, a sturdy opponent of the conception of government as the intimate regulator of private activity and the guarantor of personal security. It was a great and valiant tradition; and we are not too sure that its loss is for the permanent gain of the American people.

If the New Deal's breach with what were considered sound principles of public finance leads to an ultimate debacle, and if the doctrine that the Government must provide cradle-to-grave security leads to the breakdown of personal responsibility and paralyzes incentive which has been the dynamic of our economic system, then Bob Taft may be hailed as the "noblest Roman of them all," to be compared with the senators of ancient Rome who resisted the Caesarism that transformed republic to empire.

But if, as seems now more probable, the United States is able to make its political and social readjustments successfully, resisting the extremes of the welfare state, preserving the essence of the competitive capitalist system, and maintaining fiscal solvency, then Taft will be remembered as a lesser figure who fought change valiantly but unsuccessfully, and his imposing memorial will stand as a monument to one who misread the signs and portents of the time in which he lived and served.

Delinquency Can Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers:

THEY PROVE TEEN CRIME CAN BE CURBED—POLICE FRIENDSHIP PLAN ENDED REIGN OF TERROR

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

One oasis in the national sand trap of juvenile terrorism and violence is Pomona, Calif., where 3 years ago warring teen-agers almost burned down the town.

That was in the winter of 1951–52—a period as tense as any community has experienced.

Today, Pomona is a quiet city with no crime waves, no juvenile uprisings. To the city's reformed youths, a policeman now is a friend—not a bogeyman.

Credit for this change goes to a police-backed program of planned activities for young people and energetic participation of its citizens.

The method was not so unique, but it was so well applied that Pomona can be set up as an example for the entire country.

Let us look at Pomona before the reformation.

Pachuco-type gangs and other juvenile desperadoes were on the rampage, fighting one another with every weapon they could muster—from knives and guns to broken bottles and beer can openers.

When not in combat, the terrorists would wreck cars with axes or fire .22-caliber rifles at a rival gang's hot rod.

At Halloween the scrouge became unbearable as they blasted and burned palm trees on quiet, residential streets and opened so many fire hydrants that the Fire Department was virtually immobilized.

Even in New York—where a teen-ager will kill senselessly—there had never been aggression so defiant and open as Pomona's young hoodlums had dared stage.

The big crisis came in February 1952, when police were tipped that rival gangs were preparing for a "rumble." But that would have been a mild word (war would have been more like it) if the gangs had not been stopped. The arsenal of one gang included:

Nineteen shotguns, 12 small-caliber rifles, 60 sticks of dynamite, three hand grenades, and a keg of black powder.

And what was the trouble all about?

FROM THE OTHER SIDE OF THE TRACKS

A rivalry built up by wide and obvious ancestral differences, between Mexican-American youths and non-Mexican boys from "the other side of the tracks."

Police got word that the showdown was to be at a dance the Mexican-American group was to stage. The non-Mexican group was to raid the premises. That was when Police Lt. Everett Holladay, now captain, made a bold move.

He invited the leaders of both gangs to attend a "truce conference." They did, reluctantly.

Chief Ralph E. Parker, 34, who heads Pomona's force of 57 officers, "moderated" the meeting, a historic one for the city. Parker had to be a supersalesman. He had to make the leaders realize neither gang had reason to fight the other.

"Anybody can fight dirty," he told them, "but it takes skill and ability to fight clean. For that, you've got to be somebody."

There was the psychological clue to all the trouble: "You've got to be somebody."

Deprive a youth from his place in the sun, or even in his community, and he will shun worthwhile activities for those that get him in trouble.

Directions and goals were needed to bring peace to the rival gangs. And Chief Parker supplied them.

He started by making the rival gang leaders shake hands, then attended the dance together. Next, he offered the clubrooms of the Pomona Police Officers Association for meetings of the two gangs. A while later, the word "gang" was replaced by "club."

BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUBS ALSO STARTED

Then a real chance for recognition and acceptance in worthwhile channels was advanced. The police association sponsored a junior baseball club for boys 14 to 17. Not long after, the Pomona Board of Education granted permission to the club to use a future school site in the neighborhood as a ballfield. The youths themselves leveled and cleared it, making a first-class sandlot diamond.

The team, which now wears the insignia of the Police Officers Association, came up a championship ball club last year.

Other teams for youths in various age groups from 7 to 14 were eventually organized. The community spirit began to take hold and boys who once fought it out with knives were now devoting their energies to baseball and softball.

Meanwhile, boys' and girls' clubs were started. Young people overflowed with energy and enthusiasm as they got a sense of "belonging" in their community.

Much of the credit for Pomona's success goes to Chief Parker and his enthusiastic young police force—they average just 33½ years—who give much of their own time to the community's youth.

But for all the effort of Chief Parker and his police force, the program could never have been successful without cooperation of school authorities, civic groups, other city departments, community leaders, businessmen, and churches.

Parker acknowledges this. Yet he always reminds—

"The credit belongs to the youths themselves. They respond to a program if one is provided."

However, this is only one phase of Pomona's success story. There are two others—the hotrod problem and narcotics. Pomona had its hands full with young lawbreakers who thrilled in making the city's streets dangerous raceways, and teen-agers who

brought marihuana parties at motel rooms in vogue.

"IF YOU CAN'T LICK 'EM, JOIN 'EM"

After trying various ways to stop the hot rodders, Chief Parker and his staff elected to take the same positive approach that was working with other juvenile problems. As with gangs, an old formula was applied—"If you can't lick 'em, join 'em."

Pomona and its police department showed the way for the rest of the Nation.

Police officer E. J. "Budd" Coons, who knew cars and understood racing, was assigned to get in touch with a loosely organized club of hot rodders known as the "Choppers."

It was apparent from the start that young drivers of "souped-up" autos were not delinquents—merely teenagers who had to have their enthusiasm channeled in safe, constructive ways.

"Their sport needed a modern, age-of-speed treatment, rather than a horse-and-buggy philosophy of suppression," said Chief Parker.

Coons first gained the drivers' confidence, then sold them on the importance of "safety first." This meant exacting observances of Pomona's traffic regulations.

"CHOPPERS" MEET IN POLICE CLUBROOMS

At the same time, he arranged to have the "Choppers" meet weekly in the police officers' private clubrooms. A lively schedule of activities was worked out, including hot rod tours.

The next big project was to find a permanent "drag" strip for safe hot rod racing. After much searching and considerable red tape—including a change in a county ordinance—supervised "drag" races started on an abandoned runway of old Fontana airfield.

Lloyds of London showed confidence by issuing a liability insurance policy, and that confidence has been justified. Statistics show that since 1950 in California accidents involving drivers under 20 increased about 10 percent, while in the same period in Pomona figures for the same group went down nine percent.

Today the Choppers have become the Pomona Valley Timing Association. Hot rod racing has become a respectable sport. And Budd Coons has taken a job as executive manager of the National Hot Rod Association.

Every Sunday "boys" from 16 to 60 enter races—with motorcycles as well as cars. Fans thrill watching speeders zoom from standing starts to speeds well over 100 miles per hour. One "dragster," a 425-horsepower job that won the State championship at Madera, Calif., last year did 141.73 miles per hour—using only high gear because it had lost second gear in a previous race.

The narcotics problem was solved this way:

A 23-year-old ex-convict was seized as Pomona's chief narcotics supplier. His defense:

"I was really trying to discourage the youths from taking dope and was selling them only bird seed, dried parsley, and pepper-tree leaves instead of marihuana."

But was he surprised. Pomona's police chose to be the first to test a new law that makes it equally illegal to provide minors with anything supposed to be a drug as it is to supply the real stuff. The suspect was convicted and sentenced to 10 years in prison.

That stopped the flow of narcotics of Pomona's teen-agers. Today, you "can't buy a stick in Pomona to save your soul."

Police have solved the juvenile delinquency problem so effectively that other law-enforcement agencies hire its members to start similar programs. Amazingly, the department has done its job with an average of 1.36 officers per 1,000 population, as compared with a national average of 1.6, or New York City's 2.5.

A WORD OF WARNING FOR OTHER CITIES

But here's a word of warning from Chief Parker for other communities which may want to follow Pomona's successful program:

"Don't lavish a lot of attention on the teen-agers. They've got to show the desire, and if you go into it hook, line, and sinker, they'd think you were trying to run it."

What it boils down to in Pomona is that youths are made to feel they are wanted and recognized. And that's what makes them a positive force—a force for good.

American Cultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in this morning's Washington Post a fine writeup by drama editor, Richard L. Coe, regarding the need for continuity and adequate funds in America's cultural program.

I earnestly hope that the Senate-House conference committee, which will shortly meet to consider the funds under the supplemental appropriation bill for next year's cultural program, will abide by the Senate's decision and provide the full budget request for theatrical, ballet, musical, art, and other performances abroad, and that thereafter this program will be placed on a regular, nonemergency basis.

I send to the desk the text of Mr. Coe's article, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE ON THE AISLE—CULTURE TRAIL NEEDS TRAFFIC

(By Richard L. Coe)

With President Eisenhower—as was President Truman—in firm favor of encouraging tours of our performing artists abroad, the focus falls on the vital need for continuity.

Salute to France, which was the overall name for America's contribution to the second international theater festival in Paris, is now represented by some gallant top-flight figures in the National's The Skin of Our Teeth. These artists might have been having a far less demanding summer than they are, staking their professional reputations on a venture which has had no Government subsidy. Aware that American culture is a comparatively unknown commodity in the world, they are striking out on a trail that's long needed travelers.

Currently, with the backing of the State Department's modest fund for such matters, Porgy and Bess is revealing to South Americans, for the first time, that Italy, France, and Spain, so long South America's cultural inspiration, are not alone in these matters. Last week's O Estado de Soa Paulo called the Gershwin musical "the richest and most ingenious entertainment one could desire * * * a truly exceptional example of progress in the North American theater."

Having seen Porgy and Bess on two continents during the past 3 years, I would venture to say that its unqualified success stems from its continuity. Coproducer-Director Robert Breen has nursed it along constantly, forming an ensemble that does not depend on star names. Thanks to the International Exchange Program's astute backing, Porgy and Bess, produced with private funds (Blevins Davis), has been doing a job which has jammed State Department files with approving reports from a dozen countries.

There have been other tours, other artists, notably the Symphony of the Air's success in the Far East, a difficult area to satisfy in these matters.

But the point is, a start has been made and as "Skin's" producer, Robert Whitehead, was saying the other day, it is vital to continue. "We'd sure look awfully uncertain of ourselves if we stopped now." While it looks as though the East Germans and the Pieping Opera copped the major notices of the Paris festival, Helen Hayes was observing yesterday that so far as general popularity, crowded audience were concerned, The Skin of Our Teeth took the lead.

JOINT CONFERENCE SOON

At the moment, next year's appropriation for this supplementary State Department fund of $2½ million is scheduled for a joint Senate-House conference committee. The Senate's appropriation committee has suggested that instead of being put into the present "emergency" category as has been the case this year and last, it be made part of the regular budget.

This could be a strong step forward, for only through the assurance of continuity can one expect the theater's leaders to take the Government's interest seriously. As ANTAs Robert Dowling, Virginia Inness-Brown, and Robert Schnitzer have all stated: "Performing artists are people, not pictures or statuary which can be moved about as one wishes. Only by planning confidently over a period of time can we do the job the way it should be done."

How it's done is the best way Overseer Dowling has been able to devise. To assure that only worthwhile projects are recommended for Government aid (which consists only of transportation and guarantee against losses in countries where admission fees and salaries are lower than our own), panels on drama, music, and dance make suggestions. These are then implemented by General Manager Schnitzer for the International Exchange Program.

CHOICES NOT EASY

Even the choice of plays and artists is more difficult than one might think. The drama panel, composed of the theater's professional workers and critics, had some ideas which could not be implemented. When finally The Skin of Our Teeth, Oklahoma, and Medea were decided on for the Paris entries and first-rank artists assured, it was felt that here was fine representation of the American theater. Oklahoma was the best of our highly indigenous musical stage. Medea was chosen to reflect our interest in the classics. Mr. Wilder's play, less well-known abroad than his widely popular Our Town, seemed a natural to represent one of our greatest living playwrights.

Perhaps better choices will be made in the future. At any event, the panels can only continue to try and the artists to contribute what is asked.

For these reasons, one hopes that the Senate-House conference on the appropriation will be considering the vital factor of continuity. A tradition is aborning of which our Government, our people, and our theater may take pride and glory.

Free General Elections Seem Unlikely in Divided Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on yesterday, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] made a very interesting and informative speech regarding the Far Eastern situation. In the course of his remarks, we had some exchange of thoughts regarding elections in Vietnam.

Under the byline of John Roderick, and with a dateline of Saigon, South Vietnam, July 24, there was published an Associated Press article under the headline, "Free General Elections Seem Unlikely in Divided Vietnam." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE GENERAL ELECTIONS SEEM UNLIKELY IN DIVIDED VIETNAM

(By John Roderick)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 24.—A Canadian member of the Armistice Control Commission estimated some time ago it would take at least five divisions of neutral troops to guarantee a free election in Vietnam.

That many soldiers, he said, would be required to police the polling places alone.

General elections to reunite the two halves of Vietnam are prescribed by the Geneva Armistice Agreement. But on July 16 the South's Premier Ngo Dinh Diem declared that as long as the North is dominated by communism and resorts to terrorism and totalitarian methods he will not even talk with them about elections.

At Geneva the United States, Britain, and France agreed to advise Diem to change his mind and arrange the talks promptly.

The Communist Viet Minh Foreign Minister, Pham Van Dong, dispatched a message to Diem last Wednesday inviting him to name the date and select a city on Vietnamese territory for an election conference. Diem has not yet received the note, but his answer, if he makes one, will be "No."

Thus, a year after nine nations meeting at Geneva ended the Indochina war the uneasy peace again is menaced.

"The South can do as she pleases," said another Canadian. "She did not sign the accords. But is she prepared to face up to the consequences? The Viet Minh may decide to settle the question by war."

There is a single ray of hope which some optimists here are nourishing. Diem said he did not oppose the election principle as long as there were guaranties it would be free. Later official declarations have indicated, too, that his government wants the United Nations, and not the Indian-Polish-Canadian Armistice Commission, to supervise the voting.

Can these two conditions be fulfilled? Many observers here doubt it.

This writer spent a year in Palestine as a witness to the divisive hatred between the Arabs and the Jews. There is a growing parallel here in the bitterness of thousands who fled the northern half of the country. It erupted senselessly last Wednesday—anniversary of the armistice accords which cut the nation in two—with the sack of two Saigon hotels.

The French assert that there would be a considerable vote against the Viet Minh in the north should the elections be really free. In the south, which still does not know the peacetime aspect of communism, Ho Chi-minh probably would get a surprisingly large following.

The country's population is not known exactly. It is said, but without real proof, that there are at least a million more persons in the Red-held north than the south.

Another factor which has to be reckoned with is the growing influence and popularity of Diem, who has seized the nationalist standard at a moment when Ho Chi-minh for broader international reasons has let it drop.

While Diem attacks colonialism and communism, Ho is reduced to the anomalous position of defending the former French enemy and praising the virtues of the Chinese, Vietnam's long-time foe.

Delinquency Can Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers:

IT CAN BE DONE—HOW 12 CITIES CURE TEEN CRIME

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

Juvenile delinquency, no matter how far spread or how bad, can be brought under control.

While statistics show juvenile crime is an engulfing disease that now afflicts more than 1 million American youths, there actually are cities and towns in the United States where teen-age criminals and terrorists have been forced to retreat.

The hopeful portrait of American cities and towns winning the fight against teen-age crime is small. Nevertheless, it indicates that this widespread problem can be solved.

Methods, however, vary from one city or town to the other, thus exposing the fallacious notion that there is one standard solution to juvenile delinquency.

In the belief that other communities may want to know what methods were used in this counterattack, the Hearst newspapers have conducted an exhaustive study in a dozen communities where the battle for law and order is being won.

Here is a quick summary of some of the achievements:

Pomona, Calif.: Gang wars, vandalism, reckless driving, and other crimes of violence and terrorism practically have been eliminated in just 3 short years. Today Pomona is a peaceful community, where youths no longer spoil for trouble.

Paterson, N. J.: Third largest city in the State with a population of 150,000—and heavily industrialized—Paterson does not have a single organized teen-age gang; not a single youth has been arrested for narcotics in 5 years. Paterson keeps its youth in line despite the fact that the city is only a few minutes commuting time from New York City, where these crimes run almost unchecked.

Boone, Iowa: In this town of 12,164 there is only a 13-man police force. There is no hue and cry here over the juvenile delinquency problem. Community action has done much to keep kids out of trouble. Last year, police averaged only 6 arrests of juveniles a month, and in 3 years only 6 were taken to court.

Seattle, Wash.: During 1954, the city's youth population increased 10 percent with annexation of new territory. But juvenile delinquency decreased considerably. The city has no marauding teen gangs and no disturbances in schools. While Seattle is a seaport to the Orient, there is no narcotics problem.

At first glance, it might seem impractical to consider adopting methods which worked in a small Midwest town or in a restricted area of Pittsburgh to a city the size of New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles. But this is not necessarily so.

While the problem in New York is citywide, it must be attacked on a precinct basis just as it must in Chicago or Los Angeles. Many cities are doing it that way.

And that method, our survey shows, is winning the fight.

One thing above all else is apparent in every instance where a community has managed to solve its problem: everyone in the community has made delinquency his problem.

In fact, some of the communities went so far as to put responsibility for control of juvenile crime on the very persons who were responsible for it—the teen-agers.

The intriguing experiment of putting themselves into a position to wage the battle against juvenile crime merits immediate discussion.

A case in point is Pittsburgh, which for 16 years has had such a plan in successful operation in its Hill district, an area only a few minutes walk from the downtown business area.

Before 1939 the Hill was ruled by crime. It swarmed with racketeers, prostitutes, dope peddlers, gamblers, and criminals of every description. To some extent the problem still exists, but the Hill is a far better place today.

HILL CHILDREN HAD NO CHANCE

Children born into this environment didn't have a chance. Raised in slums and exposed to those conditions of criminal activity, they fell heir to all the vices before them. Juvenile delinquency raced out of control.

Today, as a result of putting responsibility for control of crime on the shoulders of youth, the Hill district proudly points to these happy statistics:

A 63-percent decrease in thefts from stores in the area.

An 80-percent drop in damages due to vandalism against schools and churches.

An 82-percent decline in false alarms that saves taxpayers about $30,000 a year.

By adopting a realistic crime-suppression program that operated on the community center plan, with youths at the helm, it established a city within a city, chartered according to the laws of Pennsylvania, and named Hill City Youth Municipality.

TEENAGERS RUN THEIR OWN CITY

Hill City officials rule the Hill district with a firm hand. The city's government is dedicated to the betterment of living conditions in its area and the fight against juvenile delinquency.

Mayor, councilman, alderman, judges, district attorney, police, bar association, city solicitor, clerk of courts, are all teenagers. They are friends, neighbors, and relatives of the area's juvenile delinquents.

Were it not for Hill City, some of the officials themselves would be delinquents.

Hill City's battle against delinquency is conducted in the same manner as other

cities conduct theirs, using the same tools—laws, police, courts.

If it is more effective, the difference obviously is not in the methods used. The difference is that in Hill City the fight against juvenile delinquency comes from within the group—not from above.

HOW THEY HANDLED A TYPICAL CASE

Let's see how this works with a typical case.

A Pittsburgh policeman recently walked into the government's headquarters building at 2038 Bedford Avenue, in the Hill district. He had a problem and came to take it up with Hill City officials.

His complaint: a gang of unknown juveniles was throwing stones and rolling tires down a hill onto Bigelow Boulevard, a speedway leading downtown, causing considerable damage and endangering lives of motorists.

Hill City officials listened to the policeman's complaint and set to work. Within 24 hours stones and tires stopped descending on the boulevard. Today, a month later, the incidents have not recurred.

Such quick and effective police work is the usual thing in Hill City.

After the police officer registered his complaint, this is what happened:

Bulletins went out to all schools, asking teachers to mention the incidents in classes and try to discourage such practices. "Police" squads were sent to the hill from which stones and tires were being launched, to persuade fellow teen-agers to stop.

Verbal persuasion helped in many cases, but not in all. Those youngsters who still tried to break the law were brought to court and tried. Those convicted were sentenced.

Punishment handed out by the judges ranged from fines—mostly nickels and dimes—to forced participation in Hill City activities for periods specified by the court. In many cases, offenders asked to be allowed to participate in the government after their sentences expired.

That's all there was to it.

Hill City was founded by Howard C. McKinney, who conceived the idea when he was secretary of the Center Avenue branch of the YMCA in the Hill district. He laid his plans before former safety director, George E. A. Fairley, who approved.

RECRUITED PARENTS FOR BLOCK CLUBS

McKinney was deputized a police detective, and once Hill City was rooted in the area it was made by ordinance a part of the city's Department of Public Safety. The same ordinance appointed McKinney director and superintendent of the project, a post he still holds.

Also at the head of the project is a board of directors, comprised of some of the city's most prominent civic and business leaders.

One of McKinney's first acts was to form "block" clubs." For these clubs he recruited parents of a street and got them to take an interest in their children's activities. He got them to improve their neighborhoods, paint their houses, plant gardens, and eliminate safety hazards.

Then he organized the children. The first meetings, and the first "city" elections were held in a neighborhood theater. Squads were organized, interest groups formed, and a band was started.

Although the city council had made Hill City part of its safety department, it had appropriated no funds. The organization's only public moneys came through WPA and NYA. The rest trickled in as contributions.

But McKinney struggled on. Recreation facilities were acquired—slow and painfully. Then, after a few years, Hill City moved into a building of its own. Throughout the years Hill City grew, with help by the city and county.

Officials, from mayor and district attorney down to clerk of courts, trained Hill City officials holding like positions. And Hill City spread its activities beyond crime prevention. It spurred drives for clothes for the destitute, for gardens on vacant lots and backyards.

But, above all, it strove for better citizenship on the part of fellow teen-agers.

Today, McKinney has a staff of 14 paid coworkers and 18 volunteers to supervise the project. He also has a $30,000 annual city appropriation.

The city operates like any other. Except for those appointed by the mayor, the district attorney, or the courts, officials are elected each spring to 1-year terms.

OTHER AREAS START SIMILAR PROGRAMS

Any citizen of Hill City between 7 and 18 can vote. Age limits for officeholders are the same, but the average age is usually 14 to 16. Some 2,600 youngsters vote in an election. This is about three-fifths or 60 percent of the juvenile electorate in the district—better than the national average.

Before elections, youthful citizens are lined up in parties. Campaigns are conducted fairly, although there have been many lively election "battles."

The success of the Hill City program has influenced formation of similar programs elsewhere in Pittsburgh. The Catholic Youth Council, which has been active in the fight against juvenile delinquency for many years, has begun its own parish-centered program.

Although the program is formed on the parish level—as part of a national program instituted by the National Council of Catholic Youth in Washington—it is not restricted to Catholic youth. While in operation only a year, the program already is showing tangible results.

The dream of the Catholic Youth Council is the formation of a city council or congress which will work with non-Catholic groups in battling juvenile delinquency through the exchange of ideas and methods.

From its success in Pittsburgh it might seem that other communities with pressing problems of juvenile delinquency might want to explore the idea of combating their own troublesome youth from within—rather than from above.

Perhaps it's up to "a little child to lead them."

National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that all during the hearings and conferences the ranking Member on the Republican side has been of very great help and a steadying influence. We do not differ in any way on this highway program except on the financial section. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and I have worked together on road programs for the past 10 years, and at no time have we ever differed on the need for road legislation that came before the House.

The reason why we shifted our attention from the Clay bill or the Dondero bill is the fact that the other body took such positive action against it. It is true that we should not always be influenced by the judgment or actions of the other body. But as a practical matter we had to take this action into consideration. If there is to be any chance of a highway bill this year, it certainly cannot be the Dondero bill, because if we were to go into conference with two different philosophies, there would be little possibility of an agreement. I think we have got to find some legislation close to the provisions of the bill from the other body. That was the main reasons why this bill was voted down by the Committee on Public Works.

Another reason was there would be $11,500,000,000 in interest, which would make this road program cost $11,500,000,000 more than it would cost under H. R. 7474. That is a fact. There is no way of dodging it. It would cost $11,500,000,000 more.

So we must decide here today whether we want to pay for these roads in 15 years in cash and no interest charges or whether we want to pay for them over a period of 30 years on credit with huge interest costs.

The fact is, at the end of 15 years, we will be able to say to the next generation. "Here is something that is paid for."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There seems to be some confusion on the utilities question. Is it possible for any utility to get any reimbursement unless the respective State highway commission recommends it?

Mr. FALLON. Under the basic law, the Bureau of Public Roads cannot honor anything coming from anybody except the State highway commission.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the State highway commission must recommend it before any reimbursement can be made?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the present law, if a particular utility wanted to apply for these benefits, and have the State reimburse them, is it not true that the Federal Government would participate in the relocation cost of the utility?

Mr. FALLON. At the present time, yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. So why is it necessary to have any section at all in here about that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. This even limits it. This is 2 percent and half of the cost.

Mr. FALLON. This limits it to 50 percent of the cost and 2 percent of the cost of the project.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does anybody believe that a State highway commission would not recommend that the Federal Government pay the 50 percent if the law authorized the Federal Government to do so? The State would not do it if it had to use only its own money, but is not the State highway commission likely to say, 'Sure, go head, if the Federal Government will pay it, it is fine."

Mr. FALLON. The State is allowed to do it now and the Federal Government picks up the check for 100 percent. Under this amendment it can pick up the check only for 50 percent, and only when rcommended by the highway commission.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the State recommends it, the State puts up half and the Government puts up half. It does not take it from the Federal Government.

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

The Kremlin Talks Peace But Red China Still Acts War—Let Us Not Fool Ourselves Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 27, 1955:

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

President Eisenhower has proclaimed a new American policy—to work with the Soviets or the Red Chinese or anyone if they show a sincere desire of wanting peace.

No man can quarrel with such a policy so long as the words after "if" are not overlooked.

It really isn't a new policy. It always has been a fundamental of American diplomacy. It looks new today because our enemies are playing a new tune which sounds as though they temporarily would prefer peace to war.

The new look in the Kremlin led to the Geneva Conference.

Now, the United States will sit down at Geneva again with Red China, primarily to try to spring 51 Americans still held by China but also to discuss other matters. "Other matters" include a cease-fire for Formosa and anything else the Reds want to bring up.

We would be less uneasy about this move to open talks with the Red Chinese if there were more evidence Red China really wants to work for peace. The record tends to show the contrary. For example:

American civilians and prisoners of war still in Chinese hands are being used by Peking as hostages—to try to buy advantages for the Communists.

Red China has refused to do anything about a Korean settlement although the armistice is 3 years old. She continues to violate the truce terms by continuous military buildups in North Korea.

In Indochina the Communists, with Chinese conniving, never evacuated the free areas completely, continued subversion and direct aggression, as in Laos, and even obstructed the passage of refugees from north to south.

Red China has been talking less about liberating Formosa by force, but has not abandoned the idea completely and continues to build up airfields on the cost opposite Formosa.

The Red Chinese still talk about peace. But they don't act that way.

We can appreciate the President's desire to do everything possible to free the Americans who have been languishing in Chinese jails for years. But we think our principles would be in better shape in Asia if we had insisted those illegally held men be freed as our price for discussing other matters.

The present guess is that both the Soviets and the Red Chinese want a breathing spell in the cold war, and want it pretty badly. If that guess is correct, it seems to us our bargaining position is better than we think—that it is we rather than the Soviets or Chinese who should demand and get concessions.

The Small Farmer Finds the Going Gets Tougher and Tougher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Democratic Digest there appears an article entitled "The Small Farmer Finds the Going Gets Tougher and Tougher." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SMALL FARMER FINDS THE GOING GETS TOUGHER AND TOUGHER

"In America's current high-level prosperity, there is at least one fellow out in the cold. He's the little farmer who harvests an inadequate living from a few acres, tries to give his kids a decent break with no money and poor schools, and who sees scant hope for the future."

Thus the Washington Star described the current plight of the small farmer. But the Star was not alone in noting the situation confronting farmers the country over. This was graphically depicted in a map published recently in the magazine, Business Week. These were the captions that appeared on the map:

Florida: Potato crop delayed by bad weather.

Kentucky: Tobacco business profitable, but acreage cuts will mean 20 percent less income than in 1954.

Louisiana: Tung nuts had freeze trouble in March, as last year. Income again will be low.

Texas-Oklahoma: Cotton and wheat crops hit hard by drought. This, plus a 33-percent acreage cut, will drop nationwide cotton income by at least 20 percent. Wheat farmers here will make little profit.

New Mexico: Cotton farmers here will do all right if they're big and efficient enough.

California: Cotton farming rough for small operators.

Business Week summed up the situation: "For United States agriculture, 1955 is shaping up as another year of adjustment to a moderately declining income."

Noting the same trend, U. S. News & World Report caught the significance to the entire national economy of the farmers' plight:

"Farmers still are in a recession," reported U. S. News, "while other people prosper. Their plight recalls the 1902's, when agriculture slumped long before the big depression. * * * One major industry affecting many millions of people is not sharing in the Nation's business recovery."

Last year, the farmers' share of the Nation's total income was the lowest on record. Farm purchasing power—off 11 percent from 1953—was at the lowest level since 1940.

Nor is the end of the farm slump in sight. Official Agriculture Department estimates indicate that this year farm income will fall off another 5 percent.

This gradual sinking of farm income does not affect all farmers alike. Business Week magazine describes the difference in the effect on large and small farmers—and also incisively describes Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson's attitude toward the small farmers. Said Business Week:

"The 1955 estimates, translated into the realities of farm life, mean this: Efficient operators will finish out all right—not up to 1954, but still with a good profit; for the marginal, inefficient farmers, though, the squeeze will be tighter. These may begin to see some good in Benson's idea that their best bet is to get off the land and into industrial jobs."

Top agriculture officials in the Eisenhower administration have actually expressed this philosophy in so many words. Agriculture Under Secretary True D. Morse, for example, is quoted by the United Press in April 1953, as saying "he felt it would be better if the marginal farmer got out of farming and into industry." The United Press also quoted John H. Davis, then President of the Commodity Credit Corporation as saying "that farming today can no longer be considered as a haven for those with less than average ability."

More recently, Assistant Agriculture Secretary Earl D. Butz told the National Farm and Ranch Congress: "Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else. Farming takes capital and managerial capacity."

Humanitarian considerations aside, farm leaders and economists question the wisdom of trying to promote an "off-the-farm" movement. For one thing, as Agriculture Secretary Benson himself readily admits, our population is growing rapidly, and within the next 20 years, there will probably be 25 percent more mouths to feed than there are today. For another, no one can ever tell when a sudden emergency (such as Korea) or the wiping out of an entire crop by flood or drought will consume all of the food reserves that now seem so burdensome, and leave us with a farm shortage. All of this means that we should think twice before stripping our farms of their manpower.

Moreover, economists point out, the farm-to-city exodus is already taking place at the rate of about 150,000 per year. With factory output per man-hour undergoing a rapid increase, stimulated by automation, most industrial centers have enough unemployment problems of their own without the addition of a Government-induced farm-to-city movement.

What has worried farmers about this administration is not only its apparent desire to get small farmers out of agriculture, but the way it has gone about it. Instead of giving sympathetic recognition to the special problems of smaller farmers, instead of trying to help them become more efficient or, as an alternative, trying to ease their transition to another occupation, this administration has seemed to feel that the best way of getting the small farmer out of agriculture is to squeeze him out.

Take, for example, the matter of farm credit, one of the most serious problems facing the small farmer, who lacks the favor-

able credit rating at the local bank enjoyed by the large industrial farms. In the past, the Government tried to step in and fill the gaps that private banking sources could not fill. But in 3 successive years, the Eisenhower administration has sought to cut the funds available for these small-farmer loans, and has also sought to cut the funds for administering the loan program. Moreover, it has raised interest rates to farmers—½ percent on regular Farmers Home Administration loans and, more recently, 2 percent on loans for disaster-stricken farmers.

One writer described the situation facing a farmer in a disaster area in these words:

"You're a farmer. Corn, your main cash crop, has been 'burned out' by drought. The drought has been so terrible that the Department of Agriculture declared the county in which you live to be a 'disaster area.' You need help, you need it bad and you need it fast. You go to the nearest office of the Farmers Home Administration, to borrow funds for another crop. The FHA lends you, say, $5,000. Fine—but then they tell you that you will have to pay back 5 percent interest every year, or $250 annually. 'Blood money,' you are thinking."

Or take the matter of crop insurance. Most small farmers do not have the reserve capital to withstand the destruction of even a single crop by hail or by drought. Several years ago, the Government began experimenting with a system of crop insurance, to protect such farmers against these natural hazards. But today the present Administration is gradually cutting back the crop insurance program. Nine counties have already been cut off, and there are reports that 80 more are scheduled to be.

Another administration action against the small farmer is its attempt to kill the Government's program for making loans to farmers who want to build a new farm home or make repairs to their existing home. President Eisenhower recommended allowing the law which authorizes this program to expire in 1954. Congress disagreed with the President, and extended the program for another year. It might as well have let the program die, however, since the President failed to ask for any funds for the farm housing program in his new budget.

Out of every dollar the housewife spends for food, the farmer today receives only 42 cents—instead of the 46 cents he was receiving in the fall of 1952. This is the lowest the farmer's share has been since 1941. Meanwhlie profits of many food processors have been on the rise. For example, in 1954, dairy farmers received 21 percent less than in 1952. In the same period, the profits of one of the giant companies in dairy processing rose by 35 percent. Yet despite President Eisenhower's repeated campaign pledge that "farmers should obtain their full share of the national income," this administration has failed to make a study of the growing "middleman's spread." In fact, the Republican 83d Congress killed such a study planned by President Truman.

Perhaps most symbolic of the administration's attitude toward the farmer is its steadfast embracing of lower farm price supports, even in the face of falling farm income. The Eisenhower-Benson "sliding scale" system of supports, only half in effect this year, will be fully in effect in 1956.

The administration has tried to argue that because farm prices declined somewhat under the Democratic program of firm supports, the Democratic program is not effective in maintaining farm prices. But the facts prove otherwise. During the 2 years following October 15, 1952 (when the parity ratio slipped below 100 percent) the prices of the 7 commodities supported at the firm level advocated by the Democrats declined only 3 percent, on the average, while the prices of commodities supported on the GOP-favored "sliding scale" fell by an average of more than 18 percent. The prices of commodities enjoying no price supports whatever fell more than 25 percent. And, of course, the farmers hardest hit by these price declines are the small farmers, who have no "nest egg" to tide them over bad times.

The administration has not been lacking in words of praise and expressions of sympathy for the small farmer. Soon after it took office, a study commission was appointed to develop a new program for the "small farmer program" was finally study and delay, the Eisenhower "small farmer program" was finally unveiled in late April. Much of the proposed program had been started under the Democrats, and was already on the statute books, simply awaiting implementation by the administration. But the most striking thing about many of the recommendations was that they were directly opposed to what the administration had been doing to the small farmers during its first 2 years in office. This prompted the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser to comment:

"We cannot restrain a persistent question mark about the seriousness of the program. It's all very well to come forth with trumpets about a poor-man's farm program, but why is it that the administration's policies to date have been directed against the little farmer?"

Democrats, meanwhile, have been pressing for new solutions to the problems of the small farmer. Democratic Senators SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee (joined by Texas Representative WRIGHT PATMAN in the House) have introduced a bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to designate 500 counties as low-income counties, to which the Government would devote special attention and special help, chiefly in the form of added credit sources to help the small farmers become more efficient. And Minnesota's Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY recently introduced a bill which would concentrate the benefits of price supports on the smaller and middle-sized farms, while at the same time broadening the price support program to include producers of many perishable commodities which do not now get price supports.

The Democrats are not the only ones who have recognized the way the Republicans have looked upon the farmer. In Minnesota, one Republican newspaper editor complained that "We (the Republicans) have kicked the farmer out of the Republican Party."

To this, another Republican editor responded, "While the Republican Party has not kicked the farmer out the door, the party has, in a sense, treated him like a second-rate party member—sort of poor relation—a problem."

Moving Step by Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Alabama has been fortunate this year to have ample rainfall for its crops.

However, the State cannot forget the droughts of 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

Barrett Shelton, of the Decatur Daily, calls attention to the fact that this year of plenteous rainfall is the period of sunshine in which we should be making irrigation hay.

He commends the efforts of our colleague, BOB JONES, to get suitable irrigation laws passed.

His editorial follows:

MOVING STEP BY STEP

Though unexpected and abundant rainfall this spring and summer have postponed to a degree some of the interest in irrigation, such a postponement is short range. The long range and the correct viewpoint is that of the farmer who knows that irrigation is going to mean the difference between successful farming and crop failures caused by drought.

Irrigation isn't being postponed in Washington. Congressman BOB JONES, of our district, has been giving much attention to the subject and this week he writes:

"The prospects for action by the Senate on the irrigation bill look very promising right now. As you know, the House passed the bill many weeks ago and it has been pending in the Senate Interior Committee for a long time. This is the bill which authorizes $106 million for irrigation loans and makes loans available to the southeastern States for the first time.

I have been in close touch with the progress of the bill for I feel that it is of paramount importance to the future of agriculture in the Southern States. I was one of the leaders in the House fight to obtain passage and was successful in getting my amendment adopted giving the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over the loan program in our part of the country.

We have put a lot of effort into the irrigation bill and it is very encouraging to know that we may have final action before this session is concluded."

Any southern State, any county, any city in the South failing to recognize the importance of irrigation to those who make a living from farming and to those who do business with farmers will indeed be missing the boat.

We are glad BOB JONES is bird-dogging this measure. We hope every Member of the Alabama delegation in both House and Senate continue as much interest for this measure should be passed. The South will either get into irrigation or get out of farming, driven out by the competition from other sections where irrigation has become common practice.

Delinquency Can Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers:

THEY PROVE TEEN CRIME CAN BE CURBED—ALERT PLANNING KEEPS GANGS OUT OF BUSINESS

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

Can you envision a city of 733,000 population without—

Marauding teenage gangsters and juvenile gang riots?

Narcotic problems, although the city is a seaport in the Orient?

Serious disturbances or vandalism in the schools?

With juvenile delinquency increasing alarmingly in the Nation, it would hardly seem possible that a city ranking as America's 20th largest could escape the curse of this trend. Yet Seattle, in the State of Washington, has.

How this west-coast metropolis has accomplished this feat is a tribute to its imaginative and forward-looking citizens and officials who have made a serious business of fighting youth crime.

How well their efforts work is reflected in these figures.

Last year Seattle's police department reported 7,909 offenses and incidents involving juveniles. In 1953 there were 8,051.

The city is one of a few in the country that can point to a decrease rather than an increase in youth crime. Importantly, half of the cases were noncriminal—such as motor violations and neglected and lost children—which many communities exclude from their juvenile-delinquency statistics.

Seattle's progress was made despite a 10-percent increase in youth population, resulting from annexation of a large developed area adjoining its northern limits, including Lake City.

Many experts have blamed slum environments and inadequate housing for delinquency. They have said time and again that tenement overcrowding forces children to the street gangs and the pathways of crime.

NO GANGS AND NO SLUMS

It should be no surprise then that Seattle—a city without gangs—is a city without slum tenements. It is a city of homes. Few families live in apartments, fewer in flats.

Inadequate recreational facilities also are blamed for upending youngsters balanced precariously between delinquency and nondelinquency.

Again, Seattle lends corroboration to this thinking. The community is rich in playgrounds, parks, salt- and fresh-water beaches. It has easily accessible forest and mountain areas. Regardless of economic status, no Seattle child need be denied camping and hiking experience.

INTERESTED IN YOUTH

But the "payoff" in the low rate of juvenile delinquency doesn't stem merely from adequate and proper housing and recreational facilities. While the evidence is reassuring that good surroundings are likely to offset influences producing delinquency, the credit for Seattle's success goes further—to an alert and efficient community and its organizations which render an intense interest in the city's youths.

Police, schools, community clubs, the park department, newspapers, service clubs, sportsmen's clubs, health and recreational agencies are all vitally interested and busy promoting activities for the city's youngsters.

Mrs. Irene Durham, captain in charge of the police department's crime prevention bureau, places "inestimable value" on the close liaison between police and groups working with youths.

FORMULATE POLICIES

One example of this cooperation is a monthly meeting by various officials to discuss juvenile delinquency and formulate policies for united and constructive action.

Among those who attend the meetings are the superintendent of schools and other school officials, the sheriff and prosecuting attorney of King County, the judge and chief probation officer of the juvenile court, the superintendent of parks, and an enforcement officer from the State liquor board.

Mrs. Durham cites the modus operandi of a typical antidelinquency program:

"We conduct daily and nightly inspection of places where young people congregate. This results in the apprehension of truants, runaways, and curfew violators.

"By this means, too, many predelinquents are discovered and through work with them and their parents, much is accomplished in the field of prevention.

"Delinquents are handled as individuals. In cases of first offenders and those committing minor offenses, the matter is usually adjusted with them, provided their attitude is good and their parents are competent and understanding.

"The importance of this first contact cannot be overestimated. Juvenile officers attempt to stimulate among parents a sense of their responsibilities for the training and behavior of their children. At the same time they try to stimulate among young people a sense of responsibility for their own action.

"Special emphasis is placed on work with children whose living conditions are injurious from neglect, abuse, or other causes. Those cases are of major importance, because the children lack opportunity for normal health development.

"A special investigation is made of all contributing factors and referrals are based upon need to juvenile court or to local agencies which offer a special service."

AID TO CHILDREN

Programs for aid to children in the Seattle area range from assistance given by a kind citizen of a neighborhood on up to State organized agencies.

An outstanding program is the one carried on by the public schools, which have an enrollment of 135,000. Of that number, only 2,370—or 1.7 percent—went to court on delinquency charges in 1954.

When tendencies toward delinquency are recognized, Seattle's schools marshal all regular and special facilities to combat and remedy those tendencies.

Here are a few examples:

Elementary schools—If the diagnosis of the department of guidance services shows regular work in school is beyond the capacity of some children, they are transferred to adjustment classes. In these classes the content and method of instruction are geared to the ability of the children, and the tasks are ones at which the youngsters may achieve success. Classes are limited in numbers so teachers may give personal help to each child—not only in studies, but also in behavior.

Secondary schools—In the junior and senior high schools efforts are redoubled to tailor what the school has to offer to the probable goals of the pupils.

The Inter-High School Council—Organized about 20 years ago, it is sponsored by the assistant superintendent of schools and consists of representatives from each high school, with faculty advisers. It meets 4 or 5 times a year.

Originally, the council was organized to deal with a communitywide problem—Halloween vandalism. For years city officials and police struggled vainly to stem the tide of these holiday depredations which ran into the thousands of dollars.

After the council was set up school authorities and city officials presented the problem to it. The young people accepted the challenge. Today police find Halloween night no different than any other night. And for each of the last Halloweens not a single offender had to be dealt with by juvenile court.

Year after year the mayor, police, fire, and park departments, juvenile court, sheriff's office, school board, parent-teachers association, and others meet regularly with the Inter-High School Council and encourage its continued leadership in all affairs.

Thus the influence—and challenge—passed down by the elders to the high school students carries along through lower grades, and youngsters have willingly accepted and followed the pattern of leadership established.

An outstanding program resulting from the council's activity is the all-city dances for Seattle high school students. Representatives of the PTA, the Seattle park system, and students get together to arrange the dances. The dances draw as many as 3,000 youngsters.

There have never been cases of gang fights, brawls, or orgies at these dances.

STUDENT PROBLEMS

The council also sponsors inter-high school conferences to focus attention on other problems concerning students, such as safe driving.

At the State level in the fight against delinquency is the Washington State Council for Children and Youth. Comprised of 21 unsalaried members, they are appointed by the governor.

Since formed four years ago the board has succeeded in improving quarters for boys in custodial schools, improving personnel and bettering their salaries, and improving methods of handling juvenile offenders.

While it has only advisory capacity, the board acts as an efficient watchdog on all State governmental agencies concerned with youth problems.

Many other programs help keep Seattle's juvenile delinquency rate in check.

BOY SCOUTS AID

The city's Boy Scout organizations are active to thie end. Membership is the largest, percentagewise, of any area in the United States.

The Seattle Post-Intelligencer, whose reporters conducted the survey for this article, has its own program of events for youngsters. The newspaper sponsors a ski school (some 800 high school boys and girls are taken by buses to a mountain ski area each Saturday of the winter season), hoop shoot, quiz down, swim classes, Golden Gloves, all-star baseball, softball, junior bowling, junior and tiny tad golf tourneys.

An alert PTA is strongly responsible for keeping many officials "on the job," and does much to arouse public support for worth-while activities.

Control of unwholesome "entertainment joints," virtual elimination of undesirable Saturday afternoon movies, better television shows, a new State law for control of crime comics, and efforts toward better health conditions, adoption, and foster home provisions are some of the PTA's contributions to a healthy juvenile situation in Seattle.

The Dreadful Dilemma of the Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an article from the July 23, 1955 issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Dreadful Dilemma of the Democrats," by Joseph and Stewart Alsop:

THE DREADFUL DILEMMA OF THE DEMOCRATS

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

One night last spring, the grand panjandrums of the Democratic Party had the riot act read to them. It was read in a ladylike way, but in no uncertain terms. The occasion was a private get-together in Washington, after a public speechmaking, $100-a-plate dinner for Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN.

After the dinner, a glittering assemblage of big names of the Democratic Party

gathered more or less impromptu, in the small Georgetown house of Philip Stern, an official of the Democratic National Committee.

Among the great Democratic movers and shakers present were Adlai Stevenson, front runner for the 1956 Presidental nomination, and his friend and potential rival, W. Averell Harriman, Governor of New York. There were a number of prominent Senators, including JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, Stevenson's 1952 running mate, and WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, one of Stevenson's chief campaign advisers. And there were Democratic propagandists, brain-trusters and idea men in every nook and cranny of the Stern living room.

The Rayburn dinner had been a veritable orgy of self-congratulation. Former President Truman, to be sure, had made a rather routine "give-'em-hell" speech. But the mood had been all mutual admiration rather than attack. Adlai Stevenson had paid tribute to the Democratic Party as the party of social progress, civil freedom, and peace, without even mentioning the existence of a Republican administration. And Speaker RAYBURN, after extolling the Democratic Party as the repository of all the virtues, even paid a little tribute to the President, saying "Our hearts go out to President Eisenhower * * * as he wrestles with the problems of life and death that confront the Nation."

The mood of stately self-approbation hung on at the Stern party, when it was suddenly and rather rudely shattered. The shatterer was the attractive and formidably articulate liberal newspaper columnist, Doris Fleeson. Miss Fleeson's reading of the riot act went about as follows, according to those who still vividly recall the occasion:

"Well, I'm glad you all love each other so much, and it's certainly been a lovely, refined evening. But you're not the Democratic Party I used to know. The Democrats used to be able to work up a sweat. The Democrats used to have a coarse and vulgar desire to win. The Democrats used to like a fight. I remember Fiorello LaGuardia saying, 'There's one thing my opponents can count on in the clinches, I ain't no gentleman.' You're all very gentlemanly, I know, but do you really think you're going to beat Eisenhower with the kind of performance you put on tonight?"

By this time, a strained silence had fallen over the assembled company. Averell Harriman, sitting directly behind the embattled Miss Fleeson, was heard to mutter, "That's the stuff; pour it on, Doris." Stevenson, sitting on a coffee table opposite the columnist, listened intently, smiling a trifle thinly. Somebody echoed former President Truman's charge that the virtues of the Democrats and the failings of the administration were being concealed by the kept Republican press. Miss Fleeson snorted.

"The press has given you a better break than you deserve," she said. "The press has made all the issues you have. If you did the opposiiton's job of opposing—and that means opposing Eisenhower—the reporters would report it and the publishers would publish it. Reporters don't report what you don't dare say. There's no news in gentlemanly refinement and mutual love feasts."

There was more in the same vein. When Miss Fleeson had finished, Adlai Stevenson got up from the coffee table, made some polite, noncommittal remark and moved away, amid a certain pained tension. The tension was understandable. With unerring if perhaps somewhat ruthless accuracy, Miss Fleeson had put her finger squarely on the infinitely painful dilemma which now confronts the Democratic Party. It is a dilemma which must somehow be resolved, moreover, if Adlai Stevenson, the almost certain 1956 Democratic candidate for President, is not to be a mere sacrificial lamb again.

The nature of the dilemma was suggested by the worried question of one of Stevenson's friends in the Senate, who asked, "How in the devil to you beat a man when it's political poison to criticize him?"

The problem is just about as simple as that. Every Democrat, even the most sanguine, agrees that President Eisenhower is remarkably popular—more popular by far than any presently visible Democrat. He is so well liked that any direct criticism of him is politically dangerous to the critic—and even to the critic's party. How, then, is the President's popularity to be so reduced and eroded that the big prize—the White House—can be won back for the Democratic party in 1956?

This problem is being constantly, anxiously and sometimes angrily debated in the inner sanctums of the Democratic Party. The debate has produced two main schools of thought, with many sub-schools and sub-sub-schools. One main body of thought might be called the Johnson-Clements, or congressional, or lay-off-Ike school. The other might be called the presidential, or National Committee, or tear-into-Ike school.

Actually, of course, the opposing lines are not all that clearly drawn. There are many shades of difference within each camp. Averell Harriman, for example, as his reaction to Miss Fleeson's little lecture suggests, is by temperament more inclined to the direct attack than Adlai Stevenson. And in the congressional group, Speaker RAYBURN, despite his kind words at the dinner, is much more outspokenly critical of the President—in private—than his opposite number in the Senate, Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. But by and large it is accurate to say that two basically contradictory views of how to deal with the awful Eisenhower problem have emerged in the Democratic Party.

Let one of the leading Democrats in the Senate describe the views of the lay-off-Ike school:

"Look, say a friend of yours buys himself a new car. Say you want to sell him another car. Do you tell him he's bought a lemon? Hell, no; that's an insult to his judgment. You tell him that, and he'll hang onto that car for dear life.

"It's the same way in politics. The voters bought Ike in 1952 in a big way. If we Democrats told them in so many words they bought a lemon—why, we wouldn't get away with it. It would help Ike and hurt us. Attacking Ike head on—that's the sure way to lose control of Congress in 1956, what with five out of six thinking Ike's a great guy. The voters never did buy the Republican Party, though. So what we've got to do is build up our party and take both houses in 1956."

"As for beating Ike, I don't think the problem is going to arise, because I don't think Ike will run—he's just like a schoolboy waiting for the school's-out bell. And if he does run—well, that's the candidate's problem. Our job up here is to make a good record and get ourselves elected."

It is easy to see why adherents of the lay-off-Ike school are concentrated in Congress. Very few Members of either House would dissent from the view that "our job up here is to get ourselves elected." Attacking a man who is enormously popular does not appeal to many Congressmen as a wise means to that end.

For equally understandable reasons, the second, or tear-into-Ike school finds its main expression in the Democratic National Committee. The committee is traditionally White House-oriented. It is responsive either to the President or to would-be Presidents. Paul Butler, the present chairman, for example, is universally regarded as a Stevenson man. Would-be Presidents quite naturally do not take so complacent a view of the problem of beating the existing President as do Members of Congress.

The arguments of this second school are rather obvious. It must be assumed that Eisenhower will run again. The White House, after all, is the real object of the exercise—the source of patronage and power. The President cannot be beaten as long as "5 out of 6 think Ike's a great guy." Therefore, ways must be found to persuade large numbers of voters that he is not really such a great guy after all.

But how do you go about it? It is at this point that the tear-into-Ike school breaks down into sub-schools and sub-sub-schools. For example, do you tear into the President himself or do you just attack the administration and leave it up to the voters to remember whose administration it is? And what is the tone of the attack to be—violent, or "Ike's a good guy, but," or high-level chiding, or what?

The violent approach was tried early this spring, by West Virginia's ancient Democratic Senator, MATTHEW NEELY. NEELY made a venomous personal attack on the President before the CIO, implying among other things that Eisenhower is hypocritical in his religion. It quickly became apparent that NEELY's attack had boomeranged, gaining the President's sympathy even among strong Democratic voting groups.

A more subtle approach is favored by the astute editors of the Democratic Digest, lively propaganda organ of the Democratic National Committee. For some time, the Digest gave the President the kid-glove treatment. But about the beginning of this year the gloves began to come off. Since then, the Digest has been engaged in an effort to picture the President as a kind of agreeable boob.

President Eisenhower, according to the Digest stereotype, is an amiable but weak fellow, who can never make up his mind about anything. He is pictured as putty in the hands of such powerful and sinister figures as Secretary of State Dulles, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, and Attorney General Herbert Brownell.

Much emphasis is also placed in the Digest on the President's golf playing; the Presidential golf clubs are roughly equated with Nero's fiddle. This amiable but incompetent golf player, the Digest implies, should be permanently retired to the golf course, and a serious political leader should be entrusted with the Nation's affairs. (This serious fellow is, of course, a Democrat, and although the Digest is not supposed to take sides among Democrats, internal evidence strongly suggests that his first name is Adlai.)

The paid circulation of the Digest is around 100,000. This is a good par for the course for a political propaganda organ, but it is not going to change any election results in an electorate of 60 million. Yet the Digest line on Eisenhower is significant for two reasons.

In the first place, it gives a clue to the way Stevenson is likely to handle the Eisenhower problem. The Digest's treatment of Eisenhower, which is humorous and subtle, rather than angry and bombastic, bears the Stevenson imprint. At any rate, it is certainly true that Clayton Fritchey, able editor of the Digest, would not take a political line which his close friend Stevenson disapproved.

In his speech on the Formosa crisis this spring, which was a mixture of sound sense and partisan politics, Stevenson had kind words for the President and extremely harsh words for the President's Formosa policies. In a more elegant way, he came pretty close to saying: "The President deserves all our sympathy, but, my God, what a mess he's making of things." This suggests that, in trying to solve the Eisenhower dilemma, Stevenson is likely to adopt some Stevensonian variant of the Digest line.

The Digest line is also important because the magazine is read principally by Democratic politicians and party workers, and the Digest line thus tends to become the party

line. There have recently been occasional echoes of the Digest's thrusts at the President. Two Senators, ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, and KERR SCOTT, of North Carolina, have criticized the President by name—previously an unheard-of thing, except in the special case of old NEELY. SCOTT got particularly rough with the President, charging him, among other things, with "passing the buck down instead of up."

But it is significant that both GORE and SCOTT are Southerners and freshmen, with most of their terms ahead of them. There has been no rush by less safely placed politicians to emulate the Democratic Digest. And the fact is that the amiable-boob stereotype has not really caught on, even among fervent Democrats. It simply does not square with the popular image of Dwight D. Eisenhower. On the contrary, if the polls and the politicians, including the Democrats themselves, are to be trusted, the popular image of Eisenhower as a combination great man and good friend is as firmly fixed as ever. And the Democrats are feeling a mounting sense of angry frustation as they search for some way to deal with the Eisenhower problem. It is strange that the search should be so difficult.

For, by all the rules of logic and history, there should be no Eisenhower problem. On the contrary, the odds should be very heavily against an Eisenhower victory in 1956. If Eisenhower were a faceless President X, every political pundit, examining what are known as "the objective facts," would conclude confidently that he was faced with a near-hopeless uphill fight for reelection.

Consider a few of these facts. President Eisenhower is, amazingly, the first President in our history to lose both Houses to the opposition in the first election after his own first-term election. Equally amazingly, the 1954 election gave the Democrats the biggest proportion of the popular vote since the depression year 1934. (The Democrats claim that gerrymandering by Republican State legislatures concealed the magnitude of their victory.)

Consider, moreover, what the 1954 election meant in terms of electoral votes. In States where Senators or Governors headed the ticket, 25 States, with 316 electoral votes, were won by Democrats, and only 12 States, with 112 electoral votes, went Republican. This very clearly suggests that if a faceless Mr. Democrat had run against a faceless Mr. Republican, Mr. Democrat would have won hands down.

There have been plenty of other indications of a powerful Democratic trend. Since 1952 the Democrats have won nine governorships and lost none, and they have made consistent impressive gains in municipal elections and in State legislatures. All this would ordinarily be enough to convince the wiseacres that the Democrats were a cinch for the White House. But it is only a part of the story.

For it is, of course, a lot easier for a Democrat to become President of these United States than a Republican. If you study the statistics, you are surprised that Republicans ever occupy the White House. Suppose, for example, that Stevenson runs against Eisenhower again in 1956, which is very far from improbable.

In 1952 Stevenson dropped 3 of the 10 supposedly "solid" Southern States to Eisenhower. He is now making a determined effort to woo the South solidly back into the Democratic fold. Suppose he succeeds, which seems likely. He will then start with the normal Democratic advantage of 104 electoral votes out of the 266 needed to win.

Suppose he wins the normally Democratic border States of Kentucky, West Virginia, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. Suppose he takes three of the big Northern States—say, New York, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, all of which went Democratic last fall. He will then have 264 electoral votes, and of the 30 remaining States he need win only 1 of the smallest to be elected.

This is enough to suggest the enormous head start which any Democratic candidate enjoys. The Republican has to score a really big lead in the popular vote in non-Southern States if he is to win. And even in terms of the popular vote the task of the Democratic candidate in 1956 looks far from impossible.

If there are 20 typical American voters gathered together in 1 place, 11 voted for Eisenhower in 1952 and 9 for Stevenson. Next year the Democratic candidate need only persuade just 1 of those 20 voters to change his mind, and the election is a tossup, with the odds favoring the Democrat because of his southern headstart.

In moments of optimism, the more sanguine Democrats sometimes succeeded in persuading themselves that the 1 vote in 20 is already changed. There are all sorts of people, they argue, who voted for Eisenhower last time and who should, logically, have changed their minds—southerners returning to the party of their fathers, disgruntled farmers, voters in the power-hungry areas who don't like the administration's power policies, workers and small-business men who have not shared in the current prosperity, mothers unhappy about the handling of the polio vaccine, even Italo-Americans who thought that Mr. Edward J. Corsi got a rough deal from the State Department. Surely if you add up all such disillusioned voters, the Democrats say hopefully, the total comes to that needed 1 vote in 20.

But when the Democrats consult those modern oracles, the pollsters, or when they simply listen to what people are saying back home, gloom returns. Indeed, it is astonishing how many Democrats have lost what Miss Fleeson called the coarse and vulgar desire to win. Leading Democrats in Congress, especially, seem remarkably reconciled to the prospect of a second Eisenhower term. The only real hope, they say—on a strictly but-don't-quote-me basis—is that the President will succumb to the charms of his Gettysburg farm and retire. Therefore, they argue, it would be fatal for the Democrats to attack him—to do so would "get his dander up," and then he would run again.

This curious theory that the President will quietly fade away if only the Democrats don't make him mad is a symptom of a political situation which has no historical precedent at all. One reason for this amazing situation is, of course, the political phenomenon called Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Not long ago a couple of Democrats and a newspaperman were chatting idly in the small, cluttered office of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. One of the Democrats took a pipe out of his mouth and pointed to a front-page newspaper photograph of the President. The picture showed the President grinning a small-boy grin, with his hand over his mouth in a funny, half-embarrassed gesture. It was a picture of an immensely likeable human being.

"That damn picture's worth 3 million votes for Ike," the Democrat remarked sadly.

The second Democrat pointed to still another newspaper photograph of the President. This one showed him grimly thoughtful, frowning slightly, his jaw thrust forward in determination, every inch the national leader.

"That one's worth another 3 million," said the second Democrat. "And the hell of it is they're not the same 3 million."

The Eisenhower personality makes it possible for the President to break all the established political rules and get away with it. In the 1954 campaign, for example, he intervened more actively for his party than any other President in modern history. The voters went right ahead and elected a Democratic Congress. This should have been a crushing blow to his prestige. It was nothing of the sort. Everybody agreed that the Republicans would have been far worse beaten if he had not intervened, and the election actually increased his political stature. What is even more astonishing, the election in no way dimmed the popular image of him as being somehow above party—an image which is one of his greatest political assets.

Moreover, the voters never seem to blame the President—as they have always blamed Presidents in the past—for what goes wrong. "The farmers get mad at Benson, or the mothers get mad at Mrs. Hobby," one frustrated Democrat remarked, "but nobody ever gets mad at Ike." This is not, to be sure, entirely accidental. The Republican strategists are wholly aware that the magical Eisenhower personality is the party's greatest asset, and they are determined to protect the asset, "even," as one of them remarked, "if a few of us have to be the fall guys." But the Democrats have obviously made this task of asset protection a great deal easier.

It is not only that the Democrats have been afraid to criticize the President. They have utterly failed to develop a single "gut issue"—an issue which really stirs the emotions of the voters, and which could be used as a springboard for an assault on the President's popularity.

There were plenty of gut issues in 1952—"the mess in Washington," "the Truman war," "time for a change," the so-called Communist issue, mink coats, deep freezes, and the rest of it. All these issues were tied directly into the White House in the voters' minds. They undoubtedly hurt Stevenson badly and helped Eisenhower. But what comparable issues have the Democrats to use against Eisenhower in 1956? The voters are not likely to be aroused to an anti-Eisenhower frenzy by the charge that the President spends too much time on the golf course.

The liberal Democrats like to blame the lack of issues on the southern leadership in Congress—above all on Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. JOHNSON is a superb political technician, and it is true that he sometimes seem more interested in running the Senate smoothly than in making issues for his party. But the real fault lies with the liberal Democrats themselves.

They are the idea men of the Democratic Party, and they have run out of ideas. A decade and a half ago, Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that "Dr. New Deal" was dead. He has never come alive again. The Fair Deal, as a body of political doctrine, never really existed at all. It was a myth. It produced only two original political ideas—the Brannan farm plan and the Ewing health plan—and both of these proved so unpopular that they were stillborn. Otherwise, ever since the war, the Democrats have simply been living on bits and pieces of dead old Dr. New Deal's prescriptions.

The Democrats have also been living on Republican shortsightedness. Harry Truman scored his great surprise in 1948, thanks to the 80th Congress, which scared many voters into thinking that the Republicans really would "take it away." The Eisenhower administration has shown no disposition to repeat the error. Far from taking it away, more people have actually been brought under the social-security umbrella and other Government umbrellas than ever before.

Moreover, although by any rational definition the Eisenhower administration is a conservative, business-minded administration, it has not been hogtied by Republican doctrine. It is the purest milk of Republican doctrine that such matters as schools and roads are strictly the business of the States. Yet when it became clear that the condition of the schools and the roads might provide the Democrats with their sought-after gut issue, the administration quickly moved in with a road program and a school program of its own.

The Democrats can shout till they're hoarse that both programs are phony and that both are dead as mutton anyway. But the fact that the administration moved first reduces the Democrats to me-tooism. Indeed, on many issues, the Democrats can only say unhappily, "Yes, but we'd spend more money on it," just as the Republicans used to say, "Yes, but we'd do it more cheaply and efficiently."

The Democratic dilemma is further complicated by "Peace and Prosperity," the prospective Republican campaign slogan for 1956. Many people equate generals with war, and in 1952 many people had been taught by memory and 20 years of Democratic indoctrination to equate Republicans with depression. There must have been large numbers of voters who pulled the lever for Adlai Stevenson because they feared that General Eisenhower would lead the country into war or that Republican Eisenhower would lead the country into depression. As of this moment of writing, both these fears have proved wholly unfounded. This is why some astute observers believe that, in another Eisenhower-Stevenson race, that much-sought-after 1 voter in 20 may come out of Stevenson's 9, not out of Eisenhower's 11.

Yet this reasoning also suggests how the Democrats' horrible dilemma might be solved for them overnight—admittedly in a rather dreary way. There already exists a curious laboratory experiment which shows how the Democratic dilemma would be solved by a serious economic letdown.

The laboratory is economically distressed West Virginia, where unemployment in the coal mines is on a full-blown depression scale. When he was running for reelection in West Virginia last year, Senator Neely, all unnoticed by the rest of the Nation, repeatedly attacked the President, whom he called "Eisenhower," even more violently than in his CIO speech. And despite his great age and a remarkably undistinguished record, the West Virginia electorate sent NEELY back to the Senate with a handsome 58,000 majority.

In short, the President's personal popularity, so potent a political factor in every other State, was no help at all to the Republicans in West Virginia. National depression would instantly produce a whole mushroom crop of Neelys, and for the Democratic Presidential candidate it would solve at a stroke the problem of dealing with the President's popularity. The President's popularity would no longer exist.

There is one other way in which the Democrats' dilemma might be resolved. No one fears any longer that the President's military background has endowed him with warlike views. On the contrary, the obvious fact that the President is profoundly a man of peace is one key to his popularity, as both parties have become increasingly aware.

Indeed, ever since the so-called peace issue was injected into the 1954 campaign, both parties have been contending for the label of "peace party." And this has created a situation potentially exceedingly dangerous for the President. For in such a situation the power of the executive to take firm preventive measures to avoid war tends to be paralyzed.

To be sure, the failure to be firm can be very popular for a time, as Neville Chamberlain discovered in the thirties. But only for a time, as Chamberlain also discovered. And although the parallel is obviously inexact, it is a trifle disturbing to recall that in the late thirties both major British parties were also competing for the peace-party label.

But such caveats and forebodings are probably unjustified. The President is wholly aware of these dangers, and determined to avoid them. No doubt he will do so. All his life things have gone right for him in the end. "He hasn't got a lucky star," one Democrat has rather bitterly pointed out. "He has a whole galaxy of lucky stars."

That galaxy of lucky stars explains at least in part the President's remarkable personal popularity. People sense by instinct that Eisenhower is a lucky man, and they want to share in the luck. As long as the Eisenhower galaxy remains firmly fixed in the firmament, the dilemma of the Democrats is going to be extraordinarily difficult, perhaps impossible, to solve, however coarse and vulgar their desire to win may become.

Delinquency Can Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers:

THEY PROVE TEEN CRIME CAN BE CURBED: COPS AND PARENTS TEAM UP TO CHECK DELINQUENCY

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

"Everybody's criticizing teen-agers today. We try to give them a pat on the back. We'd rather have them on our side than against us."

That's Police Chief Edward L. Peterson talking. He's head man of a 13-member police force responsible for keeping law and order in Boone, Iowa, a typical Midwest town of 12,164.

A railroad division center, Boone is the birthplace of Mamie Eisenhower.

Take away its autos and television sets, and anyone visiting Boone will think it a town out of a "gentler era"—not like one of today's many communities throughout the country that are overrun with juvenile terrorists and plagued by teen-aged crime waves.

There is hardly any juvenile delinquency in Boone worth mentioning. Last year police averaged only 6 arrests a month—72 boys and 1 girl for the year—compared to 10 a month in 1953.

And in 3 years only 6 youths were taken to court. The others were straightened out by police and parents—and psychiatric help when necessary.

The town has no juvenile dope cases, no knifings, no brutal assaults. In fact, none of the spectacular crimes of the big cities. The last murder was in 1948, when a crazed father killed his wife and son, then himself.

How does Boone do it?

"We don't threaten kids when they get in trouble," explained Chief Peterson. "We don't get tough with them. You just lose them that way.

"We try to gain their confidence and let them know someone cares about them. That must be proved to them before they'll cooperate."

But Boone's treatment of juvenile delinquents can hardly be called soft. If anything, it has distinct earmarks of firmness.

"As our first contact with a juvenile will leave a lasting impression," said Peterson, "we conduct ourselves in the best possible manner. Thus we invariably tell a kid in trouble what we're going to do with his case.

"Then we make certain that we keep that promise. No police force can maintain proper respect of its juvenile population with a reputation of not keeping promises."

TYPICAL CASE

Here is a typical handling of a case:

A boy from one of the finest families in town got mixed up with a boy paroled from a reformatory. The two were accused of stealing cars. Both were brought to the stationhouse.

The boy from the fine family convinced his father police were all wet in suspecting him.

"He was laughing up his sleeve at me," said Peterson.

"I let him go home, but he knew darn well I didn't believe him. The next day I saw him on the streets and asked him to come along to the station.

PAROLED TO FATHER

"I asked him why he didn't tell the truth, and pretty soon he told me the whole story.

"I instructed him to go home and tell his dad what he'd told me.

"Was I around when he did? No, sir. That's the boy's job, not mine.

"A little later, the father came in and he was singing a different tune. We paroled the boy to his father and didn't have any more trouble.

"Usually I visit the parents after we get a case sewed up. We hash over the whole thing and try to come to some definite conclusion. I don't see any sense sending kids to court if you can straighten out the matter at home."

ABOUT TEEN DRIVERS

Operating this way, Boone's police force has earned the respect not only of the town's younger population, but its grownups as well. Chief Peterson said:

"It's been at least 15 years since a man was taken to the stationhouse and beaten. It just isn't necessary. Everyone respects us."

By far the biggest problem to both police and schools in Boone is the teen-age driver. Car ownership in Boone County is high—one car for every third person. Last year, drivers 16 to 20 accounted for three times as many accidents proportionately as the 31 to 40 age group.

Some of the youths have "souped up" their cars, and they sometimes race through the town's residential and business streets. Unlike Pomona, Calif., which solved the problem with a "drag" strip for hot rodders, Boone has yet to establish a track.

Many of the cars that teenagers have are "old chunks" that eat up gas and oil. So some boys play hookey occasionally to work and earn money to pay the upkeep.

TRUANCY LOW

Despite this, the high school averages close to 97 percent daily attendance. That's less than 1 absence in each class for all causes—sickness, excused absence, truancy.

There's one other complaint from the high school about teen-age conduct.

"Eight of our class of 80 senior girls dropped out this year to be married," said Principal Glen P. Moore. "We don't go into it, but I presume that all were pregnant."

Five other girls outside the senior class assertedly dropped out of school last year for the same reason. One was 15, another 14.

Moore explained that, as well as he could judge, most of the girls got in trouble with "steady boy friends" and were not available to all comers.

BLAMES BROKEN HOMES

The town seems to attach little scandal to the "shotgun" weddings, many of which are performed in church. The attitude of most persons is that these incidents are "mishaps" and not juvenile delinquency.

Superintendent of Schools Donald F Seaton, who supervises 2,623 children in 6 elementary, 1 junior high, 1 senior high school, and a junior college, attributes most of the

trouble to broken homes and to parents who don't care.

"That's because Boone is a railroad town. Many of the fathers are gone from home half the time. Railroad employment is so general that if you don't know the occupation of a child's father, you just assume he's a railroad man."

While Boone has a tolerant attitude toward its youth, it has taken ample precautions to protect itself against incipient outbreaks of juvenile lawlessness.

CURFEW MAINTAINED

The town's heaviest artillery in its fight to keep delinquency in check is a wartime curfew law requiring youths under 17 to be off the streets by 10:30 p. m.

"We don't enforce it to the letter," Chief Peterson confided. "If the kids have a reasonable excuse we let them go. But if they're out gallivanting and raising heck, we crack down on them and their parents."

The town's youths obviously don't have to be reminded of the regulations. Neither do their parents. There hasn't been a prosecution of either parent or child under that law in several years.

Boone is strict in other ways, too. Take, for example, this recent case in the town's "Mayor's Court," which hears all infractions of city ordinances.

Mayor Ralph L. Cooper, 72, a retired civil engineer, who also presides as judge, had 2 16-year-olds before him. They were accused of racing each other in hot rods through the town's streets. The charges were made by a citizen!

DENY RACING CHARGE

The boys denied they were racing. But after listening to all the testimony, Cooper fined each $25, then suspended all but $10 of the fine. One of the boys still protested his innocence, insisting he hadn't signaled his friends in the other car to race.

"I was just dropping a cigarette out the window," the youth pleaded.

"If that's the case," Mayor Cooper shot back, "maybe you'd like to tell us where you bought the cigarettes. That's against the law, you know."

That shut the kid up.

Town officials agree that youngsters cannot get in serious trouble in Boone because the town has none of the "wicked haunts" of the big cities.

NO NIGHT CLUBS

There are no night clubs in Boone, and the town's taverns are "mild" by comparison to the gin mills of the bigger towns and cities. Women are seldom seen in them, and the hardest drink served is beer. Iowa law prohibits sale of liquor by the drink—only State liquor stores sell the stuff to licensed purchasers.

Only gathering places for teen-agers "on a spree" are a few local restaurants and soda parlors.

One of these places, labeled by Chief Peterson as the worst teen hangout, was visited by Reporter Frederick Bird, of the Chicago American, who made the 350-mile trip to Boone for the survey.

YOUTHFUL PRANKS

The waitresses were up in arms about the teen-agers and their bad ways. Their complaints boiled down to:

(1) Teen-agers smoking, which the management firmly prohibits.

(2) Hooking the loose silverware.

(3) Putting salt in the sugar bowls.

(4) Loud and crude behavior, such as lolling in the booths.

Despite these complaints, Boone's citizens almost to a man will agree that the town's youthful population is far better behaved than that of a majority of communities around the country.

MANY PLAY FACILITIES

Boone has a large number of recreational facilities—so many, in fact, that a youth center failed recently because the kids were already too busy.

In natural recreational facilities, the town is wealthy. Across from the high school is a block-square park. At one edge of town is a heavily wooded park of several hundred acres, with deep ravines and an explored look about it.

The large park has a big municipal swimming pool and a lighted baseball diamond, which is among the best in Iowa.

Then, too, Boone is a town of avid churchgoers. There is an astounding total of 27 churches. Sunday attendance is high. Most churches have meeting halls and facilities for teenagers, such as shuffleboard, badminton, and table tennis.

TOWN GOLF-MAD

Boone is also golf-mad, and membership in the local country club is relatively unrestricted, fees low. There is also an 8-week summer recreation program for youths, supported by the Community Chest.

No wonder the youth center failed.

In Boone, it seems, the children live in a setting of a society that understands them, wants to help them, and does. Their excellent record as juveniles is a reflection of that community's sincere dedication to the welfare of its youths.

Red Threat in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, in connection with a bill which I introduced today for the relief of Hasan Muhammad Tiro, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Tiro entitled "Red Threat in Indonesia," reprinted from the New Leader of April 11, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED THREAT IN INDONESIA

(By Hasan Muhammad Tiro)

The 80 million people of Indonesia—sixth largest nation on earth, third richest in natural resources after the United States and the Soviet Union—are on the verge of complete Communist domination. The Communists and fellow travelers, their sympathizers, and naive dupes already exercise virtual control over the army, police, Government administration, Parliament, and trade unions.

The present situation exists because the people of Indonesia have been denied the right to vote and elect representatives of their own choice. The present regime, headed by Premier Ali Sastroamidjojo, has been trying to avoid elections for years. The Communists and their accomplices are aware that if the people of Indonesia were given the opportunity to vote freely, they would almost certainly lose the election to the non- and anti-Communist Masjumi and Socialist Parties. While postponing Indonesia's first free election, the Sastroamidjojo forces are tightening their grip on all power levers of government.

There has been a series of purges of high-ranking anti-Communist government officials. Among the anti-Communist army officers who have been removed are General Simatupang (Armed Forces Chief of Staff), Colonel Nasution (Army Chief of Staff), Col. Gatot Subroto (commander of the Seventh Division), Lieutenant Colonel Parman (commander of the Djakarta police force), and Lieutenant Colonel Kosasih (commander of the South Sumatra Division). These and others were purged for demanding that the regime hold a speedy general election for a democratic government. The Communists maintained that these officers had interfered in political affairs and that their actions constituted insubordination. But the Communists had only praise for the pro-Communist army officers (Lieutenant Colonel Warrouw in Celebes, Lieutenant Colonel Sudirman in East Java, and Lieutenant Colonel Kretarto in South Sumatra) who deposed and arrested their anti-Communist superiors, simultaneously declaring their allegiance to President Soekarno. No charge of insubordination was raised against them. In fact, Soekarno soon recognized them as division commanders and promoted each of them to the rank of colonel.

As for the government administration, the Governor of North Sumatra, Abdul Hakim, and the mayor of Djakarta, Sjamsuridjal, were ousted after declaring their open opposition to the Communist Party. The Socialist Governor of Central Java, Milono, was also replaced by a fellow-traveler. On March 5, the regime removed Sosrodanukusumo, head of the secret police department, to make way for the new Red chief of the newly-established Indonesian GPU. Sosrodanukusumo, a Masjumi party member, was accused by the Minister of Justice of trying to help anti-Communist Chinese leaders in connection with the deportation actions taken against them.

Meanwhile, the public's clamor for a general election gained momentum. To appease the public, the regime made a gesture in the direction of preparing for a general election by establishing a central election committee in Djakarta. This body will be responsible for counting the votes if the election ever takes place. This election committee, however, is of strange composition. Represented on it are the PKI (the Communist Party), the PNI (Scekarno's Nationalist Party), the PRN (People's National Party, whose leading figure, Minister of Justice Gondokusumo, prosecuted the anti-Communist Chinese in Indonesia), the Sobsi (the Communist-controlled federation of labor), the SKI (the People's Association Party), the Murba (a proletarian party), and the Perti (a Moslem sect whose leader, Siradjudin Abas, participated in the Peking peace conference). The anti-Communist Moslem Masjumi Party (by far the largest party in the country) and the Socialist Party, were specifically excluded from representation on the committee. Thus, the chance for an honest election has been precluded from the start by Soekarno's adroit stacking of the cards in favor of the pro-Communist forces.

Since the Sastroamidjojo regime took over the government more than a year and a half ago, no open criticism against the Communist Party has been tolerated. Even the former Premier, Muhammad Natsir, chairman of the Masjumi Party, and Isa Anshary, prominent Moslem leader, were arraigned for interrogation by the prosecutor general's office because of anti-Communist speeches they delivered on September 23, 1953. The newspaper, Tindjauan, in Macassar, was put out of business because it criticized the Red defense minister. Only last month, Tan Po Goan, a member of parliament and therefore supposedly entitled to parliamentary immunity, was interrogated by the prosecutor general for speeches he delivered on the

floor of parliament. A "bamboo curtain" has thus been drawn inside Indonesia, preparatory to next week's meeting of Asian and African leaders in Bandung.

Three times in 9 years, the Communists have tried to take over Indonesia. Twice they were defeated. In 1946, a Communist coup d'etat failed. In 1948, the outright proclamation of a Communist people's republic in Madiun, Central Java, under the leadership of Amir Sjarifuddin, a former Premier and Defense Minister and Soekarno's righthand man, met with failure. Among those convicted and sentenced to jail in the Communist plot of 1946 were Iwa Kusumasumantri, a Moscow-trained Communist, and Mohamed Yamin. Soekarno not only pardoned these men, but appointed both of them to high office. Yamin is now Minister of Education, and Kusumasumantri is now Minister of Defense. It is beyond understanding how the Indonesian people can defend themselves against Soviet encroachment when their Defense Minister is a Communist party leader whose family, to this day, resides in Moscow.

Little consolation can be drawn from the backgrounds of other members of Sastroamidjojo's cabinet. Gondokusmo, the Minister of Justice participated in the Budapest Peace Conference and, as already mentioned, ousted the anti-Communist Chinese leaders from Indonesia. Minister of Labor Abidin participated in the Peking Peace Conference. Minister of Agriculture Sadjarwo represented a Communist-front organization, the Peasant Association. Foreign Minister Sunarjo helped with the Stockholm Peace Appeal drive in Indonesia. The Minister of State Welfare, Siradjudin Abas, also participated in the Peking Peace Conference.

Immediately upon assuming power in July 1953, the Sastroamidjojo regime took dastic steps to destroy all actual or potential anti-Communist forces in the country. In August 1953, the Red defense minister sent his troops to Sumatra to arrest 300 anti-Communist leaders there. The anti-Communist leaders, under the leadership of Tengku Daud Beureueh, Governor of Sumatra, resorted to armed resistance. On September 21, 1953, a united front of all anti-Communist Moslem forces was formed under the leadership of Tengku Daud Beureueh, backed by Gen. Sanusi Partawidjaja in Java, Gen. Kahar Muzakar in Celebes, and Col. Ibnu Hadjar in Borneo. The forces of these leaders are now in de facto control of north Sumatra, parts of west and central Java, south and central Celebes, and part of Borneo. Ironically, these are the same Indonesian patriots who valiantly resisted Dutch colonial forces in the period of 1945–49 when most leaders of the present Sastroamidjojo regime were either in hiding or were meekly permitting themselves to be put in detention camps.

In January 1954, after suffering the brunt of the civil war which it had created, the Sastroamidjojo regime sought to legalize its action by asking the Parliament in Djakarta to declare the anti-Communist movement under the leadership of Tengku Daud Beureueh an outlaw organization. The pro-Communists, however, had to vote by themselves, because the Masjumi Party and the Socialists refused to vote and walked out of Parliament.

The Sastroamidjojo regime had labeled the anti-Communist forces terrorists and fanatics, while in fact the Government itself employs terror as a matter of policy in order to intimidate the people. Massacres of anti-Communist peasants and burning of homes by Government troops are daily occurrences in places far from Djakarta. The regime, by means of the state-controlled radio and subsidized press, has blamed these barbaric acts on the anti-Communist forces, while the latter have no facilities to make their voice heard by the outside world. Documentation of these charges is now in the hands of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, which is investigating the violations of cultural freedom in Indonesia.

The writer of this article was privileged to present a list of violations of human rights by the Sastroamidjojo regime to the United Nations during the last General Assembly. Then anti-Communist forces in Indonesia challenged the regime to permit an international investigation of these atrocities. Nothing has been done. The Communists and their allies have effectively dropped a bamboo curtain over Indonesia. They have assumed power in fact if not in name. But the people of Indonesia, who fought successfully for their independence, will not permit their freedom to be lost again—this time to communism—if they know that they have the free world's sympathy and support.

Delinquency Can Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers:

THEY PROVE TEEN CRIME CAN BE CURBED: TOUGH POLICY ELIMINATES GANGS

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

Paterson, N. J., is waging a winning fight against juvenile delinquency.

A strict and tough policy by police and the courts is one reason.

Cooperation and participation by the community's citizens in the handling of the problems of youth is another.

A third and most important reason: When a child gets into trouble, his parents are in trouble, too.

Parents are held responsible for their children's acts, including truancy and vandalism.

Third largest city in the State, with a population of 150,000, Paterson does not have a single organized teen-age gang.

In the past 5 years not a single teen-ager has been caught using or peddling narcotics.

In the entire history of the city there has never been a case of a teen-ager beating up a cop.

Major credit for the success in the fight against delinquency—and all crime— goes to Police Chief James Walker, who has headed the police department for 16 years.

Under his direction Paterson has enjoyed one of the lowest delinquency and crime rates in the country. The record is even more astonishing in view of two delinquency-inducing factors:

The city is a heavy industrial center. • • • It is only a few minutes commuting time from New York City and its influences of gang warfare and narcotic problems, which have yet to creep across the Hudson River to Paterson.

USE FEAR AS WEAPON

How does Paterson do it?

"The element of fear is our most effective weapon against juvenile crime," explained Police Capt. Charles A. McGrath, head of the city's youth guidance bureau, an arm of the police department.

"We allow a youngster only one chance to make a mistake. The next time he steps out of line we lower the boom."

How well this works may be gleaned from this recent case:

About 3 weeks ago there was a sudden epidemic of fireworks explosions. Police caught several youngsters. Following procedure, police turned over the youngsters to the youth guidance bureau.

PARENTS CALLED IN

Parents were ordered to appear with the children at the bureau's headquarters. All of the youths were subsequently released in their parents' custody, after promises were made to keep the children from firecrackers in the future. But the trouble persisted.

Police then called school authorities and requested them to announce in schools that the youth guidance bureau would process no fireworks cases, but would refer them to the juvenile domestic relations court.

Judge Milton Schmach, Passaic County's only juvenile court judge, promised to cooperate and to level severe penalties against all offenders.

"Since then," Captain McGrath said, "we haven't had a single report of firecrackers being exploded in the city limits. The element of fear stopped it."

Here is how police cope with the problem of juvenile offenders:

A youth picked up for any offense—even staying out late at night (although there is no curfew law as such)—is brought to police headquarters. Parents are summoned at once.

If the child is not involved in a crime such as a robbery, burglary, or other felony, police will release him to the parent. But the parent must sign a form assuring appearance of the child—with the parent—at the youth guidance bureau for a hearing.

Juveniles arrested for serious crimes are sent at once to Hope Dell Detention Home in Wayne Township. They are not released to their parents.

The bureau holds hearings on all cases once a week, on Saturday. The cases are heard by an eight-member Youth Guidance Commission, a group appointed by Mayor Lester F. Titus.

If the offense is minor and it's the first time the youngster has been in trouble, the commission usually recommends release of the child to the parent. However, if the parents' background is not good and chances of rehabilitation are small, the case is referred to court.

A second offender, no matter how minor the offense, seldom escapes referral to court.

At the court trial, the juvenile may be represented by an attorney, who can make excuses for the suspect. But he cannot cross-examine the patrolman.

Last year the Youth Guidance Bureau handled 542 cases. The commission adjusted 321 of these. It referred 126 to the court.

Now see why the youth of Paterson is discouraged from trying to step out of line a section time. Out of the 126 cases that went before Judge Schmach, 86 offenders—or nearly 70 percent—were sent to one of three institutions for indefinite confinement.

Paterson doesn't tolerate nonsense in schools either. The city has 25,000 school kids in 26 grammar schools, 2 high schools, and 2 vocational high schools.

Truancy—authorities agree it is one of the first steps to delinquency—is a serious offense in any Paterson school. By State law, it is a misdemeanor.

DEALING WITH TRUANCY

Here is how truancy is handled by the schools:

Principals must report all truants at once to the superintendent of schools. In turn, he notifies the attendance bureau of the Board of Education, which has seven attendance officers.

One of the officers immediately investigates the truant by visiting his home and

bringing the youngster and one of his parents to the bureau's headquarters.

After a conference with Senior Clerk Tom Morris, the truant is ordered to report every day after school to the attendance bureau. This punishment may last a week or two or more, depending on the case.

If a child fails to report on any day, another week is tacked onto his punishment. Chronic offenders are referred without hesitation to the Child Welfare Bureau. With the cooperation of the superintendent of schools, the child may then be transferred to the city's "adjustment" school, operated by the Child Welfare Bureau.

If there is no improvement at this school, the truant is referred to the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. The court may send the truant to one of the State institutions.

And the judge may also sentence the parent to a jail term.

Vandalism—also a misdemeanor under State law—is another nuisance that Paterson has little truck with. The city handles all cases with an iron fist. The children themselves may be dealt with in the way other delinquents are processed

But, in addition, parents are held responsible for any damage against city property, and must make restitution. That may be fined up to $25 by the court.

POLICE MORALE HIGH

"The cooperation of schools, courts, and citizens is all-important in our success," said Chief Walker. "But our greatest asset is the high morale of the department."

Department strength consists of 272 members; including all ranks. In addition, there are 70 women school traffic guards who relieve patrolmen for other duties. Annual salary of the Paterson patrolman is $3,900—about average for a city its size.

National Vegetable Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the beginning of National Vegetable Week which draws attention to the developments in an important segment of our great agricultural program. We Americans are fortunate, both from the standpoint of enjoyment and health, in having access to such abundant variety and supply of fresh and processed vegetables. Under leave granted, I include herewith an editorial from the July 23 edition of the Packer:

NATIONAL VEGETABLE WEEK

Promotion on a broad scale in virtually every medium of publicity, backed by some of the country's biggest names, including that of President Eisenhower, will give the seventh annual National Vegetable Week, July 28 to August 6, and sponsored by the Vegetable Growers Association of America, the biggest support it has yet enjoyed.

In a statement issued recently at the White House, President Eisenhower told the people of the country: "Our vegetable growers make an important contribution to the maintenance of a flourishing American agriculture, essential to American prosperity.

"They decide for themselves what to grow, how much to produce, and when to harvest. In their efforts they are assisted by the Department of Agriculture, which, through research projects, fact-gathering facilities, and the issuance of acreage and marketing guides, provides them with information relevant to production and marketing problems.

"With my congratulations, I extend on the occasion of seventh annual National Vegetable Week, to the members of your association my best wishes for continued success in their endeavors to increase our Nation's agricultural abundance and advance the well-being of our people."

National Vegetable Week was originated in 1949 by the Vegetable Growers' Association of America. The object was and is, to acquaint consumers with the importance of vitamins and energy in vegetables, to emphasize nutrition, avoid waste and loss, and to give consumers fresher vegetables of better quality at lower prices when they are at peak supply.

Indicating the increasing interest on the part of public officials in the part National Vegetable Week plays in the Nation's health program, the governors of some 30 States have issued National Vegetable Week proclamations which are in line with the thought expressed by President Eisenhower.

The Packer joins in extending congratulations to VGAA and its membership and its officers on this worthwhile annual promotion, which, incidentally, seems to be doing a better job, and accomplishing more, each year. May it continue to expand.

David Crockett (Davy Crockett) Actually Served in House of Representatives During Three Congresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you, as well as all other Members of this great legislative body, have recently and frequently been asked about one David Crockett, and whether or not he actually served in the House of Representatives from Tennessee. I, having been asked that question several times by adults as well as youngsters, including my own grandchildren, asked the Library of Congress to give me what the facts were, and I know their reply to me will not only be of interest but will enable every Members of this great legislative body to give the accurate information about David Crockett's service in the 20th, 21st and 22d Congresses:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
Twenty-third District, Calif.

REFERENCE SERVICE REPORT

Inquiry: Information about the service of David Crockett in the House of Representatives as a Representative from Tennessee during the 20th, 21st, and 23d Congresses.

Report: A search in the files of the House of Representatives (Record Group 233) in the National Archives has disclosed the following original documents bearing on the service of Davy Crockett in the House of Representatives during the 20th, 21st, and 23d Congresses. The cost of making negative photostat copies of these documents is indicated.

TWENTIETH CONGRESS

1. Resolution submitted on January 17, 1828, instructing the Committee on Military Affairs "to inquire into the expediency of authorizing the Secretary of War to appoint one or more skillful engineers to examine several points on Big Shoal Creek, and Big Buffalo, in Lawrence County, in Tennessee, and to report upon the fitness of these places, respectively, as a site for a national armory, similar to the Armories of the United States at Springfield and Harper's Ferry." Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

2. Resolution submitted on February 19, 1828, instructing the Committee on Military Pensions "to inquire into the expediency of placing Andrew Derryberry, a soldier of the Revolution, on the pension roll." Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

3. Resolution submitted on February 19, 1828, instructing the Committees on Military Pensions "to inquire into the expediency of placing William Walker, a soldier of the Revolution, upon the pension roll." Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

4. Resolution submitted on April 2, 1828, instructing the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads "to inquire into the expediency of establishing a post route from Jackson to Mount Pierson; thence to Purdy's office, thence to Perryville, Perry County, State of Tennessee." Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

5. Resolution submitted on May 10, 1828, instructing the Committee on Public Lands "to inquire into the propriety of making a donation of 160 acres of land to each actual settler on the land of the United States in the State of Tennessee, south and west of the congressional reservation line, to include their improvement." Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

6. Resolution submitted on January 20, 1829, instructing the Committee on Roads and Canals "to inquire into the expediency of having reviewed and opened a road from Bolivar, in the State of Tennessee, through the Chickasaw nation of Indians, to the Cotton-gin Port, in the State of Mississippi; and, also, a road leading from Memphis, in the former State, to Jackson, in the latter, passing also through said nation of Indians." Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

7. Resolution submitted on January 29, 1829, instructing the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads "to inquire into the expediency of establishing a post route from Memphis, in the Western District of Tennessee, by Loves' Settlement and Tocklish, in the Chickasaw Nation, to Columbus, on the military road in Mississippi, to intersect the great southern mail route at that point." Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

8. Certificate of election, signed on September 18, 1827, by William Carroll, Governor of Tennessee, commissioning David Crockett to represent the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee in the House of Representatives during the 20th Congress. Two pages. Cost of photostatic copy, 80 cents.

TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESS

9. Resolution submitted on December 15, 1829, to appoint a select committee with instructions to inquire "into the most equitable and advantageous mode of disposing of the refuse land lying south and west of the Congressional reservation line in the State of Tennessee." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy, 80 cents.

10. Resolution submitted on January 26, 1830, instructing the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads "to inquire into the expediency of establishing a post route from Dyers Burgh in Tennessee to Rutherfords Mills thence to Baerfields on the west bank of the Mississippi in Arkansas Territory—then to Rutherfords Mill then to Natchez Bluff then to the town of Eaton thence to Trenton

Gibson City." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy, 80 cents.

11. Resolution submitted on January 27, 1830, instructing the Committee on Internal Improvements to inquire "into the expediency of having a survey of a rout [sic] for a canal from the head of the Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River State of Alabama to some proper point on the Big Natches above Bolivar in the State of Tennessee." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy, 80 cents.

12. Resolution submitted on February 1, 1830, instructing the Committee on Military Pensons [sic] to inquire into the expediency of placing George W. Stell of Tennessee a soldier of the last war on the penson [sic] role as an involede [sic] pensioner." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

13. Resolution submitted on February 9, 1830, directing the Committee on Military Pensions to inquire "into the expediency of placing Joseph Asbridge of Tennessee a sailor in the Revolutionary War on the list of military pensioners." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

14. Resolution submitted on February 25, 1830, that the West Point Academy be abolished, and "the appropriations annually made for its support be discontinued." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

15. Resolution submitted on April 6, 1830, instructing the Committee on Post Offices and Post Road to inquire "into the expediency of establishing a post rout [sic] from Duncan's post office in Hardeman county to Mitchell's store in McNairy County thence to Cypress Bridge in said county at James Smith's from that to J. C. Simpson's in Harden county thence to Esq. Lettery's to intersect the Savannah rout [sic] in said county." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

16. Resolution submitted on April 20, 1830, instructing the Committee on Military Pensions to inquire "into the expediency of placing the names of James Dougan and George Clarke both of Tennessee on the roll as Military pensioners for services rendered in the Revolutionary War." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

17. Resolution submitted on December 16, 1830, requesting the Postmaster General to communicate to the House of Representatives "the amount of money agreed to be paid by him under the late contract for carrying the mail from the City of Washington to the City of Baltimore also the amount of money heretofore paid by his predecessor for the like services." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

18. Resolution submitted on January 5, 1831, instructing the Committee on Military Pensions to inquire "into the expediency of placing the names of Andrew Derryberry of Perry County and William Gillispie of Hardeman County, Tennessee, both revolutionary soldiers—on the pension list * * *" Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

19. Resolution submitted on January 20, 1831, instructing the Committee on Pensions to inquire "into the expediency of placing the name of James Crawford of Tipton County Tennessee a soldier of the Revolutionary War on the pension list. * * *" Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

20. Resolution submitted by Crockett, with the date not indicated, "that 6,000 copies of the report of the Secretary of War communicated to this House on Monday last in relation to the Military Academy at West Point be printed for the information of the people of the United States." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

21. Report made by Crockett as a member of the select committee appointed "to enquire into the most equitable manner of disposing of the refuse public lands lying south and west of the Congressional Reservation line in the State of Tennessee." House Report 137, 21st Congress, 1st session (Jan. 29, 1830). Four pages. Cost of photostat copy: $1.60.

22. Bill H. R. 185, 21st Congress, reported by Crockett from the aforesaid select committee (accompanying House Report 137, 21st Congress, 1st session), titled "A bill to amend 'an act authorizing the State of Tennessee to issue grants and perfect titles to certain lands herein described and to settle the claims to the vacant and unappropriated lands within the same.'" Four pages. Cost of photostat copy: $1.60.

23. Certificate of election, signed on October 7, 1829, by William Carroll, Governor of Tennessee, commissioning "David Crockett, a citizen of the Ninth Congressional District of this State * * * to represent the said district, as a Member of the House of Representatives, in the 21st Congress of the United States." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS

24. Resolution submitted on December 17, 1833, to appoint a select committee, "consisting of seven members, whose duty it shall be to inquire into, and report the most equitable and advantageous mode of disposing of that portion of the lands belonging to the United States, situated south and west of the Congressional Reservation line, within the State of Tennessee." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

25. Resolution submitted on April 10, 1834, instructing the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads to inquire "into the expediency of establishing a post rout [sic] from Totten's Walls in Obion County by Seth Bedford's to Troy in Tennessee." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy: 80 cents.

26. Resolution submitted on December 11, 1834, instructing the Committee on Roads and Canals "to enquire and report to this House whether the improvemint [sic] of the navigation of Obion Fork, Deer, and Hatchy Rivers would be a national object and if so what would be the probable cost of removing the obstructions to the head of navigation of said rivers." Two pages. Cost of photostat copy, 80 cents.

27. Report made by Davy Crockett as chairman of the select committee "to whom was referred the subject of 'inquiring into and reporting the most equitable and advantageous mode of disposing of that portion of the lands belonging to the United States situated south and west of the Congressional reservation line, within the State of Tennessee.'" House Report 120, 23rd Congress, 2d session (January 2, 1834). Six pages. Cost of photostat copy, $2.40.

28. Bill H. R. 126, 23rd Congress, reported by Representative Crockett from the aforesaid select committee (accompanying House Report 120, 23rd Congress, 2d session), titled A Bill to amend an 'act authorizing the State of Tennessee to issue grants and perfect titles to certain lands therein described, and to settle the claims to the vacant and unappropriated lands within the same.'" Four pages. Cost of photostat copy, $1.60.

In the 22nd Congress, William Fitzgerald won election to the seat in the House of Representatives which David Crockett had occupied in the 20th and 21st Congresses, but Crockett made a contest of the election. Certain depositions taken in the contest are in the files of the House of Representatives at the National Archives, and photostat copies of these depositions, amounting to 17 pages, can be made for $6.50.

GEORGE P. PERROS,
Legislative Section.

(Report prepared by the National Archives and Records Service.)

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

DAVID CROCKETT

Crockett, David (August 17, 1786–March 6, 1836), frontiersman, was the son of John and Rebecca (Hawkins) Crockett, and was born near the present Rogersville, Hawkins County, Tenn. His father, a revolutionary soldier who fought at King's Mountain, was born either in Ireland or on the voyage to America, and his mother in northern Maryland. His parents moved (probably from Lincoln County, N. C.) to the Hawkins County location about 3 years before he was born, later settling on the Holston, where the father kept a tavern. Here the boy remained until about his 13th year. To escape an anticipated beating he ran away from home, making his way as far as Baltimore and wandering about for nearly 3 years. On his return he worked for 6 months for a neighbor to pay off a debt of $36 owed by his father, and another 6 months for another neighbor to cancel a similar debt of $40. At 18, to heighten his chances with the girl of his choice, he went to school for nearly 6 months, but left when he learned that he had been jilted. Some months afterward he married Polly Findlay, and on a rented tract, with a horse, his bride's dower of two cows with calves, and $15 capital borrowed from a friend, he set up a home of his own. Though a mighty hunter, he was a poor farmer, indolent and shiftless, and he did not prosper. A couple of years later, with his wife and two babies, he moved to a farm in Lincoln County, near the Alabama line. In the Creek War of 1813–14, under the command of Andrew Jackson, he served with distinction as a scout, but retired before the end of the campaign, hiring a substitute to fill out his term of enlistment.

His wife died about 1815, leaving him with three children. He acquired two more by his marriage, some months later, to the widow of a fellow soldier. He now moved to a settlement 80 miles west, where he was informally chosen a magistrate, and on the incorporation of the district into Giles County was appointed a justice of the peace. In after years he could boast that in reaching his decisions he "relied on natural-born sense instead of law learning" and that none of his judgments was ever reversed. He was elected as a colonel of a militia regiment organized in his district, and in 1821 was elected to the legislature. He was then wholly unacquainted with public affairs and did not even know the meaning of the word "judiciary." He moved again, this time to a point in the extreme western part of the State, near the junction of the Obion with the Mississippi, where his nearest neighbor was 7 miles distant. Here, among other activities, he hunted bears; and unless he woefully miscounted his victims, he succeeded in killing, during a period of 8 or 9 months, 105 of them. His new constituency elected him to the legislature in 1823. In the spring of 1826 he attempted to float a cargo of staves down the Mississippi, losing all his cargo and nearly losing his life. A jocular proposal that he run for Congress decided him to make the race in earnest, and after a campaign enlivened by his humorous stories and the ridicule of his two opponents he was elected. He served in the 20th and 21st Congresses (1827–31), was defeated for the 22d, but was elected to the 23rd (1833–35). In April 1834, he commenced his celebrated "tour of the north," visiting Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, and, after returning to Washington, left for home to prepare for a new campaign. From the time he entered public life he had generally opposed Jackson, having voted in the legislature against him for United States Senator, and later having voted against many of the Jackson measures in Congress. An effective rally of the Jackson sentiment in his district caused his defeat. Disheartened by this reverse, he resolved to leave Tennessee. The movement for Texan independence attracted him, and he started for the war front by way of Little Rock. He arrived at the Alamo in February 1836, took part in its heroic defense, and fell, bullet riddled, in the final assault.

Crockett was a brave soldier, an able scout,

and an expert rifleman. He was generous and openhanded, frank and upright, of a sterling independence of spirit and blessed with a bubbling good nature and an exceptional degree of self-confidence. His knowledge of public questions, meager at the start of his career, was probably not greatly enhanced by his service in Washington. He was not a student. He rather prided himself on his lack of education—correct spelling appearing to him in the main as something "contrary to nature" and grammar "nothing at all," despite "the fuss that is made about it." To what degree the autobiographical writings published in his name were his own cannot be said; but it is noteworthy that they bear little resemblance, either in substance or manner, to such of his letters as have come down to us.

Source: Dictionary of American Biography. 1930. Vol. IV. pp. 555–56.

NORMAN D. BURCH,
History and General Research Division.
FEBRUARY 16, 1955.

Delinquency Can Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers:

DETROIT SHAKES OFF GRIP OF JUVENILE GANG TERROR

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

Not long ago, a reign of juvenile terror had Detroit, Mich., in its grip.

It was a fearful situation. No youth was safe from the savagery of the teen-age hoodlums who—while few in number—wielded terrible power.

Here is an exact picture of the situation as it existed then:

Frequent stabbings, often after high-school football and basketball games.

Wanton destruction of school facilities when roving gangs broke into buildings and smashed furniture, desks, and lockers.

Battles at drive-in restaurants when rival groups fought over parking places.

Girl auxiliaries who would instigate fights among boy gangs, cheer them on, and even join the fights.

Bullies forcing younger children to turn over allowance money to avoid beatings.

Drinking and petting parties in public parks and homes where parents were absent.

Police seemed virtually powerless to stop the marauding youths as their outrages grew daily.

The situation might have continued to this day had it not been for Detroit's citizenry, which finally found itself no longer able to stomach that condition. They shouted for action.

POLICE ORDERED TO GET TOUGH

Police then adopted a new strategy in dealing with the troublemakers. The strategy was contained in a two-word command Police Commissioner Edward S. Piggins gave his officers:

"Get tough."

Ordering immediate action, Piggins said:

"This time we act first and get the survey reports later. A survey report won't help a policeman if a group of rowdies jump him."

Did the get-tough policy pay off in Detroit?

Let's look at the record:

There are no organized teen-age gangs in the city today; juvenile offenses since the first of the year are down 15.2 percent.

PROGRAM DEVISED TO CURB HOODLUMS

Detroit Times Reporter Ed Breslin, who conducted the survey for this article reported:

"Piggins' idea clicked at once. Scared by the knowledge they would not be coddled by police, the young hoodlums stopped causing trouble."

But Piggins sought a program that would prevent other youths from trying to flout the law.

He went to leading church, school, business, and family groups to get help in mapping a preventive program. The group drew up this six-point program:

Police Department Youth Bureau strengthened by addition of 15 officers.

Six officers assigned to work only on the gang problem.

The entire graduating class from the Police Academy placed in high delinquency areas.

The public alerted, and kept alerted, to the many needs of youth to prevent their falling into a gang.

Youth given a sense of belonging and showing them Detroit was also their city.

Cooperation between church, school, business, and family groups to provide outlets for the youths.

DETROIT'S SOLUTION A SIMPLE ONE

The show of police officers on the street held down trouble as Detroit hurried to set up educational and entertainment programs to keep its youth busy. Business sponsored athletic leagues for boys and girls, schools were opened for activities that kept children off streets, churches set up youth clubs, and family groups arranged neighborhood programs.

It was that simple to solve Detroit's problem. While there are still some loosely knit groups of boys who fancy themselves "gangs," they are actually groups who play and work together.

Another city which has juvenile delinquency under control is San Francisco.

Again, as has been the case so often with communities which have the upper hand over young lawbreakers, the entire city is interested—and doing something—about the problem.

San Francisco police won't tolerate nonsense from youths. A strict policy by the Police Juvenile Bureau keeps constant tabs on youngsters.

Police pay regular visits to saloons to check on whether minors are being served. They also visit "creameries" (soda parlors) to break up "unhealthy" gatherings of youngsters.

DELINQUENCY CUT IN SAN FRANCISCO

Juvenile delinquency reached its peak in San Francisco in 1953, when 2,204 boys were referred to the probation office of the Youth Guidance Center for action. Eighty percent of the cases were reported by police, the others by schools, parents, relatives, social agencies and even private citizens.

In that peak delinquency period, 912 youths went before Juvenile Court in actions seeking to have them declared wards of the court, because parents were unable to control them.

Not bad for a city approaching 1,000,000 population.

And last year, the number dropped to 674.

Quincy, Mass., is one of the few cities in Greater Boston where major crime seldom rises.

HOW MASSACHUSETTS TOWN LICKED PROBLEM

And juvenile delinuency is even less frequent. The rate of court-adjudged delinquency in this city of 84,000 dropped to 1.1 percent of the 7-to-17-year-old population in 1953—to less than 1 percent in 1954.

Quincy's apparently successful solution of the juvenile delinquency problem is due to these factors—a three-man Juvenile Delinquency Bureau in Police headquarters, an excellent probation officer, the cooperation of civic organizations and a broad municipal recreation program.

But the work of these groups probably never could have achieved the success it has if it were not for a single policy—prevention.

Here's how that works:

Two of the three men assigned to the juvenile delinquency bureau—established in 1953 and one of the few in the State—investigate all cases of delinquency; the other concentrates on prevention.

The latter visits every classroom in the school system—there are 13,800 school kids—from September through June. He even explains to high-school students the meaning and need for city ordinances and State statutes.

The other two juvenile experts work with schools, too, but their job is to handle children in trouble. They take each case to the child's school guidance counselor, ask for suggestions, and string along if time is sought by the counselor to help a child.

"We don't go to court unless there's nothing else left to do," they say.

But none of the three is "softheaded" about juveniles.

With prevention in mind, the word has gone out in Quincy that it's a good idea for parents to get in touch with the juvenile delinquency bureau when their children are in borderline scrapes.

To make things easier, Quincy has a 9:30 p. m. curfew.

"If all parents carried out their responsibilities," says Judge James A. Mulhall, "you wouldn't need a curfew."

Boston Record-American Reporter Harold K. Banks, who surveyed the Quincy situation for the Hearst newspapers, reported that the recreation commission also was doing a phenomenal job on a small budget and with generally fair-to-middling facilities."

While able to spend only $35,908 in 1954, the commission, nevertheless, attracted a total child attendance of 162,815 to its various activities in a 9-month season.

NO TEEN-AGE GANGS IN ALBANY

The cost per child in the program has been figured at 7 cents a year.

Albany, N. Y., also has been kept free from the delinquency plague.

In Albany, a city of 150,000, there are no organized teen-age gangs.

Last year, only 237 cases of delinquency were handled in Albany County Children's Court. The number is more remarkable when compared to the incident of youth crime in other cities the size of Albany.

Probably the most important factor in keeping delinquency down in the Empire State capital is a variety of youth-activity movements, which include two Boys Clubs, the Catholic Youth Organization, YMCA, YMHA, and a number of community chest-sponsored organizations.

All teach youngsters the benefits of good, clean play.

Another factor in keeping delinquency in check is the Albany Children's Court, which pulls no punches with young hoodlums—especially any who would form gangs.

Whenever there is a hint that a gang is being formed the leaders of these would-be gangs are brought into court at once. Supervision of the leaders is continued until there is assurance the threat has been dispelled.

In Albany—as in Quincy and in all the cities and towns where delinquency has been routed—the campaign against delinquency seems to be wrapped up in a single motto, so aply expressed by Quincy's Police Chief William Ferrazzi, "prevention is far cheaper than reformation."

Should the Natural-Gas Bill Be Considered at This Late Date in the Session?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable surprise that a bill of the importance of the natural-gas amendments should be brought before the House at this late date in the session.

This bill is important from the standpoint of producers, transmission lines, distributing utilities, and consumers. It vitally affects each of these classes, particularly the 60 million or more consumers. They are fearful if the Federal Power Commission is stripped of all its power to regulate the producers that then unrestrained increases in the price of gas will follow.

Competent authorities have stated that even a slight increase in the cost of gas at the wellhead could mean as much as a $200 million to $800 million annual increase to the consumers of the Nation. This would be over and above what they are now paying.

It is because of the danger of such a possible result under the terms of the pending bill, as presently written, that has caused a terrific storm of opposition to arise against the bill. The fundamental objection that has been most often expressed relates to the bill being a repeal of the Supreme Court decision and of the Natural Gas Act in its endeavor to provide protection to the public against unwarranted price increases.

Transmission lines, distributing companies, local utilities, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers—consisting of 900 members representing cities, towns, and municipalities—mayors of 258 cities and towns representing a population of 31,600,000, labor organizations, and many others are against the bill.

Furthermore, it is important to realize that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with a membership of 31, after months of hearings and consideration, was unable to come to a satisfactory solution if we are to judge by the fact that the first motion to report the bill was defeated by a vote of 14 to 14, and, finally, upon a reconsideration vote, was able to report it by only a 16-to-15 vote.

Furthermore, the Rules Committee reported a rule to consider the bill by the close vote of 6 to 5, with 1 member not voting. Had he voted against the granting of a rule, the bill would not be before the House at this time.

Under the above circumstances, is it wise or advisable to attempt to consider the bill at this late date in the session? It seems to the undersigned members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the importance of the matter justifies our voting against its consideration at this time.

To do so would give the committee an opportunity to give the matter further study and investigation of the whole subject during the recess of Congress and come back to the House with recommendations that would express a greater unanimity of thought than now exists.

As part of my remarks, I include a copy of the letter that was addressed today to our colleagues in the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On July 2 Congressmen HARRIS and HINSHAW directed to their colleagues in the House a letter urging support of the Harris bill, H. R. 6645, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill would amend the Natural Gas Act so as to exempt producers of natural gas from Federal regulation.

The undersigned are strongly opposed to the enactment of H. R. 6645. We believe it is contrary to the public interest and to the interest of millions of consumers in thousands of cities, towns, and communities throughout the whole United States.

This legislation has been vigorously opposed by the mayors of New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Nashville, Louisville, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Buffalo, Newark, and many others representing cities and towns, both large and small. The mayors committee, representing 258 cities with a total population of 31,600,000, is opposed to the bill; also State public utility commissions generally, by gas distributing companies, and by nearly all the pipeline transmission companies.

As an indication of the unsatisfactory solution of this highly complex and controversial problem, it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that the bill was reported to the House by a vote of 16 to 15, after it had previously failed of being reported by a vote of 14 to 14. There are no less than five minority reports.

It would be unwise, in our opinion, to pass or even consider on the floor of the House this legislation (H. R. 6645) in its present form. The matter should have closer and more careful consideration before it is brought before the House for action. To do otherwise would mean that numerous and varied amendments would be offered from the floor. This subject presents problems that require the careful, studious, and deliberate consideration that can be obtained in the first instance only in the committee room.

If there is any doubt as to this being the proper course to follow, it seems to us that the statement made by the author of the bill, Mr. HARRIS, within a few days after the bill had been reported by the committee makes plain the necessity of such. We refer to the fact that Mr. HARRIS introduced a resolution for an investigation of the natural gas transmission lines and the distributors of natural gas with respect to the cost of the commodity to the consumer. In urging the necessity for such in a release issued by him at the time of the introduction of his resolution, Congressman HARRIS said:

"It is quite obvious to me, as illustrated by the closeness of the vote by which the bill was reported, that before this situation is cleared up in the interest of the industry as well as the consumer, other factors are going to have to be considered."

We agree with this statement of Mr. Harris. However, we do feel that any such investigation should include all elements that enter into the cost to the consumer, namely, production, transportation, and distribution and not merely the last two elements mentioned. To accomplish this complete purpose we favor such an investigation either under the general jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or by a special investigation committee. And, accordingly, we suggest it would be wise to withhold action on H. R. 6645 until the completion of such an investigation.

Furthermore, to have such further study or investigation would prove highly beneficial in supplying information that the committee hearings did not divulge and which, in our opinion, the House should have. For instance, notwithstanding the fact that the committee conducted long and extensive hearings, at no time did any independent producer appear and testify in person, although an attorney appeared and represented himself as speaking for them. And, at no time was any testimony given as to the cost of production of natural gas. The proper course would be to investigate the facts and then develop recommendations for any needed remedial legislation after all of the facts are in.

In conclusion, there are many technical questions, legal and otherwise, involved in the Harris bill that need clarification and careful consideration before adoption. We have not entered into a discussion of such in this letter because the minority reports cover all such in detail. We recommend that you read the minority reports. They are a full, complete, and satisfactory answer to every argument that was made by Messrs. HARRIS and HINSHAW in their letter to the Members of the House urging support of the Harris bill (H. R. 6645).

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, are convinced there should be further study and investigation before the House is called upon to act on H. R. 6645. We submit our views for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER, JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr., SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, DON HAYWORTH, JOHN W. HESELTON, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, TORBERT MACDONALD, PETER F. MACK, Jr., KENNETH A. ROBERTS, PAUL F. SCHENCK, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CHARLES A. WOLVERTON.

Philosophies of Justice Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the Columbus Enquirer, Columbus, Ga., July 25, 1955, and credited to the Memphis Commercial Appeal, and reading as follows, should challenge the interest of every true American:

BLACK'S AMAZING RECOMMENDATION

Associate Justice Hugo L. Black, of the Supreme Court of the United States, has been widely quoted as having said in a public meeting in New York that "the world could not do better than to follow the political and social ideas" of the late Albert Einstein. In view of those same ideas, it is amazing to find Justice Black recommending them.

No one questions the lofty rank of Professor Einstein as a scientist, but almost invariably the results were unfortunate when he ventured out of his specific field. In a magazine article, for example, he once proposed to analyze "the crisis of our times," and went on to declare: "The economic an-

archy of capitalist society as it exists today is, in my opinion, the real source of the evil."

In the same article Professor Einstein scored the principle of production for profit instead of use and what he termed the worker's constant fear of losing his job. He went on: "The profit motive, in conjunction with competition among capitalists, is responsible for an instability in the accumulation and utilization of capital which leads to increasingly severe depressions."

To cure the ills he conceived in effect, he wrote: "I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate these grave ills—namely, through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system that would be oriented toward socialist goals." On numerous other occasions Professor Einstein revealed his inability to understand the fallacies of socialism as a theory and its perversions by those who profess to operate under it.

There may be some excuses offered for Professor Einstein on the ground that he really dwelt in a world apart and knew too little about politics and the social order to be other than easily deluded by glib and specious partisans of socialism. What palliation can be offered for a man of Justice Black's background, experience, and lofty position when he commends such social and political notions it is impossible to imagine.

It has been an accepted rule that jurists and especially Appellate Court Judges should remain aloof from political questions. Inasmuch as so many of our United States Supreme Court Justices are continually thrusting their political opinions upon the public, I am wondering of their lack of judicial experience explains their failure to recognize the ethics, or whether many of them are so imbued with concepts foreign to our Constitution that they cannot remain silent.

According to the above article, Justice Black says that "the world could not do better than to follow the political and social ideas of the late Albert Einstein." Justice Black undoubtedly knows that Mr. Einstein advised persons working in the Government and teachers in our schools to invoke the fifth amendment, and decline to testify whether they were or were not Communists. Justice Black knows that Mr. Einstein defended the record of J. Robert Oppenheimer, which record was nothing less than amazing regarding his congeniality and friendship to known Communists, extending to even contributing money to most every well-known Communist cause. Justice Black well knows that Mr. Einstein was against "the profit motive" and against private enterprise, and, by the same token, was absolutely against the very foundations of our Government. Mr. Einstein was socialist, at least, and Justice Black evidently thinks that is the supreme way of ilfe for our country.

I am wondering if the philosophies of Justice Black and Justice Douglas, who has demonstrated his devotion to queer ideas to everyone who would listen, do not cause grave concern to every member of the United States Congress and to every true American. No wonder decisions based solely on physchology and sociology are being rendered. No wonder it is practically impossible for the Government to win any case where there is an attempt to restrain or prevent persons under suspicion from working for this Government. No wonder it has become impossible for the Government to deprive anyone of citizenship, and the Government, realizing the situation, is dismissing cases that had been brought for that object. No wonder it has become impossible to deny anyone a visa on account of the theory that every citizen of the United States is entitled to travel anywhere at any time, whether the authorities think it is in the interest of our country, or not. No wonder that our criminal jurisprudence founded on the wisdom of the ages has been virtually destroyed. No wonder that persons who would change our Government have become so bold and so arrogant.

The Federal Flammable Fabrics Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to believe that the House, now driving for an early adjournment, would consider any bill which would weaken the provisions of the Federal Flammable Fabrics Act passed by the 83d Congress to protect the lives of our people from experiencing the fate of the hundreds who had been killed or maimed in yesteryear.

My interest in promoting such legislation was borne several years ago when children in my area wearing cheap cowboy suits were casualties because the suits, highly flammable, caught fire and they could not be saved. This interest was intensified after a rash of exploding sweater incidents. I became a sponsor of a bill to stop this kind of business and it was extremely difficult getting such legislation through the Congress. Efforts to amend and weaken the act began soon after the President signed the bill and there were those who predicted the act would be amended and diluted to death.

Currently, importers of Japanese scarves are extremely busy in an effort to secure the passage of H. R. 5222 before we adjourn. Among the first to protest were American textile workers speaking through their unions. Those who would weaken the act spread the story the workers had made an about-face but that is not true and the following telegram I have just received from William Gordon, vice president of the Textile Workers Union of American, emphasizes their unalterable opposition:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 27, 1955.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Rumors are being circulated that the Textile Workers Union of America has withdrawn its opposition to H. R. 5222.

The Textile Workers Union of America has been and still is violently opposed to exempting scarves from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. The exemption would grant special consideration to increase the importation of the fully printed and finished Japanese scarf. The present importation of the scarf has already caused the loss of jobs of 3,000 American textile workers. It would give preference to Japanese fabrics which are not being given to American-produced fabrics. The passage of this bill will seriously endanger the women of our country who wear scarves about the neck and head. It is highly dangerous to exempt scarves from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act and thus create a serious safety hazard.

We urge you to do everything in your power to defeat H. R. 5222.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
WILLIAM GORDON,
Vice President.

Friends of the Flammable Fabrics Act, these including leaders of the American textile industry and unions, national women's organizations, the press, fire marshals and fire chiefs, and consumer groups should be alerted that the drive is on. The challenge must be met.

Free Europe Is on the Up—Communist Europe Is on the Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a summary of conditions in Europe as reported to me by a good friend who has recently returned from one of the almost annual visits he has been making to Europe for many years in connection with his own business. He is an accurate observer and trusted interpreter of events there, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe. His report is the sort of boiled-down concise information that is most helpful:

DEAR DR. JUDD: I wish to advise you of the following developments I ran into on my recent trip abroad.

1. Swedish friends advised me that the Russian satellites, especially Poland (but also Czechoslovakia and East Germany) had been buying increasing amounts of Swedish grain, and from other sources through Sweden, even since the fall of 1954. Increasing food shortages are reported prevailing behind the Iron Curtain, with hunger serious in Czechoslovakia.

2. Other internal production problems are reported from inside Russia and the satellites. Following such production declines, it is no wonder there are such continuing personnel shifts at the higher levels.

3. While the economy of Western Europe is forging ahead so impressively (and Austria this year impressed me most), it can be assumed that the grapevine is informing Russians of their own ill and declining lot, in contrast to the progress in the West.

4. The signing of the NATO treaties is a triumph for the West, as the Russians tried everything to stop it. Their pinpricks in Berlin are signs of their resentment—more are likely to follow.

5. Bitter hatreds and stronger underground activity are underway in Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, etc.

6. Russians seem cocky about their air force, its size, etc., and have sent German scientists home, telling them to tell the West what they know about Russia's air force.

7. After 2 years of better food supplies for East Germans, shortages are again showing up in East Germany.

8. Spanish recovery is beginning.

9. Italian Communist strength is declining; but this may prove temporary only.

Now I believe we have a real chance to make hay if we will pursue our objectives with a measure of intensity. I hope we can learn to move faster than heretofore and thus cope with our fast-moving enemies.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

One Good Way To Determine What America Should Not Do Is To Examine What Communists Are Urging Us To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent summary by Jack Lotto, of INS, of the official line being plugged day and night by Communists. I hold my breath when I see us tending to move more and more in exactly the directions the Communists are urging us to take—to their advantage and our own mortal peril:

ON GUARD

(By Jack Lotto)

Communists were instructed this week to come out of their shells and actively "fraternize" with non-Communists in unions and industry. The new "friendship" approach was described by the Red politburo as a good way to win recruits for their program of eventual revolution.

Here is a summary of this important campaign and other themes stressed in Communist propaganda organs in the United States and abroad:

Labor: The latest bulletin of the national board of the American Communist Party slapped the comrades for plugging away almost exclusively in left-wing circles. "Changing times dictate that we be flexible," said the party voice. Criticizing the "imposed self-isolation," the bulletin declared:

"Having lunch with our coworkers, going out on shop-arranged theater parties, bowling, etc., visiting our shopmates, are all natural and enjoyable ways of building lasting and wonderful friendships. * * *

"If we Communists are to play our role, our ties in the labor and people's organizations must be multiplied and strengthened. Our organizational structure and work methods must be geared to speed up the process of extending our mass ties and stimulating mass struggle. * * *

"Recruiting new members is our richest reservoir of future leaders. And there is reason to believe we can increase our recruiting rate in the period ahead."

Geneva: With the Big Four summit talks opening tomorrow, the Communist press reached a high pitch in its efforts to paint President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles as "reluctant dragons." From every direction the Communist publications charged that both American leaders were being literally "dragged" to the Geneva conference tables.

The leading voice in the Red outcry was National Chairman William Z. Foster. Writing in the Daily Worker, where he called for the greatest pressure to force decisions at the talks, he asserted:

"The Washington reactionaries' * * * dearest wish would be to see it (talks) end in a bitter stalemate. Of course, all this sabotage of peace they are carrying out under a thick blanket of peace demagogy, in order not to be repudiated by the peoples.

"At this time the worst and most dangerous illusion is the belief among the American masses that President Eisenhower is going to Geneva as a genuine peacemaker. The reality is that Eisenhower will take constructive peace steps at Geneva only if, under the peace pressure of the vast majority of mankind, he has no other alternative."

Slogans: The party's top official magazine, Political Affairs, told the comrades to keep hammering at these slogans as the talks get underway:

1. Negotiate in a spirit of mutual concessions.
2. Don't rearm (Western) Germany when the whole world can begin to disarm.
3. Ban the H-bomb.
4. Expand East-West trade.
5. Allocate Government expenditures for peace, not war.
6. Seat (Red) China in the U. N.
7. End the cold war.
8. Oppose all "appeasement" of "the Knowlands and McCarthys."
9. Eliminate all international barriers.
10. Negotiate until settlements are reached.

The Big Four Conference at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last week I gave an outline of what I thought of the Big Four Conference at Geneva, and without claiming too much for myself I can state that the result was just what I expected. Knowing the Russian communistic philosophy pretty well, I could forecast that the Russians would shy away from a united Germany and would not discuss Russian aggression. They were nice and smiled better than they have before, yet the communistic determination to spread their propaganda beyond their own borders was as insistent as ever. They did not call us names, as Vishinsky and Molotov have religiously done before, but they opposed us as solidly as ever on essential points.

President Eisenhower performed admirably and, I think, did break down the barriers of ill-feeling against the United States that the Russians in their propaganda had succeeded in building up. From the great newspaper spread of President Eisenhower's speeches, the world has been officially advised that the United States seeks nothing but world peace, and that we were sincere in our efforts at Geneva to bring about world peace. I think the position of the United States has been so admirably put before the conference by the President that even if there is nothing agreed to, we have gained by the conference.

The President did not surrender any rights of the United States and made it perfectly clear that we would agree to a reduction in armaments, provided there was a clear and complete inspection of the arms program of our potential enemies. The President played a trump card when he said we would offer for inspection of any of the big or little powers our armament blueprint if Russia would do likewise, conditioned on a free inspection of the arms buildup of those with whom we sought a limitation of armaments. The Russians did not accept this offer, and the world ought to see that the United States is acting in good faith, but reserving the power of self-defense against any nation that may not be sincere. The Russian word has been so many times repudiated that unless a thorough inspection of Russian armaments were made a part of the general curtailment of armaments, the bare agreement to disarm would be only a gesture and might, as it has in the past, be a gesture to our great damage, as was the sinking of our fleet in the Gulf of Mexico.

The President is to be congratulated for putting his statements right on the line and in doing so gave up nothing in concessions as was done at Yalta and Potsdam. The President meant just what he said, and I am sure he has the backing of 99 percent of the people of the United States. I feel that the position of the United States is much more understood by the world than it was before the conference, and that the attempt on our part to bring about world peace was not in vain.

Life Under the Capitalistic System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 26, 1955, should be read by every Member of Congress:

NOT BAD, NOT BAD

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, with some $35 million in its treasury, is doing a nice thing for its president, Dave Beck. It is paying Mr. Beck a reported $160,000 for his Seattle home and letting him live in it rent-free. The union will also pay for all maintenance and taxes.

It cannot be said that this is doing too much for Mr. Beck. For the union, which has just moved into a handsome $5 million headquarters in Washington, did even better by his predecessor, Dan Tobin, according to the New York Times. It provided Mr. Tobin, now president emeritus, with an expensive home at Miami Beach, another house at a summer resort near Boston, a costly limousine, a combination chauffeur-handyman, a full-time maid, and incidental expenses. Mr. Beck, who, like Mr. Tobin, is paid $50,000 a year, gets along without a chauffeur or union-provided house servants.

If all of this points to the conclusion that the union is doing rather handsomely by Messrs. Beck and Tobin, it must be remem-

bered that they have done a great deal for the union. Which, in its own turn, prompts a question: What in the world has become of that iniquitous Taft-Hartley Act—the law that was going to enslave the working people, destroy their unions, and bankrupt their treasuries?

Delinquency Can Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers:

THEY PROVE TEEN CRIME CAN BE CURBED: PREVENTIVE TEAMS HELP DISCOURAGE DELINQUENCY—RATE CUT IN SAN ANTONIO

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

San Antonio's juvenile delinquency decreased in 1954 despite—

An adult crime rate which, while not abnormally high, is marked by bizarre violence springing "from a land basically untamed and a people still close to the frontier."

A narcotics problem aggravated by this Texas city's geographical position as the crossroad of travel from Mexico, which makes it "the easiest town in the Nation for a fix."

HIGH POVERTY RATE

Poverty among one-fifth of the city's more than 500,000 inhabitants that breaks down to 6 percent with incomes of less than $500, 13 percent with incomes less than $1,000 a year.

Not a single new park or recreation facility, thus continuing the city's failure to pass a bond issue for those purposes since 1929.

A lack of even a single psychiatric team to treat children showing signs of delinquency.

A school system of 60,000 students with only four partly trained social workers.

A desperate slum condition and housing shortage aggravated by a 100 percent population growth in 25 years.

DELINQUENCY DROPS

Yet, despite all these handicaps, police figures show San Antonio's juvenile delinquency rate dropped from 2,833 in 1953 to 2,702 in 1954, or about 5 percent.

Even San Antonio's gloomiest juvenile workers agree the figures are encouraging and won't say above a whisper that, with so many problems, things could have been much worse.

How San Antonio reduced its youth crime while faced with so many delinquency-producing conditions is an outstanding accomplishment, and credit belongs in several places.

For instance, police and juvenile officers. They work strongly not only for detection and appehension, but prevention, too.

ROUND OF LECTURES

During 1954 Police Capt. G. E. Matheny lectured 122 civic clubs and P-TA groups, 42 school assemblies, and conductd 45 school classes on guided tours of police headquarters.

In his lectures he uses films, weapons displays, narcotics, facts, figures, and case histories. No oratorical expert, Captain Matheny more than makes up for it with an almost unbelievable earnestness to put over his points.

His lectures to adults are aimed at the danger signs they may see in their own children; his lectures to children are aimed at discouraging predelinquent conduct which leads toward delinquency.

DISPLAY OF CONTRABAND

His weapons and narcotics displays—fearsome things—are all contraband taken from San Antonio juveniles.

Another antidelinquency program yielding high dividends is the police-organized safety patrol, which is basically designed to protect school children at street crossings.

Matheny says it is almost unheard of for a safety-patrol child to get in trouble.

Sometimes the jobs are given to potential delinquents to keep them out of trouble. One such potential delinquent who entered the safety patrol is now nearly through training for the priesthood.

JUNIOR DEPUTIES

In the same class, with similar good results, are the Bexar County Junior Deputies, administered by Sheriff Owen Kilday.

Several hundred junior deputies carry cards and badges, live by a strict code, consider themselves allied with law enforcement, and occasionally in emergencies give real aid with information.

To achieve the success they have, the programs have relied heavily on full cooperation from schools and other agencies.

In addition to various national youth organizations which have chapters in San Antonio, a variety of neighborhood, nonuniform, nonfee recreation halls are in operation.

The Mule Stall in Alamo Heights, a wealthy independent municipality surrounded by San Antonio proper, is a sort of USO for teen-agers, where they can dance, buy refreshments and lounge without encountering trouble.

The city also has about a half dozen settlement houses sponsored by churches and financed by them and the Community Chest, which operate in various neighborhoods of the city.

In addition to recreation, they offer classes in sewing, woodwork, citizenship, English and any other course in demand.

OTHER EFFORTS

While these efforts to check delinquency are exerted, other efforts are underway in San Antonio to extend the prevention field, particularly where the city is lacking.

The Community Welfare Council, allied to Community Chest and deeply interested in delinquency, is currently working on establishment of a child guidance clinic.

The council is raising $135,000 to finance the first 3 years of a $45,000-a-year clinic to handle about 450 young patients annually.

As a long-range approach, San Antonio is pushing for a minimum housing code, but will not be effective until public housing assistance is increased.

San Antonio's goal is clear—it is out to conquer delinquency.

As determination is the keystone of San Antonio's fight against juvenile delinquency, so it is in another "white spot" where the skids have been knocked out from under teen-age crime—Milwaukee, Wis.

SOLVES PROBLEM

Milwaukee likes to pride itself in thinking that it meets the juvenile delinquency problem with some degree of success. Facts and figures leave no doubt that it does.

Since establishment of the police department's Youth Aid Bureau in 1945, Milwaukee's juvenile crime rate has dropped nearly 25 percent.

The bureau is the heart of Milwaukee's antidelinquency program, and while a police function, it is essentially a predelinquency program, which catches youngsters headed for trouble before they get there. This is how it works:

In their regular course of duty, policemen may come upon youngsters in minor scrapes or in potentially troublesome situations, such as loitering around a used car lot after midnight.

AVOID ARRESTS

Rather than book them as juvenile offenders, police get the youngsters' identity and refer them to the Youth Aid Bureau.

The next step is to send a YAB patrolman or policewoman to each of the youth's homes—in plainclothes, to avoid stigmatizing the youngster or his parents in the eyes of neighbors.

Once the cause of trouble is identified, the YAB officer will suggest an activity to eliminate it—hobbies or recreational activities at a social center to replace unsupervised idleness, perhaps a job to earn pocket money and cancel urges to get it the easy way, perhaps a change in schools or curriculum to dispel truancy-producing factors.

What youngsters do with their idle time is the key to youth control, according to Captain Michael Wolke, who has headed the Youth Aid Bureau since its inception.

INTEREST DIRECTED

"Try to find out what a boy or girl is interested in and then put them to work at it," he says. "They crave activity. We try to direct that craving into channels which will be profitable, thus keeping the youngsters out of mischief."

As a further preventive measure, the YAB advises and counsels 20 Junior Safety Councils organized in Milwaukee schools. Bureau members lecture on safety, respect for law and order, citizenship, and civic responsibility.

One means the Bureau uses to direct youth into constructive channels is active promotion of the Soapbox Derby, sponsored by the Milwaukee Sentinel, another of the Hearst Newspapers contributing to the fight against delinquency.

SHARE CREDIT

Sharing credit with police for Milwaukee's antidelinquency drive are such agencies as the metropolitan youth commission, boys' club, municipal recreation department and its wide network of social center activities for winter and summer—indoors and out—an understanding children's court judge, and an efficient probation department staff.

Then, too—as it is in the Nation's cities which have teen-age crime under control—the citizens themselves are actively engaged in the fight.

For example, the Milwaukee County board recently invited suggestions in combating juvenile delinquency. It asked for ideas from organizations and groups—but it also called out to individuals to contribute recommendations.

DETENTION HOME

Most suggested first a new detention home for children, next an activities program to fit in with the new home to combat idleness while confined there.

Other programs to keep youngsters out of trouble are continually being sponsored in the city.

Not long ago a dress right guild was formed by merchants and wholesalers of haberdashery and men's clothing—not to promote the merchandise, but rather to create an awareness in youth for proper dress for various occasions.

Awards were made in schools and other places, the judging conducted without advance warning to the kids. Officials credit the program with stimulating an immediate desire in schoolchildren to look neat, well groomed. Thus, the program which continued for many weeks will be resumed in the fall.

Ike's School-Aid Program Is More Like an Obstacle Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I take this means of calling your attention to the sorry record of this administration at a time of crisis in our schools.

During the 1952 campaign General Eisenhower spoke sympathetically of the classroom shortage, and I was among those who hoped that he meant to do something about it. We were disappointed when his school program in the 83d Congress consisted of more studies of the problem.

Only a year ago, the administration, speaking through Education Commissioner Brownell, said there would be no Federal aid to school construction, regardless of the need, until after another round of conferences next winter.

It was surprising then that President Eisenhower took note of the crisis in our schools early this year. In a special message to Congress, Mr. Eisenhower said the "best possible education for all our young people is a fixed objective of the American Nation."

He called attention to an emergency situation, the deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms, and said that "unless the Federal Government steps forward, to join with the States and communities, this emergency situation will continue."

Now the school-construction program put forward in that special message is completely inadequate to meet the tremendous and growing need.

How inadequate is pointed out in the following interview with the senior Senator from Alabama, Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, in the May issue of the Democratic Digest:

IKE'S SCHOOL-AID PROGRAM IS MORE LIKE AN OBSTACLE COURSE

(An interview with Senator LISTER HILL)

Question. Senator, we hear a great deal about the "crisis" in our schools. I wonder if you could explain just what this crisis is and what brought it about.

Answer. To put it very simply, the number of new babies has grown much faster than the number of new schools. During World War II, for instance, we had to virtually stop building schools, but children kept on being born. And since the war we have continued to break records as to the number of children born. In fact, for 9 straight years we have broken the record of the year before. We haven't been able to build enough schools to keep even, let alone catch up.

Question. How far behind are we at this point?

Answer. The best estimate is that we are currently short some 370,000 classrooms. At current costs, it would take about $12 billion to build that many schools. Of course, there's a shortage of teachers, too, and most teachers are badly underpaid. But that's a separate question.

Question. Well, if the shortage is as severe as you say, why aren't more schools being built?

Answer. As a matter of fact, the States and localities are doing quite a job. Schools are being built at the record rate of about $2 billion worth a year. But that won't make up for the backlog of school needs. And the States and local school districts are about at the end of their rope. Many districts have reached their legal ceiling for selling school bonds, and most of them have raised the school taxes as much as the local or State law permits.

Question. Now, as I understand it, there are two major plans for Federal help to the States and cities now pending before the Congress—the Eisenhower administration plan and your own plan, which you've sponsored, along with 29 other Senators. Would you tell us about these plans?

Answer. Well, first I might tell you what happened in the last Congress. You may remember that General Eisenhower spoke very sympathetically about the school shortage during the 1952 campaign, and many of us hoped he would really try to do something about it when he got into office. I was frankly surprised and disappointed when the administration's entire school program in the last Congress consisted of two or three studies of the school situation that were supposed to be followed up by a national White House conference next November to decide what to do.

Now, for one thing, there are already plenty of facts and figures about the school shortage, although I doubt most parents need statistics to persuade them there is a crisis. For another thing, studies won't build schools, and we need more schools right away—today—not next year. As someone put it, this is a time for fact-facing, not fact-finding.

Question. What about this year?

Answer. Last November, after it became clear that the Democrats had won control of the Senate and that I would be the Chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which handles school bills, I made a pledge to do my best to get action on a bill to provide $1 billion in direct aid to help the States and localities to build schools. I and 29 of my Senate colleagues introduced such a bill on the first day of Congress.

Question. What did the administration plan consist of when it reached Congress?

Answer. Well, rather than describing it to you in my own words—because you might think I was only grinding an axe for my own bill—let me tell you what Dr. Edgar Fuller, representing the chief State school officers—the State Superintendents or Commissioners of Education—told our committee. He said that the administration bill is "39 pages of intricate, complex procedures, with more Federal controls than have been seen in any seriously considered bill in recent years, with a pittance of Federal funds and with provisions which forecast long delays."

Question. How does the administration's plan work?

Answer. It is in 3 parts, so perhaps I'd better take them up 1 by 1.

The first part is for school districts that are still legally allowed to sell school bonds to finance new schools, but which are so poor that they can't sell them except at abnormally high interest rates.

Under the administration plan, the Federal Government will buy up to 80 percent—or 60 percent on the average—of the bonds these districts can't sell.

Question. Where is the district supposed to get the other 40 percent of the money it needs?

Answer. That's a good question—and frankly, I haven't been able to get the answer to it from any administration official. This is apparently what they consider a local responsibility.

But there's another, more serious weakness in this part of the administration program—and that is the question of interest rates. You see, before a district can ask the Federal Government to buy bonds, it's got to offer them on the market at rates considerably higher than the going rates on most school bonds. Many experts believe that this will probably result in artificially jacking up the borrowing costs of these local school districts. Now this is very helpful to the banks, insurance companies and other investors who buy up these bonds, but it just means that the school districts have to take money that would otherwise go to build schools or pay teachers' salaries, and put it into these higher borrowing costs.

Question. Can any local school agency sell to the Federal Government the 60 percent share of their bonds which you mentioned?

Answer. No. Before the United States Commissioner of Education can purchase bonds under this part of the program he must be satisfied that the local agency will be able to meet its obligations as they become due. Of course this qualification means that the most desperately poor districts, those which have the greatest need for help, will not be able to get even this small amount of Federal aid.

Question. What happens to school districts which have already reached their legal bond-issuing ceilings? They can't sell their bonds to the Government, can they?

Answer. No, they have to apply for help under another and far more complicated part of the administration school program. And believe me, by the time most school districts can work themselves through that obstacle course, most of the kids who are of high-school age today may be too old for college.

Question. Can you tell us how this part of the program works?

Answer. To put it as simply as I can, the States will have to set up a special new agency that can float bonds, build schools, and then rent them to the local school districts. The Government proposes to lend the States a small amount of money to start these school-building agencies. This is not a grant, of course. The State will have to repay it.

Question. Why is all that so time-consuming?

Answer. To begin with, practically every State in the Union would have to pass a special law authorizing these school-building agencies to be set up. Most of the State legislatures—35 of them, I think—won't meet again until 1957 after they adjourn this year, unless they are called into special session. So there is a probable 2-year delay right there. Besides, in a great many States, the constitutionality of these school-building agencies is in serious doubt. In such States a further delay is inevitable while this question is settled by a legal action. If it develops that the agency is unconstitutional further delay will result while the necessary constitutional amendment is adopted. You know, for an administration that preaches about not forcing things on the States from Washington, this is a mighty funny proposal—attempting to force the States to do something that seems to run counter to a lot of State constitutions.

Question. Are there any other objections to this part of the administration program—aside from the delay involved?

Answer. Yes, I'd say there are two main objections. One is the red tape and controls from Washington that are involved. I believe I mentioned earlier that one witness before our committee said there were more Federal controls in the administration bill than in any other school-aid bill he's seen in recent years. The other objection is that the local school districts will have to rent the new schools from the State and pay a lot of service charges, besides. Now here, too, the teachers are likely to bear the main burden, since the money to pay the rent has

to come out of the same fund that's used to pay teachers' salaries. I must say, I am at a loss to understand why President Eisenhower went to such lengths to explain in his message to Congress, how important—and how underpaid—our teachers are when the administration is proposing a program that's so tough on the teachers.

Question. I'm told that many districts are too poor either to pay rent to the States, or to repay the bonds that the Government might be willing to buy. What do they do?

Answer. Now you've come to what seems to me the most impractical part of the administration bill—because instead of these neediest districts getting help the quickest, they get helped last.

Question. How do you mean?

Answer. Well, these neediest districts can get some direct-grant money from the Government—although very little. But before they can even apply for that money, they must have applied for the other kinds of Federal help I've spoken of, and prove they're too poor to repay bonds or rent schools. Then they have to go through a lot more red tape before they actually get the money.

Question. But after that they can use it to build schools right away, can't they?

Answer. No, they can't even do that. All the money is meant to do is to bring these neediest districts up to a par with the other school districts, so they can apply again for the other kinds of Federal aid. In other words, after these neediest districts have run completely through the Eisenhower obstacle course, their reward is that they get to go back to the starting line and begin all over again. And besides that, there are only small amounts of direct-grant money provided for in the Eisenhower program—only about $66 million a year to cover the whole country.

Question. Wasn't this supposed to be a $7 billion program?

Answer. That's what the administration wanted people to believe. But almost all of that $7 billion will have to be put up by the States and local school districts. The total outlay by the Federal Government amounts to $200 million in direct grants, spread over a 3-year period. This is less than 3 percent of the $7 billion figure which administration spokesmen have been talking about.

Question. But how can the States be expected to put up all of the money? I thought you said the problem was that they had largely exhausted their resources.

Answer. Exactly. And that's why I and 29 of my colleagues in the Senate—as well as a good many Congressmen in the House, are so anxious to get action on our own bill—which provides for a billion dollars in direct grants—$500 million a year for 2 years. We believe that the energy and talent that lies in our young people is a great national resource. And when that resource is wasted, it is a national tragedy. We believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to help the States meet this crisis—not to foot the whole bill, mind you, but to lend a helping hand.

Question. What do you mean when you say the Federal Government won't foot the whole bill?

Answer. Under the bill which I and 29 of my colleagues are sponsoring—just as under a great many other Federal-aid plans already in existence—the States have to match the dollars given them by the Federal Government with a cetrtain amount of money of their own.

Question. How soon can your program get underway?

Answer. That depends on when it passes the Congress. But I want to emphasize this: My bill calls for no new agencies to be set up by the States. All the machinery is already set up. Most State educational authorities already have authority to accept Federal grants for school construction. All they have to do is match the Federal money with either State or local money and they are ready to build school houses.

Question. What have the education experts around the country had to say about the administration school program?

Answer. Well, I must say I have never seen such unanimous opposition to a program since I've been in the Senate. The chief school officers in 40 States sent letters or wires to our committee opposing one part or another of the administration program. Many of them said flatly that their States wouldn't get any help whatever from the administration program.

Question. Well, weren't the education experts consulted while this program was being developed?

Answer. No; they weren't. In fact, they weren't even told about it until just before it was announced. The main people the administration consulted in making up this program were bond experts from the New York bond houses.

Question. Is that why some people have called this a banker's bill?

Answer. I don't know if that's the reason or not. But I think it's a fact that the administration is more interested in protecting the investment bankers who may be involved in financing this program than they are in building schoolrooms. I have nothing whatever against the banks and insurance companies. But I would rather see money go to pay higher teachers' salaries than to pay higher interest rates on bonds.

Question. What is the outlook for the passage of your bill, S. 5, Senator?

Answer. I remind you of the fact that the Senate has on two previous occasions by overwhelming votes passed Federal-aid bills embodying the principles of S. 5. Since that time the school crisis has grown very much worse. I believe that the prospects are very favorable for the Congress to enact legislation of the character of S. 5.

Department of Agriculture Summarizes Utilization of Surplus Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the excellent work now being done by our Department of Agriculture on the substantial increases they are making in the utilization of surplus foods.

This is a news release issued at Washington, July 13, 1955:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SUMMARIZES UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS FOODS

Substantial increases in the utilization of surplus foods were reported in the past fiscal year, by United States Department of Agriculture. Total distribution in the 12 months ending June 30 was 78 percent larger than in the previous fiscal year.

The increase was primarily the result of new legislation enacted by Congress, and intensified efforts to make best possible use of these foods acquired under price-support and surplus-removal operations. Distribution of these foods is made to schools, charitable institutions, and needy persons in such a manner as not to diminish normal expenditures for foods.

Preliminary figures show that 1,073,900,000 pounds of food were distributed to users at home and abroad during the 1954–55 fiscal year, compared with total distribution of 601,700,000 pounds in the 1953–54 fiscal year.

Distribution to users in this country increased by 18 percent over the previous fiscal year. Exhaustion of the supplies of beef and gravy, which were distributed during the 1953–54 fiscal year, held down the comparative increase in domestic distribution, despite gains in donations of all other commodity groups. These included butter, cheese, dry milk, dry beans, rice, shortening, and several other items in limited amounts.

The total of 580,500,000 pounds distributed to United States welfare agencies for overseas distribution compared with 183,900,000 pounds distributed in the previous fiscal year. This increase resulted from use of new authority in Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. This law liberalized previous legislation to permit greater latitude in the use of United States food stocks to aid persons in friendly countries overseas.

Although total pounds distributed to schools and institutions in this country decreased this past year due to the exhaustion of the supplies of beef and gravy, the quantities of other commodities donated to these grounds increased.

At the same time distribution to needy persons living at home increased by more than 5 times, from 37,500,000 to 198,700,000 pounds.

The foods distributed in this country went to 11 million schoolchildren, and over 1 million needy persons in charitable institutions. In addition, 2,998,600 needy persons in family units are currently certified by State agencies to receive commodities. The number of these people actually receiving commodities at any one time is always considerably below the number certified; in May, for example, eligible recipients totaled 2,961,610, but actual recipients totaled 2,476,878.

This represents the second month in a row that the total number of recipients has declined. The peak month during the year was March when 3.3 million needy persons actually received the donated commodities out of a total of about 3.5 million persons certified as eligible to receive commodities. Increased distribution in this category during the year came as more States made use of the availability of these commodities to help more needy persons, including victims of drought and hurricane and the unemployed, principally in coal mining and railroad industries.

Requests for food for distribution abroad are met after all domestic demands have been satisfied. By the end of the fiscal year, 19 United States welfare agencies were participating in this program, with commodities going to 57 countries. Commodities donated abroad included butter and butter oil, cheese, dry milk, and shortening.

The Inventor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Talbert Dick, a registered patent attorney and lawyer, of Des Moines, Iowa, in which he stated his strong opposition to the passage of H. R. 7416. He said, in sub-

stance, that the idea of the increase in Patent Office fees might not be so bad if only the inventor was penalized, but it looked to him as if the country as a whole might well be the loser. To show the part that the inventor has played in the onward progress of civilization, he sent me a poem of his own composition.

The poem follows:

THE INVENTOR

(By Talbert Dick)

When time was Paleozoic
I had no earthly name;
The mammals roamed and sands were marked
With never thought of fame.
It was warm red meat for only the fleet
Or one with handy stone;
There was no lamp in man's first cave
And seldom toothsome bone—
For I was not yet the inventor.

Then on the clay Devonian
There gutted a log with center hole;
By hairy hand and axle stick
I found that it would roll.
The wheel was born that distant morn
To carry civilization all the way—
The chariot first and wagon next
And the trains and cars of today—
For I was the inventor.

But even when Tremadoc beds
Were sodden slimy rot
I sharpened flint to razor edge
So food and clothes would be your lot.
The arrow and bow was a step to go
And guns and rockets too;
And decades came and decades passed
With something ever new—
For I am the inventor.

Yes, the ancient dawn grew brighter
'Ere the bitter ice age passed.
I took some iron from Rodesia ridge
And found that it would cast.
Mechanical schemes and chemical dreams
Then followed the fruitful fad.
And I figured out the Arabic numerals
That even a child could add—
I am the inventor.

For all the things you have,
I've burned the midnight oil—
From pocket knives to sailing ships
And tools that till the soil.
The Micro waves are willing slaves
For pictures and for sound;
The printing press and aeroplane,
And medicines newly found—
For I am the inventor.

The crust of Earth has hardened now.
The spawn of my kin is legion—
We favor no race and we have no creed
For we come from every region.
We've tendered our gifts since Cambrian Drifts
That man may live and prosper.
But the atom's power and ships of space
Are just the start of all we'll offer—
For we are the inventors.

Low Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the way some people figure it, there is never a "good" time or an auspicious time for improving standards for the lower income groups in our country. The time is never considered just quite ripe, it seems.

The feeling among such people appears to be that if business is on the upswing, as right now, why just let it alone and do not rock the boat and do not upset the applecart and do not meddle in and do not do anything, and things will get better and better and all problems will automatically disappear.

On the other hand, if business is on the downswing, as was happening this time a year ago, the same people were saying just let it alone and do not rock the boat and do not upset the applecart and do not meddle in and do not do anything about anything and things will automatically correct themselves and then get better and better.

As a result of that feeling holding the upper hand last year, we have gone through a whole year in which the Pittsburgh labor-market area consisting of Allegheny, Beaver, Washington and Westmoreland Counties—one of the great industrial centers of the world—has been a "distress" area of from 6 to 9 percent unemployment. Yet during much of this time, steel's operating rate has been skyrocketing and coal production has been improving. So, obviously, employment opportunities were not nearly in balance with production advances, as output per worker steadily improved.

It is my hope that the employment sampling now in process, and the evaluation studies yet to be made, will show that in July the Pittsburgh labor-market area had finally gotten off the "distress" list. But we will not know that one way or another for some weeks yet.

But this idea of not rocking the boat either when business is good or when it is bad—an attitude which often leads to the ignoring of important economic problems—still had a lot of support in the House of Representatives last week when we finally pushed through my bill to raise the minimum wage from 75 cents and hour to $1 an hour. My original bill on this, introduced last January, was for $1.25, but like all important legislation, compromise had to be practiced in order to get anything through. The $1 figure represented, then, less than many of us wanted, but more than the 90 cents, or $36 a week, which President Eisenhower said he thought was enough for our lowest income workers.

MORE PURCHASING POWER NECESSARY

Throughout the debate on the House floor, I was assailed by the arguments of opposition Members that a figure of $1 an hour in interstate commerce would put lots of businesses out of business. These people were trying to tell us that in what is now supposed to be the most prosperous era in our history, with a gross national product at a rate of $383 billion a year at the latest count, and with corporate profits and business proprietors' incomes also at record heights, that a minimum wage of $40 a week for work in interstate commerce would ruin business.

Actually, a better foundation for our lower income groups in terms of fair minimum wages does more to help business than anything else, for it puts more real purchasing power in consumers' hands. The reports I receive as a member of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, composed of 7 Senators and 7 Congressmen, is that so much more purchasing is now being done on installment credit, while other types of credit have remained pretty stationary, that many economists are beginning to worry over the $24 billion of installment credit outstanding. Less than half of this is on automobile purchases, incidentally, and more than a fifth of it—more than $5 billion—represents personal loans, which indicates a lot of families may be in serious trouble in meeting monthly bills.

The economists point also to the continued decline in farm income as showing a need for more purchasing power in consumer hands with which to buy nourishing food. A higher minimum wage, providing wage raises for several million workers, will thus help the entire economy, and I am proud to have had a part in this as sponsor of the House bill.

Pennsylvania's Future in Atomic Industrial Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, Sunday, July 24, 1955, which explains what the State of Pennsylvania has done and is planning to do in the field of atomic industrial power:

STATE WILL SEEK LEAD IN ATOMIC ENERGY FIELD

HARRISBURG.—State Secretary of Commerce John P. Robin wants Pennsylvania to take steps to become the leading State in the Nation in the field of atomic industrial power.

"If we act now and get in on the ground floor in the industrial development of atomic energy, in time to come we well could be to atomic industrial development what Detroit is to the automobile industry," Secretary Robins said.

"One of the first things the new State planning board will do after its 18 members are appointed will be to make a survey of possible atomic development in Pennsylvania on a large scale," the secretary explained.

BOARD NOT NAMED

Governor Leader has not yet appointed 15 members to the planning board as authorized by the general assembly under the State government reorganization program.

The secretaries of forests and waters, highways and commerce departments will automatically serve as ex-officio members of the new board which will be taken from the commerce department and report directly to the Governor.

Robin noted that Pennsylvania already has 2 atomic power development projects under way on an industrial basis, and 2 more are in the advanced planning stages.

"At present I would think that Pennsylvania either leads or comes close to leading the Nation in the number of atomic power development plants in operation or planned by private industry," the secretary said.

He explained that the board will "look deep into the matter to make sure that Pennsylvania is on its toes and gets all that it has coming in the development and manufacture of this new type power for peaceful uses."

OTHERS ARE PLANNED

The Duquesne Light Co. recently opened an atomic power production plant at Shippingport and Pennsylvania State University last month began using a nuclear reactor erected on the Centre County campus with university funds.

Westinghouse Electric Co. recently announced plans to construct an atomic reactor at Blairsville and the Curtiss-Wright Aeronautical Corp. soon will open an aircraft research and development center in north-central Pennsylvania with a Government contract of nuclear work.

"We also intend to find out exactly what effect atomic power will have on the economy of the State, based on Pennsylvania's output of other type powers," Robin said.

He outlined a plan for bringing more nuclear plants into the State, including a "solid move to provide the public facilities for the plants and capitalizing on the research and other scientific personnel so abundant in the State."

Businessmen Shape Ike's Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, previously I have called the attention of my colleagues to the new system of amending the Taft-Hartley Act by administrative fiat.

An excellent summary of these amendments, and other evidence that businessmen are shaping this administration's labor policy, appeared in the February issue of the Democratic Digest.

The article follows:

BUSINESSMEN SHAPE IKE'S LABOR POLICY

In December 1948, not long after the Taft-Hartley labor law had been put on the statute books, the conservative magazine, Business Week, commented:

"Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion, the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement."

While the past 2 years under the Republicans have not wrecked the labor movement, they have demonstrated clearly what drastic changes can be brought about by "an administration in Washington which is not prounion," and how those changes can hamper and impede the development of a healthy labor movement.

For, although the last Republican Congress did not change so much as a comma in the Taft-Hartley law itself, the National Labor Relations Board, under new Republican management, has succeeded in toughening up Taft-Hartley in practice, via a series of decisions giving new interpretations to the law.

As the conservative U. S. News & World Report put it, "Policy changes of importance • • • are taking place at the NLRB. • • • Employers generally look with favor on what is going on." And Fortune magazine added, more recently, "management is unquestionably getting a better break at the NLRB than it has had in many years."

This is entirely understandable in view of the complexion of the new Republican-controlled Labor Board. This board, established nearly 20 years ago to administer and interpret the various provisions of our basic labor laws, is supposed to be nonpartisan and semijudicial in nature, and under Democratic Administrations a consistent effort was made to choose board members who could neither be identified with labor nor management.

Under the Republicans, however, this effort was apparently abandoned. The Eisenhower administration's first three appointees—who now constitute a majority of the five-man board—are all clearly identified with management, or with management's point of view.

The new chairman, Guy Farmer, was an attorney who had represented management clients in labor-management relations. A second member, Philip Ray Rodgers, came to the board from the staff of the Senate Labor Committee, to which he had been appointed by the late Senator Taft. And the third member, Albert Beeson, labor consultant for a California corporation, raised a storm of controversy when he told a Senate Committee that he had severed all relations with his corporation when, as it was later revealed, he was still receiving a pension from the firm, and had an agreement to return to the company after his service with the NLRB. President Eisenhower would undoubtedly hesitate to "pack" a Federal court with three men of such uniform viewpoints, but he apparently saw nothing wrong in "packing" the Labor Board with three men identified with a single point of view.

The fourth vital Eisenhower labor appointment, still to be considered by the Senate, follows a similar pattern. Mr. Theophile Kammholz nominated by the President to the powerful post of NLRB General Counsel, has also represented management in labor law matters.

The Eisenhower majority of the Labor Board lost little time in making its pro-management views felt. In a long series of vital rulings, it has drastically altered the Taft-Hartley law as it affects day-to-day labor-management relations and the ability of labor unions to win new members to their ranks.

In its most important series of rulings, the board has sharply narrowed the number and type of labor cases it will handle, thus eliminating a great many companies and unions who formerly could appeal to the Board when they felt their rights were being violated. Such companies or unions are now to be left either in a legal "no man's land," with no agency to appeal to, or they must find relief under State laws which are frequently less protective of labor's rights than Federal law.

Labor Board Member Murdock, dissenting from these rulings, estimates that the Board has cut down its jurisdiction by 25 to 33 percent, and he points out the key importance of the Board's action. What it has done, he says, is to take away the protection of labor's right to organize new unions in the very areas where unions are weakest and are struggling the hardest to get a foothold, against strong employer opposition.

In a number of other rulings, the Republican majority of the Board has prevailed over the former Democratic appointees in favor of management. For example, the Board has reversed a long standing ruling and now permits employers to question workers about their union membership on the theory that, so long as no open threat is involved, such questioning does not intimidate workers. But in the very case in which the Board made this ruling, four workers with signed union cards in their pockets were sufficiently intimidated to deny to their employer that they were union members.

In another decision, the board permits employers to bring penalties, after an illegal strike, even against union members who may have been ill or on leave during the strike, and therefore took no part in it. The board has also broadened the rights of employers to assemble workers on company property and on company time, prior to union elections, and compel them to listen to company speeches (usually against the union). It has narrowed the rights of unions to answer such speeches.

This unfriendly attitude toward labor has not been confined to the Labor Board. Union leaders were prepared to face a hostile Republican Congress in early 1953 but, after the moderate tone of General Eisenhower's campaign speeches on labor, and his surprising appointment of Martin Durkin of the AFL as Secretary of Labor, most union officials adopted a wait-and-see attitude as the new administration moved into Washington.

They were soon to be disappointed. In mid-1953, Secretary Durkin's moderate proposals for amendment of Taft-Hartley received the Presidential blessing and were on the verge of being submitted to Congress when they were "leaked" to the press. After GOP congressional leaders stormed the White House in protest, President Eisenhower withdrew his approval of the proposals and Mr. Durkin resigned in protest.

Many labor spokesmen have been generally pleased with Durkin's successor, James P. Mitchell. What has disturbed them has been the fact that Mitchell has not seemed to be the dominant spokesman within the administration on labor matters. The prevailing voice appears to be that of Commerce Secretary Weeks, who seems to have the ear of the President more than Mitchell—or at least the inside track with the White House staff.

For example, the most surprising of President Eisenhower's proposed Taft-Hartley changes, which would require a Government-conducted union vote of approval of every strike, was generally said to have been inserted in the President's message to Congress at the least moment, at the behest of Mr. Weeks, and without the knowledge of Mr. Eisenhower's own Labor Secretary, Mr. Mitchell, who is said to have first read about the strike-vote proposal in the newspapers.

In early December, Mr. Mitchell received another White House rebuff. The day after Mitchell spoke out against so-called right to work laws which have been enacted by many States and which are bitterly opposed by labor unions, the White House hastily issued a statement stating that Mitchell spoke only for himself, and not for the administration in which he is the top labor official.

Commerce Secretary Weeks, whose principal duties center around the Government's relations with the business community, has not confined his interest in the administration's labor policies to Taft-Hartley changes. In an apparently unsolicited memorandum to a Justice Department Study Committee which is reviewing the entire field of antitrust legislation, Mr. Weeks recommended bringing certain activities of labor unions back under the antitrust laws. In doing so, Mr. Weeks was favoring a return to the 1920's, when antitrust actions were among the principal weapons used to harass labor unions, with workingmen being treated, legally speaking, as a "product" or "commodity," instead of as human beings. This concept was expressly repudiated by the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1930 which, as President Eisenhower proudly pointed out during the 1952 campaign, was enacted by a Republican Congress.

Although a task force of the Justice Department Antitrust Study Committee has

recommended against bringing unions under the antitrust laws, the full Committee is still said to be considering such action, and labor unions, with not a single spokesman on the Committee, are virtually powerless to protest.

Labor's lack of representation on this Antitrust Study Committee is not unique; when Welfare Secretary Hobby first set up a Advisory Committee on Social Security, she omitted any labor union representatives until a storm of protest broke over her head; and the President's Advisory Commission on Housing was also lacking in labor representation, although builders and mortgage bankers were amply represented.

All of the administration's and the Labor Board's activities in the labor field are in for close scrutiny by the incoming 84th Congress. Alabama's Senator LISTER HILL, who will take over the chairmanship of the Senate Labor Committee, is reportedly ready to look into the rulings and operations of the National Labor Relations Board, to see if the Board has gone beyond or contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting the Taft-Hartley law.

Meanwhile, however, union growth is being stultified and the large concerns are far from unhappy over their development in industrial relations. The September 6 issue of Steel, a publication of the major steel companies, noted that "Unions are winning fewer representation elections. * * * Labor is still winning the majority of these contests, but the average has slipped."

The administration is again going through the motions of asking Congress to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, but many observers believe that the real test of the President's views on labor matters will be his reaction to the severely antilabor amendments which will be proposed by individual Republican Senators. Those who have watched the President appoint antilabor spokesmen to the Labor Board and stand silently by while labor's rights have been whittled away have little hope that Mr. Eisenhower will intervene actively on labor's behalf during the coming year.

Problems of the Satellites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think that all patriotic Americans, those who would fight to the last for our form of government, are earnestly interested in free elections in the satellite countries of Soviet Russia. We hope for that, but I am not optimistic about such a thing coming to pass.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by George Sokolsky which appeared in the July 26, 1955, edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald that is, in my opinion, a very good analysis of the situation.

The article follows:

PROBLEM OF THE SATELLITES

(By George Sokolsky)

What are generally termed "the satellites" are a series of countries which once were independent and now are part of the Soviet universal state. These countries first lost their independence to Germany as a result of the Nazi expansion in Europe; they were liberated from Germany in World War II and became a part of Russian imperialism. They were first delineated in the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact (1939) which divided Europe between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. At Yalta, Roosevelt and Churchill permitted Stalin to regard these areas as a Russian sphere. At Potsdam, it was agreed that governments were to be established in these countries by free elections. No free elections have ever been held. They have since for all practical purposes become part of Russia.

The satellite countries are: Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and East Germany. In Asia, they include Mongolia, Tannu Tuva, North Korea. Red China might be called a satellite state, although its position is somewhat different because of its size, its history, and the importance of its leader, Mao Tze-tung, in the Marxist world. The satellites of Red China are Tibet and northern Indochina.

Prior to World War I, a German philosophic historian, Baron Heinrich von Treitschke, wrote a book in which he sought to establish the need for a number of satellite states to protect a great country, such as Germany then was. Treitschke has influenced the thinking of the Germans and Russians because his ideas fit what they wanted to be accepted as truth.

While the United States would like to see free nations in eastern Europe and while it is sound political policy to raise this issue because so many Americans are vitally interested in the homelands of their parents and grandparents, the Russians can always say that these satellites are Communist countries because the peoples of those countries have not opposed the Communist regimes in them. And where there are no free elections, how can anyone say what the people really want?

So far as we know, there have been no successful revolutions in any satellite countries. And those who have resisted have either been killed or sent to slave camps. The Communists, having achieved power by revolution, having had a century of experience with revolutionary strategy and tactics, are extraordinarily skillful in anticipating and suppressing deviations. Each satellite country has had its purges and even though some purges achieved only party purification, others must have been related to underground revolutionary action.

In the present period of good will, it is even possible that some sort of election might be worked out to satisfy President Eisenhower, but the party machinery is so well established in each one of these countries that an anti-Communist regime is not likely to be set up. It would be as difficult to upset Communist bossism there as it would be to elect a Socialist mayor of New York City.

Should Russia show real weakness, should the regime in the Kremlin totter, it is within the realm of possibility that a revolutionary movement could develop in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or some areas of Poland. But while there is real power in the Kremlin, it is not believable that any of the satellites will risk liberation from the Communist regime. No matter what agreements the Russians might sign, they will never retreat from the satellites except by force.

Problems of the American Tuna Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the serious problems of the great American tuna fishing fleet have concerned me for some time. We are witnessing the decline of an important American industry because of unlimited importation of frozen tuna from Japan. The decimation of our tuna fleet can only result in a monopoly by foreign fishing interests, and the American consumer, who today enjoys a choice of foreign-packed or domestic-packed tuna, will be the ultimate loser.

Mr. Harold Cary, general manager of the American Tunaboat Association, is recognized as the leading spokesman of the American tuna fishing fleet. He has prepared some startling statistics on the plight of the fleet, and, under unanimous consent, I include several letters from Mr. Cary in the Appendix as a portion of my remarks:

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., July 25, 1955.

The Honorable BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: In our recent discussion you asked the following question:

How many people are adversely affected when a given quantity of frozen tuna enters this country and supplants rather than supplements a ton of domestically produced tuna?

This can be answered in graphic form by the enclosed drawing showing the component elements found in the cost of a case of tuna. This drawing can be elaborated upon as follows:

1. To enter the fishery it is necessary to build efficient vessels. This requires naval architects, carpenters, painters, welders, galvanizers, electricians, refrigeration men, pipe fitters, machinists, marine architects, foundrymen, riggers, patternmakers, radio and radar men, insurance men, bankers, accountants.

The low rate of construction and replacement by reason of imports adversely affects this group.

2. This also requires manufacturers of, as well as dealers in lumber, hardware, steel supplies, pipe and plumbing supplies, electrical equipment, fittings and fixtures, communications equipment, electronic equipment, diesel engines, gasoline engines, refrigeration machines, paint, ropes and rigging.

The low rate of construction, by reason of imports, adversely affects this group. The material supplied for repairs has declined also.

3. After the vessels are built it is necessary to man them with masters, fishing captains, navigators, engineers, radio operators, fishermen, mast men, chummers, cooks.

Decline in vessel numbers and vessel operation because of imports has affected this group.

4. When vessels are built and manned it is necessary to supply and service them by provisioners, ship chandlers, refrigerant suppliers, fuel-oil suppliers, medical suppliers, ships brokers.

Decline in vessel numbers and vessel operation because of imports has affected this group.

5. When vessels return from sea with fish catches they deliver these to a cannery employing: unloaders, fish room workers, cleaners, packing machine operators, sealers, cooker operators, engineers, foremen, warehousemen, timekeepers, office employees, supervisory personnel.

This group has been adversely affected in some areas. It will be more severely affected once the Japanese control the supply of frozen fish.

6. After vessels discharge cargo it is necessary to undergo repairs before returning to sea and to utilize the services of all or part of the following: Carpenters, painters, welders, electricians, refrigeration men, pipefitters, marine machinists, machinists, riggers, radio and radar men, marine surveyors.

The decline in numbers and operation of vessels because of imports has affected this group.

7. In a fishery engaged in by these vessels there are auxiliary activities requiring the services of the following: Fish and game inspectors, laboratory technicians, researchers, lawyers, appraisers for taxes, statisticians.

The vessel then departs and this whole cycle is carried through once more. If the venture is successful other new vessels will be built.

A United States Tariff Commission report considers that raw fish is 55.94 percent of the cost of a case of tuna. All the foregoing society of skilled people, and these businesses, contribute to the fish production and participate in its returns.

Last year the United States Government estimated production at 161,000 tons of fish by United States flag fishing vessels delivering in this country. This produced approximately 7,100,000 cases of tuna. The value of this production divided by the average hourly manufacturing earning in 1954 would provide nearly 46,000,000 man-hours of employment at that average earning.

When a ton of Japanese fish is canned in place of a ton of domestic fish, 44.06 percent of the value of a can of tuna remains in this country. This may be augmented slightly by brokerage fees and earnings of dockworkers.

Thus the need for domestic fishermen and the skilled mechanical, technical, and professional skills supplied all over the United States is totally gone. The need for cannery workers and allied activities remains.

If the 161,000 tons of fish delivered by United States flag fishing vessels were supplanted by foreign fish there would still remain enough new wealth to provide 20,000,000 man-hours of employment.

However, frozen tuna has been experimentally exported from Japan in the form of cleaned loins which would, if successful, eliminate cleaners from United States canneries. Also experimentally shipped have been a lidless can of tuna (also coming under the duty-free classification). This, if successful, would eliminate another group of cannery workers and reduce this 20,000,000 hours. This is quite apart from giving consideration to whether or not canners in this country could get an assured supply at a competitive price once control of the raw material passed almost entirely to Japan.

Returning to your question, we find specifically that when a ton of frozen imported tuna supplants a ton of domestically produced tuna it eliminates 55 percent of the value which would acrue to Americans and to the domestic economy.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
H. F. CARY, *General Manager.*

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., July 18, 1955.

(Attention Mr. A. M. Sandberg.)

ECONOMICS AND MARKETING SECTION, UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

We have reviewed and updated information on the prices of yellowfin and skipjack tunas. Attached to this letter is a graph showing the price trends. Three different measures are taken, i. e.: Posted prices, average ex-vessel prices as computed by Fish and Wildlife Service, and effective prices. Usually there are few significant departures from posted prices; however, effective prices were higher than posted prices in 1947 and 1948 and can be fairly accurately calculated. Effective prices are, on an average basis, lower than posted prices in 1955, but cannot be fairly accurately calculated.

Placing these prices on an index basis shows this comparison:

Yellowfin

January–December 1948:	
Posted	100.0
Average	100.0
Effective	100.0
July 1955:	
Posted	91.2
Average	92.5
Effective	83.8

Skipjack

January–December 1948:	
Posted	100.0
Average	100.0
Effective	100.0
July 1955:	
Posted	85.8
Average	84.4
Effective	77.1

There has been a downtrend in prices apparent by any one of these means of measurement. There is now great downward pressure on the presently existing price structure.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
H. F. CAREY, *General Manager.*

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., July 12, 1955.

(Attention Mr. A. M. Sandberg.)

ECONOMICS AND MARKETING SECTION, UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

During my recent trip to Washington as an adviser to the California Commission on Interstate Cooperation several requests for information were received. One of these concerned the size of the tuna fleet. Information on this subject has previously been given on several occasions. We have updated this information as it applies to the tuna clipper (bait boat) fleet as follows:

Year	Vessels	Capacity tons	Registered tonnage	
			Gross	Net
January 1948	161	29,165	37,266	18,425
January 1949	189	36,625	47,975	23,654
January 1950	193	38,370	50,613	24,738
January 1951	199	40,430	53,092	25,977
January 1952	210	44,300	57,924	28,386
January 1953	191	42,470	55,479	27,120
January 1954	180	40,535	52,800	25,788
January 1955	170	38,440	49,769	24,269
July 1955	161	36,970	47,812	23,320

Enclosed with this letter are graphs showing these trends in terms of capacity tonnage and numbers of vessels. Also enclosed is a list of vessels as of July 1, 1955. A copy of this letter together with the enclosures is being sent to Mr. V. J. Samson at the Fish and Wildlife Service office in San Pedro. Additional copies of this letter and graphs are being sent to others interested in and working on the tuna problem.

Additional studies are being made in regard to the fleet. Such information as you or others may require as necessary to studies now being made or to be made will be sent at your request.

Trends evident herein have been discussed in hearings and other meetings in the past. While a decline in production is a means of measuring injury it is apparent that a decline in production facilities is also such evidence.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
H. F. CARY, *General Manager.*

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., July 12, 1955.

Attention Mr. Philip Arnow, Associate Director.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS,
Department of Labor,
Department of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.

During my recent trip to Washington as an adviser to the California Commission on Interstate Cooperation several requests for information were received. One of these concerned employment in the tuna fleet. This type of information has been reviewed and brought up to date insofar as it concerns the tuna clipper (bait boat) fleet.

First, we have computed employment on the basis of job oppoturnities on these boats based on the number of berths available:

1948	2,460
1949	2,510
1950	2,590
1951	2,730
1952	2,480
1953	2,340
1954	2,210
1955	2,090

The foregoing figures make no provision for turnover of employment or take into account whether or not vessels operate full time or part time.

Second, we have computed employment on the basis of membership in the two labor organizations with which these vessels hold contracts. These unions are the Cannery Workers' and Fishermen's Union, A. F. of L., and the Tuna Clipper Engineers of the International Association of Machinists. They have just furnished these figures:

1949	2,649
1955	2,054

The above figures do not reflect all persons employed or employable inasmuch as there are a great number of owners working in the fleet.

Third, we have computed employment on the basis of a report on covered employment in fishing in San Diego. This report includes no owners nor employment on vessels operating in the fleet reporting employment to jurisdictions other than San Diego. The use of this information is therefore limited to indicating trends.

We enclose a graph exhibiting employment on the basis of berths available. There is also enclosed a graph exhibiting employment on the basis of a comparison between berths available, union membership, and covered employment. There is also a graph showing monthly fluctuations on the report on covered employment, this latter graph being useful only in determining trends.

The trend in employment is severely downward in each case.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
H. F. CARY, *General Manager.*

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., July 14, 1955.

Attention Mr. Thomas S. Campen.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEFENSE AND TRADE POLICY, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In the June meetings on the tuna problem the trend in imports was discussed. Import figures for the month of May 1955 have been received from the Bureau of the Census. These have been analyzed by us with respect to frozen tuna by means of comparing the import totals for frozen tuna for the years 1948 to 1955, inclusive.

These are the figures:

January–May:	*Pounds*
1948	687,000
1949	3,363,000
1950	10,313,000
1951	25,103,000
1952	23,510,000
1953	32,653,000
1954	48,206,000
1955	65,157,000

The figures themselves demonstrate the alarming uptrend. The first 5 months imports for 1955 are over 35 percent more than he previous record year. Stated another way, frozen tuna imports for the first 5 months of 1955 are greater than the yearly totals for 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951, and almost as great as the total for the year 1952.

A graph is enclosed exhibiting a line for each of these 8 years, showing this progressive increase.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
H. F. CARY, *General Manager.*

The President Needs Some Explanations From His Assistants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean under the date of July 19, last, entitled "Must for Ike's Staff."

It is a fine editorial which carefully analyzes and evaluates the good work that is being done by the Honorable JOE EVINS as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee.

The White House staff and Presidential assistants have an obligation to see that the President is not isolated from the news of operations and activities of his Bureau of the White House Budget and other aids.

The editorial follows:

MUST FOR IKE'S STAFF

Mr. Sherman Adams and others who are said to brief President Eisenhower on all important domestic happenings, including those that affect the reputation of his administration, should be prepared for overtime duty when their Chief comes back from Geneva.

They have a special obligation to see that the Chief is not isolated from news about the investigation initiated by Representative JOE EVINS, of Tennessee, as chairman of a House Small Business Subcommittee. These hearings are aimed at finding out just how much independent agencies of Government, largely responsible to Congress, have become puppets of the executive branch.

In view of the fact that Mr. Eisenhower has nominated many members of such agencies, it might be expected that he would know what kind of policies they were pursuing. This is especially true, since most of the appointees were named because of their "middle way" affiliations.

Surely the President has heard that one of his recent nominees for the Atomic Energy Commission was bipartisanly opposed in Congress as an unworthy political hack and, seeing the handwriting on the wall, withdrew his candidacy. Furthermore, he is said to be hopping made because the Burget Bureau and the SEC have put him on a bad spot over the abandoned Dixon-Yates deal.

Yet his education needs completing, and that is what Representative EVINS intends to do as he starts out by putting the Federal Trade Commission under the microscope.

Later he will deal with the SEC, the Federal Power Commission, the AEC, and what not.

From the people's standpoint, there could be no more important inquisition since their welfare largely depends on keeping regulatory and protective agencies out of the hands of grasping politicians or interests.

Just as the small business subcommittee is interested in promoting free and fair competition in an era of giant mergers, it realizes the danger of permitting the SEC from being diverted from its original role as a protector of the people from shocking conditions which brought on the great depression of 30 years ago. If it does no more than restore the original position of the AEC, now bogged down in low political activity, it will have achieved much.

Representative EVINS' recognition of the dangers are of long standing, but recent developments in the Dixon-Yates deal have given his investigation unusual timeliness.

Evidence of executive tampering, tinkering and rigging is so strong under Republican rule that Congress has a duty to clarify the situation and maintain its constitutional prerogatives against executive invasion.

Inasmuch as he contributes to this end, Representative EVINS will be entitled to public gratitude.

And as for the President, it is difficult to believe he could miss the significance of what is gong on. Assuming, however, that he knows only what he is told, his staff must now choose between keeping him fully informed or betraying the trust that has been placed in it.

Better Read the Fine Print Behind the GOP Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, that there is a great difference between promise and performance—at least between first promise and third clarification—has been demonstrated to us regularly in the past 3 years.

Examples include farm parity, massive retaliation, balancing the budget, and "unleashing" Chiang Kai-shek. Administration statements about these difficult problems are "double or even triple talk, which can be taken to mean whatever the listener wants it to mean" in the words of the following article from the May issue of the Democratic Digest:

BETTER READ THE FINE PRINT BEHIND THE GOP PROGRAMS

"We've sure got us guessing," said the Milwaukee Journal of Secretary Dulles' speech on the Formosan Straits.

To prove its point, the Journal cited these conflicting headlines on reports of the speech:

"U. S. Vows To Defend China Offshore Isles."

"U. S. Might Fight for Quemoy if Reds Attack."

"Dulles Avoids Pledge To Fight for Coastal Isles."

"A reading of the speech supports any of these headlines," the Journal said. "It is now obvious, therefore, that this 'policy of ambiguity' is deliberate."

Although the Journal did not say so, the Formosan crisis does not mark the first time that the administration has met a tough political problem with double or even triple talk, which can be taken to mean whatever the listener wants it to mean.

On a number of public questions, from budget balancing through parity for farmers to so-called liberation of the satellites, the administration has tried to make political hay by out-and-out huckstering. Time and time again, they have faced a troubled public with some dreamlike solution which was no more realistic than the claims of a patent medicine manufacturer.

But in all these instances, when later events have forced a revision of policy, responsible officials have produced some careful legalistic language, some hitherto unnoticed fine print, in an effort to prove that they never said what everyone thought they said.

Knowing this, experienced newsmen looked around for the escape clause with which the administration will probably try to save its face on Formosa when the showdown comes.

After a careful reading of the Secretary's speech, Scripps-Howard staff writer, R. H. Shackford, reported: "Even a lawyer the equal of Mr. Dulles would have great difficulty proving by the exact words of his speech" that the Secretary had said what he seemed to say. "Mr. Dulles planned it that way * * * he has demonstrated again that he is first, last, and always a lawyer."

Columnist Doris Fleeson found the earlier Formosan resolution equally indefinite. For this she gave credit to Secretary Dulles who is "adept at putting something for everybody in his foreign policy moves."

Of course, once again, the administration can be vague only until there are developments which must be met with action. At that time, it will no longer be possible to satisfy both the men who want our Asian responsibilities increased and those who want them curtailed.

But until then, it will not be easy for the disappointed to complain that they have been let down. For as the Washington News said, "No words you could pin down; Dulles vaguely firm."

Are newsmen justified in this feeling that the administration has adopted a deliberate policy of vagueness? Those who believe so point to the classic use of this technique: Candidate Eisenhower's farm speech at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952.

The headlines following the speech tell the story:

"Ike Favors More Farm Props and 100 Percent Parity," said the Indianapolis News.

"Eisenhower Promises Farmers He's Behind Full Parity for Them," said the Lincoln Evening Journal.

"Ike Promises To Work for 100 Percent Parity," said the Milwaukee Journal.

When a year of the President's farm policy turned up no evidence of 100 percent parity, reporters brought it up at a Presidential press conference. "During the campaign, in Minnesota," one newsman said to the President, "you said that you couldn't understand why the farmers shouldn't have full parity rather than 90 percent of parity."

"That was right," the President answered.

The reporter went on: "In other words, 100 percent of parity. Do you still feel that way?"

He "hadn't said 'price supports of 100 percent'," the President protested.

He had said the "objective" in "any decent farm program" should be to get 100 percent of parity for farmers in the market place, but that he had said "there should be rigid price support laws at 100 percent of parity, never."

The record bears out the President's contention. It was true he had not in so many words favored a law for full parity. His statement that the farmers' fair share of the economy was full parity had served its purpose: the headlines did not report the extenuation—they only told of Eisenhower's supposed support of 100 percent parity.

This episode seemed of a piece with the administration's balance-the-budget talk. During the 1952 campaign, Candidate Eisenhower created the impression that he intended to bring the Federal budget into balance. He talked about it in no less than 42 campaign speeches.

Since then the notion that a balanced budget is just around the corner has been kept alive by Treasury Secretary Humphrey. But despite much wishful thinking and talking, all three Eisenhower budgets have been billions of dollars from the goal. The only apparent result of this insistent Republican talk has been to place the President in a somewhat delicate position, since Mr. Eisenhower's performance compares unfavorably with the record he criticized so sharply. President Truman, after all, was able to balance the budget in 1947 and 1951, while in 1948 he produced a whopping $8.4 billion surplus.

There are some signs that Republicans are a little touchy about the spread between their promises and their performance on this matter. So the President was ready for newsmen at his January 19 press conference, 2 days after he had sent Congress his third unbalanced budget.

Before he was asked any questions about the deficit, the President dug deep into his pocket and produced a quotation from one of his 42 campaign speeches on the subject—this one made in Peoria, Ill., on October 2, 1952. The key sentences read: "My goal, assuming that the cold war gets no worse, is to cut Federal spending to something like $60 billion within 4 years. Such a cut would eliminate the deficit in the budget."

Reminding reporters that his new budget and his deficit both stand at $2.4 billion above the promised $60 billion figure, the President said, "I almost can claim credit for being a prophet." The President's statement implied that his position on a balanced budget was unassailable. Yet many newsmen had an uncomfortable feeling that the President was dismissing 41 other campaign speeches rather lightly.

This same resort to legalistic language was apparent last fall when Vice President Nixon toured some 30 States, smearing the Democratic candidates and their party. The intent of his remarks, as accounts in the press bear out, was to suggest that Democrats are so soft on communism that they can't be trusted with public office.

Mr. NIXON "accused the noisy leftwing of the Truman administration' of opposing legal weapons needed to combat the 'Communist fifth column which made a shambles of our domestic security,'" said the New York Herald Tribune.

In Lansing, Mich., the Vice President said: "The lax procedures of previous administrations * * * permitted espionage agents to give away to our potential enemies secret information from the State Department." And in New Bedford, Mass., he said: "We have driven the Communists, the fellow travelers, and the security risks out of Government by the thousands."

When Democrats accused him of a smear, the Republican National Committee cited one wire service dispatch which had quoted Mr. NIXON as saying, "We have driven the Communists out of Government by the thousands," and asserted it was inaccurate. But the wire service had only missed the fine print. The Vice President insisted that his exact words were "Communists, fellow travelers, and security risks," and a transcription proved he was right.

Thereupon Republican Chairman Hall said there was a "highly organized campaign" to "smear" NIXON by "falsely accusing him of smearing others." The defenses, as might be expected, were legalistic reexaminations of exact wording; they did not take account of the impression which NIXON had sought to create or the headlines his accusations earned in the press.

This was reminiscent of Attorney General Brownell's charge in November 1953 that Harry Truman had promoted a man who "was known to be a Communist spy," Harry Dexter White. The press got the implications of that immediately. Brownell obviously was trying to put over the idea that Harry Truman was a traitor. What else could he mean by the charge that the former President had "knowingly" promoted a Russian agent?

But this was not Mr. Brownell's later version when the charge began to boomerang. Though he refused to see reporters for 2½ months, he was driven into an amplifying statement 6 days after his first blast. He had "no intention of impugning the loyalty" of Harry Truman. Not at all. He only considered him guilty of "laxity."

It was true Brownell had not specifically accused Mr. Truman of treason; he had only said he promoted a known spy.

More recently Mr. Brownell faced another storm. His Justice Department had relied heavily on the evidence of several unsavory witnesses. Last winter, three anti-Communist witnesses, Harvey Matusow, Mrs. Marie Natvig, and Lowell Watson, said that they had lied under oath, and charged that Government attorneys had known of and even coached their perjured testimony. When their recantations threw doubt over the outcome of several Government trials and hearings, reporters asked the Attorney General whether his Department should not have been leary at least of Harvey Matusow. He had made obviously untrue public statements months earlier.

But the Attorney General retreated to the fine print generally that there is always a problem of risk in any criminal proceedings, when you get evidence from coconspirators.

This seemed like legalistic quibbling to Columnist Doris Fleeson. She raised the question of responsibility for using witnesses of this caliber. Perhaps no one in Government encouraged the liars to lie, as the liars charge, but they were certainly encouraged to testify.

A prominent member of this not-too-exclusive fine print club is Secretary Dulles. In January 1954, he alarmed our allies and a good many Americans by proclaiming the doctrine of massive retaliation.

This was widely taken to mean that if the Communists took one more step, we would drop atom bombs on them. The speech earned big headlines, and some praise, but the sober second-thinkers began to raise some questions: Congress wanted to know whether the President would launch world war III without a legislative by-their-leave: our allies asked if they would be consulted before the fateful decision.

In the wake of these questions and some sharp criticism, the Secretary explained in a press conference 2 months after the speech, that he had not said America was relying on massive retaliation. No, no, he insisted, we were relying on the capacity for massive retaliation.

The Secretary, at his belated press conference, was officially wide-eyed over the ominous impression created by his words. And of course, a quick check of the Secretary's original speech bore him out; the word "capacity" was in the record.

The administration has a similar history on liberation. During the campaign, liberation looked like a simple straightforward doctrine to many Americans who have relatives behind the Iron Curtain: Candidate Eisenhower apparently meant to replace "the futile and immoral policy of containment" with some bold specific action which would roll back the Iron Curtain and free relatives of Americans from tyranny.

But once in office the doctrine faded from view. Just how it would work had never been clear, though there was a vague impression that somehow the Voice of America and other Government propaganda would stir the people of the satellite nations to revolt.

This notion went by the boards after the futile East German riots the summer of 1953. That autumn, the Secretary officially gave up the liberation policy for the American Government when he said "our creed does not call for exporting revolution and inciting others to violence."

Early this year a drive for $10 million was launched by Crusade for Freedom, the private propaganda organization which operates Radio Free Europe and the Free Europe Press. The President spoke on behalf of the fund appeal, but the word "liberation" did not occur once in the speech. It did occur, however, in the speech of Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, former Under Secretary of State to Mr. Eisenhower, who said, on the some program, that "the so-called promise of liberation is a very tricky and a dangerous one."

The Des Moines Register had this explanation for those Americans whose hopes have been dashed by the collapse of the policy:

"What was abandoned about the liberation policy was the misinterpretations placed upon it by hasty analysts. Dulles never meant that he was preparing actively to liberate the unhappy peoples of the Communist dictatorship lands by military force, economic pressure, and encouragements to revolt.

"All he meant was that the United States should try to keep hope alive by not recognizing Communist conquests and Communist dictatorships as permanent, and not making any deal."

Mr. Dulles and the President could hardly have explained it better.

Investigation of Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hearings being held by the House Select Committee on Small Business concerning the functions and operations of the so-called independent agencies of our Government—the regulatory agencies since the Hoover Commission reorganization plans went into effect with respect to these agencies—I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD two articles by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, syndicated columnist, dealing with work of the subcommittee and other matters. Congressman EVINS is doing a wonderful and effective job as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on Small Business.

The articles by Mr. Stokes entitled "He's Out To Nail Puppets" and "The Bankers in Our Government," serve to indicate how the "direct" and "chain-of-command" system now in effect works in some of these agencies' functions—following adoption of Mr. Hoover's reorganization plan for agencies created to be arms of the Congress rather than the Executive.

The articles follow:

HE'S OUT TO NAIL POLITICAL PUPPETS—RECENT ADAMS-ARMSTRONG FIASCO SHOWED EXACTLY HOW THEY WORK

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—Most timely is a House investigation opening next week into Federal regulatory commissions to try to find out what is happening in these supposedly independent agencies created by Congress to protect the public.

Singularly enough, Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, who will direct this inquiry by a House Small Business Subcommittee, turns out to be prophetic in light of recent dramatic developments in a Senate committee investigation conducted by a fellow Tennessean, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. (EDITOR'S NOTE.—EVINS represents the fourth district, and lives at Smithville, Tenn.) Months ago, on February 23, Representative EVINS, in a statement about his plans and objectives in his investigation, said:

"If it proves to be true, as we frequently hear, that these supposedly hear, that these supposedly independent commissions have become political puppets on telephone wires leading from the White House, or from a political committee, then it is time we made the facts known."

WANTS SEC INVESTIGATION

In the same statement, in concluding, he referred to "recent actions and decisions by the Securities and Exchange Commission in its handling of the Dixon-Yates financing arrangements" and other SEC actions which, he said, require an investigation into that Commission.

That was February 23. Well, we learned last week about a White House telephone call to a commission. Lo, it happened to be the SEC. Lo, also, it happened to be about the Dixon-Yates case. The man at the White House end of the telephone was none other than Sherman Adams, assistant to the President. He was calling the SEC Chairman, J. Sinclair Armstrong. He asked Chairman Armstrong to suspend hearings, then in progress for a few days to delay testimony scheduled from Adolphe Wenzell. This was on June 11.

DAMAGING TESTIMONY

If Mr. Wenzell had appeared the following Monday, June 13, as originally scheduled, he would have testified as he did later, about how he was serving the Budget Bureau as consultant on TVA and on the Dixon-Yates contract while still an official of the First Boston Corp., leading utility underwriting house, which handled financing arrangements for the Dixon-Yates contract, now canceled.

The story would have come out in time for Members of the House of Representatives to know about it before they had to vote on funds for transmission lines for the Dixon-Yates plant which Democrats were seeking to cut off. But when the SEC postponed its hearings as Mr. Adams had asked, the House did not get that story which, Democrats claim, would have changed votes. They lost in their effort to deny funds for the transmission line.

The Sherman Adams pressure from the White House came out last week before the KEFAUVER Senate Committee investigating Dixon-Yates.

A BASIC REASON

This incident illuminates a basic reason for the Evins investigation. For, as the Tennessee House Member points out, the regulatory commissions are arms of Congress and not beholden to the Executive. One after another, beginning in 1887 with the Interstate Commerce Commission, they were created by Congress to handle administration of regulatory laws. Regulation is the function of Congress imposed by the Constitution; but, with the rapid development of our economy, Congress found itself unable to handle the endless intricacies and details of regulation, and so delegated commissions to do this detail work for it.

How the attitude of the commissions, themselves, has changed was indicated by Chairman Armstrong before the KEFAUVER committee. This was not only in his subservience to Sherman Adams at the White House but in his refusal for a whole day to say whether the White House had asked him to defer the Dixon-Yates hearings. That added suspense to the eposide. As anyone might imagine, it also ruffled Senators who were puzzled by such reluctance on the part of the chairman of a commission set up in 1934 by Congress as a result of the stock market shenanigans of the late 1920's to protect the public interest. They naturally expect the SEC in its exercise of that function, to keep Congress fully informed of all of its activities. It was an eyeopener to the Senators.

Congress is partly to blame. For it accepted Hoover Commission recommendations that made the chairmen of regulatory commissions, except the Interstate Commerce Commission, responsible to the President, designated by him and serving at his pleasure, and giving the chairman complete control over the commission staff. The effect of this change will be carefully explored by Representative EVINS in his investigation.

It always has been possible for a President to have influence on the attitude of a regulatory commission through his power to appoint members subject, of course, to approval by the Senate. Many changes have been made by the Eisenhower administration which, it is clear, have tended to incline the commissions more favorably to the interests they are supposed to regulate. The Evins committee will look into these changes in personnel and their effect on policy.

The reorganization has been of a sweeping character, for example, in the Federal Trade Commission, which is charged with preventing unfair trade practices and monopolistic tendencies. The FTC is first in line in the investigation which opens Monday. There has been a drastic shakeup also in the Federal Power Commission, which has regulatory authority over electric and gas utilities. It will be given an early going-over by the Evins committee.

THE BANKERS IN OUR GOVERNMENT—ONLY NOW IS THE PENETRATING INFLUENCE OF EX-BUDGET CHIEF DODGE FULLY REALIZED

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

How banker-big business influences penetrated into the Eisenhower administration at the outset and now have permeated Government operations is slowly being traced as one bit of evidence is added to another in current congressional investigations.

Emerging as a key figure is a Detroit banker long since retired from Government, Joseph M. Dodge, who was first Director of the Budget of the new Republican administration. In the last several years, beginning in previous Democratic administrations, the Budget Bureau has become a coordinating agency of great potential power which reaches into every area of government. Under a strong figure, such as banker Dodge, it can exercise large influence on policy. It did just that under Mr. Dodge, and has continued to do so since he left here in April, last year.

We have seen a sample recently in the KEFAUVER investigation of the Dixon-Yates contract, now canceled. That revealed how at Mr. Dodge's direction a plan was worked out in the Budget Bureau for a complete change in Government water resource conservation policy by which TVA, and eventually other giant multiple public projects presumably, were to be turned over to big private utility combines. The author of that plan, in which TVA was the first guinea pig, was Adolphe Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp., who, as we know, was brought to the Budget Bureau as a consultant by Mr. Dodge. This we also now know, was at the suggestion of George D. Woods, chairman of First Boston Corp.'s board, who told in his engagingly frank manner how he had certain ideas about changing Government policy and so he called up his old friend Joe—Joe Dodge. He went to the right place.

How Joe Dodge reached out to exercise his influence on policy in another area now has come to light. This is the Federal Trade Commission, which was created by Congress in 1914 during the first Woodrow Wilson administration to protect the public against unfair trade practices and monopoly. It was chosen as the first regulatory commission to be explored in the current investigation of regulatory commissions by a House Small Business Subcommittee of which Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, is chairman.

This Joe Dodge episode relates to the final budget submitted to Congress by President Truman on the eve of his retirement. It provided $5.5 million for the Federal Trade Commission. The first Eisenhower administration budget, prepared by Mr. Dodge, cut this to $4.5 million. But, beyond this slash, the Budget Bureau also specified where the cuts were to be made. It eliminated funds for an investigation of what happens to the consumer's food dollars—including what the farmer gets and how much the middlemen all along the line take out—an investigation that powerful business interests sought to prevent when proposed originally in Congress. The Budget Bureau also sharply reduced funds for antimerger prosecutions by the FTC and antimonopoly investigations.

The story of the Dodge intercession was told to the Evins subcommittee by a former Democratic member of the FTC, Stephen J. Spingarn, who was delegated to handle budget matters. When orders for the cuts came to him orally from the Budget Bureau, he said he called Director Dodge to protest and asked the Director if he would put the orders in writing. That Mr. Dodge refused to do, saying oral instructions were sufficient.

Mr. Spingarn testified he tried, but was unable to get, the new Republican Chairman of the Commission, Edward F. Howrey, to intercede with the Budget Bureau to restore funds. During the Evins inquiry, Chairman Howrey has been questioned about his administration, the changes in personnel, and the conduct of cases, and constantly it has been brought up that he was for many years a lawyer representing big business clients before the FTC.

During his own testimony, former Commissioner Spingarn told how Chairman Howrey had revealed early in his administration that he was having to resist enormous pressure for jobs in the FTC from the Republican National Committee which, he said, was trying to find places in the Government for 8,000 Republicans.

Testimony developed thus far in the FTC phase of the House investigation—the policy orders from the Budget Bureau which is an adjunct of the White House, the political pressures from the Republican National Committee—contribute to the picture of deterioration of the FTC, and of other regulatory commissions, that were created originally by Congress as arms of Congress to administer regulatory laws, and to be completely independent of the executive branch. This deterioration is blamed on a Hoover Commission reorganization order, approved by Congress in the Truman administration, that gave the President power to name the Chairman, and empowered the Chairman to appoint the staff and exercise control over it. Consequently the White House now exerts direct influence through the line of authority running from the Chairman to personnel and policy.

Repeal of the Hoover Commission order, which applies to several other regulatory commissions, was urged by Mr. Spingarn and also by Commissioner James M. Mead, another Democrat, who is retiring soon, and who was the first Chairman to serve under the enlarged powers of the Hoover Commission order.

Appendix

Tribute to Senator Saltonstall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Sunday, July 24, 1955, a celebration was held in Sagamore, Mass., to pay tribute to the Massachusetts State Constitution, which was written 175 years ago. On that occasion high tributes were paid to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for his 35 years of outstanding public service. I ask unanimous consent that a tribute to Senator SALTONSTALL, together with a copy of an excellent address which he delivered on that occasion, be printed together in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Presented to the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts, on this 24th day of July in the year of our Lord 1955, in commemoration of his 35 years of service to the people of the State and of the Nation.

To commend him and demonstrate our appreciation for his admirable record as governor of this Commonwealth for 3 terms, his achievements as a member of the United States Senate Armed Services Committee, and to compliment him for the outstanding service he has rendered to the fishing industry not only of this State but of the Nation.

May he continue to serve the people for many years in the future as ably as he has in the past.

We feel confident we will one day honor him as President of these United States of America.

Tendered to him by his friends and members of the Women's Republican Club of the Upper Cape.

Mrs. Joseph R. Sorenti, President; Edith C. Deering, First Vice President; Mrs. Austin B. Walker, Second Vice President; Marguerite A. Brown, Third Vice President; Mrs. Vincent A. Mackesy, Fourth Vice President; M. Spray Richardson, Recording Secretary; Mrs. Ashley W. Rice, Corresponding Secretary; Muriel S. Torrey, Treasurer; Florence G. Snow, Auditor.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR SALTONSTALL AS GUEST OF HONOR AND PRINCIPAL SPEAKER AT PICNIC SPONSORED BY UPPER CAPE WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB, SAGAMORE, MASS., KEITH MEMORIAL FIELD, JULY 24

This is a great meeting. It shows that we Republicans like to get together in the off year, just as in election years, even though it may be hot, distances may be long, and other attractions many. We do so because we are practical idealists. We know that friendships are the backbone of politics and friends love to discuss current problems.

In 1952 when President Eisenhower was a candidate, he promised to do his utmost to end the fighting in Korea, to eliminate corruption, communism, and controls from our Government in Washington. Those things have in the main been accomplished. Now the slogan heard so often is "Peace and Prosperity."

Peace and prosperity do not just happen. It takes hard work to bring them about; the present administration has worked hard and has achieved results. Today peace and prosperity are talked about with real confidence. Peace and prosperity have come about through the policies and the program of this administration, through the confidence the people have gained in the leadership of President Eisenhower. Let's look at the record. What have these achievements been?

The ending of the fighting in Korea.

The treaties with Austria, Germany, and Japan.

The settlement in Trieste.

Mutual defense treaties with the Free Republic of China and with Korea.

The Manila Pact with Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan and the Philippines, Thailand, and Great Britain.

Support of NATO and Western Germany's defense.

Advancement of President Eisenhower's epochal atoms for peace plan.

Through cooperation with our allies we achieved these things:

A ceasefire in Indochina.

A settlement of the Guatemalan crisis.

Adoption of the Caracas resolution.

Full support of the United Nations in its efforts to achieve peace and to further health, education, and scientific advancement throughout the world.

The United States, under President Eisenhower's leadership, has without hesitation demonstrated its willingness to explore from a position of strength all means of obtaining a greater opportunity for peace and security in the world. The Geneva parley at the summit is the latest and best example of this. Let us hope that from this parley come ways and methods of procedure through which there will be greater mutual understanding among all peoples.

But peace is not easily come by. It takes patience, understanding, and mutual willingness to get together. These we Americans have.

Since January 1953, in spite of many forebodings and pessimistic utterances from the Democratic Party, there have been tremendous achievements for a greater prosperity, a more healthy economy in our country.

President Eisenhower, immediately after taking office, urged the elimination of strangling economic controls and wage ceilings. He stimulated maximum encouragement of full and free across-the-table collective bargaining, with a minimum of participation or interference by the Government. He urged the expansion of America's homebuilding and construction program by the enactment of the Housing Act of 1954. The present housing and construction boom is the greatest in America's history. The administration carried out its campaign promise of tax relief by approving a $7.4 billion reduction in our taxes. This represents more take-home pay for all our workers. This stimulated our industries to enlarge their plants.

The buying power of the dollar has been maintained. The discouraging increase in the cost of living has been stabilized. Small business has been helped by the creation of a thoroughly independent Small Business Administration. There has been a gradual but steady elimination of Government competition with private business.

The President has advocated an historic highway-construction proposal and additional school construction. Our social-security coverage has been expanded to include 10 million more Americans. In June of this year, for the first time in our Nation's history, employment has exceeded 64 million. It increased by 1,300,000 people in the month of June alone. The Department of Commerce reports that total production of goods and services reached a record level on an annual basis of approximately $375 billion in the first quarter of this year.

Such economic progress spells prosperity. It is helped by the courageous application of commonsense in the actions of the Federal Government. Good sense in deciding what the Federal Government ought not to do helps us to stimulate our economy as well. In both these ways, the Eisenhower administration has helped to achieve this prosperity. But how well or how long it continues depends greatly on our own commonsense and good judgment as individuals.

"Peace and prosperity." This is indeed a good slogan for it stimulates greater confidence in the future, greater peace of mind—a feeling that another war is not just around the corner—the satisfaction that comes with a good job—a peace of mind that comes with a more comfortable home and a greater opportunity for the schooling of our future generations.

But just as "peace and prosperity" has become a slogan about which we read in the papers, about which we talk on the street corner, our job now is to make peace and prosperity a cornerstone for the future, just as it is a fact today. We do not want another war. We do not want another depression. So, we look to the administration in Washington for guidance, for action designed to maintain this peace and prosperity we know today.

Our way of life here in America has been based not upon security, but upon opportunity. Our system of government has been based upon service, not bureaucracy. We want our Government to be close to the people. We want our people to take an active, vigorous part in our Government. Under recent Democratic administrations, I ask you, have these things been possible?

When President Eisenhower took over, those practices were drastically changed. He knows that the "policy of partnership" is a good one, a healthy one, an effective one at every level in human relations. He wants the Federal Government to do those things for our people that it is its clear duty to perform. He wants the Federal Government to refrain from interfering in decisions that can best be made by State governments, by local communities, and by individuals. This is his attitude and philosophy. It is the one which I like to think is mine, too.

One of my greatest privileges in Washington has been the opportunity since January of 1953 to meet with the President, our JOE MARTIN, and other administration leaders each Tuesday morning at the White House. These meetings give us an insight

into the President's personality, his friendliness, his quick understanding of problems, his frankness, his sincerity, and his desire to do what is right regardless of how it affects him personally. They reflect equally his determination that his policy of partnership shall continue and endure.

We have achieved much together under this administration in our efforts to obtain peace. But there is lots yet to be done. Geneva is only the first of many steps to be taken. We do not know what the Geneva parley may produce among the "Big Four," but we must, I am convinced, look to its outcome with hopeful realism. But there are other things to be done, too. To list a few:

The securing of an agreement for a regular and reliable international inspection of nuclear weapon development and manufacture.

The vigorous promotion of President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" proposal.

The achievement of a united Germany.

The giving of an ever-greater stimulus to active international trade and commerce.

The promotion of a gradual, sensible disarmament program.

The settlement of the tension in the Strait of Formosa, a problem which stimulates our deepest consideration.

The discouragement of colonialism throughout the world, with a clear realization that modern times, the upsurge of nationalism and present-day international relations have made colonial policies and programs subjects for historians.

Here in our own country there is much to be done if the prosperity we now enjoy is to be maintained and continued. Some of the principal jobs which lie ahead are:

Continued development of a sound, flexible farm policy that will hold farm prices steady and avoid costly surpluses.

Greater ecouragement of small business participation in both Government and private contracts.

Continuance of the policy of sensible Government action in labor-management relations and carefully considered amendments to the laws.

Achievement of an adequate highway program.

Achievement of a vitally needed, adequate school construction program.

Development of power resources programs based on the partnership policy of cooperation between Government and private enterprise.

Our rapidly expanding population, soon to approach 166 million, demands more factories, schools, homes, hospitals; a comprehensive hospitalization program; a tax structure geared equally to the Nation's needs and the individual's income.

So, today, when we come to this beautiful spot where so many citizens of Massachusetts and other States find recreation and enjoyment in their vacation periods, we have good reason to think for a few moments upon our responsibilities as citizens, upon our feelings regarding this Administration's policies and practices, upon the future of our great country. We come together to give thanks for the leadership that is ours in national affairs. We are proud of our President and his conduct of the most difficult office in the World. We admire and respect him as a man. We want him to continue as our leader. That confidence in our administration must be demonstrated by our active participation, by giving him support because we believe in his policies and his conduct of the presidential office. In that spirit I come to this meeting today. It is with that feeling that I know we all join with Governor Herter, Congressmen Martin and Nicholson, in working hard to make Ike's administration continue to succeed.

Does it sound as if I believed he should run in 1956? I'll answer that question. You bet it does.

Four Dozen Miscues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Four Dozen Miscues," which was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR DOZEN MISCUES

The Democratic-controlled Senate Investigations Subcommittee has handed down a belated verdict that the Department of the Army was guilty of 48 mistakes in handling the case of Maj. Irving Peress, who was given an honorable discharge after invoking the fifth amendment 33 times when questioned whether he was a Communist or had engaged in Communist activity.

Peress put on this act before the same subcommittee on January 30, 1954, when a Republican majority was in control and Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, was the chairman. McCARTHY immediately sent a message to the Pentagon demanding that Peress be court-martialed. Instead, though McCARTHY's demand had been received and considered, the Army tried to unload itself of a hot potato by giving Peress an honorable discharge.

Incensed, McCARTHY summoned Brig. Gen. Ralph Zwicker, commander of the camp through which the discharge was granted. Zwicker dodged all over the lot when the Senator tried to pin down responsibility. McCARTHY then asked Zwicker whether he thought that any officer recommending Peress' discharge in view of the known circumstances should be removed from the military rolls. Zwicker replied:

"I do not think he should be removed by the military."

"Then, General," retorted McCARTHY, "you should be removed from any command. Any man who has been given the honor of being promoted to general and who says, 'I will protect another general who protected Communists,' is not fit to wear that uniform, General."

This observation touched the Army on a delicate nerve. There was a chorus of shouts that the honor of the Army had been assailed. Mr. Eisenhower went out of his way to support General Zwicker. McCARTHY had already proved a headache to the Pentagon by investigating Communist infiltration of the secret Army radar laboratory at Fort Monmouth. His activity in the Peress case and his lese-majesty to a general were considered insupportable.

The result was a campaign to "get" McCARTHY, sparked by the Pentagon, the White House, and enemies in the Senate. The issue was a trivial one—the charge that undue influence had been extreed out of McCARTHY's subcommittee office to get an Army commission for an investigator, G. David Shine, who was being drafted.

Plaintiffs of record in this proceeding, which led to a marathon Senate investigation, were Secretary of the Army Stevens and John Adams, Army department counselor, both of whom have since resigned. The findings of the investigation left McCARTHY untouched, but heat had been engendered for a further step—an action to "censure" McCARTHY. One of the two original specifications supporting such a motion returned by a select committee acting as "grand jury" dealt with McCARTHY's alleged abuse of General Zwicker.

This charge fell by the wayside when the Senate as a whole considered the case, for even though it was apparent in advance that McCARTHY's enemies had the votes to report a verdict against him, the Zwicker affair was so dubious that even a jury which had prejudged the case was forced to back away, holding its nose. The final Senate action was to the effect that McCARTHY's conduct or manners stood "condemned" in matters bearing no relationship to the Zwicker affair.

Now the Democratic subcommittee sweeps all this old dirt under the rug with a report holding that in the Peress matter, which gave rise to all subsequent action against Senator McCARTHY, it was the Army, Stevens, and Adams that were at fault—not once, but 48 times. McCARTHY did not draw a breath of criticism. The Army crowd, on the contrary, was castigated for failing to act on the information supplied by the Senator.

This is vindication, but of a left-handed kind. The Democrats who now absolve Senator McCARTHY pretended during the Pentagon-McCARTHY inquiry that the Peress case had no bearing on the charges. These same Democrats voted condemnation to a man. Now they switch around and discover that culpability lay in the other direction. Senator McCARTHY deserves an apology from all 67 Senators who voted to put him in his place, but, aware as he is of the ways of politics and hypocrisy, he knows that he will not get it.

Talks With Peiping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 26, 1955, there was published an editorial entitled "Talks With Peiping," dealing with the proposed Far Eastern conference which has been so ably suggested by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE]. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALKS WITH PEIPING

Senator GEORGE again has taken the lead in proposing an international conference to ease world tensions. His suggestion Sunday that the United States meet with Communist China is as appropriate and timely as his suggestion last March for a Big Four conference. The Senator has spoken bluntly on a subject that others have hesitated to meet head on. He thus has made it easier for the administration to do what it ought to do in this respect. The announcement yesterday that direct talks between American and Chinese Communist diplomatic officials will be held at Geneva August 1 on the fate of 51 imprisoned Americans and certain other issues is a good augury.

The Prime Ministers of India and Burma also have helped pave the way for negotiations by acting as intermediaries between the United States and Red China. But they have not resolved the issue of Chiang Kai-shek's role in any future talks. Senator

GEORGE did not mention Chiang, but the White House has made it clear the United States would not meet with Peiping on the Formosa question without a representative from Chiang present. The presence of such a representative presents one of the many difficult technical questions that must be cleared up before a meeting can be held. It may be doubted, therefore, whether the conference can take place as quickly as Senator GEORGE suggested.

Nevertheless, the situation in the Far East demands that efforts be made at once toward making arrangements for the talks. Senator GEORGE is correct in arguing that that summit conference has not settled the Formosan issue and that it could be ignited again by a word or deed from Peiping. It would be most unfortunate, in view of the change of atmosphere that the Geneva meeting has brought about, if Peiping should carelessly inflame the situation anew.

Given the best will in the world on both sides, the Far Eastern situation presents certain complexities, particularly involving the rights of third parties, that were not present at Geneva. While Geneva was concerned with generalities, a conference with Peiping must be concerned with such specifics as Quemoy, Matsu, and Formosa and the future recognition of Peiping by the United States and the United Nations. Peiping has begun to take steps that should lead toward a settlement in the release of some of the Americans held in Chinese prisons. The others still held likewise must be released before direct Washington-Peiping negotiations can have much meaning. That is why the new conference to begin at Geneva August 1 is of first-rate importance. It has been called to deal with a specific issue that has been one of the roadblocks to a discussion of the broader Far Eastern questions.

The President's Suggestions at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Results of Improvising at Geneva—Exchange of Arms Data Is Unlawful—Reds May View Plan With Contempt," written by the famous columnist, Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Evening Star on yesterday, July 27.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESULTS OF IMPROVISING AT GENEVA—EXCHANGE OF ARMS DATA IS UNLAWFUL—REDS MAY VIEW PLAN WITH CONTEMPT

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Senator KNOWLAND refused to comment on the President's sensational suggestion at Geneva that the United States and the Soviet Union let each other know everything about each other's military establishments, and that Russian reconnaissance planes be permitted to fly all over the United States, with similar privileges granted Americans in Russia. The Senator said he preferred to wait until the Geneva Conference was over and the whole picture could be analyzed. That might be good advice for a columnist, if events halted long enough to permit adequate deliberation before something else required admission to consideration.

My impression of this conference, as of all others in which an American Chief of State has participated in the past 12 years, is that the President went into it inadequately prepared, and without a fundamental agreement with his partners regarding what would be proposed.

There was evidence of considerable improvisation, of which the President's call to "exchange arms blueprints" was the most startling. The general reaction here and abroad, insofar as the press and Congress reflects it, was that it was a propaganda move in the certainty that the Russians would not accept.

The President, throughout the conference, was bent on making a demonstration of almost unlimited American good will and showing the Russians that they had nothing to fear from the United States.

But one can overdo this, and always does overdo it, if for the sake of propaganda one makes a half-baked proposal that opens up more problems than the unlocking of Pandora's box.

The President's proposal is incompatible with American law. It amounts to open espionage openly arrived at. Practically speaking, aerial reconnaissance cannot reveal all military secrets, nor, indeed, the most important ones, presently secured against the curiosity of even the most patriotic American citizens.

If the object were genuinely to expose our entire Military Establishment, the Rosenbergs should be resurrected to cooperate.

To implement it would raise the bitterest controversy in American history and give rise to rumors and recriminations of suppressions by both sides. The Russians would still be in a better position to hide operations than we.

The danger is that neither the Russians nor anybody else will take it seriously, seeing in it just another of those off-the-cuff moves—that it will be viewed with contempt by the Russians and exasperation by our allies.

The lack of western unity was palpable. Mr. Faure's sponsorship of disarmament control by budgetary means was unsupported by the Americans and British.

Who can control the Soviet military budget, or, for that matter, the American? There are secret funds in all budgets, expended for such essentially military purposes as espionage and psychological warfare. Even the Congress of the United States knows little about the expenditures of our counterintelligence apparatus.

Sir Anthony Eden had French opposition to his proposal to demilitarize the German out, made specific proposals of a negotiable allied with the West. The French remember the demilitarized Rhineland. Eden, throughout, made specific proposals of a negotiable character, that were not proclamations. In all he said one saw the hand of an accomplished diplomatist—which none of the other chiefs of state were.

There is no doubt that he precisely reflected the views of his Foreign Minister, Mr. Macmillan, or that Premier Bulganin fully represented Foreign Minister Molotov. But there is doubt that the President was speaking at all points for Mr. Dulles, or Mr. Faure for his Foreign Minister, M. Pinay.

The Russian game was made clear in the two texts presented, both having to do with an all-European system of collective security which we have again postponed analyzing because of the President's later proposal.

The Russians believe that diplomatically speaking time is on their side. "The situation is not yet ripe for German unification," implies their conviction that it will ripen in a Russian sun. And every Western rift and American improvisation aids and encourages them.

Resolution of Wisconsin Department, VFW, on Publicizing America Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution adopted by the Department of Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at its 34th annual encampment at Eau Claire, Wis., June 23–25, 1955:

Whereas the everlasting friendship of the peoples of the free countries of the world, based upon mutual trust and understanding, is vitally essential to the future national security of the United States; and

Whereas this friendly relationship is extremely important to our national economy in times of peace through the preservation of foreign markets for our vast agricultural and industrial surpluses; and

Whereas this enduring friendship will increase the strength of our military alliances with those free countries that are equally willing to fight for their freedom against Communist subversion and aggression; and

Whereas American journalists, publicists, and experts in international human relations are unanimously agreed that the peoples of all foreign countries must know the truth about America before we can rightfully expect their unswerving allegiance in any cold or hot wars with Soviet Russia; and

Whereas a majority of the peoples in foreign countries suffer from a deplorable lack of knowledge as to how freedom operates in America, and the individual rights and liberties that we enjoy under our form of government; and

Whereas this ignorance of the truth about America is due primarily to a constant stream of vicious anti-American Communist propaganda emanating from Moscow and designed to portray the average American as a slave of his alleged economic bosses, and as an enemy who seeks to exploit the military strength and economic markets of all foreign countries, free or enslaved; and

Whereas many of the people of the free world labor under the impression that the typical American citizen is accurately reflected in certain motion-picture films that are produced in Hollywood, particularly those films that glorify murder, rackets, sex, and immorality; and

Whereas the ordinary citizen in foreign countries truly believes conditions in the United States are honestly described in newspapers that are either edited by Communists or published by persons whose personal distrust of the United States is reflected in their news columns; and

Whereas some people in foreign countries are hostile and suspicious toward America because they do not know that we prize our rights of religious freedom, our rights of free speech and a free press, and our many cultural blessings above the value of our telephones, automobiles, TV sets, washing machines, and bathtubs; and

Whereas certain animosity toward the American people persists despite the millions of dollars that have been spent for the dissemination of pro-America information via Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, and the United States Information Agency; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has entered into a program to further extend the effectiveness of its loyalty day, observed annually on May 1, with its true meaning and purport made clear

to the peoples of other lands in order to strengthen mutual understanding and thereby our Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States should foster and promote an aggressive, nationwide campaign dedicated to the objective of conveying the truth about the United States to the peoples of other countries through the transmittal of personal letters, books, magazines, catalogs, and other literature direct to individual friends and relatives, and others, in other countries; and be it further

Resolved, That we direct our appeal for cooperation particularly to those of our citizens who are of foreign extraction themselves and who possess the means of communicating direct with relatives and friends in their native countries; and be it further

Resolved, That each VFW post and its ladies auxiliary be urged to help implement this effort on the community level by enlisting the support of newspaper, radio, and television facilities as a means of acquainting the general public with the desperate need for this campaign and the opportunity it offers the individual citizen to do his bit in the fight against communism, and the threat of universal devastation if humanity is confronted with the terrifying possibilities of atomic destruction in a third world war—a war that is certain to come if the free nations of the world allow themselves to be divided by distrust, evil suspicions, and groundless fears spawned by the Communist dictators in the Kremlin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate from this State so that they may understand our feelings, and our desire to stop the spread of anti-Americanism, and its corollary the spread of communism; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to make adequate appropriations for a thorough, complete, and truly American, United States Overseas Information Service to the end that those in Europe, Africa, the Near East, and the Far East may understand the blessings of liberty, the peaceful goals of "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as advocated by the United States, and the terrors, loss of liberty, war and regimentation, and slavery to be the true goal of communism.

A Bill To Authorize Additional War Damage Payments in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill today, I am only concerned with what I believe to be the best interest of the United States. I believe that a strong Philippines is of vital importance to the United States in the Far East. Incontrovertibly this legislation will help greatly to strengthen Philippine economy.

Having been a member of the Insular Affairs Committee since the 79th Congress, it has always been my honor and privilege to have taken an active part on all legislation concerning the Philippines. I participated in the preparation and passage of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. Indeed, in 1950, I introduced H. R. 7600 to implement the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. Hence my continued deep interest in legislation affecting the relationship of the United States and the Philippines. And I may add that it is my earnest belief, which I am sure will be shared by my colleagues who participated in that legislation, that the Philippine Rehabilitation Act and the Bell Trade Act constituted a compact between the United States and the Philippines as soon as the latter accepted the conditions therein required. So that when the Philippine Rehabilitation Act provided that the claims approved in excess of $500 should be paid up to a maximum of 75 percent, it is my best judgment that this is a commitment to the Philippine people which they took into account when they approved the amendment to their constitution and therefore the same must be met by us now.

Many have asked "why should the United States continue to assist the Philippines?" The Philippine Rehabilitation Act was enacted by Congress to fulfill promises made to the Philippine people during the dark days of the occupation. It represented a generous gesture by the people of the United States to assist their ally in the rehabilitation of their war-torn economy. Over and above all these it represented the recognition by the United States of the aid and assistance it had rendered us in the allied cause. Again, we must not forget the special and peculiar relations between our two countries during the last half century. We have labored with the Philippine people to assist in their education and self-government so that they might realize one day their own self-democratic government. Our prestige in the Far East is inescapably bound to the success of the Philippine experiment. Equally important and significant is the fact that the cause of democracy in southeast Asia is directly involved in the Philippine success, for southeast Asia today, in a fluid state, has its attention focused on the Philippines and how democracy functions there. Needless to say that with the recent development in China, militarily speaking, the Philippines has assumed an increased strategic importance. Moreover, the Philippines has been a significant factor in the foreign trade of the United States. We have there a major market for American products and a source of essential commodities, sugar, copra, Manila hemp and hardwoods. For all these reasons, in my opinion, the United States must keep its commitments to the Philippine people.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Philippine Republic is one of our most dependable allies in that area of the world where the international situation is presently so very delicate. She has made wonderful progress in combating communism, principally by demonstrating that the democratic system can provide a higher standard of living to the working class than any totalitarian method. This she has been able to do notwithstanding the still unsatisfactory condition of her economy resulting from her loyalty to the cause of freedom in the last war.

The Philippines are, indeed, the showcase of democracy in Asia. If the Filipinos succeed in proving to the great masses of the people of Asia that under democratic practices they are able to establish, and maintain, a higher standard of living than the people of the Communist and neutralist countries, the free world will have won a battle that will be more effective than the gains effected by divisions of soldiers or billions in handouts.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In this connection, I should like to recall that on April 11 the President of the United States in a message to Congress stressed the need for intensifying our cooperation with the free nations of southeast Asia in their efforts to achieve economic development and a rising standard of living. I quote from his message:

> The motivation behind this cooperation is twofold: Our fixed belief in the worth and dignity of the human individual whatever his race or flag may be, and our dedication to the principle that the fruits of national growth must be widely shared in every society.
>
> As a people we insist that the dignity of the individual and his manifold rights require for their preservation a constantly expanding economic base. We are convinced that our continued economic, cultural, and spiritual progress are furthered by similar progress everywhere. * * *
>
> We seek to evolve a consistent and stable economic policy which will assist free nations in their efforts to achieve a sound growth for their economies.

General Eisenhower stated, upon first seeing postwar Manila, that it was the worst war torn city that he had seen, with the possible exception of Warsaw. The damage was not limited to Manila, but extended as devastatingly throughout the Archipelago.

PHILIPPINE ECONOMY: IT IS STILL FAR FROM COMPLETE RECOVERY

The Philippine Islands, which always had a favorable balance of trade with us and with the world before the war, have piled up a tremendous trade deficit during the years of reconstruction and rehabilitation. It is significant to note in this connection that, in the 8-year period before the war, 1934–41, the Philippines had a total favorable trade balance with the United States of $257 million—imports, $621 million; exports, $878 million—in the 8-year period after the war, 1946–53, the Philippines had a total negative trade balance with the United States of $1,268 million—imports, $2,861 million; exports, $1,593 million.

The country is still plagued by inflation and unemployment, and has had to adopt strict currency and import controls. These conditions prevail, even though there have been pronounced strides toward full recovery.

It is indeed fortunate that there is one nation in Asia bound to us by strong ties on which we can depend. The Republic of the Philippines has been tested in war. The blood of her heroes has mingled freely with that of our own sons on many a battlefield of World War II and in Korea.

We must preserve and protect that friendship.

Mr. Speaker, what happens to this champion of democracy in the Orient is of the greatest interest to us.

We must keep the Republic of the Philippines strong morally, militarily, and economically so she can stand side by side with us in the world conflict against communism.

The election and acceptance of President Magsaysay to lead the Republic of the Philippines is evidence of the direction in which that country lays its course.

This bill which I have introduced in the House today would authorize the appropriation of $100 million for additional war-damage payments in the Philippines. In this connection, I deem it expedient at this time to briefly relate the facts and thus refresh our memory with regard to war damage and the Philippines.

Throughout the half-century when the Philippines was a possession of the United States, there were frequent declarations by our policymakers that the Philippines would be created a free and independent nation at such time as its people were able to govern themselves—the only Christian nation in that part of the world. The Philippines had been under foreign rule for several centuries. Chinese, Dutch, British, and Spanish were among those who conquered parts or all of the 7,000-island archipelago from time to time, despite the resistance of the Filipinos and their desire for independence. In the 50 years of American control, there was no lessening of the wish for freedom which was promised at such time as the people demonstrated their ability to sustain it. Meanwhile, American teachers sought to improve the education of the youth; agricultural experts endeavored to demonstrate improved methods of crop production; technicians introduced new procedures for industries and business; and efforts were made to instruct in the sound administration of public and private enterprises.

World War II interrupted the preparation for independence by the Philippines. History records the grim events that occurred in what was then the Commonwealth between December 7, 1941, and the time of liberation in 1945. Despite the propaganda of the Japanese, the vast majority of the Philippine people remained loyal to the United States because of the bonds of friendship that had been developed in the years of American jurisdiction. They fought side by side with the forces of the United States and, during the Japanese occupation, gave aid and comfort to those nationals of the United States who were imprisoned or who waged guerrilla warfare against the invaders. Their loyalty and assistance continued, notwithstanding the havoc that was wreaked on their homes, farms, industries, and businesses, or the torture and even death to which many were subjected. When the military forces of the United States returned to the Philippines, the people again fought to overcome the Japanese.

With the conclusion of the war, the United States made ready to grant the long-awaited independence to the Philippine people. The ravages of the conflict, including the destruction caused in the battle of liberation and the tragic events of the occupation, however, had seriously disrupted the life and economy of the Philippines. Its financial condition prevented the people from embarking on a career as a free nation without assistance. The relationship between the United States and the Philippines had been unique and, during the occupation, the highest American officials had given assurances that the damage of war would be repaired and the people repaid. With the granting of independence, the time for the fulfillment of these assurances had come.

In the Senate and the House of Representatives there was overwhelming sentiment to restore damaged and destroyed public and private property in the Philippines. One of the difficulties, however, was the question of cost. Various surveys had been made, but it was a practical impossibility to obtain a detailed accounting of all destruction. On the basis of the statistics then available, it was agreed in April 1946 that the United States Government would authorize the appropriation of $400 million for the payment of claims for damage to private property. In addition, the Congress authorized the appropriation of $120 million for the restoration and improvement of public property and essential public services.

The legislation which contained these authorizations was entitled the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, and provided for the creation of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission to expend the $400 million for private claim payments. In addition, the Commission was allotted $57 million of the $120 million authorized for the restoration of public property. The balance of the latter fund was allocated as follows:

Public Roads Administration, for rehabilitation of roads and bridges, $40 million; Corps of Engineers, for restoration of ports and harbors, $18 million; and the Public Health Service, for the restoration and improvement of health services, $5 million.

THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was an early implementation of the expressed purposes of Members of our Congress to take care of immediate Philippine rehabilitation problems in rough outline as quickly as possible. It was obviously not intended as blanket legislation to cover all of the vexatious challenges implicit in these problems.

The act was administered by the Honorable Frank A. Waring, of California; the Honorable John A. O'Donnell, of Pennsylvania; and the then judge, now senator, Francisco A. Delgado, of Bulacan, Philippine Islands. Senator Delgado is now chairman of the committee on foreign affairs of the Filipino Senate. In this connection, he is not unknown to the older Members of this body, who remember him as a former Resident Commissioner from the Philippines in the House of Representatives during the 74th Congress.

The Commission was to receive, investigate, approve, or disapprove, claims covering damage to property during and as a consequence of World War II in the Philippines.

Claims up to $500 were to be paid in full as quickly as allowed. Further, the successful claimants were to be paid on the basis of 1941 market prices, less depreciation of amount per year from the date of acquisition of the lost or damaged properties.

Payments made by the Philippine War Damage Commission, prorated according to law among all claimants, totaled 52.5 percent of the amount allowed on each claim in excess of $500. In contemplation of exorbitant postwar cost, of substantial disallowances on the claim as filed, and the partial payment of slightly more than half of the amount approved, it is estimated by the War Damage Commission that successful claimants probably received no more than 20 percent of the cost of the reproduction of their homes, businesses, and other property.

Finally, when all the claims had been adjudicated and it was adjudged that with the funds available the combined total would be 52.5 percent of the approved balance of any claim adjudicated for more than $500, or 22.5 percent less than the statutory maximum of 75 percent fixed by the act.

The War Damage Act aforesaid was reported by the old Committee on Insular Affairs. I had the honor to serve on this committee under the chairmanship of Judge Jasper Bell, of Missouri, affectionately known to all who were here through the 79th Congress. The committee had no precedent to guide it. In its wisdom, however, the committee wrote the following language into Report No. 1921, page 32, Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 79th Congress, 2d session:

> While the committee feels it is urgently necessary to provide through this legislation (S. 1610) for the rebuilding and restoration of the physical plant of the Philippines, it is generally realized that additional legislation will probably be necessary in the future to augment and supplement the benefits which will be accomplished through S. 1610. * * * It is expected that proposals for additional legislation will be made from time to time by the agencies of the United States Government, by the Government of the Philippines, and the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission to meet needs for legislation as they arise.

It is fair to state that the foregoing paragraph of the report certainly was not placed in there by accident and cannot be discarded. The Philippine War Damage Commission, as the record will attest, did a most efficient and exemplary job. It not only concluded its work a month ahead of the statutory deadline, but it returned a substantial part of the money authorized for its administrative expenses to the United States Treasury.

We have a moral responsibility to the people of the Philippines. They were our wards and we their tutors in democracy for nearly half a century. We encouraged them to fight, and they responded to our request. They paid in blood and sweat and the raw red wounds and, yes, in the lives of their people for their resistance to an enemy drunk with

power intent on establishing the doctrine "coprosperity sphere of Asia," another way of saying "Asia for the Asians."

The valiant resistance of our then political ward shortened the war in the Pacific by many months, if not by many years.

The Philippines are the anchor of our defense in the Pacific.

Then, too, the Philippine Republic will consume both our soft and durable goods. They have a great capacity to absorb them. Our nationally known brand names are familiar to them. Our trade with the Philippines is not a one-way street. They produce much that is essential in our economy. We use their hemp, their sugar, their hardwoods, and their pineapple. Any money we spend in the Philippines encourages the solid type of trade we so badly need.

I repeat that the Philippines present the showcase of democracy in that area, and that other countries of that region are closely watching the Philippines and everything that happens there.

Let me mention just a few more items in the structure of our connecting bridge with the Philippines:

Under our mutual defense pact with the Philippines, we have established important military, naval, and aerial bases in their country.

Under our trade agreement with them our investments are guaranteed the same protection and privileges as those of their own nationals.

Under the dynamic leadership of President Magsaysay, the Philippines is undergoing a program of development and strengthening their economy, so that they may better cope with the threat of communism.

New Dollar-a-Year Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 26 appeared an editorial entitled "New Dollar-a-Year Men." It is a very interesting discussion of the so-called dollar-a-year men, or w. o. c.'s, as they are now referred to. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN

The Senate took a step backward last week when it weakened the provision in the defense production bill against the employment of w. o. c. officials—persons who serve without compensation from the Government but are paid by their companies, the successors to the dollar-a-year men. The Banking and Currency Committee, on the recommendation of the Comptroller General, had proposed that in peacetime w. o. c.'s be employed only as consultants and advisers. Whether even that goes far enough in abiding by the spirit of the conflict of interest statutes is a serious question. But it is much better than the amendment the Senate adopted by a vote of 46–45 which says that w. o. c. men may hold administrative positions but not make policy decisions.

The conflict of interest statutes are made up of at least six separate statutes, and it is not easy to generalize concerning them. One is a prohibition against dual compensation. It makes it a crime for any Government employee to accept any salary from any private source "in connection with his services" as an official. Another prohibits Government employees from transacting business with any firm or corporation in which he is directly or indirectly interested. These are sound expressions of policy.

The argument for exempting w. o. c.'s is that in time of national emergency the Government requires the services of highly paid industrialists who cannot live on a Government salary or who will not risk criminal prosecution if, in dealing with the area of business with which they are most useful, they have to be concerned about how some future Attorney General may construe the prohibition against an official doing business with his own company. However much this sort of exemption may be necessary to get businessmen to work for the Government in time of crisis, it is distasteful business at any time.

In 1942, the Truman committee argued against the use of dollar-a-year men even in wartime. It pointed out that John Lord O'Brian, general counsel of the Office of Production Management, required lawyers on his staff to sever their connections with private law firms. "If such action was desirable with respect to lawyers whose firms were not obtaining any defense contracts," the Truman committee said, "it is all the more proper and desirable with respect to those dollar-a-year and without-compensation men whose companies are directly obtaining the great bulk of the defense contracts." The Truman committee's advice, however, was not taken because of the pressure to obtain qualified industrialists to assist in the war production program.

Representative CELLER's investigation into the employment of w. o. c.'s is most timely. Congress particularly owes it to the country to scrutinize the operation in practice of any exemptions it may authorize. It also owes it to the country to see that not only the letter but the spirit of the conflict-of-interest laws is lived up to in those situations where it has not authorized exemptions. The case of Secretary Talbott, for example, raises the issue of whether the dual compensation statute has been complied with. Mr. CELLER should find out how many other Defense or Commerce Department officials are similarly drawing double compensation.

The House Banking Committee, like the Senate committee, voted for tighter restrictions on w. o. c.'s. The committees are on sounder ground than the Senate. As the Comptroller General argued, w. o. c.'s should not be given policymaking or administrative positions over full-fledged Government employees. They should be used, if at all, only as consultants and advisers.

Slow and Cautious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, overlong the Benton Harbor-St. Joseph turning basin has needed improvement, but action has been slower than slow.

Millions—and all too often billions—are quickly appropriated and turned over to those administering foreign aid. Many a local improvement in a foreign country has been quickly made while here at home caution and deliberation in the spending of the taxpayers' dollars seems to be the program. Overlong the St. Joseph-Benton Harbor turning basin has needed and occasionally been promised improvement.

H. R. 6766 became Public Law 163 on July 15 last. It carried $4,500,000 for small navigation projects. Included in that total was $105,000 earmarked by the Army engineers for the harbor improvement.

Army engineers now advise that they do not know just when the work will start, but the job is scheduled for completion during the present fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1956.

If Michigan is to take full advantage of the facilities of the St. Lawrence seaway, many a harbor will need improvement, but harbor improvement will bring neither prosperity to lake ports nor friendship from foreign lands, where so many of our billions have gone, if racketeers posing as labor leaders are permitted, as recently they did in Sheboygan and Milwaukee, Wis., to prevent, because of a labor dispute between a union and an employer, the docking and unloading of ships bringing cargoes to America from other lands.

Local authorities at Sheboygan and Milwaukee—and, yes, the Governor of Wisconsin—have brought shame to that great State because of their failure to enforce the law—to protect the rights of employees and employers, as well as of citizens generally.

To date, Berrien County authorities have protected the civil rights of citizens by refusing to permit violence to interfere with normal activities. With the harbor improved and the right of citizens to work and carry on a business protected by local authorities, the St. Joseph-Benton Harbor port may get some business that otherwise would go to other ports where lawlessness rules.

It not only pays to be honest, but it pays to abide by the law.

Golden Agers of Cleveland's Karamu House Have Memorable Visit to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a group of some 40 members of the Golden Age Club of Cleveland's famous Karamu House visited me last month as part of a tour of Washington they arranged. It was a thrilling ex-

perience for these fine people in spite of the intense heat of that day.

Although most of them had never been to Washington before, one of them had, and this trip was especially memorable. Mr. W. W. Curtis, of 2296 East 93d Street, Cleveland—at 86 years of age, the oldest of this group—had gone to school here. In a delightful letter to me recently he went on to add a bit of personal history about the Civil War that I would like to quote:

When the first gun was fired at the first battle of Bull Run, my father was at the breakfast table. He rushed out from his cabin that was close to the road leading from Manassas and there the road was lined with the men rushing out from Manassas to the battlefield. He and some other men went upon Mount Pone Hill and watched the battle until the Confederates made the Union men retreat to Washington. He lived there through the war and I, the baby boy of 15 brothers, was born there over 86 years ago. My father spent his slave days in the counties of Prince William and Loudoun.

The Golden Agers' warm friendship and interest which they brought with them to the Nation's Capital is a great inspiration to all of here.

Salute To a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that the following letter from former Marine Lieutenant Coombe, of Kearny, N. J., is in the highest tradition. It bespeaks a devotion to America that is in the spirit which has made America great. It is, therefore, a privilege for me, Mr. Speaker, to be able to insert Lieutenant Coombe's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: Undoubtedly this letter will prove to be a waste of time on your part in helping me in my problem. I realize that as I write this yet I feel I must cover every path open to me before I admit final defeat in this matter.

I would like to go on active duty again with the United States Marine Corps. The facts briefly are these: I was a member of the USMCR, volunteered for Korean duty, wounded in action in July of 1953, and temporarily retired by the Marine Corps in June of 1954. I was recommended to transfer to the regular ranks after finishing basic school at Quantico in February of 1953. I had several opportunities to do this before I was wounded but neglected to transfer until after my Korean duty. My leg was amputated below the knee and I received other wounds amounting to 80 percent disabled by Marine standards and 100 percent disabled by the VA scale.

In October of 1953 I was asked by my doctor if I would like to stay on active duty. At that time I was a bed patient, had not been fitted for a new leg, and was looking forward, somewhat dubiously, to 4 or 5 more operations. Naturally I said "No," considering the somewhat hopeless situation I was in at the time. By June of 1954 I was before a medical board which found me unfit to perform the duties of my rank and temporarily retired me at 70 percent which was boosted to 80 percent by the review board in Washington.

I was paid $166.73 per month by the Corps as retired disability pay. In January of 1955 my VA claim was complete and I am now receiving $249 a month from that agency. Since being released I have served in an associate (nonpay) status with the Pittsburgh, Pa., Reserve Battalion while attending graduate school in that city. I have tried to keep myself abreast of the current orders of the Marine Corps by reading and studying. Also I have mastered the use of my leg and have tried to put it to as many tests as possible from playing baseball to walking over rough ground for the distance of 4 miles.

My inquiries of just where I stand with the corps have been confined to asking questions of superior officers and a letter written to Leatherneck magazine as to my chances of going back. The information I have received has been a jumble of existing orders and answers to the effect, "I never heard of anyone on duty with one leg but I don't know." Others tell me to wait until I receive my next physical from the corps. Frankly, I'm afraid that will be too late judging by my last encounter with a medical board. My medical board was headed by a senior naval officer who was a baby doctor.

When I told him I was a teacher in civilian life he seemed to think I might have a chance at making a living there. Although the board gave me every break in the book as far as rating my case I don't believe they quite understood the amount of handicap with an artificial leg.

My service record was not brilliant. I received the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star with "V." Yet I'm sure it must be at least a little above average. One year from the date I entered active service I was a casualty. Seems to me somebody lost a lot of money on my training. I have no idea what it costs to train a marine officer in the Infantry field but I do know $249 a month for life, hospital care, and other benefits are a lot to pay out to anyone for the limited service performed by me.

I found a challenge and a purpose in the Marine Corps and I'm not ashamed to admit that I enjoyed my service tour and also profited by it in many ways. I am certain I can hold down many billets. Certainly not as a rifle platoon leader again but there are many other jobs. The country is cost and tax conscious today or to put in crudely everyone wants to save a buck whether in private life or in government. And here the Government pays me for merely living. You might say I'm being paid for my sacrifice but it is no more than many men gave and a lot less than others gave who will never come back. In a breakdown of a first lieutenant's pay, should I hold such a billet, the Government would be paying me about $120 for my services. I would not get my retired pay, but the hospitalization and health benefits would remain the same. So would other things such as buying in the PX, etc. In other words the Marine Corps would be paying me $120 for doing a job and the Government would be paying me $249 for doing nothing. Of course I realize with an up in rank the margin would be greater.

You now have the facts as I know them. I would appreciate some information to the following questions. Would the Marine Corps consider taking a disabled man of my rank back? Or should I forget this mad idea, take my money from the VA and attend the Marine Corps ball every November 11?

In closing I would like to say if the rest of the services take care of their men half as well as the corps does then there should be no complaint. I would also like to say that the naval medical system is superb and especially the amputee center Oakland, Calif., headed up by Capt. Thomas Canty, MC/USN, whom I can't praise enough. The VA, too, has helped me no end and although they get caught in the fine network of redtape they do all they can to help you. Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Yours truly,

PHILIP W. COOMBE,
Second Lieutenant, USMCR, (retired).

Highway Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed highway legislation that has been so widely discussed all over the country for so long was disposed of yesterday by a much agitated House of Representatives.

I think that never in my somewhat lengthy service as a Member of Congress have I seen so much confusion and parliamentary maneuvering in connection with any piece of legislation. The Committee on Public Works of the House consists of 34 members, a majority of whom are Democrats, and among the membership of the committee are many very competent Members from both political parties. This great committee started out to write a highway bill and spent much time trying to accomplish their assumed task. They changed their position many times and broke up into a number of groups. And when they finally voted out a bill a large number of them did not approve of the bill, and there were several different reports put out by different members of this committee.

President Eisenhower, through his administrative assistants, recommended a course of action as to what the program should be and as to how it should be financed. He wanted to finance it by the issuance of Government road bonds. This would cost about $30 billion.

The other group, under the leadership of Speaker RAYBURN, was set on the adoption of a program costing more than $25 billion to be paid by the levying of taxes on gasoline, tires, tubes, and other commodities.

In other words, both groups were loud in their protestations of their desire to get good roads for the whole country, and to do this as soon as possible with the full knowledge that the cost was going to be many, many billions of dollars.

The bill that was finally recommended for passage by a majority of the committee was the bill that met the approval of Speaker RAYBURN and the other leaders of the Democratic Party and that would cost many billions of dollars to be paid by a heavy increase of taxes that the people would be compelled to pay for

diesel oil, gasoline, tires, tubes, and other sundry products.

This bill was opposed by the other half of the committee headed by Congressman DONDERO. He and his Republican cohorts were in favor of the President's plan, which was to issue bonds in payment of this road program.

After 2 days of active debate in which many Members participated, when the matter came on for a vote Mr. DONDERO and his followers sought to substitute their program for the program of the Democrats, but lost by a vote of 184 nays, 178 yeas. This was a very close vote—I voted with Mr. DONDERO.

Then, immediately, the final vote was taken—it looked as if the Rayburn forces would win easily. But something very unusual happened. It happened that while the membership was quite equally divided between the Dondero plan and the Rayburn plan, there was a strong sentiment against both plans, partly because the membership was against the terrific cost and were against the manner in which the Public Works Committee had conducted its hearings and deliberations. Its usurpation of the functions of the Ways and Means Committee, which, from the foundation of the Republic, has been given the responsibility of preparing and presenting the tax bills to the Congress, was resented by the public, generally, and by a number of the members of the Public Works Committee, itself. The House voted against the Rayburn plan by a vote of 292 nays, 123 yeas. I voted with those who were opposed to the levying of the gasoline and other taxes to pay for all these billions of dollars that this program would cost.

When the Committee on Public Works had fully realized that they had made serious mistakes they proceeded to try to work their way out. They divided themselves into groups, as appeared from the different kinds of reports they made, but when they had a chance they realized that the best thing to do was to join the many Congressmen who had become disappointed at the failure of this great committee to do what it should have done from the beginning. So when the final vote came the membership discarded both the Dondero plan and the Rayburn plan and voted the whole project down by a terrific majority of 292 to 123. I voted with the majority and was glad to help to bring the matter to a sensible conclusion.

I am for good roads and have always been. But I am also against the levying of these terrific taxes that will be necessary for the construction of these roads now. The thing to do is to take the road building program out of politics and plan it carefully and properly from an engineering standpoint, and sensibly from a taxpaying standpoint. This taxpaying part of the program should be written by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, which committee from the very beginning of the Government, had had this responsibility.

I repeat, I am for good roads, but I am also for economy and against exorbitant and crushing new taxes. We are taxed heavily enough now.

Tribute to the Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today and this weekend Milwaukee, the capital of Eagledom, is host to the 57th annual convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

We of Wisconsin have the warmest and longest ties with this great organization. As a member of the order I convey my warmest personal greetings to all the Eagles who are assembled in Milwaukee, and to all other Eagles, wherever their aeries, working for liberty, trust, justice, and equality—the Eagle creed.

I send to the desk the text of a fine article from the Wilwaukee Journal describing the outstanding role of the Eagles in fighting for social welfare and other worthy causes. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILWAUKEE INFLUENCE HELPED MAKE EAGLES A FRATERNITY DEDICATED TO WIPING OUT POVERTY

Milwaukee, the capital of Eagledom, will be swarming with some 30,000 of the friendly fellows Thursday at the start of the 57th annual convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The official international headquarters of the organization (since October 1953) have been in the Eagles' million-dollar clubhouse at West Wisconsin Avenue and North 24th Street, the finest structure in Eagledom and a mecca for admiring Eagle tourists. Milwaukee also is the home of Eagles' publications.

Milwaukee looms large in Eagle affairs in another respect, too. The late Con (The Dutchman) Mann, a Milwaukeean in his youth, guided the affairs of the order for more than 30 years as managing organizer and his bass voice and robust waist were known in aeries from coast to coast.

One of his proteges was a fledgling with a knack for oratory and an inborn liking for rubbing elbows with fellow Eagles. He is Robert W. Hansen, a district judge in Milwaukee who has twice been elected grand worthy president of the organization.

FOUNDED IN SEATTLE

The Eagles organization began 57 years ago on February 6, 1898, when six lonely theatrical men sauntered over to the tideflats at Seattle and sat down on a lumber pile to form a friendship society called "The Seattle Order of Good Things." A few weeks later it was renamed the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Little did they realize that their chummy group was the progenitor of what is now one of the world's great fraternities with aeries in more than 1,600 communities in the United States, Canada, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The creed of the fraternity was "liberty, truth, justice, and equality." John Cort, one of the founders who became the first grand worthy president, enunciated the purpose of the organization: "To make human life desirable by lessening its ills and promoting peace, prosperity, gladness, and hope." It was a lofty concept, and the Eagles, with a record of civic, community, and humanitarian service over the years, believe they have not let down their idealistic first president.

Onc asked to define the Eagles, a spokesman answered: "You want to know who the Eagles are—I'll tell you. We're the crowd, the one everybody else gets lost in."

It was a way of saying that the Eagles are "the common man's" fraternity, but it was a statement only partially accurate. There are many Eagles who have never been lost in the crowd: Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Theodore Roosevelt, Warren G. Harding, J. Edgar Hoover, Stan Musial, Father Flanagan, William Green, Phil Murray, and James J. Jeffries, to mention only a few.

MILWAUKEE INFLUENCE

The Eagles call their organization "the fighting fraternity," too, because it plunged into red-hot battles for social legislative measures. The order conducted the pioneering campaign for State old-age pensions and the Social Security Act in the early twenties. The Milwaukee influence was mainly responsible. Con Mann, in his early days here, hobnobbed with liberal leaders, and absorbed much of their political philosophy. There is little doubt that this climate inspired him to lead the Eagles on a crusade to rid America of its poorhouses. The fraternity spent more than a million dollars on printed material to drum up support for a National Social Security Act.

The fraternity sponsored the New York State old-age pension act which Roosevelt signed as Governor, and the President presented the pen to the Eagles. It now lodges in their archives, with the signature pens of State old-age pension laws given to the fraternity by the Governors who signed Eagle supported pension legislation.

There are several other firsts, besides social security, in the fraternity's legislative annals. The country's first State old-age pension law was enacted in Montana, sponsored by an Eagle legislator, Lester H. Loble, with the backing of his fraternity. When Gov. Joseph M. Dixon, of Missouri, signed the first State mothers' pension act, in Missouri, in 1923, he said: "You Eagles have planted the seed."

Another "first" in the Eagle lexicon is the national observance of Mothers' Day, although this subject occasions a lifting of eyebrows by the Anna Mae Jarvis devotees. Eagles give full credit to Miss Jarvis for popularizing the idea, but they point to their own role in no shy manner. It is a matter of record that Frank Hering, a onetime Notre Dame professor and football coach, who later became a prominent national Eagle leader, made the first public plea for a Mothers' Day at an Indianapolis aerie meeting, on February 7, 1904. The proposal was received warmly by the Eagles who conducted Mothers' Day programs long before they were national events.

Eagles point with pride to the fact that the American War Mothers in 1929 dedicated a plaque in honor of Hering at the Indianapolis speech site, citing his as "The Father of Mothers' Day."

YOUTH ACTIVITIES

Eagles have long backed wholesome youth activities in a war on juvenile delinquency. Aeries sponsor junior sports, teen-age dances, and recreation centers. In 1941, the Eagles built a $160,000 dormitory for Boys Town. In the youth guidance sphere, the Eagles have spread their wings to West Berlin, where they established Eaglehaus, a vocational training project for German youth to make friends for democracy, a project worked out between Judge Hansen and Ernst Reuter, the late mayor of West Berlin.

A pet undertaking is the Eagles Memorial Foundation, a unique "living memorial" to the Eagles who serves their country in the

armed services. Through donations of the aeries and auxiliaries, a $3 million fund was established to provide physical welfare services and college educations for the children of Eagle dads who lost their lives in military service. More than 1,300 children benefit from the foundation.

The Eagles have their ardent champions, but none has quite expressed himself as appreciatively as Tony Galento, the ex-boxer and wrestler, who is a member of Newark, N. J., aerie.

"This America must be a wonderful country," explained Tony, "and the Eagles a wonderful organization to take in a bum like me."

The Seamy Side of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during this session much has been said on the Senate floor about Dixon-Yates and about the TVA. I think it proper that we keep both in their proper perspective.

Mr. President, there is much about TVA that is dishonest. I ask unanimous consent to have this approach to the TVA problem, as covered in an article entitled, "The Seamy Side of TVA," written by Henry Hazlitt, and published in this week's edition of Newsweek, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAMY SIDE OF TVA
(By Henry Hazlitt)

One wonders whether the hue and cry that Democrats have raised over an alleged Dixon-Yates scandal is intended to divert public attention away from the failure of TVA and from the deceptions practiced to put over and extend that and many other socialized power projects.

In the 218-page report of the Hoover Commission, and in the 1,783-page report of the task force under Admiral Moreell on which the final Commission report was in large part based, we now have a mine of material exposing some of the misleading estimates and unkept promises by which Congress and the taxpayers were induced to undertake many public-power projects. There is not space enough here to cite more than a few random examples from the Hoover Commission report.

Among these are the persistent underestimates of Government engineers concerning the real cost of these projects. "In the field of reclamation the original estimated cost of the 90 projects (outside the Missouri Basin) was $1,580 million, and in 1952, the estimated cost at completion was $3,317 million. The cost of the reclamation portion of the Missouri River Basin project was estimated in 1944 at $850 million. In 1953, the same work was estimated at $3,717 million, an increase of about 343 percent." Only a small percentage of these increases was owing to soaring prices.

"A report to the House Committee on Public Works, rendered by its subcommittee to study civil works, in December 1952, states that the TVA reports its costs had exceeded its estimates by only 3.1 percent. But an examination of a 1936 report of the Authority showed that later estimates for Kentucky Dam exceeded the original by 93.6 percent; for Fort Loudoun Dam, by 74.7 percent; and for Fontana Dam, by 137.7 percent."

In a group of Bureau of Reclamation proposed projects the construction costs of irrigated land averaged $509 per acre for land that had an average market value of less than $150 per acre even with the full water supply.

Under the Constitution, Congress has authority to control navigable streams and floods, but no discoverable right to build hydroelectric powerplants. This has led to the development of the shrewd doctrine that hydroelectric power may be developed and sold by the Federal Government to the extent that it is incidental to flood control and navigation. It has also led, as the Hoover Commission report points out, to a bookkeeping allocation of all the costs possible to flood control and irrigation rather than power.

The Hoover task group laid down certain criteria for determining the real success or failure of Federal power projects: They ought to earn 3 percent interest annually to insure return of Federal borrowing costs. The investment should be properly amortized. The projects should pay local taxes equal to those of private utilities. Earnings of Federal projects should include an amount equal to the Federal tax exemptions, based on the tax payments of private utilities. With such an honest yardstick, the TVA would show a deficit of $30 million in the fiscal year 1953 and an accumulated deficit up to that time of $100 million. The principal groups of Federal projects would show a cumulative deficit of $332 million.

The Hoover Commission points out that the Federal taxpayer is subsidizing these projects. Less than 10 percent of the total population will be directly benefited even when the programs are completed. This means that 90 percent of citizens are forced to subsidize an arbitrarily favored 10 percent. The task group estimates that the Federal projects are selling power on the average at about 50 percent below its real cost.

Finally, while hydroelectric powerplants were built under the pretense that they were merely incidental to navigation and flood control, the TVA has now embarked upon an expansion of its power-generating capacity beyond hydroelectric plants by the building of steam plants.

The moral indignation of the zealots for socialized power at the Dixon-Yates contract seems misplaced.

Tall Corn and Tall Tales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL C. KING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 28, 1955, entitled "Tall Corn and Tall Tales":

TALL CORN AND TALL TALES

An effort was made to explain our farm price support program to the Russians now touring Iowa's corn country. No success.

If the Russians are mystified by price supports, so are most Americans. But let our visitors be patient. The U. S. S. R. may yet be a beneficiary of our price-support plan.

Because United States consumers are taxed so the Government can buy agricultural surpluses, to keep consumer prices high, Uncle Sam has vast hoards of bought-in wheat, butter, and other products. It has been a problem to get rid of those surpluses. Some $1,200,000,000 worth has been disposed of, mostly abroad, in the past 10 months. But much remains.

Up to now Iron Curtain countries have been barred from receiving United States farm surpluses. No such bar exists, however, in Canada, which has a farm-price program like ours, and also surpluses like ours. Quite a ruckus started recently when Canada negotiated deals to sell butter and wheat behind the Iron Curtain—at prices far below those in Canada. Czechoslovakia, for example, will get Canadian butter for 42½ cents a pound, which is 15½ cents per pound less than it cost the Canadian Government to buy it in.

So if the era of good feeling continues, before long the Russians now touring Iowa may find Iowa's products arriving in the U. S. S. R.—and at prices far below those which Iowans would pay in Iowa.

When our visitors get back to the U. S. S. R. there may be skeptical shrugs when they tell of the tall corn in I-oway. But we're betting caviar to a corncob nobody will believe their tall tales of United States price supports.

Protest by Members of New York Democratic Delegation Re Ban on Remanufacture of Watch Movements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter which the New York Democratic delegation sent to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable JERE COOPER, on July 27, 1955:

JULY 27, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned, of the New York Democratic delegation strenuously oppose H. R. 7466 and H. R. 7467, upon which legislation your committee will initiate hearings on Wednesday.

The proposed indiscriminate ban on the remanufacture of all watch movements will have a serious effect on scores of American importer-assembler companies, most of whom are located in New York and who employ thousands of skilled workmen. Its effect will be equally serious to the retail jewelers of the United States whose sales of imported watches amount to half a billion dollars a year.

Since the proposed legislation departs drastically from established customs procedures and introduces new concepts in regulation governing the imports, we believe that much more thorough study should be given by this committee and the executive branch of the Government than time permits during the closing days of this session of Congress. It is our conviction that

this is more than a mere technical change in the statute.

Because of the complicated nature of this whole upjeweling problem, and because the importers and retailers in the New York area have not had the opportunity to analyze with more precision the effect on their business, we urge your committee to defer action on these bills until the next session.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER: On Behalf of VICTOR L. ANFUSO, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, JAMES J. DELANEY, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, JAMES G. DONOVAN, SIDNEY A. FINE, LESTER HOLTZMAN, EDNA F. KELLY, EUGENE J. KEOGH, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., JOHN J. ROONEY, HERBERT ZELENKO.

P. S.—The New York State Department of Commerce has just informed me that they are in agreement with the above staetment.

Leadership of President Eisenhower—Article From the Democratic Digest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Is It Explanation Enough That The President Didn't Know?", which appears in the August number of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IT EXPLANATION ENOUGH THAT THE PRESIDENT DIDN'T KNOW?

May Day was rainy in Moscow this year, so rainy that the Russians had to cancel the "fly-by" scheduled for their annual military parade.

But the weather was not permitted to interfere with Russian plans to let the free world know that Soviet aircraft production was far greater than the West had realized. Foreign newsmen and diplomats were treated to pre-May Day rehearsals and a series of flights after the big Communist holiday. These displays made it all too plain that Russia had made dangerous progress in the output of supersonic fighters and long-range jet bombers.

The revelation dramatized questions about the wisdom of cutting American defense expenditures which had been raised earlier by Democratic Senators. It also raised the possibility that spending should be stepped up.

Since the President had put his own personal stamp on the defense budget, reporters seized their first opportunity to ask Mr. Eisenhower whether this new intelligence would prompt an increase in air defense expenditures.

"I haven't had any such recommendations yet," said the President.

Would it affect other programs such as civil defense, the reporters wanted to know.

"I don't know," said the Chief Executive. "It hasn't been brought up to me in those terms." Reporters were surprised by this image of the President postponing action on a vital matter until someone brought him some recommendations.

Yet this same predisposition to wait for others to suggest what he should do has been apparent before, for example, in the President's discussions of Formosa. Here again Mr. Eisenhower has definitely told the American people that he is personally responsible. He has given his assurance that he and he alone will decide whether to send American military forces into action in that area; yet there is a remote quality about his knowledge and thinking on Formosa which raises the question as to how easily he could reach an independent decision should an emergency arise. For example:

On the eve of the Formosa resolution last January, the President was asked whether there were plans to withdraw an American detachment from the Tachen Islands (which have since been abandoned to the Communists). "I will have to ask the commander on the spot what orders these individuals are under," said the President.

Did the President think Formosa could be held without committing American ground forces? The President passed, saying that he had received "no recommendation" on committing ground troops to Formosa.

Reporters returned to this important question in May. Were we going to set up a military base on Formosa? The President didn't seem to know; he said he had received "no suggestion" to do so.

This vagueness was not lost on the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer. "Never before has the explanation 'He didn't know' been made for any President with anything approaching the frequency it has been made for President Eisenhower," said this newspaper.

The editors were concerned because the White House explained away release of the Yalta papers by saying the President hadn't known about it, but they might also have cited the fact that Mr. Eisenhower—

Had never heard that the Cutter Laboratories had been in trouble with the Food and Drug Administration before they were licensed to manufacture Salk polio vaccine.

Had never heard of Defense Secretary Wilson's controversial ruling that the Defense Department would only release information which made a constructive contribution.

Had never heard of the Republican National Committee's May press release calling Gov. Averell Harriman the "architect of the Yalta Agreement."

Had never heard that Government officials are urging small farmers to sell out to big dealers. "Frankly, I don't believe it," said the President. Yet his Assistant Agriculture Secretary Earl D. Butz had said in March that "agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture."

In addition, the President was not sure last year whether the Secretary of Agriculture had consulted him before he lowered dairy price supports to 75 percent of parity; had forgotten whether he wants Congress to extend unemployment benefits beyond the customary 6 months' period; did not know last August whether his administration was in favor of a then proposed $250 million emergency school building program; couldn't be expected to recall whether the TVA, the agency most affected by the Dixon-Yates disputes, was consulted in the initial steps leading to the Dixon-Yates contract.

Surely one of the most surprising things to escape the President's notice—in view of his twice-stated opinion that communism should not be made a campaign issue—has been the persistent Republican accusation that Democrats are soft on communism. During the Lincoln Day orating season in 1954, House Speaker MARTIN charged Democrats with Communist coddling. Senator JENNER (Republican, Indiana) claimed he had found "heaps of evidence of * * * treason." When he was asked about these charges, the President said that he had seen no statements suggesting that Democrats are "tinged with treason."

During the 1954 campaign, Vice President NIXON went into more than 30 States on a speaking tour, making headlines with his heavy emphasis on the Communist issue. Yet when he was asked about this, the President said he had never heard of Mr. NIXON making "any sweeping condemnation of any party." Was the reporter's question "based upon an actual reading of Mr. NIXON's speeches or what you had learned from what the critics said about his speeches?" the President wanted to know. The reporter said he had read the speeches, while the New York Post commented that Mr. Eisenhower's question "led everybody in the room to wonder when the President will read them.' '

Mr. Eisenhower's defenders attribute his haziness on all these matters to the fact that he came to the Presidency without any previous experience in civilian government. His lack of background, they point out, plus the Army custom of reliance on a staff, has tended to preserve the President's aloofness from many of the daily developments in public affairs.

Probably the role of the staff in this picture cannot be overemphasized. The New York Times has said that "staff has achieved a measure of responsibility under Mr. Eisenhower which it has never enjoyed before."

This dependence on staff, which was so apparent in the President's approach to the Formosan problem, has also showed up in many of his other press conference answers. Last December, for instance, when he was asked whether there would be a Marshall plan for Asia, the President said, "the proposal had not been brought far enough along that it had been argued" in front of him.

Again, when he was asked whether he thought the atomic energy law should be revised to give the commission chairman more authority, he said he had received "no recommendations * * * on the subject * * *."

On another occasion he was asked whether he approved Treasury Secretary Humphrey's stated desire to lift the limits on income earned by social security pensioners.

"Well," the President said, he really didn't know since "that particular point hadn't been suggested" to him.

Another indication of the President's dependence on staff work is his tendency to refer reporters to "the people who are responsible, the people who make the decisions," as though the President himself is not responsible under the Constitution for the conduct of the Government's executive branch.

Will the Navy continue to let our vessels visit ports where the crew must submit to segregation, the President was asked during a recent press conference. "* * * go and ask the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Navy," said Mr. Eisenhower. He himself "didn't know anything about it."

The President had washed his hands in the same public way last January when the Agriculture Department and the Foreign Operations Administration were at dagger points over whether our leading land reform expert, Wolf Ladejinsky, was or was not a security risk. When reporters pressed the President to clear this matter up, he advised them to "go to the people responsible for the decisions directly and ask them the questions."

During the later hassle over Edward Corsi, immigration expediter, the President answered reporters' queries with the explanation that Mr. Corsi "had been put in that position actually, of course, by the Secretary of State." He was sure the answers they wanted 'could be looked up if [the reporters] went to the Secretary of State."

There have been other indications that the President leans heavily on his staff when there are vacancies to be filled. For example, the press corps was surprised when the President turned the administration of the foreign-aid program over to John Hollister, a former Member of Congress, and

long-time associate of the late Senator Robert Taft, since Mr. Hollister had been identified as a foe of foreign aid.

So they asked the President whether he had had assurances from Mr. Hollister that he believed in foreign aid. The President seemed surprised that the question should be raised.

"Did I have what?" he asked.

"Assurances that Hollister favors foreign aid," the reported repeated.

"No," said the President, "that is, personally, no."

The President seemed to have no duobt over whether a program could be effectively administered by a man who might not believe in it. Mr. Hollister had been recommended by his staff, and that seemed to be that, so far as Mr. Eisenhower was concerned.

The almost total dependence on subordinates might not be a serious matter if those close to Mr. Eisenhower were urged to direct his attention to all matters on which they feel Presidential guidance is needed. Apparently, however, the opposite is true. According to columnist Marquis Childs, Cabinet officers and others high in the administration, have been told that if they expect Mr. Eisenhower to serve a second term, "you cannot come running in here every other day with your troubles. Decisions must be taken by those who should take them."

New York Times correspondent Cabell Phillips has written at considerable length about this tendency to delegate so much responsibility.

"The danger of too much staff," he has said, "is that it tends, in time, to do the Chief's thinking for him; that it may heduce him to a mere ratifier of decisions that have been worked out below. There is also something to be said * * * for the brilliant inspiration, as a source of policy. Such an idea is likely to be dejuiced, however, by the time it works its way up through staff levels. Complaints such as these have been heard about the staff system as it exists in the White House today."

But of all the doubts expressed over Mr. Eisenhower's lack of leadership, perhaps the most telling was historian Gerald W. Johnson's observation that "You can elect a man to the White House, but you can't make him President. He must do that for himself."

Wisconsin Is Proud of Lester Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin are understandably proud of our colleague, LESTER JOHNSON, from the Ninth Congressional District. LESTER JOHNSON represents a primarily rural part of the State, but he has shown a remarkably understanding attitude for the needs of city people.

LESTER JOHNSON understands that city and farm folk must work together for the common good of all Americans. He has always recognized that a prosperous industry and a prosperous agriculture are mutually interdependent.

The election of LESTER JOHNSON has brought to this House a man who appreciates the needs of an expanding economy benefiting both city people and farmers alike. LESTER JOHNSON'S fine support for city and farm legislation has exemplified for me how to act in the public interest.

It is gratifying that LESTER JOHNSON'S colleagues in the House appreciate the outstanding job he is doing here, not only for the people of his district, but for all America.

Statement of Dr. Joseph Lifshitz, Vice President of the Schlome Mendelsohn Branch of the Workmen's Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the statement of Dr. Joseph Lifshitz, vice president of the Schlome Mendelsohn Branch of the Workmen's Circle, a Jewish labor-fraternal organization with some 70,000 members throughout the United States.

The statement was made at a reception in the Washington office of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, on July 23, 1955. The occasion for the presentation of these remarks was a pilgrimage to the Nation's Capitol of this group which is composed of former inmates of Nazi and concentration camps. They are all newly naturalized citizens of the United States, and the purpose of their visit was to express their gratitude not only to this great country of ours for befriending them but to express to Senator LEHMAN their deep and grateful appreciation for the role he has played in fighting intolerance and tyranny in the world and for his efforts to bring about a liberalized immigration policy in this country.

The statement follows:

REMARKS OF DR. JOSEPH LIFSHITZ AT RECEPTION IN WASHINGTON OFFICE OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN, JULY 23, 1955

It is my privilege to have been assigned the honor of speaking for our group of the Schlome Mendelsohn Branch of the Workmen's Circle.

First, we would like to express our thanks to you for your warm and gracious reception.

When we first discussed with the general secretary of the Workmen's Circle, Mr. Nathan Chanin, the matter of being received by a representative personality in American political life, our unhesitating choice was Senator LEHMAN. But this was not because you are the Senator of our home State, New York, but rather because more than anyone else we could think of, you personify the forces of democracy which contend against intolerance and tyranny and stand for a liberalized American immigration policy. It is through such a policy that it is possible for us and others like us to leave the places where we have been victimized and oppressed and find an open door to this great free country of America.

Having found the door open we eagerly entered through it and now in a very genuine sense we feel ourselves to be new-born souls, knowing for the first time what it really means to be free. Our gratitude for this, to you and to America, is beyond words to describe.

For who more than we can appreciate and understand what it means to be able to live, to breathe, and to work as free citizens, as free human beings? We, the oppressed and hunted, we who were the objects of derision, we who were stepped upon, and who through miracles somehow survived the crematoria readied for us by the Nazis, crematoria, and gas chambers and firing lines, which had already destroyed 6 million of our fathers, our mothers, our brothers, our sisters, and our children? And the same miracles which enabled us to survive the Nazis also enabled us to escape the police state, and the prison camps, and the brutal totalitarianism of Communist Russia.

With how much deep feeling, therefore, do we stand before you attempting to give words to our thanks and to the great esteem we have toward you, Senator LEHMAN, for the outstanding role you have played in our emancipation and toward the democratic community which you represent in this country?

It was you and the American people who opened the gates to us, received us so warmly, and gave us the opportunity to rebuild our lives, to become productive citizens of this country, and to begin to give of ourselves, our talents, and our devotion and our energies, to the ever-increasing greatness of these United States in the same way as have so many immigrants before us.

We here are members of a branch of the Workmen's Circle, a fraternal organization of 70,000 members throughout the country, which was formed and built by earlier immigrants. For the 55 years of the organization's existence it has made considerable contributions to the economic, social, and cultural life of this country. We know that you are acquainted with the Workmen's Circle and we need not tell you about it.

You also know about the role the Workmen's Circle has played in molding the countenance of Jewish life in America and in being helpful to Jewish life all over the world.

Our own branch carries the name of Schlome Mendelsohn, one of the noblest figures of our old home life in Poland. He was our revered teacher and cultural leader and a builder of the modern, progressive Jewish school movement in Poland. He was able to emerge from the hell of nazism together with us, and came here to America only to pass from our midst in 1948. Our own branch was formed in 1950, and as new Americans, as survivors of the Nazi tyranny, as escapees from communism, as fighters of the underground, of the partisan movements, and of the ghetto uprisings against the Nazis, we deemed it appropriate to name ourselves after one of our most beloved comrades, Schlome Mendelsohn.

We want to state that we feel ourselves very much at home in the Workmen's Circle where we have joined those who were immigrants of earlier decades. Having entered such an organization we feel ourselves already integrated into the American community, and even in the short number of years that we are in this country we have all become citizens of America and feel in this citizenship a pride, and a triumph which we joyously proclaim.

Thus far I have only spoken of our gratitude, but we also want to express our assurance to you and to our fellow citizens of this country that America will find in us the loyalty and trustworthiness it has a right to expect from every citizen, and we shall give ourselves wholeheartedly to the defense of this country and the enrichment of its traditions and institutions.

We earnestly hope that the priceless opportunity given to us to enter this country and become citizens will also be given to those who are still refugees from tyranny, who, wherever they may find themselves, have little hope in life except to be received in a

land of freedom and to breathe as freemen as we now do in this country. They, as well as we, look principally to America as a haven of refuge for the oppressed and as a homeland for those who not only believe in freedom but wish to live in freedom. What greater tribute than this can be paid any country?

Again, Senator LEHMAN, with the greatest respect we thank you wholeheartedly for receiving us and adding so richly to this visit we are making to the Capital City of our country. Having come here to learn more about our institutions and our form of government, this visit with you has also made it possible for us to come face to face with one of the greatest exponents of American democracy. This occasion will always be one of our happiest memories.

Ted Granik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article from the August 1955 issue of Reader's Digest entitled "Champion of Plain Talk," by Lois Mattox Miller:

CHAMPION OF PLAIN TALK

(By Lois Mattox Miller)

Three years ago, Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the popular radio-TV programs American Forum of the Air and Youth Wants to Know was stricken by a heart attack. He was then 45 and still had a lot of things he wanted to do in life.

After a spell in the hospital, he went to Florida. His law partners and broadcast associates were sure he was in the first stages of retirement. But he fooled them. The next thing they knew, he had teamed up with local businessmen and started a television station in West Palm Beach. Then the memos and phone calls began to pour into Washington and New York, and Ted was on the way back.

Today he is going stronger than ever. In addition to his two weekly forums and his TV station in Florida he has started three new programs. He is a successful Washington attorney and the friend and confidant of Government leaders.

"When I was flat on my back," says Granik, "I found wisdom in the doctor's bromide that a coronary is the greatest lifesaver of middle-aged men. I've learned to conserve energy and make it produce more than ever before."

Theodore Granik is a sturdy man with thinning sandy hair, an engaging smile and a mission in life that won't let him sit still. He got into radio on the ground floor in 1925, and for the past 30 years he has been the champion of plain talk on the air.

While still in law school, he was hired as secretary to Lee Adam Gimbel of the famous New York department store. To lure customers to bargain sales, Gimbel's had just set up a new radio station, WGBS. Granik was given the chore of keeping the station on the air between commercials with poetry readings and newscasts. Broadcasting fascinated him. He sensed its enormous educational possibilities. "There were so many things people ought to know," he says, "and no one was telling them."

He set out to remedy that by arranging a program called Law for the Layman. With himself as interrogator, he lured his professors from St. John's Law School to the microphone to inform the public about wills, leases, contracts, debts, alimony.

When WGBS was sold in 1928, Granik was invited to bring Law for the Layman to station WOR. Prohibition was then a controversial issue, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, was scheduled to speak against the 18th amendment. The Woman's Christian Temperature Union demanded equal time for its representative to defend the amendment.

"Let's put them both on my show at the same time," Ted suggested. "Then we can present both sides of the issue."

That broadcast made radio history. Facing her angry opponent at the microphone, the temperance lady let loose the charge that, in Washington, underground passages connected Government buildings with nearby speakeasies. The press took it from there, and next morning the Nation was aware of a new type of broadcasting.

Granik convinced the broadcasters that there was place for controversy on the air so long as the proceedings were kept under control by an impartial moderator. The program became the American Forum of the Air; its shelf of transcripts represents a lively history of the past 27 years.

Arranging and moderating the weekly forum could have been a full-time job; Granik managed it in his spare moments—with the help of his wife, Hannah. Then, with a sheaf of glowing letters from members of the bar, he applied for the post of assistant district attorney of New York County and got the job.

In 1937, when he was appointed counsel of the United States Housing Authority, he took the forum with him to Washington, where it became a network feature. With the New Deal controversies raging and a war brewing in Europe, Granik was able to bring to the microphone an increasing number of Congressmen and Cabinet officers who were willing to speak out on everything from social security and farm policy to neutrality and armed intervention. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinted the proceedings, and the program became known as the Unofficial Congress of the United States.

Sometimes the debates taxed Granik's adroitness as moderator. Once the late Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, an irascible ex-New Dealer, tried to beat Senator Claude Pepper over the head with a table microphone. During the bitter wrangles between the isolationists and interventionists in 1940–41, the American Forum was also the scene of some dramatic conversions. Clarence Streit, founder of Union Now, converted an isolationist Senator in the course of the broadcast. On another forum, Mrs. Irving Berlin, an ardent interventionist, persuaded her opponent to resign publicly from the America First Committee.

Granik retired from the United States Housing Authority in 1941 to enter private practice. But his impulse to give friends in Government a hand with their problems left little time for his clients. He helped Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey launch the selective-service program. When Mario Giannini, president of the Bank of America, told him of the problems small-business men of California were having getting war contracts, Granik went to California and organized scores of little firms into subcontractors' pools that became models for the entire Nation. This job so impressed the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that he was retained to help draft the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act. Meanwhile, the American Forum served a vital purpose in wartime information and morale.

After the war Granik's friends tried to persuade him to forget public service and concentrate on his law practice. Nearly 20 years of broadcasting had been carried on at a personal financial loss; his out-of-pocket expenses represent a fabulous sum. Ted rejoined, "Can't a man have a hobby?"

For a few years he concentrated on the law and the American Forum. Then in 1951 he had another broadcasting idea. When lining up speakers for the forum, he was frequently accompanied by his teen-age son Bill. Often he was amazed by the clarity and directness of Bill's questions and the respect with which they were answered.

The result was Youth Wants To Know, which made its debut on the NBC radio and TV networks in 1951. On the first broadcast Senator Robert A. Taft faced an audience of Washington teen-agers who asked searching questions about the coming Presidential campaign, General MacArthur's recall from the Far East, and the liberal-conservative struggle within the Republican Party. After the broadcast, switchboards were swamped with calls from enthusiastic listeners. Senator Taft remained in the studio with the kids for 2 hours. Later, the Senator told Granik, "I've never been questioned so intelligently in my entire public life."

The youth program gives Granik more satisfaction than anything else in his career. The youngsters' questions go directly—sometimes ruthlessly—to the crux of the matter. They are quick to spot evasions. One lad stopped a famous public-relations expert, "Please, sir, quit filibustering."

This year Youth Wants To Know attracted a sponsor, the General Dynamics Corp., which is considering sending it on a nationwide tour, enabling youngsters in many cities to participate.

With State Department blessing, Granik is planning a TV program which will take the public to a party in a different Washington Embassy each week. He has another program planned with the Overseas Press Club, in which leading journalists will talk things over with foreign statesmen.

Last year Granik logged 100,000 miles of air travel, and 15,000 more by sea. Yet he seems calm and never in a hurry. The doctors say that he never has been in better shape.

Natural Gas Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent and very penetrating article dealing with the natural gas legislation that is now before the House for consideration. This article was written on June 20, 1955 by my constituent and good friend Alexander J. Cella. Mr. Cella is a teaching fellow in government at Harvard. I feel that this article is an analysis worthy of thought and consideration by all Members of Congress:

NATURAL GAS GIVEAWAY

Behind the closed doors of executive sessions of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Congressional battle lines have been drawn for what may become the bitterest struggle of the present legislative session. The controversy centers around a bill to exempt the so-called independent producer of natural gas from Federal regulation under the Natural Gas Act of 1938. The outcome of this battle concerns the more than 60 million Americans who cur-

rently use natural gas, since it will substantially affect the prices they pay for their gas in the future.

Since the end of World War II, the natural gas industry has almost tripled its sales. In 1940, natural gas furnished slightly more than a tenth of the Nation's energy requirements; today, it meets almost one-fourth of the Nation's needs. Approximately 9 trillion cubic feet are now sold annually.

It has been variously estimated that, if the present legislation is enacted, American consumers of natural gas will pay from $200 million to $800 million more each year than at the present time. Recently, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, declared that, for every penny increase per thousand cubic feet in the field price of natural gas, approximately $2 billion would be added to the value of the present reserves owned by producers.

By definition, an independent producer neither owns its own pipelines nor transports its own gas for ultimate resale and public consumption. Of all the natural gas produced in the United States in 1953, about 81 percent was produced by the independents.

The natural-gas industry's struggle to prevent Federal regulation of the independents was initiated in the wake of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in the interstate case in 1947. The nub of the legal controversy which has raged ever since hinges on the proper interpretation of section 1 (B) of the Natural Gas Act of 1938. Industry spokesmen have contended that the latter part of this section specifically excludes the independents from Federal regulation. Moreover, they assert, this view was clearly intended by the proponents and framers of the legislation in 1938 and, until 1947, was manifestly recognized as correct by the Federal Power Commission, which consistently refused to regulate their operations. But unresolved doubt as to the continued legality of the FPC's inaction, combined with uneasy suspicions as to the future intentions of some FPC members, spurred the industry's efforts to secure explicit exemption legislation. Finally, after several unsuccessful legislative bids, the Kerr-Harris bill was narrowly pushed through Congress in 1950, only to meet with a stinging veto from President Truman.

The industry was further incensed by the Supreme Court's conclusively adverse ruling in the 1954 test case of the Phillips' Petroleum Co., largest of the independents. The Court ruled that the FPC does, indeed, possess regulatory authority over the independents under the existing terms of the Natural Gas Act.

Now the industry and its strategically positioned congressional spokesmen have launched a frontal assault on the whole concept of Federal regulation. The industry's Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee has embarked upon what it calls, "a king-sized publicity campaign" which, according to the Wall Street Journal, is expected to cost upward of $1,500,000. Large advertisements decrying the "new interpretation" and outlining the industry's arguments have periodically appeared in newspapers and magazines throughout the Nation, and local "monitoring teams" have been established to correct and counterbalance any unfavorable information.

Basically, the industry contends that regulation heralds the abandonment of free enterprise and "vigorous competition" among the more than 4,000 independent producers; that the Federal Government, by "clamping bureaucratic controls" over production dampens the incentive for further risk-taking in the exploration and development of new wells; that Federal regulation will not bring lower consumer rates, since less than 10 percent of the consumer gas bill reflects the prices charged by independent producers and gatherers; that regulation will, in fact, lessen the supply of available gas; that regulation at the source will create a precedent for regulation of other commodities at the source, especially coal, copper and other minerals; and, finally, that all of these evils are to be unleashed because of a strained interpretation of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 directly contrary to the legislative intent of those who wrote the act.

Industry spokesmen make much of the charge of a "new interpretation" Yet since 1938 the Supreme Court has never held that the FPC has no jurisdiction over the independents. In fact, the Court has been gradually progressively inching its way toward the sweeping pronouncement in the Phillips case last June that the FPC has authority over "all wholesales of natural gas in interstate commerce whether by a pipeline company or not and whether occurring before, during, or after transmission by an interstate pipeline company."

The new interpretation contention applies with greater cognecy to the FPC, which at various times has been on all sides of this issue. But even here the charge is not fully justified. This is true even in the first case involving an independent to come before the FPC, the celebrated 1940 Columbian Fuel Corp. case which industry spokesmen cite as antiregulation. The Commission decision in that case contained a significant paragraph warning that further administration of the Natural Gas Act might eventually show that through affiliation, field agreement, or dominant position in a field, a situation had been created where an unreasonable price prevailed. Under such circumstances, the FPC observed, it would have to decide whether it can assume jurisdiction over arbitrary field prices under the present act or should report the facts to Congress with appropriate recommendations.

Obviously, the FPC was not enunciating a rigid rule in the Columbian case. Instead, it was quite explicitly keeping an open mind on the question of the extent of its powers, reserving the right to reexamine the issue at a later date. In any event, as the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia once remarked of this line of argumentation, "We cannot destroy the plain language of the statute because the Commission, at one time, interpreted it narrowly."

The production and gathering phase of the natural-gas industry is characterized today, as it was at the time of the Truman veto, by limited and restricted competition and by a large measure of concentrated ownership of the provable reserves. The inherent physical characteristics of the industry minimize effective competition. The pipeline company must invest large sums in the construction of immobile pipeline systems; the consumer is unable to choose between buying or refusing to buy from the one distributing company which services his area. And, while it is true that more than 4,000 independents are affected, it is also worth noting that less than 100 companies produce 85 percent of the gas produced by the independents, with 7 companies providing 35 percent of this total.

As for industry concern that Federal regulation will hamper further exploration and development, there is no inherent reason why regulation cannot proceed on the basis of a rate formula and rate schedule which gives the fullest sympathetic consideration to the peculiar risk-taking hazards legitimately involved. Moreover, the courts are always open to appeal on the grounds that regulation is confiscatory.

Finally, industry declares that the field price of natural gas has risen much less rapidly than the general cost of living, and that it comprises only a small percentage of the total cost of gas to the consumer. But industry spokesmen are unwilling to talk about the steadily increasing field prices since the end of the war and the even more rapid price increases which will take place in the future under provisions of long-term contracts between the independents and the pipeline companies. Most of these contracts contain escalator clauses providing for automatic price increases, many to 3 or 4 times their original starting rates. Consequently, their full impact on consumer prices, while it has yet to be felt, can readily be evaluated. It is disingenuous to boast, as the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee did in a recent advertisement, that natural-gas prices had remained reasonable during the past 16 years "under free competition without Federal regulation," without mentioning the impending disastrous effects on consumer rates of such automatic price-increasing devices as escalator and most-favored-nation clauses.

The present natural gas controversy readily invites comparison with the tidelands oil giveaway in 1953. Owing to the geological fact that natural gas is frequently found commingled with oil, and historically was largely discovered as a by-product of the quest for oil, many of the largest oil companies today own the known reserves of natural gas. Accordingly, the same economic interests behind the offshore oil grab (whose political and financial power has been enhanced by beneficial oil depletion allowance provisions in our tax structure) are now actively embroiled in the natural gas struggle.

Politically, the issue is a sectional one which cuts across party lines. The only ones who stand to benefit from exemption legislation are independent producers in the seven Southern States (Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas), who produce 95 percent of the gas produced by United States independents.

Until this spring, industry prospects in the controversy appeared extremely bright. late in February a top-level Cabinet Committee on Fuel and Energy Resources, headed by Defense Mobilizer Arthur Fleming, reported to President Eisenhower and urged that "the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line." Industry hopes received another boost when 4 of the 5 members of the FPC endorsed the antiregulation viewpoint in a statement delivered before the House Commerce Committee by Jerome K. Kuykendall, the Eisenhower-appointed Chairman of the FPC.

But, as the opposition began to testify, the balance turned the other way. Mayors of more than 50 gas-consuming cities, representing a combined population of 30 million people, organized under the joint leadership of Mayors Robert F. Wagner, of New York; Clark, of Philadelphia; and David Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, began to publicize the consumers' side of the controversy. Today, many industry spokesmen believe that time is working against them.

True, the House Commerce Committee, by a 16–15 vote, finally has reported out a modified antiregulation bill. But, in the Senate, the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington, who voted against the Kerr bill in 1950. In open hearings last month on the exemption of the independents, MAGNUSON argued that an overall appraisal of the Natural Gas Act was now necessary. He declared that his committee would also concern itself with a series of technical proposals for amending the act which had been advanced by the FPC in its last report. Industry spokesmen regard MAGNUSON's action as an unofficial filibuster, designed to prevent an exemption bill from reaching the Senate floor in time for debate and a vote.

If and when regulation is debated on the floor of Congress, the influence of President Eisenhower is likely to be the decisive factor, especially in the Senate. Thus far, the President has still to enunciate a position. A few months ago, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, was still optimistic that, despite the Fleming committee report, Mr. Eisenhower was still keeping his mind open.

Nevertheless, the President thus far has not been one to stand in the path of give-away government, especially when the give-away is to be accomplished in the name of free enterprise, private initiative, and States rights. When the chips are down, Mr. Eisenhower will very likely be found in the ranks of the industry behind the Fleming Committee and the FPC. If this proves so, whatever else future historians may say about this administration, at least they can say that its natural-resources policies were thoroughly consistent.

GI Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the privilege of submitting for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting and informative article entitled "GI Conservation," by Cleveland Van Dresser, one of the Nation's better-known conservationists and sports authorities. His article touches on H. R. 5442, which I introduced, but the article is primarily aimed at hunting and fishing that could be made available for military personnel on military reservations:

GI CONSERVATION

(By Cleveland Van Dresser)

Recently a bill was introduced in Washington aimed at activating one of the greatest hunting, fishing, and wildlife conservation programs, ever instigated in this country.

As of now there are literally millions of acres of publicly owned land scattered in every State in the Union, much of it fully capable of supporting good hunting and fishing. This land is composed of military installations, and every branch of the armed services is represented. If the combined areas administered by the Navy, Army, Marine Corps, veterans' hospitals, and Air Force were all joined together, they would easily make a good-sized State.

Some of these military installations are immense. Eglin Air Force Base in Florida is over half a million acres in extent, and some areas in the Western States are even larger than that.

With but few exceptions, hunting, fishing, and wildlife conservation is being ignored on these huge areas.

The bill, introduced by Congressman BOB SIKES, of Florida, seeks to develop the sportsman-potential of these great tracts of lands. The measure would affect millions of fishermen and hunters in every State in the Union. In area for Florida alone, 64,000 acres would be affected, not counting Eglin Field.

Servicemen are not the only persons by any means who would enjoy improved hunting and fishing as a result of SIKES' bill. Every Nimrod and Izaac Walton in the land would feel its beneficial effects.

During the past several months I made a study of military installations in regard to their hunting and fishing possibilities. I found that throughout the land there are only two such areas that have any official status as wildlife areas. One is the large Naval Ammunition Depot at McAlester, Okla., and the other is Eglin Air Force Base, in Florida.

By a special act, McAlester has been declared a wildlife refuge with a full-fledged conservation program in force there. The program is conducted jointly by the civilian personnel at the depot, the Oklahoma Game and Fish Department and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Eglin Air Force Base has a wildlife restoration plan plus a public-hunting program administered by base personnel. It is the only setup of its size on any military installation in the United States.

What I learned during my extensive tour was both discouraging and encouraging. The discouraging part was observing such huge areas virtually going to waste, so to speak. The encouraging part was the local programs in effect on some of the military bases, plus the obvious deduction that wildlife programs were feasible on most military areas that don't have them.

One of the principal ills connected with any concentration of men is the drain upon hunting and fishing resources of adjacent areas. I encountered repeated complaints from civilians on this score. In my opinion, such complaints are justifiable and understandable.

As every sportsman knows, public hunting and fishing areas are becoming increasingly scarce. Just because a man dons a uniform doesn't mean he's given up hunting and fishing. And when you have several thousand men practically living under one roof, you're going to have heavy use, indeed, of any fishing and hunting facilities available. Private citizens howl lustily, indeed, when their fishing and hunting grounds are invaded by hordes of the military.

In some sections of the country, it has reached the point where outdoor editors don't dare print anything about a good catch of fish being landed in any particular lake or stream for fear the water will be overrun by men in uniform.

The GI can't be blamed for this unhappy state of affairs. It's not his fault he's stuck in a camp with several thousand other guys who like to hunt and fish and can't get away long enough to indulge in his favorite sport any distance from camp. He does the best he can, fishing and hunting whenever opportunity affords with the result that the areas available get worn pretty thin.

Hunting and fishing on military installations throughout the country today is carried on in a desultory fashion. It's pretty much up to the commanding officer of any given area. If he likes to fish and hunt, he can readily instigate and carry on a program in his own bailiwick. If he's not interested, these sports are virtually neglected.

Even though "military hunting"—so to speak, is on a strictly local basis, some programs in effect are truly remarkable. This is due in great measure to unstinted cooperation and assistance of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the various State game and fish commissions. Both of these organizations offer unqualified help to any request from the military to start and maintain sportsmen's programs.

The exact number of military installations in the United States and their aggregate total in acreage is classified information. However, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the sparkplug in most cooperative deals between the military and the conservation agencies, estimate there are 80 Air Force bases alone that are large enough to support effective hunting and fishing programs. Add to that total the Army, Navy, Marine, and VA hospitals, and you have a total acreage that is something to reckon with, a fact which has been pointed out before in this article.

The hit-or-miss arrangement now practiced in military installations has both good and bad points, from the sportsman's angle. Commanding officers are shifted fairly often, and it is not unprecedented to have an officer who has fostered hunting and fishing at one military base start another such program on another base when he is transferred. On the other hand, many a good conservation program has died from lack of attention due to the shifting of a disinterested officer from one base to another.

To get an idea of the potential involved for Florida in case the military ever does decide to adopt fishing and hunting, let's take a quick look at what is going on in other parts of the country.

The McAlester, Okla., setup is absolutely unique. It is a wildlife refuge, not a hunting area. Which means no hunting is allowed.

That's not as dismal as it sounds, for fishing, and plenty of it, is permitted. Furthermore, there is a natural overflow of surplus game birds and animals outside the refuge, and private citizens as well as GI's are getting the benefit of it.

The entire wildlife conservation program at McAlester is in charge of a civilian, Dewey Johnson, chief of the maintenance division of the naval depot. His crews plant huge cover crops, build numerous ponds and lakes, and engage in extensive soil erosion work. Practically everything they do in the way of upkeep of the immense ammunition depot is done with an eye toward wildlife restoration.

McAlester depot was originally a hunk of beat-up, eroded farmland interspersed with a few sorry swamps. Now it is rapidly becoming a wildlife paradise with quail, wild turkey, deer, waterfowl, and other game roaming all over the place. To think of a wildlife refuge existing on an ammunition depot is fantastic, but it does, I assure you. I made a thorough inspection of the place with the express permission of the United States Navy.

Reason for the extensive water conservation is the fire hazard. No one has to be told what could happen if a fire ever broke out on an ammunition depot. Water, and lots of it, must be handy at all times. Thus the ponds and lakes. Needless to say, the lakes are full of fish—Johnson sees to that—and waterfowl use them (the lakes) extensively during migration flights. Johnson has even started a nesting population of Canada geese.

Another conservation project I found intensely interesting is located at the Quantico Marine Base, 40 miles down the Potomac River from Washington, D. C. The setup here is quite different from that at McAlester.

The marines really go in for active hunting and fishing at Quantico, and have a program that could readily be used as a model for any sportsmen's area. They have their own Rod and Gun Club with dues at $2 per year. All moneys thus collected are spent on improving hunting and fishing.

The marines engaged in a lot of food-plot planting for game birds, have cleared out streams and lakes, and have improved waterfowl habitat along the Potomac to such an extent that hunting and fishing within the confines of Quantico is in some respects better than it is on the outside.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service started a nucleus of a wild turkey flock which has grown to sizable proportions. The deer herd has also grown considerably, and both the Federal Bureau and the Virginia Department of Fish and Game are actively engaged in stocking both bass and trout in suitable waters within the area.

Any one stationed at or connected with the Quantico base can fish and hunt therein, subject to Virginia game laws.

It is the purpose of Congressman SIKES' bill to have hunting and fishing become part of the regular military program. The thing makes sense and think what an enlistment inducement it could be. In addition, imagine what a boon it would be to servicemen and civilians alike. No sportsman today is confronted with more territory than he can hunt and fish, and any additions thereto, especially those the size of military reservations, will be enthusiastically welcomed.

What if the civilian can't hunt on a military area? The GI's can and every man in uniform who can hunt and fish on his own area means less crowded conditions on public areas, many of which are busting at the seams as it is.

SIKES' bill makes provisions for State and Federal cooperation in developing the hunting and fishing potential of all military areas. To my way of thinking, this is definitely as it should be. Wildlife restoration is a highly specialized job these days, and it takes trained men with plenty of know-how to get the desired results.

Taking everything into consideration, a bill to foster and promote fishing and hunting on military reservations is one of the best conservation ideas to find its way into the legislative hopper on Capitol Hill in a long time.

Here's hoping it goes over.

Suitable Airports From an Airline Pilot's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Capt. Barton Hewitt, one of the TWA pilots, spoke on the subject of suitable airports from an airline pilot's viewpoint, and made some very interesting comments during the course of his remarks. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, a few days ago I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which had been delivered by Capt. Barton Hewitt, one of the outstanding pilots of a leading airline. The address dealt with the subject of suitable airports from an airline pilot's viewpoint. I think this address is of particular interest to Members of Congress, as well as to the people of Washington and the surrounding area, because of the vexatious problem of expanding airport facilities in this general area.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the address exceeds by one-half a page the amount allowed to be printed without an estimate. The Public Printer estimates the cost of printing the article at $200.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the extra cost, this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I believe it is well worthwhile.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUITABLE AIRPORTS FROM AN AIRLINE PILOT'S VIEWPOINT

(By Capt. Barton Hewett)

AIRLINE AIRPORTS

The ideal airline airport is one which adequately provides for the safe takeoff and landing of the type of aircraft which serve the community where it is located, and which has facilities which permit efficient handling of the passengers, baggage and cargo to be carried plus catering to all the needs and desires of the traveling and the visiting public. It is located as close to the traffic generating center of the community as possible without interfering with the community pattern, becoming an undesirable neighbor, or enforcing flight paths which snarl air traffic. Transportation to the ideal airport is direct and speedy from all segments of the community and these routes are so located that they do not interfere or conflict with industrial traffic which will cause delays. The airport is so designed and financed and operated that it does not become an economic burden either on the community or the carriers.

It will, in all but exceptional cases, have at least two runways or parallel pairs of runways which can be expanded to accommodate forecast aircraft and which are not partially useless because of obstructions; it will have a terminal which is flexible, functional and economically practical. It may have underground fueling or other special built-in services if the provision of these services results in a lowering of the cost of operations.

Airport location is playing an increasingly important role in the operation of airline aircraft. Of course, everyone traveling by air would like the airports to be located right downtown like MKC but this idea is becoming less and less practical. It becomes less practical for reasons of obstructions, room for expansion and from the noise-control standpoint. The best locations from operational viewpoint are perhaps more remote from the cities but ideally, within easy travel time and distance from the community centers. The remote locations are best from many points; safety, less obstruction, fewer residential squawks about all the noise and room for overrun areas and expansion. We are having a terrific amount of trouble over this noise problem with the New York area as the prime example, though New York is not the only area raising a commotion by any means. Capt. Joe Hull, of Capital Airlines, wrote a very interesting article in the February issue of the Air Line Pilot, ALPA's monthly publication, which sums up the noise problem perhaps in the best manner yet conceived.

Captain Hull suggests that the right of eminent domain be extended to incorporate airports as equally important to the general need and well-being of the country as are the railroads or powerlines or sewage disposal plants. This would realize the fact that residence near airports might be just as undesirable as that near any of the facilities of these other outfits which are recognized under the right of eminent domain legislation, eliminating expensive litigation involving complainants and airport operators, airlines, and pilots.

Remote location of proposed airports will enable the restriction of surrounding areas in such a manner as to preclude the creeping type of paralysis which is now occurring around LaGuardia and Newark. I understand a new hospital is under construction near LaGuardia. It seems rather hard to understand the planning of a hospital, which traditionally requires quiet for the good of the patients, in an area which already is squawking its head off because of the aircraft noise. This area, like Newark, has built up tremendously in the immediate vicinity of the airport during recent years because of the cost of property and through lack of any kind of building restrictions. It is recommended, therefore, that wherever possible around existing airports restrictions are placed in effect to prevent this problem from arising in the future. The Doolittle Committee report emphasizes this.

Moving airport locations farther out from the cities in proposed construction projects might present something of a transportation problem at the present time but let us not overlook the eventual helicopter-shuttle services. We already have three such services in operation around New York, Los Angeles, and Miami. They are still in the embryonic stages but with new equipment such as the Piasecki YP-16 already flying it should not be too long before these services are in position to provide really valuable transportation from remote major terminals to cities' downtown terminals.

In planning new airport construction there are many other advantages in moving farther away from cities. The first major advantage lies in the ability to preplan larger areas for the airports, acquiring more land for expansion purposes. Runway lengths can be planned to accommodate present aircraft with foresight of ability to expand for later types which may require even greater lengths. Sufficient area should be planned for utilization of multiple and parallel runways at major terminals. Areas immediately surrounding the active airport area can be made into lovely park areas with the help of the State game and forest preservation services, serving multiple purposes. This idea will help to make clear approaches to the airports in compliance with the recommendations of the Doolittle Committee. It will also provide safe areas in which overshoot or undershoot procedures will not be damaging or fatal. We actually have some airports where concrete abutments have been erected in order to keep aircraft from winding up in residential or business districts in event of overshoot or brake failure on landings. This is a bit tough on equipment and provides something of a psychological hazard to the gentlemen seated in the front end of the planes. Let's not put up any more concrete barriers. This same additional area around airports will provide another safety factor to the pilots in event of aborted takeoffs wherein engine failure during the takeoff roll occurs at a time when the aircraft might not be stopped in the normal runway length. This overrun area idea is becoming increasingly important with present high wing-loading aircraft and will be even more important with the advent of the pure-jet transport. At present, leading aircraft manufacturers are designing the United States of America's first jet transport, notable among which is Boeing's No. 707, a direct descendant of the B-47 and B-52. Boeing has the 707 well along toward production and should fly the first prototype model late this year or early in 1955. Remember the overrun area when thinking of designing airports to handle jet transports. High performance jet aircraft which may not have reverse thrust provisions will require long runways and good overrun areas in order to operate safely without payload restrictions.

General airport layout

A little over 10 years ago, in January 1944, a gentleman whose name many of you will recall, did a bit of prognosticating, and I will quote some of the ideas which he came up with. The man to whom I refer is the late David L. Behncke, founder and longtime president of the Air Line Pilots Association. Dave, like most of you gentlemen present at this convention today, was a man of great foresight and expressed this tremendous foresight in many ways. Over 10 years ago he said:

"1. That there be parallel runways in all the cardinal directions of the compass.

"2. That these parallel runways have a minimum length of 10,000 feet or the possibility of being extended to same.

"3. That airport peripheries be obstruction-free and that there be no obstacles in such peripheries of greater height than a ratio of 1 foot in 40.

"4. That all runways shall be light-colored, rough-surface concrete, capable of supporting aircraft weighing a minimum of 250,000 pounds gross under all conditions of speed and load.

"5. That all runways be of uniform width—minimum or 250 feet.

"6. That the distance between parallel runways, inner edge to inner edge, measure a minimum of 800 feet.

"7. That each runway shall have suitable lighting so arranged and operated to effect positive identification of each individual runway in all kinds of weather conditions, and that the lighting control of the runways be arranged to make it possible to light one or more runways and related lights without lighting the entire field.

"8. That vehicular traffic not be permitted to cross runways and, where airports have a central terminal area, underground traffic-ways be utilized.

"9. That the central control tower be so located as to furnish a clear and unobstructed view for 360°; namely, a complete and unobstructed view of the entire airport area, including all of its runway approaches.

"10. That suitable rescue equipment be continuously available and operative for any kind of an emergency rescue.

"11. That the between-runway surface of the airport be graded and improved to a condition to insure against damage to aircraft that are for any reason unable to remain on the runways or taxiways."

All of these observations certainly are logical today and offer us something in the way of criteria at which to shoot in the future. There have been some revisions in the thinking along the line of the number of runways necessary since the costs have skyrocketed so tremendously in construction and since the preferential-runway system has been placed in effect at many major terminals. The use of this preferential-runway idea has been accepted by ALPA after careful study at specific locations with reservations on the degree and velocity of crosswind component acceptable in line with safe operating practice. However, this acceptance has proven to be of great help in eliminating noise complaints in some areas and also in the expeditious flow of traffic at airports which are not laid out with parallel runways. This is made possible by increased utilization of the runways in different directions during conditions of light and variable winds. This business of higher runway utilization during light wind conditions should not be misconstrued to mean that landing and taking off into the wind is no longer a most desirable manner in which to fly airplanes because if sufficient runways are not provided flight operations will of necessity cease altogether during conditions of high winds.

There are some single runway airport ideas floating around, but they are subject to many limitations and relatively impractical. I had the pleasure of talking with Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky on one of my flights last year. He showed me some plans which he has drawn up for a single-runway airport which include a principle of utilizing wind shutters along the sides of the runway to deflect winds onto the parallel to the runway. The idea has some merit but needs practical-service testing of a full-scale unit.

There have also been developments in the so-called crosswind landing gear field and some real progress has been made. This progress has been confined, however, to relatively small aircraft and is presently not deemed practical for large transport-type aircraft.

An airline pilot still likes to have a choice of runways and it is strongly recommended that all major terminals be planned to include multiple-parallel runways. This is a must for the future and should be incorporated at all airports which have been laid out and surveyed for parallel runways. Baltimore's Friendship Airport is a good example of this. Friendship was originally laid out for parallel runways but the financial problems precluded laying the extra runways during initial construction. The city fathers' idea was that the additional runways would be laid when the traffic as an international airport demanded them. At first thought, that seems a logical explanation but what the city fathers failed to take into consideration was that Friendship will never become an international airport so long as those parallel runways do not exist and the traffic will never demand their laying. Idlewild is the international airport now because of its facilities just as much as because of its location. We know what some of the financial problems are and do appreciate them, but the fact remains that progress must be made and progress is going to cost a lot of money. The problem is not so much how to cut corners and save money, but rather how to raise sufficient funds to do the job properly and prevent the wastage of public funds on construction which will ultimately prove unsatisfactory through lack of foresight or salesmanship on the part of the planners. This point cannot be emphasized too strongly.

To give an example of just how important parallel runways are in major terminal operation; there have been numerous instances where I have had to hold at the end of the runway at Washington National for 45 minutes before I could get takeoff clearance to make the 13-minute run to Baltimore Friendship. This was due to landing traffic arriving at Washington every 2 minutes at certain times of the day during which the departing flights have to be sandwiched in between arrivals. Parallel runways would have eliminated that. Increased frequency of flights each year makes this more imperative with heavier traffic having saturated many of our major terminals already.

As mentioned earlier in Mr. Behncke's forecast new runway design should be sufficient for aircraft weighing up to about 250,000 pounds, but we now must consider that weight spread out over many tandem and dual wheels. The CAA's technical standard order No. N6a offers a pretty good set of figures on runway lengths, widths, and weight loads for different type of airline airports. Aircraft manufacturers are taking the weight distribution into consideration in planning more supporting points in the form of wheels as the aircraft becomes larger and heavier, so the pavement loading figures advanced in TSO–N6a should be effective for some time.

When speaking of runway construction I cannot help but think from the ground up, such thoughts always reverting to a couple of glaring examples of what not to do when preparing subsoil for runway construction. I have to refer once again to my own hometown, Baltimore, and the old Harbor Airport. Like LaGuardia Airport, the old Harbord Airport was built on fill along the river bank. In both instances improper type of fill was used with the settling effect literally wrecking the runways and buildings constructed on the fill. Washington National Airport is one example of a fill airport reclaiming river space which seems to be holding up reasonably well. Grave fill was used exclusively there and worked pretty well, the big limitation at Washington National now being the lack of possible room for expansion or for parallel runways.

Now we get into the surface construction and materials used for runway surfacing. The first thing which we will consider here is the safety angle and the coefficients of friction of different types of surfaces:

	Free rolling	Incipient skid		Skidding	
		Dry	Wet	Dry	Wet
Rough concrete	0.05	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.35
Turf	.05	.5	.1	.1	.04
Macadam	.05	.7	.5	.5	.3
Ice	.05	.05	.05	.05	.03

Airline pilots are almost unanimous in their selection of rough surface concrete as the most desirable runway surface. Their reasons for this thinking are primarily due to its better braking coefficient and its light color. The lightness is enhanced by the reflective characteristics of the aggregate and cement making the concrete runway much easier to see and judge height on a dark and stormy night. There really is nothing more difficult in the physical manipulation of a plane than a night landing during precipitation on a black surface runway. It is sort of like trying to land in the bottom of a well, and these present-day transports have had a lot of the "feel" designed out of them. The brushed concrete surface is much more easily seen and judged during the same conditions.

From the maintenance angle concrete seems to hold up longer and with less actual work than any other surface. All reports seem to indicate that properly poured concrete runway and apron surfaces have held up for extended periods during the past and are now proving to be more impervious to the new fuels being used in different types of aircraft. The fuel-spillage problem will not be so acute on the actual runways as it will be on taxiways and around ramp aprons.

While discussing runway maintenance it should be brought out that, if scheduled flights are to have a high degree of scheduled operation, runways should be cleared rapidly during conditions of snow or ice. We all know what ice does to braking action and packed snow will effect just about the same loss of braking. At the same time there is a considerable effect on the lift characteristics of a wing during a take-off roll when the aircraft is bouncing over rough runway surface. Ice ruts and runways which have suffered deterioration to a point of having large holes or waves in them will cause a considerable loss of lift due to the landing gear transmitting shocks through the airframe to the wings causing a vibration or shudder effect which causes a considerable amount of lift spillage. With aircraft wing loadings on a seemingly consistent increase this problem becomes increasingly important and is one which the airport operators must consider seriously. Flying a DC–3 out of old Baltimore Harbor Field I used to count three humps in the runway on takeoff and haul back on the yoke to get it into the air because that next bump was a rascal. We cannot do that with modern transport aircraft. There are no longer DC–3 design ideas being built into transport and the new ships do not behave like the old "3." Therefore, improved paving and maintenance of that paving are essential to good, safe operating practice.

Runway borders and end frequently prove to be just as important to a pilot as the center of the runway, especially with the use of higher crosswind components and the preferential runway system. These ends and borders of runways should be graded up and given a surface which will support aircraft which might of necessity be forced off the main runway surface. Many aircraft have been damaged some with resulting fatalities from fire which might have been prevented if borders and between runway areas had been properly graded. We realize that the cost of making the whole airport surface capable of withstanding the weight loads of modern aircraft is an impossibility, but it

certainly is not beyond the realm of possibility to expect that a large portion of the airport be graded in such a manner as to prevent unnecessary damage to aircraft forced off paved surfaces. These new flying machines cost too much money to have them damaged beyond repair should they run off paved surfaces, and the chief pilots take a mighty dim view of lads who scuttle one that might have been saved with a little more runway or a little wider runway. All this ties in with the overrun area mentioned earlier when discussing airport area and expansion.

While we are on the subject of runways, their lighting seems to be a logical subject. Many types and varieties of runway lights have been developed and many are approved. The airline pilot likes the kind of light which can be readily seen from 360 degrees when approaching the airport; the light which is not rendered ineffective by snow and ice; which is strong and distinctive enough so as not to be confused with other lights and reflections; which is rheostatically controlled and adequate for daytime use during conditions of poor visibility; and which has equal to or more beam spread than the AGA type runway light. The normal recommended distance between these lights is 200 feet, paralleling the runway and the width governing the spread across the runway. Great widths of runways are not particularly desirable, due to having the lights so widely separated that they lose their effectiveness to the pilot in judging his altitude during landing.

Taxiway patterns

Taxiways are a frequently overlooked item in the construction of many feeder and trunkline airports usually due to financial problems. This lack of a proper taxiway pattern will begin to pose a more serious problem at smaller terminals as the traffic continues its inevitable increase. Taxiing of aircraft on active runways is a poor procedure at best particularly during conditions of poor visibility. Every effort should be made to plan taxiways in such a manner as to keep taxiing planes off active runways for all operation except while actually taking position for takeoff. The safest and most expeditious manner of pretakeoff taxiing is to be able to continue a roll from the engine runup position directly into the takeoff roll. Turnoff taxi strips along the runway should be located at 500-foot intervals starting at a point one-third of the distance from the leading end of the runway. Rounded turnoff strips or so-called high-speed turnoffs are desirable.

In the design of taxiways it should be remembered that strips too close to active runways are within the realm of danger. All taxi strips should be at least 300 feet from runways except at turnoffs and at the runway ends. The warmup blocks at runway ends should be adequate for handling at least 4 aircraft at major terminals and 3 at trunkline terminals. In addition to the necessary room for these aircraft to runup, there should be room for them to be able to pass should the last man be the first read to go, or in case traffic clearances necessitate departures not in the order of aircraft sequence at the runup position.

The British used to use an interesting form of taxiway. They called it a perimeter strip arrangement and that's just what it amounted to. A taxiway strip was built around the complete perimeter of the airport, enabling any aircraft to taxi to any runway for takeoff or to the terminal after landing on any runway without ever crossing the active runway. That is a very safe method, but it is costly to build and requires excessively long periods of taxiing sometimes.

Terminals and ramp areas

A modern airline airport terminal is something which will present many problems if it is to remain modern for any length of time. There must be great foresight used in the design of any new terminal in the consideration of providing adequate room for the expansion of ramp area, gate space, and the terminal facility itself. It must be functional in design, enabling rapid and expeditious handling of passengers, spectators, baggage, cargo, and aircraft. The new terminals at Baltimore Friendship and at Greater Pittsburgh are good examples of functional terminals. The trend in design is toward this end and should remain that way.

At the largest terminals gate space seems to present one of the largest problems. It is difficult to design sufficient gate space for peak-load periods and still have functional action during relatively slack periods, but that is just about what is needed. It is both costly and mighty inconvenient for passengers to have to sit on a plane waiting for extended periods for gate space. This incurs costly delays, misses connections, and many other similar inconveniences which should be ironed out if we are to have a good smooth operation.

Location of hangars and other buildings around an airport are very important both in their accessibility and in relation to any plans for expansion. If buildings are jammed up against the terminal, it is impossible to enlarge that terminal. If hangars are too close to active runways there is restriction to how much you can do to lengthen or expand overrun areas to keep up with aircraft designs. The Washington National and LaGuardia Field are examples of the V-type terminal and hanger layout with the terminal at the point of the V. A better scheme may be found in the Idlewild and Greater Pitt layout, in that both have more widely separated buildings which give complete room for flexibility. It is felt that the flexibility is more important than the easy access of the V-type. Above all, it is imperative that no duplication of the it is imperative that no duplication of the Chicago Midway madhouse be considered. The square layout at Midway with buildings around the complete perimeter is not good operationally, safetywise, or in any other respect except compactness. Midway is the busiest, but it is not without effort and close coordination of all agencies involved in its operation that it got to be the busiest. It is the firm conviction of many people that Midway has reached its saturation point, trafficwise, but we may yet have more schedules operating in and out of Midway before a coterminal at O'Hare Field starts into operation this year. A single air terminal is insufficient a the largest cities. The New York Port authority has the right idea for the service best suited to the needs of the area. The Los Angeles area has enough airports, but there is not the proper amount of coordination between them. Chicago needs at least 2 airports for its commercial traffic and probably 3 in the very near future if it is to handle its growing traffic safely and expeditiously.

Locate the airport control towers in central positions with complete observation of all runways and their approaches. For some reason there never seems to be enough room to move around in a tower. It would appear to be worthwhile making the towers a little larger so the operators can move around, but not so as to hinder their visibility.

Surface transportation on airports is a very hazardous operation at best and should be limited to only absolutely necessary vehicles. Where surface transportation around airports is necessary it should be so routed through tunnels and underpasses or around perimeter strips as not to provide any hazards to taxiing aircraft.

The complete lighting problem for airports and their approaches is such a complicated one that I feel it only necessary to mention at this time that ALPA has approved the center line approach lighting system and has all the information which might be of interest to this convention for ready reference and advice concerning runway and taxiway lighting criteria. Along the advisory line it might be apropos to advise that there are ALP safety committeemen available to help in advisory capacities with airport problems, noise problems or nearly any other problem except financial troubles and we have our own to worry about just like everyone else.

Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an incisive and important article entitled "Monopoly Is On The March Again." This article was published in the August issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONOPOLY IS ON THE MARCH AGAIN

When the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan recently combined to form the second largest bank in the country, they celebrated the event like a wedding. Full page newspaper advertisements showed a happy couple driving off on their honeymoon, a banner on their car reading "Just merged."

Of course, it was hardly the typical marriage, since it isn't often that the husband is worth $6 billion and the wife $1½ billion. But the Chase-Manhattan merger was typical of the growing tendency of big businesses to swallow up smaller ones—a trend which a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee has called "monopoly run wild."

Headlines throughout 1954 told the story. Wave of Mergers Seeking Sanction, said the New York Times. Merger Trend Grows in Textile Companies, headlined the Union Labor Record of Springfield, Mo. Financial columnist Sylvia Porter wrote: "The greatest wave of corporate mergers in 30 years is now surging over our land. Even today—with 4 months of the year still to go—it is a certainty that 1954 will go down in the books as 'the year of the mergers.' • • • Not since the late twenties has our country seen anything approaching this wave of corporate consolidations."

Last year, there were a third more mergers than in 1953 and three times as many as in 1949. Hundreds of banks have been swallowed up, until today less than 1 percent of the banks in the United States hold nearly half of all banking assets. Countless firms in the food, dairy, textile, and chemical industries have also been absorbed. These figures show a concentrating of economic power which threatens not only small-business men, but also consumers, who depend upon competition to hold down the prices of what they buy.

The Federal Trade Commission, which was set up to enforce competition in the economy, has issued a report calling this "alarming increase" in monopoly a "disturbing fact of life of our economy." This expression of concern could be taken more seriously if it came from an FTC which had done more than sit idly by while the merger

trend quickened. Since the Republicans took office, the FTC has not completed a single antimerger action in 2½ years. It has begun only two new cases of its own, and in one of these, there was some heavy foot-dragging. This case dealt with the acquisition of a competitor by the Crown-Zellerbach Paper Co., giving Zellerbach control over 70 percent of the West Coast coarse-paper market. In September 1953, the FTC staff recommended the merger be prosecuted. For reasons still unexplained, the FTC allowed the case to hang in mid-air for 5 months before taking any action. Meanwhile, the properties of the two companies became so "scrambled" that it became almost impossible to unscramble them.

In mid-1954, Business Week magazine observed the difference in atmosphere at the FTC under the Republicans. "As compared with the way the Democrats did things," Business Week reported, "the Republicans are making it easier for the businessman who is up on the FTC carpet, harder for the FTC lawyers handling the cases." In the words of New York's Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, coauthor of the most recent antimerger law, the administration of the law under the Republicans has been "somnolent"—that is, the FTC has been asleep at the switch.

This siesta in enforcement of the laws against monopoly could have been predicted when President Eisenhower placed at the head of the FTC one Edward Howrey, who had previously earned much of his livelihood defending corporations against monopoly charges by the FTC.

Typical of the FTC's new solicitude for big business was the way it condoned the attempt of the General Foods Corp. to stamp out competition on the West Coast. While keeping its prices up in other regions, General Foods gave big discounts to western customers, thus putting the "squeeze" on its western competitors. The Robinson-Patman Act prohibits this practice, provided that the smaller competitors can show they have been injured. The FTC made General Foods' competitors show more financial scars than even the Supreme Court had required. General Foods won. Dissenting in the case, Commissioner James M. Mead, one of the Democratic minority on the Commission said:

"It is admitted that the Government did not offer in evidence in this case the scalps or the hides of the small-business competitors of General Foods. We do not have in evidence pounds of flesh or buckets of blood * * * but we do have substantially all (General Foods') competitors on the West Coast testifying that they have been victimized."

Commissioner Mead's appointment has not been renewed.

One would think that an administration which professes to be "disturbed" about the growth of monopoly would not only put some steam behind the enforcement of the laws, but would also try to strengthen the laws themselves. Yet shortly before the FTC issued its report bemoaning the merger trend, the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws was recommending that the most effective laws in the field be weakened.

Once again, the result can be explained by a glance at the Committee's membership, for while small business, labor, and agricultural cooperatives had almost no representation, big business was there in force.

When Attorney General Brownell selected the Committee, he pledged its members "would be guided by the broadest viewpoint of what is best for the American economy." Apparently what Brownell considers a broad viewpoint can best be developed looking out the window of a Wall Street law firm. For as a careful analysis of the Committee's makeup by Texas' Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN (of Robinson-Patman Act fame) revealed, of the 62 members on the Committee, 42 were lawyers. Twenty-one of them were from firms which at that very time were defending businesses that had been charged with violations of the antitrust laws. Another 15 had defended such corporations in the past. Yet none disqualified themselves from making recommendations on the very points they had urged against the Government in court. As Tennessee's Senator KEFAUVER, a long-time foe of monopoly, pointed out. "These men came not to praise competition, but to bury it."

Much of the committee's work is shrouded in mystery. Its cochairman, S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, has refused to tell Congressman CELLER's Antitrust Subcommittee who worked on the task forces which did much of the research for the Attorney General's committee. The administration, moreover, tried to give the impression that there was far more agreement within the committee than actually existed. This was done very simply. In the final report, dissenting opinions were sliced up and condensed, portions of them omitted entirely. One member had to publish his dissent at his own expense.

Typical of what the committee proposed is its recommendation to dilute the Robinson-Patman Act. This act, called "the Magna Carta of small business," was passed in 1936 to prevent large firms from chopping prices for selected customers in order to get rid of competition. As the Grafton (W. Va.) Sentinel put it: "The big fellows use price cuts to drive competition out of business and then raise prices as far as the traffic will bear. Any advantage the consumer gets from the price cut is short-lived and he suffers in the long run." But the committee's proposals, according to the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, would "rip out the vitals of the act, leaving it a feeble imitation of what it once was."

Among the committee members was FTC Chairman Howrey. His presence might explain why the committee recommended repeal of that part of the Robinson-Patman Act which limits the quantity of goods which can be sold at a discount to big purchasers. A few years ago Howrey represented the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. when it was called before the FTC for violation of that very clause. It might be noted that the administration kept judges off the committee for fear they might be making recommendations on issues they would later have to judge. But there was no objection to Howrey's participation, even though, as Chairman of the FTC, he judges more antitrust cases than any court.

But the most sweeping of the Committee's recommendations is one that would change the ground rules for proving an antitrust law violation and would, in the opinion of many experts, virtually paralyze the Government's efforts to prevent monopolies. A good illustration of how this proposed rule of reason would work is the Pillsbury flour case. In 1952, the Government issued a complaint against the Pillsbury company for buying out one of its major competitors and nearly doubling its share of the ready-mix flour market. Under ordinary antitrust rules, such an action might be judged a violation of the law in and of itself, and the Pillsbury case would probably be decided by now. But the new Republican Federal Trade Commission decided to apply to the case the rule of reason endorsed by the Study Committee. The result: Three years and 8,600 pages of testimony after the complaint was filed, the case is still being tried, and probably won't be decided for at least another year. Meanwhile, Pillsbury's domination of the ready-mix flour market continues unchecked.

The same big business-mindedness that has held up enforcement of the antitrust laws and rigged the report of the Attorney General's Committee shows up in other highlights of the Republican record on small business. In recent months, the administration has—

Failed to use the Government's authority to block a single bank merger in 2½ years, even though mergers have greatly lessened bank competition.

Released 150,000 pounds of stockpiled aluminum to the big three aluminum producers, Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser, without making them distribute a fair share of the metal to small aluminum fabricators and extruders.

Tried to transfer the Small Business Administration, presently an independent Government agency which makes loans to small businesses, to the Department of Commerce where, as one small business journal put it, "it could die quietly."

For the small businessman, the lesson to be learned from the Republican record is that if he wants to find his friends, he had better look to Congress, not the Administration. In the present Congress, Democratic members have introduced a number of bills to strengthen the antimonopoly laws. One would raise the fine for violation of the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000, to make it more difficult for giant corporations to charge their fines off to petty cash.

Another would let the Government itself sue corporations for damages if the price at which it must buy goods for defense and other purposes is held artificially high by monopolistic agreements.

A third would require any companies that wanted to merge to notify the Government beforehand, so that the effects of the merger upon competition and prices could be more carefully weighed and the merger blocked before the "eggs become scrambled" if the facts warrant.

In addition, Democrats, spearheaded by Representative PATMAN and by Representative CELLER and his Antitrust Subcommittee are, in PATMAN'S words, "stripping the Attorney General's committee of the pretense that its recommendations are really intended to strengthen the antitrust laws," making it unlikely that any of the Committee's proposals will get by the Democratic Congress.

Before President Eisenhower took office, he pledged that "our laws against * * * practices leading to monopoly must be energetically enforced." The record shows, instead, that many of them are being sabotaged. Because of this record, the magazine Meat and Food Merchandising has concluded that "President Eisenhower, who as a Republican has enjoyed almost unanimous support from small business, stands in grave danger of losing its respect and favor."

The New South Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at 10:45 this morning Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, delivered an address entitled "The New South Looks Ahead." He delivered the address at the Farm and Home Week, Mississippi State College, State College, Miss. In his speech he made a very fine statement on the cotton situation. I ask unanimous consent that the

text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW SOUTH LOOKS AHEAD

In less than a couple of decades, the South has staged one of the most remarkable economic recoveries in the history of our Nation. Fundamental adjustments have occurred quietly and without farfare. A solid foundation is now laid for continuing growth and prosperity in the days ahead. Wise leadership, combined with imagination and courage, can assure continued growth and opportunity for all of us.

Less than 20 years ago, the South was greatly concerned about its basic economy. Many who studied the situation carefully and sympathetically concluded that the South presented "the Nation's No. 1 economic problem." Town and country people alike were having great difficulties. Job opportunities were few and far between. Both wages and incomes were low. There was relatively little industry in the South to provide the many jobs that were so badly needed.

The main source of employment was agriculture. The typical Southern farmer was chained by circumstances to a 1-mule-and-scooter operation producing row crops on a few acres of land. Cotton had long been the one big crop over most of the South. But cotton no longer could carry all the people who depended on it. Thus the fatal weakness of a 1-crop agriculture revealed itself.

Since those relatively recent hardship years, some great and significant changes have taken place in the South. During this interval, the people of this vast region of our country have been turning their resourcefulness into an effectively functioning resource. Today the new South presents a first-class economic opportunity. In many respects, the South is the Nation's modern frontier in agriculture. The people who live and work here are now looking forward to an ever-brightening future. While many of the difficult problems of the old South still remain to be solved, former patterns of economic activity and outmoded ways of living are being broken up by a tremendous upsurge in industry and the application of a new technology in agriculture.

The big industrial expansion in the South has created new employment opportunities for workers and has greatly broadened market outlets for all kinds of products. Industries which now tower in importance in the South include chemicals, petroleum, metals, textiles, synthetic fibers, pulp and paper, furniture, and many others. The gains in most of these have been more rapid in the South than in the rest of the country. In a true sense, the South is fast developing a well diversified industrial empire, and at the same time improving its economic balance. As this industrial expansion progresses, more and more jobs become available and fewer people need to depend on the land for their livelihood. In this way those who choose to remain on the land are afforded greater opportunities for fuller employment in farming.

NEW LOOK IN SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE

Rising industrial employment in the South in the last 10 years has contributed much to the new look now prevailing in southern agriculture. This factor coupled with the development of machinery more suitable to the needs of the South and the reduced demand for its major crop—cotton—brought southern agriculture face to face with some difficult problems of readjustment. What has happened so far in this readjustment process is a tribute to the initiative, courage, and vision of the people of the South. Let's look at what has taken place in southern agriculture.

As all of us know so well, cotton has been hard hit by the piling up of surpluses and the change demand situation. Since 1930 the acreage of cotton harvested in the United States has declined from 42.4 million acres to a low of 17 million acres in 1945. In 1954 it was 19.2 million acres. The 1955 cotton acreage in cultivation is now indicated at only a little more than 17 million acres. This drop represents a reduction in harvested acreage of three-fifths in 25 years. The relative drop in the Southeastern States has been even greater than this, because cotton acreage has been shifting westward within the United States.

With the expansion of industry in the South, many farm workers and small farmers obtained employment in new factories and businesses. There has been a reduction in the number of farms, and many small farms have increased in size to more nearly economic operating units.

Southern agriculture has become much more diversified and also more productive in the last generation. The larger farmers have added other enterprises such as livestock and small grains. Many of them have even given up cotton production for other types of farming.

One of the remarkable aspects of southern agriculture has been the rising importance of poultry and livestock production since World War II. The area from Mississippi through North Carolina has increased its production of eggs, broilers, and turkeys at faster rates than has the rest of the country. Among these States, Mississippi has shown the greatest increase since 1945 in broiler output, rising from a little over 2 million to over 40 million birds.

Pasture improvement and increased feed production have made possible a substantial increase in production of livestock and livestock products. Last year, for example, beef production in the Southern States east of Texas and Oklahoma was about three times as high as in 1930. The national increase was two times. During this same period there was a 40-percent increase in butterfat production in this area. The national increase was 10 percent.

RAPID MECHANIZATION

Mechanization of southern agriculture is proceeding at a rapid rate, although it was slower getting started than in some other sections of the country. The small row tractor and the small combine adapted to conditions on small farms have increased in use throughout the South, as more and more farmers became able to finance the investment. The number of tractors on farms in the 11 Southern States east of Texas and Oklahoma is now 7 times the 110,000 in 1940 and 3.5 times the 235,000 in 1945. This compares with an increase of 2.5 times since 1940 for the entire United States. The number of combines on farms in the South is now 4 times the 29,000 in 1945. This compares with an increase of 2.5 times since 1945 for the entire United States.

Mechanical harvesting of cotton is also making some progress, but more improvements are apparently needed in this equipment. Last year 16 percent of the United States cotton production was harvested with mechanical pickers and 6 percent with mechanical strippers. The use of this equipment was largely, although not entirely, limited to the Delta area of the Mississippi River and the States farther west. With additional improvements and some lowering of the initial high investment now required, mechanical cotton pickers will be used much more widely than they are at present.

Aside from cotton harvesting, mechanization of agriculture in the South is widespread, although the adoption of machinery has not been uniform over the whole area. In the Delta area tractor power has replaced mule power on practically all the plantations. And 4-row tractor equipment is rapidly replacing 2-row equipment. In the Southern Piedmont area of South Carolina and Georgia, where small farms are more numerous, only about one-half of the farms are operated with tractor power. Large farms in the Southern Piedmont area are operated mostly with tractor power. This is even more so in Mississippi.

All of these developments have been associated with a rise in the wage level and a rapid movement of labor off the farms. The reduction in farm labor has been especially heavy among croppers, where the curtailment was 37 percent from 1940 to 1950.

Farm wage rates are now roughly four times the wage rates of 1940, whereas the price of machinery is only twice the pre-war level. Employment opportunities at higher wages in industry both in the South and elsewhere have, of course, played an important part in the movement of people off farms and in the rise of farm wage rates. As you may recall, it was once feared that mechanization, particularly the cotton picker, would leave farm labor in the South without employment. What actually has happened is that the living standard of both farmers and farm workers has risen, as mechanization has helped to make possible a rise in output per worker.

Herein lies an important lesson for all of us. Real levels of income must always be associated with production per worker. We should support programs and policies which will raise per worker output and we should discourage programs and policies which do not.

Tightening up of the farm labor supply has put a premium on more efficient farm operations in the South. Increasing pressure against inefficiency in farming continues to force changes in production patterns and techniques that contribute to higher farm income. One bit of evidence that efficiency is increasing may be seen from the fact that the acreage of cropland farmed per worker in the South is now 20 percent higher than in 1940. This increase is still too small. It compares with an increase nationally of 33 percent. There are still too many families in the South depending on the land for their support. The inevitable result is low per worker productivity and resultant low incomes.

As important as mechanization has been in the improvement of southern agriculture, we should not overlook the effect of measures that have been taken to increase per acre yields. Here in the South the use of more fertilizer, improved seed, hybrid corn, more effective insect and disease control, and in some cases better land selection have resulted in much higher yields. Overall crop production per acre for the past 5 years was about 25 percent above the 1935–39 average. Since 1940, the use of commercial fertilizer has just about doubled. In the Delta the use of anhydrous ammonia has reduced the cost of applying nitrogen on larger farms by as much as one-fourth. Expenditures for sprays and dusts to control insects and plant diseases have increased greatly in most areas of the South.

CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS ARE UP

These changes have required substantial expenditures by farmers and increased their investment in the farm. In 1954 the total investment on commercial family operated farms averaged about $14,000 in the southern Piedmont area of South Carolina and Georgia, $27,000 in the Black Prairie area of Texas, and $35,000 for nonirrigated cotton farms in the high plains of Texas. In each case total investment is about three times the investment in 1940. The investment in machinery and equipment alone is 4 or 5 times that in 1940. All of this means that the average farm worker in the South now has more to help him in his farm-production job. It has raised the efficiency of production and helped increase total farm output. It has raised real inoome per worker on southern farms. It has meant better homes,

better food, better clothes, better education, and a brighter outlook for everyone.

While in many respects economic growth and development in this part of the country has been at a more rapid rate in recent years than that for the Nation, we need to remember that before all this happened the South was very much at a disadvantage. It had much farther to climb simply to catch up with other sections. And even though a great deal of progress has been made in both industry and agriculture, the total economy of the South is still below par and it has not yet caught up with the rest of the country.

RURAL-DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Many of our economic and social difficulties still remain concentrated in southern rural areas where employment is limited and incomes are relatively low. The people in these areas need more opportunities for fuller employment and greater earnings.

One approach to the problems of the small farmer and low incomes of rural people is being taken through our recently announced rural-development program. This is a cooperative program to help small farmers in problem areas help themselves to find a better life. The program includes more credit from all sources, more educational work, and more research to help improve the farms. It includes efforts to bring industry into these rural areas, and to provide vocational training so that the people will be better qualified for part- or full-time nonfarm jobs. It includes the promotion of better health, and greater social security protection.

This rural-development program is just getting organized. The responsibility for carrying it out rests with the State and local people. Last month a meeting on this program was held in Memphis, Tenn. Representatives of 28 States attended this meeting and it was indeed gratifying to see the enthusiasm and cooperative attitude shown by this group. Your own Mississippi State College will play a leading role in this program in your State.

I believe you will agree that the ultimate goal of the South should be to provide incomes to southern farmers and other workers comparable with those of people in other areas and with those in other occupations. To attain this goal means further industrial expansion and further significant adjustments in southern agriculture. This calls for a continuation on an even broader scale of the very substantial progress that has already been made.

LET'S LOOK AT COTTON

Cotton will unquestionably continue to play a very important role in the economy of the South. Right now, however, cotton is in a tight spot. In saying this I do not mean that the outlook for cotton's future is dark—cotton prices have been fairly good and the industry has greatly increased its efficiency in growing and handling this important fiber. Our present uncomfortable cotton situation grows out of a series of dynamic changes which result in the surplus of cotton we now have on hand. The supply of cotton in the United States for this current—1954–55—marketing season is estimated at about 23.5 million bales, the second largest since 1939–40 when we had a total supply of 24.6 million bales.

Our current cotton supply situation is in part due to the increasing efficiency of production through improved cultural practices, higher yielding varieties, and more effective use of both labor and land. Our current surplus situation is also due in part to our persistence in following a pattern of price supports which was more political than economic.

While farmers have been reducing their cotton acreage in an effort to bring production more nearly in line with demand, some of this curtailment has been offset by the higher yields resulting from growing cotton more efficiently. For example, the total acres of cotton harvested in 1954–55 was 21 percent below the previous year's acreage. The 1954 crop, however, was only about 17 percent smaller than that of 1953. Last year's average yield per acre set a new record of 341 pounds, or 17 pounds of cotton per acre above the previous record set in 1953. The yield of cotton has been increasing steadily since the mid-1920's, and recently the rate of increase has become greater.

The way the cotton situation now stacks up, our stocks at the start of the 1955–56 marketing season beginning August 1, 1955, will also be large—around 11 million bales. Such a carryover would be almost 30 percent more than our domestic mills consumed during the entire 1954–55 marketing season. Moreover, these stocks would be only about 1.3 million bales less than our domestic mill consumption of cotton plus exports. The national marketing quota for the 1955 crop has been set at 10 million bales. Thus if production equals this quota and if we receive our normal cotton imports, our supply of cotton in 1955–56 will be close to 21.5 million bales, or about 75 percent larger than the 1954–55 disappearance.

The one thing that stands out today in our cotton picture is the demonstrated ability of our efficient growers to provide us with more than enough cotton to meet domestic and foreign demand at current prices. If the efficiency of cotton production continues to improve, the market demand—as we have known it in recent years—can be met from fewer and still fewer acres. But if farmers are to sell their output of cotton from increasingly efficient production operations, then it is obvious that larger markets for United States cotton will have to be developed. The question is what can be done to expand the market for our cotton.

There are two main segments to the market for our cotton—domestic mill consumption and exports. Our domestic mill consumption of cotton has expanded from an annual average of 6.9 million bales during the 1935–39 period to an average of about 9.3 million bales in 1950–54. Most of this increase resulted from the growth in United States population. During the last 5 years domestic mill consumption of cotton per person averaged about 28.8 pounds per year, or only about 3.3 pounds per person more than in the 1935–39 period.

Cotton has encountered stiff competition from synthetic fibers, the consumption of which has been increasing markedly. At the same time, cotton prices have been increasing. This combination of rising synthetic fiber consumption and higher cotton prices has kept the gain in United States cotton consumption per person considerably below the level which probably would have otherwise prevailed because of larger consumer incomes. In other words, high price supports for cotton have discouraged added domestic consumption. They have channeled cotton into the Commodity Credit Corporation, which this fall will have about 8 million bales. This constitutes a serious cloud over the cotton situation, and necessitates the severe acreage curtailments you are experiencing today.

Exports of cotton have been following a downward trend for some time. From an annual average of 5.3 million bales in 1935–39, United States cotton exports dropped to an average of about 4 million bales in the 1950–54 period. This is a striking decrease, particularly when we consider that foreign population increased about 340 million people from 1938 to 1954 and that consumption of cotton, wool, and rayon and acetate, all taken together, increased by about 1 pound per person over the same period. Most of the gain in fiber consumption per person was taken up by synthetic fibers, since cotton consumption per person abroad was only about 0.3 pound higher in 1954 than in 1938, and wool consumption remained about the same.

Even though cotton consumption per person did not show much gain, total foreign cotton consumption rose by about 23 percent from 1938 to 1954, primarily because of the increase in population abroad. The increase in overall foreign consumption, however, has been more than taken up by increases in world cotton production.

UNITED STATES PRICES STIMULATE PRODUCTION ABROAD

Over the years there has been a tendency for the acreage planted to cotton in foreign countries to increase by about 1 percent a year regardless of cotton prices. Our studies show, however, that on top of this general tendency, a rise of 1 percent in cotton prices tends to bring about a further increase in foreign cotton acreage by about 0.2 percent in the following year. This important fact indicates the extent to which larger cotton production abroad has been stimulated by United States cotton prices which, expressed in constant dollars, increased about 40 percent between 1935–39 and 1950–54.

By this time it has become abundantly clear that for both our cotton exports and domestic consumption, recent United States price support levels have worked to hinder the expansion of markets for the cotton we produce. It is true, of course, that our industry promotion, smart styling, and improvements in the quality of our cotton textiles have helped cotton hold and even gain in some end uses. The fact remains, however, that competitive prices for cotton are still highly important in obtaining larger domestic and foreign markets for the output of our efficient cotton farms.

Because of the competition we face from synthetic fibers at home and abroad and from expanding foreign cotton production in export markets, we urgently need to make our cotton competitive both from the standpoint of price and quality. Being competitive in the market does not mean that we have to be aggressive in pushing down world prices or using fire-sale methods. We cannot afford to follow such a course because, in the final analysis, it would hurt both producers and processors in our cotton industry.

To meet the situation that confronts us, we need to place greater emphasis on improving our selling and on supplying better quality cotton at fair prices. In order that we may be sure of being able to continue marketing our cotton on a fully competitive basis in both domestic and foreign outlets, we will need to find ways of lowering the cost of our cotton still more by further increasing production and marketing efficiency. More research and related work will be required to keep our cotton industry ahead of its competitors at all times. After all is said and done, it is the buyer who must be satisfied. To do so, we always must be able to supply the kind and quality of cotton when it is desired and at a competitive price that is fair both to buyer and seller. We must sell our cotton to people—not to Government. In the final analysis it is people—not Government—that constitute a lasting and permanently profitable market for our product.

The cotton problem that confronts us at this time presents a challenge to the common sense and ingenuity of all who are genuinely interested in the long-term welfare of this great industry. The position of cotton in the South can be strengthened very materially for the future if we are willing to face the bold facts and deal realistically with the problem.

Helpful in this connection is the fact that the South is no longer wholly dependent on a one-crop system of farming. There is now greater diversity in southern agriculture, and

a vast industrial expansion has taken place. These developments must be further stimulated and encouraged since they will afford more employment opportunities and lead to better living conditions for the people. It is in such a setting that cotton is finding its permanent place in a diversified southern agriculture so that it may contribute even more to the strength of the overall economy.

The people of the South have taken on the job of transforming their problems into opportunities. The progress they have made to date foreshadows the gains that lie ahead.

Dedication of Museum of the Presidents of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which was delivered in my State of Illinois on May 29, 1955, at Lincoln College, Lincoln, Ill., by Mr. John Hilldring, president of the General Aniline & Film Corp., and a major general, retired, in dedicating the Museum of the Presidents of the United States, the first museum of its kind in the country. The museum has been established in the only college or university named after the 16th President of the Nation which was built during his lifetime. This latest national shrine contains a rare collection of memorabilia relating to the 33 chief executives of our Nation from President Washington to, and including, President Eisenhower. Illinois is proud and the Nation should be proud of this latest citadel of democracy and symbol of freedom which maintains such spiritual influence within its walls, as pointed out in the following address by General Hilldring:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Stratton, President Dooley, honored guests, students and faculty of Lincoln College, ladies, and gentlemen, I am highly honored that you have asked me to come here today to dedicate the Presidential room in University Hall—a museum devoted to the highest office and honor that our Nation can bestow upon any one of its native sons.

I can think of a no more fitting and appropriate location for the site of this memorial to our Presidents than right here in the heart of America in a college named for one of the greatest—Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States.

The contents of this museum—and that is what it is—are a symbol of our glorious American heritage. The history of our Presidents is, in fact, a history of the United States itself.

Ever since George Washington, each and every President of our country in his time has been identified throughout the entire world in a greater or lesser degree as a leader of democracy, a champion of freedom. This, of course, follows naturally because the United States, itself, has been a recognized citadel of freedom since the founding of our Republic.

And perhaps the most representative of all these Presidential leaders of freedom was the Great Emancipator.

Lincoln won his place in history, more than for any other reason, as the champion of the oppressed and so he has been held by students of history throughout the world as a symbol of the fight against all injustice.

This Museum of the Presidents which we are dedicating here today, upon the 90th anniversary of the founding of Lincoln College in 1865, contains momentos of 33 men—33 great and distinguished Americans.

The Presidential room has in it a most impressive collection of autographs, manuscripts, and other memorabilia relating to the Chief Executives of our country and their terms of office. Through the courtesy of your President Dooley here at Lincoln I have had the pleasure of a preview of the museum. Each President from the Father of our Country, George Washington, to President Eisenhower is represented.

The rare documents have been collected over a period of years of research. Their collection has been under the supervision of one of the ablest rare book and manuscript collectors in the country, Mr. Ralph Newman, of the famed Abraham Lincoln Book Shop. I am sure you are very proud to say that he is a trustee of Lincoln College.

Through the hard work and kindness of friends of Lincoln College, this museum, or memorial, has become a reality of which the college, the State of Illinois, and all of America should be justly proud on this day.

I am told by President Dooley that collectors throughout the Nation have pledged additional material. So as the years go by the value and importance of this museum will steadily increase.

I predict that before long increasing numbers of Americans, and even foreign visitors to our shores, will visit Lincoln, Ill., and the campus and University Hall to see this symbol of democracy.

I hope that this museum will stand as a symbol of the philosophy of all of our American Presidents for freedom and justice, as particularly dramatized by the life of Abraham Lincoln, for whom this college and city of Lincoln, Ill., were named during his lifetime.

If sufficient thought is given today to this philosophy—to the Lincoln story—the world might well reach an understanding for a lasting peace based on the Lincolnian principles that all men are created equal under God, and that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are birthrights of every man.

In considering Lincoln in the light of world affairs today, it might be suggested that today's conflicts are just a continuance of those that so threatened the unity of this Republic in Lincoln's time—the enslavery, the oppression of man for one reason or another. The Lincoln story also makes abundantly clear that the solution of these conflicts is not an easy task. Neither is there a quick overnight remedy.

These unfortunate human failures may yet take years and years to correct and resolve.

Let us pray that in its small way this Museum of the Presidents of the United States will be a reminder of the fact that freedom and liberty are not the exclusive properties of any single man—even as the great spirit of Lincoln is about us here.

The characteristics of leaders of liberty and freedom are many and as varied as have been those of the Presidents of the United States whom we so highly honor today. This is true whether the leader be Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, or Eisenhower.

Let us reflect upon the eloquent historical fact that freedom and liberty are the ideological philosophies brought to our shores by the Founding Fathers. These philosophies can be advanced by leaders of all nations for the common brotherhood of man. They are American philosophies proclaimed by Washington and defended by every American President since. The freedom we enjoy today is the envy of every man, woman, and child the world over. The enjoyments that go with this freedom constitute the highest of ambitions. The way of freedom is the way of America and with this thought I hereby dedicate this Museum of the Presidents to all Americans on behalf of Lincoln College. May it long remain a citadel of democracy and a symbol of freedom by the spiritual influence within its walls.

The Proposed Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have again gone to the people for counsel and advice in another Cramer citizens' poll before voting on a measure that would vitally affect their homes and lives. By telephone I made a poll sampling opinion of the entire First District of Florida in an effort to determine the wishes of my constituents on the subject now before us and asked that they express their opinion to me as to the method they preferred of financing the proposed highway program.

In my telephone poll both methods of proposed financing—the President's pay-as-you-use bond-issue program and the committee tax measure that would provide pay-as-you-go financing—were stated.

The question asked was: "As you know, there is a proposal before Congress to authorize a Federal road-building program at a cost of $36 billion. It is generally agreed this program is needed. The construction period of the program extends over 10 to 15 years. How would you suggest paying for this program? First, pay-as-you-use, as suggested by President Eisenhower, involving no additional taxes and a bond issue with interest of $11 billion over a 30-year period; or, second, pay-as-you-go plan, with additional taxes now of $12 billion extending over a 15-year period, principally being an additional 1-cent-per-gallon increased gasoline tax, 2 cents additional on diesel fuel, added taxes on trucks and busses and large tires, exempting off-the-road users?"

The result of that poll was 77.72 percent in favor of the committee bill tax-payment plan.

This poll was taken through telephone poll captains disbursed throughout the district, who called indiscriminately people in the area. In a period of a few short hours over 2,000 people had been personally contacted and asked the question involved, and, as the figures show, the result was decisive. It is important to note that the poll was taken on the morning of the day the House voted on the measure and after full publicity had been given the matter and my office was

advised of the results in the early afternoon.

It appears that the poll clearly indicates that the people of the First District of Florida do not look kindly upon, nor are they willing to accept additional taxes at this time, even for such a worthy project as this highway bill.

I supported the Eisenhower proposal in the Dondero bill, which would have provided an adequate road system without additional taxes only after due and deliberate consideration which, of course, I had an opportunity to make after some 11 weeks of the hearings before the Public Works Committee of which I am a member. I supported this plan in committee, feeling all along that the temperament of this Congress was not one to accept additional taxes at this time and that this reflected the feeling of the people all over the country. It was my sincere effort to work for a bill that had a reasonable chance of passage and that would accomplish the much-needed highway construction purpose.

I believe that such a poll as has been taken in this instance reflects a good cross section of opinion in my district, and after lengthy consideration of all aspects of the question, I voted consistent therewith.

The Ethics of the Talbott Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, which appeared in last evening's Washington Star, entitled "The Ethics of the Talbott Affair."

It seems to me that the article contains information pertinent to a situation which has become quite prominent in the last few weeks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ETHICS OF THE TALBOTT AFFAIR—LONG LINE OF PRECEDENTS DEMONSTRATES PERSISTENCE AND COMPLEXITY OF ISSUE

Just what is "ethical" or "unethical" in the day-by-day conduct of persons who enter the Government service from business and the professions?

The case of Harold Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, sharpens the issue. He told the Senate committee, when he was confirmed for his present post in 1953, that he was giving up all his connections except one, his special partnership in Paul B. Mulligan & Co., a management engineering firm. He said in recent testimony that he had not in any way promoted business for the Mulligan company in connection with Air Force contracts.

Was it ethical for Mr. Talbott to continue this partnership after his confirmation, and should the Senate committee have told him that it was unethical when he was confirmed? Should any official engage in a sideline of a money-making nature while drawing a salary from the Government as a full-time employe?

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt didn't see anything improper in allowing his private secretary, Louis Howe, to receive more than $1,000 a week from a public utility company for a broadcast over a national radio network. Nor did Mr. Roosevelt see anything improper in intervening from the White House with businessmen to help his sons in their commercial endeavors.

But all this was under a Democratic administration. Officials of the Eisenhower Republican administration are supposed to be above such things.

It develops, however, that Mr. Talbott, while Secretary of the Air Force, wrote letters to friends of long standing and told them about the services of the engineering company, which it appears saved a lot of money for its clients because of the introduction of efficient methods.

If Mr. Talbott's action is considered now to be unethical, what was the responsibility of the Senate committee which confirmed him and failed to look into it?

What is the responsibility also of the House and Senate today with respect to those Members who continue to receive regular income from their law firms back home whose clients do business with the Government of the United States.

Many Members of Congress act as attorneys in local and State courts for labor unions as well as corporations, and receive fees while they are serving in the House of Representatives or the Senate. Is it ethical for this practice to be continued?

Many Members of Congress make speeches and receive large sums as "honorariums." Some of these fees come from labor unions and from trade associations, many of which are interested in legislation pending before Congress. Is it ethical for Members of Congress to accept such fees?

Averell Harriman was Secretary of Commerce in President Truman's Cabinet, but was not requested to give up his huge holdings in the Union Pacific Railroad.

Martin Durkin was Secretary of Labor in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, and the Senate voted confirmation without requesting him to sever his relations with the plumbers' union with which he still had a contract, though he was given leave of absence and his pension rights were continued while he was on duty in the Government.

Edward F. Howrey was formerly the attorney for the Firestone Co., and is now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. When the Firestone case came up before the Commission, he took no part in it. When the Commission voted three to none to file an appeal from the court decision which was in favor of the Firestone Co., Mr. Howrey urged the Department of Justice to appeal the case to a higher court, which is exactly the opposite from the position he had once taken on that issue as a private lawyer. He thinks he should be commended for this action, but Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee member of the House Small Business Committee, said Mr. Howrey's action had raised a "grave ethical question."

Perhaps the Talbott case will focus attention on the entire issue of ethics in the Government, but the biggest single phase will probably not be touched. It is that substantial contributions to campaign funds of members of Congress are made by individual connected with companies or labor unions which have a continuing interest in legislation before Congress. Until and unless Congress passes a law prohibiting campaign contributions in excess of a nominal sum—$10 or $25—Members of Congress will still be beholden, theoretically at least, to the large campaign contributors, and the question of ethics will never really be removed from the realm of public criticism.

This correspondent many years ago suggested that campaign contributions be limited by law to very small sums, but the argument has always been made in rebuttal that the cost of soliciting small contributions is prohibitive and consumes virtually all the receipts. The fact is that it has never had a trial, and that's about the only way to resolve the issue.

TVA and Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the voice of organized labor has joined the chorus which is commending the President for his action in canceling the Dixon-Yates contract. Thus labor joins those of us who have opposed the contract, not only as a poor business deal, but as an example of executive interference with the internal functions of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the city of Memphis.

I call particular attention to an editorial by Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, in the August issue of the American Federationist.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which appears on pages 18 and 19 of the magazine, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA AND DIXON-YATES
(By George Meany)

Cancellation of the Dixon-Yates power contract with the Federal Government provides a happy outcome for a heated controversy, but it does not settle the big issues involved in this widely criticized deal. The crux of the whole problem is the administration's power policy, especially in relation to the future of the Tennessee Valley Authority and other public power projects.

The TVA is one of the great wonders of America. To the foreign visitors who flock to see it, as well as to most Americans, it represents a triumph over the obstacles that nature sometimes interposes in the path of humanity's progress.

Before TVA the Tennessee River Valley was a wasted, impoverished area, subjected to periodic floods and devastation. Farmers struggled to eke out a living from their depleted land, workers were handicapped by low working and living standards, businessmen were afflicted with the economic anemia of low purchasing power.

Then came the TVA, and with it a complete transformation. Dams were built to control the floods and provide a constant source of waterpower for the generation of low-cost electric power. The river itself became a broad highway of commerce. The farms, replenished with cheap fertilizer and electrified, began to flourish beyond all expectations. Many thousands of workers were given employment at good wages. Business began breaking records.

It should be remembered also that, before TVA, monopolistic practices and lack of enterprise by the private utility interests had resulted in maintaining high power prices and thereby preventing wider use of electricity to lighten the lives and the burdens of people of this country. The TVA provided

a much-needed yardstick for the production and distribution of cheap power. As a result, even the private utilities soon discovered they could make greater profits by wider consumption at lower rates.

Even the sharpest critics of public power development concede these inescapable facts. But, they insist, why use the tax revenues collected by the Federal Government from citizens all over the Nation for the special benefit of a comparatively few in a local area?

The answer to that argument is simple. Without the TVA, America would not have been able to win the last world war as soon as we did. TVA power made possible the vast expansion of aluminum production needed for building the planes which were the key to allied victory.

Despite TVA's wonderful record, supporters of TVA began to fear for its future when the Eisenhower administration came into office and proclaimed a policy of favoring local initiative in power development. These fears were crystalized when the Atomic Energy Commission, at the direction of the White House, entered into a contract with the Dixon-Yates private utility syndicate.

The AEC had decided to use large amounts of TVA power for the operation of a new atomic-energy establishment. This would deprive the city of Memphis of its power source. The Government, instead of authorizing the TVA to augment its power production through building new steam plants, entered into a contract with the Dixon-Yates syndicate to build a power plant in West Memphis, Ark., to supply the needeed power to Memphis.

These bare facts, of course, do not tell the whole story. There were many dubious aspects to the Dixon-Yates deal, especially the lack of competitive bidding. There were also justifiable suspicions of an attempt to crowd the TVA out of its natural field and gradually dispose of its power facilities on a piecemeal basis to private utility interests.

However, the city of Memphis, which had vigorously opposed the Dixon-Yates contract, found the solution by deciding to build its own municipal power plant. This made the Administration's position completely untenable and forced it to cancel its contract with Dixon-Yates.

The American Federation of Labor, as a firm believer in the free enterprise system, supports the private ownership and management of public utilities, including electric power. We do not believe in the nationalization of the power industry. However, we are convinced that the TVA has performed a highly useful function for the area affected and the Nation as a whole. No private company or combination of companies could have undertaken such a tremendous job on such a broad scale. Likewise the development of other major river valleys exceeds the scope of private capital and should be undertaken by the Federal Government.

So, as we look ahead to the future, it would be nothing short of suicidal for our Government to stifle the TVA or fail to build other TVA's in areas where the national welfare would be enhanced by sound investment of public funds in building a better America.

Plight of the Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I join in commending the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] for his thorough analysis of the plight of our dairy farmers and his untiring efforts on their behalf.

The dairy farmers of this Nation do not have a better friend in Congress than LESTER JOHNSON. As he has said today, our dairy farmers are being ruined by this administration's price-support program being administered by food processors and others who "farm the farmer." It was fitting that the administration, which has made so many of them, recently announced a program for the relief of the low-income farmer. It was unfortunate, however, that the man picked to head this program was the man who early in 1953 said it would be better if the marginal farmer got out of farming and into industry and his land were turned over to grass or trees or other soil-conserving practices.

If the Committee on Agriculture reports Congressman JOHNSON's H. R. 4360, I will support it.

Armenian Revolutionary Federation Holds 62d Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation held its 62d annual convention in Washington during the period July 2 to July 9. The delegates attending that convention from 17 States passed a series of very significant resolutions having to do with the preservation of our American way of life and the extension of freedom and independence to all those nations now enslaved by communism. Among those resolutions was an endorsement of H. R. 183 which is now before the House Rules Committee.

At the closing banquet of the convention, Mr. Beglar Navassardian, executive secretary of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, and Dr. Ruben Darbinean, former Minister of Justice of Armenia, delivered very thoughtful addresses. Because their remarks reflect a hopeful light on the most urgent problems of our times, I feel they will be of interest to all the Members of Congress. Under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD these two addresses together with one of the resolutions passed by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation:

Whereas the Armenian Revolutionary Federation meeting in 62d annual convention in Washington, D. C., from July 2 to July 9, did consider the perilous days in which we live because of the aggressive threat of Russian imperial communism;

Whereas the national independence of the United States of America and all other free and sovereign nations is threatened by the Communist conspiratorial plan for world conquest;

Whereas the many non-Russian nations and people enslaved by the Red colonial policy of the Kremlin look to the United States for hope, inspiration, and enlightened leadership: Therefore be it

Resolved—

That the Armenian Revolutionary Federation pledges itself to a continuation of unqualified support in the fight against Red colonialism and expresses its warm appreciation to Congress for the passage of House Resolution 149, which puts us clearly on record as against colonialism and for self-government and national independence.

That the Armenian Revolutionary Federation pledges itself to continue and to increase its efforts to better acquaint the American people with the true nature of communism, the subversive methods used by that conspiracy and the sufferings of the many nations and people now enslaved by that tyranny.

That the Armenian Revolutionary Federation puts itself on record as favoring House Resolution 183, a resolution which requests the United States delegation to the United Nations to submit a resolution to the General Assembly of the United Nations naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor, and urges the House Rules Committee to report that resolution to the floor of the House so that it may be put to the test of public debate and vote by Members of Congress.

That the Armenian Revolutionary Federation expresses to President Eisenhower and his associates who will attend the conference at the summit their full support for all those actions which will bring to an anxious world true peace with freedom and dawn of a new and golden era of national independence and self-government for all the nations of the world.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. BEGLAR NAVASSARDIAN AT THE 62D ANNUAL CONVENTION BANQUET OF THE ARMENIAN REVOLUTIONARY FEDERATION ON JULY 8, 1955, WASHINGTON, D. C.

This is the first time that the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, which has held 62 annual conventions in the United States, meets in the capital of this great Republic.

However, its junior organization, the Armenian Youth Federation, did hold an annual convention in Washington during the last week of June 5 years ago.

I mention this, because at the time of the Armenian Youth Federation convention an event of international import took place. While the Armenian Youth Federation convention was in session, thousands of miles away from here in a remote part of the East, without justification, provocation, or forewarning, Communist armies attacked a peaceful democracy and began their invasion of the country.

I am, obviously, referring to the Korean war. Yet when I said that this even was of utmost international significance I was not referrring to aggression—for that was nothing new. Neither was I referring to the cowardly manner in which the Soviet struck—for that, also, is not novel. And war itself is one of the oldest constants of our history.

I was referring to the reaction, the reaction of the free world, led by the United States, since every family, every group, every nation, and group of nations must in the final analysis have a leader. And in this case the leader was and remains the United States.

This was the first time that free nations were pooling together their military strength under one unified command to fight an aggressor—that is, to punish a power which, though it might be convinced in the justice of its case, had resorted to brute, military might in order to enforce that cause.

This was then the basic principle. And history—history in its profoundest sense—was made on that day in June of 1950 when free free men of free nations came together and together faced the aggressor with the determination to push him back.

And yet, though the phenomenon of physical resistence was new, the underlying fabric

of morality could not be overlooked. The morality was this, that no matter what nation, how small or insignificant, the principle that in the loss of freedom for that nation there is loss for all was an irrefutable one.

Therefore, when Armenia was attacked by the Soviets in 1921, the free world should have had the same reaction.

Here was a nation 4,000 years old. The first Christian nation of mankind. A nation that through its culture, its language, its centuries-old seacrifice for freedom, its political maturity and political restraint, its alliance with the western democracies throughout the First World War had every right to be an independent, soveriegn state. And this right and the execution of this right was internationally recognized. The United States recognized the Independent Republic of Armenia on April 23, 1920. The Treaty of Sevres gave it international recognition.

But when the Soviet attack, which was perpetrated through an infernal instigation and exploitation of Turkish military forces also, was effected, the collective defense of that right—the principle which prompted the free world's help to Korea—was not yet in being.

We have traveled quite a bit since Armenia was sovietized. Country after country, nation after nation has fallen to the brute force of the Soviet. Many have fallen victim to the cunning methods of the communist world conspiracy.

Now, we are gradually approaching a realization of this danger which is not merely a threat to Laos, or East Germany or Guatemala or Madagascar, but is an overall danger, menacing us at every geographic point and which reaches out within each and every nation.

We need weapons, we need wealth, material and otherwise, we need industry and we need military preparedness to counter this world conspiracy and this international threat.

Yet none of these, indeed, nor all of these combined, are as potent in fighting world communism as our arsenal of ideals. There it is that the deciding weapons shall be found. There it is that our fate, and with ours the fate of the world, will be decided.

Today, has not the time come at last where we should cease to fall into the Soviet trap of delineating the victims of communist aggression according to their chronology of conquest. In other words—in the case of the most recent attack, that against Korea, we stood up together and repelled the aggressor, for we accepted beyond discussion Korea's right to its independence.

In the case of the east European states, we have been hoodwinked into this strange term of a "satellite" and somehow we are much less reluctant to bring up their right to independence, although it is the selfsame right for which we sent our boys to die in Korea.

And beyond that, in the case of the Baltic countries and further on, the Ukraine, Turkestan, Georgia, and Armenia—the first valiant victims of Communist expansionism—we have put them in a special case and refer to them only for the sake of eloquent, political speeches.

Whereas, once again, the right of Armenia to independence and sovereignty was in every way and at each point the exact same right for which we stood up under the flag of the United Nations in the Republic of Korea.

There was no difference of essence. The difference was set by Moscow and we—unknowingly perhaps—accepted Moscow's definition.

But what is worse, we still tend to continue this tacit acceptance.

After all is said and done, one incontrovertible fact of history remains unchanged, gleaming before us, bright as the sun and just as guiding in its light.

The fact that morality is the basis of lasting political action; those of expediency may give results and may seem more effective, and they may be justified, but only when the fundamental underlying base is one of morality.

In our foreign policy, it is important, it is essential, I would say it is a matter of triumph or defeat, for us to make the matter crystal clear.

To make it clear that this great country, our own United States, where the most noble of all revolutions gave birth to the most democratic of all republics, that this great leader recognizes the God-given right of a nation to be a sovereign member of the family of nations. And having recognized this principle—which it does by the very instrument of its own freedom: the Declaration of Independence—that it shall not fall into the fallacies which are woven by the agents of Moscow.

If the term satellite is to imply a nation now under Communist domination, whose independence must be reestablished, then not only are Poland, Rumania, and East Germany "satellites," but so are North Korea and the Baltic countries and the Ukraine and Georgia and Turkestan and Armenia.

It is our firm conviction that we weaken our position, especially our moral position, especially at these crucial times, by evading an open, indisputable foreign policy which has as its ultimate aim the reestablishment or the establishment of the sovereignty of nations, great or small, based on the principle of self-determination.

We know that there are strategic, tactical and other considerations. We understand that in this infinitely complex world it might be easy to oversimplify.

But the greatest things are often the simplest. Love—the secret of Christianity—is simple. Faith—the most profound phenomenon in man—is essentially simple. The determination to stand up for what you believe is right—this one characteristic which brings man nearer to his God—is basically simple.

And similarly, the importance of a moral foundation to our foreign policy is simple. That moral foundation must, by its very nature, establish the purpose, the goal, the aim, the ultimate objective of our foreign policy.

And if it is true that we believe in freedom, in justice, in the dignity of man and his God-given right to have his nation an equal of the family of nations, then we must accept that our foreign policy must aim at the realization of the freedom, national independence and complete sovereignty of the countries not only outside the Soviet geographic periphery, but also the nations within the frontiers of the Soviet Empire, the countries of the earliest Communist conquest—the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Turkestan, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Caucasia, and Armenia.

Remarks of Mr. Ruben Darbinian, Former Minister of Justice of Armenia

Freedom-loving mankind, under the leadership of the United States, is waging today a life and death struggle against Soviet imperialism which under the mask of Communist revolution is bent on dominating the world through force, deceit, and conspiracy.

The Armenian Revolutionary Federation on whose 62d annual convention this banquet is being held is one of those modest forces which is allied with the free world. And yet the ARF occupies a distinctive position by virtue of the fact that it started this fight not recently but as early as November of 1917 when the Bolsheviks seized the power in Russia which had scarcely 8 months before been liberated from the Czarist regime, by trampling over the free democratic government which have been established after the downfall of that regime.

Unfortunately, both the errors committed by the Russian and non-Russian democratic leaders and the disastrous polices pursued by the western governments with regard to Russia enabled the Bolsheviks not only to consolidate their power in Russia but to extend their rule over a number of neighboring countries. As a result, this new tyranny, much more oppressive than Czarist tyranny, has become a menance to the peace, the freedom, and the very existence of all the nations.

The Armenian people, unfortunately, is one of those nations whose parental homeland has come under Soviet rule. This happened on December 2, 1920. It is an irrefutable historical fact that when the Bolsheviks suppressed all opposition in Russia by armed force and deceit and started to subjugate one after another all the non-Russian provinces on the periphery of the Czarist empire, the Red army also conquered Armenia which had been an independent country since May 28, 1918, but before setting foot on Armenian soil they came to an agreement with Kemalist Turkey, armed the Turks, supported them, and incited them to attack Armenia from the south. Thus, they readied the stage for their invasion of Armenia as the liberators or the saviors of the Armenian people from the north.

This procedure was very similar to the Soviet action in 1939 when they concluded their friendship pact with Hitlerite Germany and encouraged the latter to attack Poland from the west in order to justify their invasion from the east as liberators of the Polish people.

Thanks to a series of tragic errors committed during and after World War II, having emerged as a greatly expanded and stronger power as a result of successive conquests of defenseless nations, the Soviet today threatens to play the same role of liberator and savior in regard to all other nations which to date have escaped her domination.

The Armenian people which was one of the first non-Russian victims of Soviet tyranny, chastened by its bitter experience of 35 years under Soviet rule, today has taken its stand in the frontline among those nations which are waging the fight against Soviet imperialism, led by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation which, by virtue of 38 years of persistent anti-Communist activity, has become one of those organizations most hated and feared by the Bolsheviks. For 38 years the Soviet has left no stone unturned to discredit and destroy the Armenian Revolutionary Federation both in the Soviet Union and abroad.

To the great misfortune of the Armenian people, their sacred institution of holy etchmiadzin, the centuries-old national center of the Armenian Church and seat of the Catholicos of all Armenians is controlled by the Soviet Government which has been abusing that circumstance to the detriment of the Armenian Church and the Armenian people at home and abroad.

Under threat of death, having converted the Armenian Catholicos—the supreme head of the Armenian Church—into its obedient and servile tool, the Soviet does everything possible in Armenian communities of the free world to place as diocesan heads such Armenian prelates who are acceptable to itself. It has contrived to suspend, unfrock or neutralize those ecclesiasticals who do not enjoy its confidence. In this manner it tries to prevent the Armenian clergy from doing anything which might hinder in the slightest Communist policies abroad, forcing them to subserve the Soviet objectives either directly or indirectly.

And when we consider the fact that the Soviet Government spares no effort to infiltrate not only the Armenian churches but

also other organizations of the Armenian communities in the dispersion through its agents, we can readily understand the present division of the Armenians and why a part of the Armenian churches and other organizations have become inveterate foes of the only anti-Communist Armenian political organization—The Armenian Revolutionary Federation.

We are confident that all freedom-loving Armenians who under the leadership of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, during the trying days of 1918 succeeded in building the independent Republic of Armenia and who directed the destinies of the Republic for 2½ years, will once again surmount all present and future obstacles on its path in freedom's fight and will help the free world shatter the Soviet tyranny, and will replant our lost freedom in our historic fatherland.

New Marketing Possibilities for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon Wheat Growers League and the Oregon Wheat Commission are setting a fine example for all similar agricultural organizations in their constructive efforts to develop new uses and new markets for their product.

This is strikingly portrayed in a letter which I have received from Mr. Marion T. Weatherford, chairman of the Oregon Wheat Commission, citing new marketing possibilities for wheat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON WHEAT COMMISSION,
Pendleton, Oreg., July 15, 1955.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sure you know that the Oregon Wheat Commission was created with its principal function to be work on marketing and marketing problems of wheat in the State of Oregon. Finding new uses and new markets for wheat is not easy; and when we meet with a measure of success, we like to tell our friends about it. Knowing of your great interest in the problems of wheat producers and the commodity of wheat nationally as well as in the Pacific Northwest, I feel sure you will be interested in a brief report on one of the projects the wheat commission has been working on for some time and which now has reached the stage of first introduction to the people of the Far East as well as to the consuming public in the United States.

Shortly after our commission was formed, in 1947, some commission member or employee remembered eating a processed wheat in the famous restaurant operated by George Mardikiam in San Francisco, which is known as Omar Khayyam's. This processed wheat appears on his menu as "pilaff." The dish is so tasty that it was thought to be deserving of further investigation. We found that "pilaff" is an old Armenian dish that has been used for generations by those people. It was processed by hand in a very crude way and the processing knowledge handed down from generation to generation. We found that currently, Mr. Mardikiam's restaurant was being supplied by a very small plant in Fresno, Calif., owned and operated by a Mr. George Perch. This plant is very small and most of the work is done by hand and the capacity is very limited.

It was realized that before the product could become available commercially in large quantities, that considerable research would have to be done on such matters as speeding up cooking time, what vitamins or other nutrients were lost in the processing, the keeping qualities in humid climates, consumer acceptance in the Far Eastern countries and a host of such related problems. Through the cooperation of various agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture, the State Colleges of Oregon and Washington, the Woman's Christian College in Madras, India, and the Miller's National Federation and the Oregon Wheat Commission, such research work was carried out over a period of several years and the necessary answers were obtained.

The next problem was to find some commercial milling firm who was willing to make the substantial investment necessary to process and package and market this new wheat food. The Oregon wheat commission had about decided it would have to build a plant and process the wheat in some foreign country such as India when Mr. John Locke, president of Fisher Flouring Mills in Seattle, Wash., showed an interest in the product and a willingeness to make the investment.

After a more thorough investigation, Mr. Locke found the investment required, in terms of the risks involved, were a little more than a modern processing plant could conveniently assume independently. The Oregon wheat commission was happy to have been able to work out a cooperative agreement between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Fisher Flouring Mills Co. which made it possible for Mr. Locke to undertake the development of this new wheat food.

We believe the cooperative arrangement is that the Fisher Flouring Mills provides the investment of equpment, building, and management for processing the wheat, which is substantially in excess of half a million dollars, while the Commodity Credit Corporation advances a substantial quantity of wheat to be processed. The processed wheat is then to be marketed in the Far East, in the countries having the most likelihood of accepting the food, and whatever net profits are realized will accrue to the Commodity Credit Corporation as payment for the wheat they have advanced.

After Mr. Locke got his plant into operation and the processed wheat on the way to Far Eastern countries, he was able to arrange his plant capacity to accommodate a relatively small amount of wheat which the mill bought outright for processing and distribution in the United States and currently with the foreign operation. This new product, which is to be sold under the trade name of "ALA" has been introduced in the Pacific Northwest markets within the past month and is now available in an attractive package on all grocery shelves in Oregon, Washington, and northern Idaho.

I am very pleased to send you herewith, 2 cases of "ALA" containing 12 individual packages each, which I hope you will use personally in your own home and will invite your friends also to try. There are recipes on the outside of the package and a more extensive recipe folder inside the package.

It is a matter of extreme satisfaction to the members of the Wheat Commission to have had an opportunity to participate in the development of this new wheat food. While the Commission has not invested a large sum of money, it has acted rather as a catalytic agency to bring together the individuals and agencies who were willing to put up substantial amounts of equity capital necessary to get this product on the market. To me, it has been quite thrilling to have participated in a venture which is now offering to the public a new wheat food. New because it has been adapted to modern cooking methods and meets the quick cooking, minimum fuel requirements of Far Eastern nations that have little fuel, is nutritious and healthful, and at the same time is perhaps the most economical food buy before the American housewife today.

In talking about the sale and distribution of "ALA" in foreign countries, we like to emphasize that we do not expect this product will be a substitute for rice but rather that it will be a supplement in rice deficit areas of the Far East and we hope it will go far to meet the minimum food requirements of those impoverished people.

Finally, it is my feeling that the development of this new wheat product is of more significance than the end product itself. To me, it is indicative of the sort of things farmers can do when they join together to help themselves. To be sure, the accomplishment of this project has required the close cooperation of private industry and the Federal Government as well as certain State agencies. Those groups have invested large amounts of money and given generously of their time in making this development possible.

In terms of money, the Wheat Commission has not invested heavily, but because of the small investment made by the Wheat Commission in money, plus the long hours of conferences and planning, were quite essential to the development of this project. Without an interested group of farmers who were willing to do something for themselves, such a development would not have occurred. Personally, it has been very gratifying to be a member of such an organization. Knowing of your great interest in wheat and wheat problems, I felt you would be interested in this baridged report of the development of a new food product.

Yours very truly,
MARION T. WEATHERFORD,
Chairman.

Sixtieth Anniversary of the Tidings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Tidings recently commemorated its 60th anniversary as a newspaper devoted to spiritual rather than material values, and to the service of the community.

From a small publication which began modestly with just eight pages under the guidance of its first editor, Patrick W. Croake, of Los Angeles, the Tidings has grown with the city of Los Angeles, and today it is one of the outstanding members of the Nation's Catholic press.

The following editorial by Msgr. W. E. North, present editor of the Tidings, which appeared in the jubilee edition, is a moving tribute to the growth and progress of this great publication:

THE TIDINGS RECORDS A SAGA

Sixty years is a span of time venerable with pride of place as man measures the days of our years. On the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul in 1895 the first copies of an

8-page tabloid called the Catholic Tidings came off the press. The type was hand-set in a dingy office somewhere on the fringe of what is now the Civic Center. There was little attempt at makeup. There were no pictures. There was little advertising. There were just 20 columns of news, some scattered world items, a few national pieces, many local tidbits, with heroic essays into the realms of apologetics and dogma.

Soon the word "Catholic" was dropped from the masthead to insure delivery in days of APA wrath, for they were troubled times. Those who were here from the beginning then found themselves a minority as the little pueblo began to stretch its limbs unto greatness. Something of the ingenuity and pluck bordering on heroism that went into the making of the paper is still evident today in the indomitable will of its first editor, Patrick W. Croake, blessedly with us yet, hale and hearty and happy in the middle nineties.

There is contrast aplenty between the first and current issues, a contrast that mirrors the marvels that have touched church and southland across the years. Los Angeles has become a mecca of the world, leaping to towering pinnacles of renown, while the church has gone serenely on from strength to strength, a princely shepherd dotting the landscape with shrines and monuments of the spirit, the fruit of his untroubled vision and of the faith and sacrifice of a flock that mounts now to a million souls.

It has been the role of the Tidings to record this march of heroism. The chapters of a saga as glorious as any in the history of the church are to be found in its Friday morning issues of the last 60 years. The apostolate of the press has been a slow but sacred cause in the archdiocese. Only the vigorous tilling of the past has made possible the promise of the present. God has given the increase, and if the circulation of the paper now nears 80,000 and if it has won increasingly wide renown, this is due not alone to the enthusiastic efforts of a dedicated staff but principally to the leadership of our priests, the zeal of our Sisters, the work of our children crusaders, and the interest of our people, not to forget the support of our advertisers. It is this cumulative concern that has brought the Tidings to the very forefront of the Catholic press in the United States.

The Tidings is more than ever conscious of its call as it moves into its new and adequate and relatively permanent offices. Our anniversary witnessed the hallowing of our new quarters after the penitential ablution. There will forever echo within these walls the admonitions of pope and bishop on the importance of the Catholic press. We have been told that in vain will be build churches and institutions of faith if these are not bolstered by the apostolate of the pen. More than ever is the work needed for we have come on strange days when men fumble around in confusion of thought before the last of the enemies that threatens the splendor of our ancient patrimony. Otherwise reasonable men scorn the ways of reason in assessing the universal threat. It is though judgment has fled to brutish beasts.

The Catholic press must not only chronicle the absorbing events in the tumult of Catholic trials and triumphs. It must increasingly sift and weigh in the light of the heritage and in the lessons of time the panorama of our proud and perplexed days. It must with the assessment of ancient truth purify the waters in the sullied stream of time. It must be bolder and more forceful in riddling the pretensions of those who would build our society on the sands of secularism. It must trumpet the return to the roots of our greatness as a free people, for it is forever true that the city is a prey to the foe unless the Lord walks the ramparts.

Resolution Providing Certain Benefits to Veterans Who Served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on Its Borders During the Period Beginning May 9, 1916, and Ending April 6, 1917, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the national convention of the veterans of the Mexican border campaign on June 11 and 12, 1955:

Whereas there was almost continuous bloodshed costing the lives of many Americans and destruction of untold millions of dollars in property; and

Whereas Woodrow Wilson, then President of the United States, on June 2, 1915, stated, "There is no proper protection either for her noncitizens or for citizens of other nations resident at work within her territory;" and

Whereas the historical raid by Villa forces on Columbus, N. Mex., in which 7 American soldiers were killed and 5 others wounded was one of many; and

Whereas General Pershing being ordered to command an expedition into Mexico to capture and destroy Villa's army had entered into Mexico 400 miles to accomplish his objective; and

Whereas Gen. Hugh Scott, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and Gen. Frederick Funston in command of the Southern Department, United States Army, held conferences with General Obregon, the War Minister of Mexico, in April and May 1916 at El Juarez, Mexico, and El Paso, United States of America, and a tentative agreement was entered into by the generals which the President of Mexico refused to sign, showing the hostile attitude of the Mexican Government; and

Whereas our Army intelligence had definite information that the Mexican generals had plans to put a large force between General Pershing's command and the border with objective of cutting communication and supplies and of destroying Pershing's entire force; and

Whereas General Funston had information that an invasion across the border with the destruction of San Antonio, Tex., as the objective; and

Whereas General Scott and General Funston reported to Washington: "We expect many attacks along the whole border. Our line is thin and weak everywhere and inadequate to protect the border anywhere if attacked in force. There are no adequate reserves. We think the border should at once be supported by at least 150,000 additional troops"; and

Whereas a call of the President was made, following a meeting of his Cabinet, for all the Organized Militia and National Guard of the United States; and

Whereas the telegraphic orders to each of the governors of the several States were worded: "Having in view the possibility of further aggression upon the territory of the United States from Mexico and the necessity of protecting the frontier, the President has thought proper to exercise the authority vested in him by the Constitution and laws to call out the organized Militia and National Guard"; and

Whereas the call was telegraphed on June 18, 1916, and by midnight of July 31, 108,661 Federalized National Guard in the Army of the United States were camped on the Mexican border with 40,000 National Guard mobilized at their home stations, and 44,154 of the Regular Army were in the southern department; and

Whereas the sudden call without previous warning did not give this National Guard any opportunity or time to plan their business or personal affairs and the interruption of civilian pursuits caused great hardships and sacrifices by the officers and enlisted men; and

Whereas no prepared cantonments or camps awaited the troops upon their arrival on the border and all camp sites had to be prepared by the soldiers, even to clearing the ground and use of irrigation ditches for water supply, and use of pup tents many weeks for sleeping quarters by many units; and

Whereas these Federalized National Guard in the Army of the United States responded to the President's call when the pay of the enlisted man was only 50 cents per day, with no war-risk insurance, no vocational training, no dependent allowances, or other benefits provided at any time; and

Whereas no provisions have been made by Congress for hospitalization, burial allowance, or even a flag to cover the casket when their dead bodies are borne to their last resting place, or other benefits commensurate with the service rendered to the country; and

Whereas the fundamental purpose of all benefit legislation for veterans is to render justice to citizen soldiers who give sacrificial service in emergencies that require actual armed defense of the Nation; and

Whereas the number of the Mexican-border veterans who did not go into World War I are few and all are approaching old age with many in need of financial assistance: Therefore be it

Resolved by the national convention of the United Mexican Border Veterans in convention assembled June 11 and 12, 1955, in South Bend, Ind., That we earnestly request the enactment into law of H. R. 2453 which will grant to Mexican-border veterans the same benefits as are granted by law to World War I veterans; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to all members of the committee, and to Congressman GARDNER R. WITHROW, address, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Unanimously adopted by United Mexican Border Veterans in national convention assembled in South Bend, Ind., June 12, 1955.

LOUIS H. WUNSCHEL,
National Commander.
ALFRED L. MOUDY,
National Adjutant.

Memorandum on the Geneva Conference: No Economic Concessions to the Communists Without Political Concessions From Them—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is alarming to see the number of Americans who seem to have accepted a few smiles and

reasonably civil speech by the Communist dictators as meaning a change in heart or even an abandonment of the Communist program of world conquest. The only prudent explanation of this change whereby they press their unvarying demands with smiles instead of snarls is that they are seeking a breathing spell in which to overcome their own difficulties, and get us to reduce our efforts. It is our economic and political pressures which have brought the Kremlin to its change of posture. Naturally it would give almost anything to get us to relieve those pressures and resume trade, reduce our embargo on strategic materials, without any real Soviet concession, such as unification of Germany, in return.

A penetrating memorandum on the Geneva Conference has been written by Mr. Christopher Emmet, a writer on foreign policy long a student of Communist behavior. Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the first section, in which he develops one aspect of a thesis I have been advocating for more than a decade—namely, that the only way to end a war with communism anywhere, whether cold or hot, is to win it. The article follows:

THE ECONOMIC MOTIVE IN THE SOVIET DRIVE FOR NEUTRALITY AND RELAXATION OF TENSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The concensus of most expert opinion is that the main, although not the only, motive for the recent Soviet drive to relax tensions is due to economic pressures. The free world has proved itself capable of producing arms for itself and for its allise, including the immense amount of electric power needed for nuclear weapons, while at the same time it has increased the production of consumer goods, not only for itself but for underdeveloped and neutral nations. The Soviet Government has been unable to compete on all these fronts, particularly in view of the need to partly industrialize and equip her Chinese ally for modern war. In the effort to increase industrial production in both China and Russia, agricultural production has been dangerously neglected, apart from the peasant resistance to collectivization.

This does not necessarily mean that the Soviet economy is weakening, still less that it is in danger of immediate collapse, but it does mean that the economy of the whole Soviet bloc is relatively weaker than that of the free world and that the effects of this relative weakness will be cumulative if the present situation continues—hence the Soviet desire for a truce in the cold war.

This explains why the recent Soviet propaganda before Geneva tried to sell the idea of relaxing tensions as an end in itself, regardless of whether or not it involved a solution of the German unification problem, etc. Some influential authorities like Walter Lippmann have even supported this Soviet thesis. But fortunately the German Government has recognized that it might be fatal for us to grant the Soviet wish for the relaxation of tensions before we attain German unification. This is made clear in despatches to the New York Times from its Bonn correspondent, M. S. Handler, on July 14 and July 19.

Every act which reduces the Soviet strain in the present armament and production race reduces our bargaining power to achieve German unification in freedom to join the West, or any of the free world's other political objectives. An article by the famous British economist, Barbara Ward, in the New York Times magazine of July 18, recognizes this basic fact, at least by implication. The London Economist in its issue of July 23 puts it specifically: "The free nations have no interest in granting the Communist powers a breathing space and enabling them to gather strength again for fresh adventures in military or political pressure, which might well be the outcome of a temporary reduction of armaments under inadequate guarantees."

The economics of neutralism

All this throws a new light on the Soviet agreement to neutralize Austria and on its effort to neutralize Germany. Aside from the obvious political and military dangers of weakening the NATO defense by German neutrality, the Communists undoubtedly hope to exploit the economy of Austria and, if possible, of Germany as they already have exploited that of Finland and Sweden. As in the case of Austria and Finland, they would hope first to exact some German reparation agreement in return for unification, perhaps under the guise of buying out Soviet "owned" properties in Eastern Germany, as was done in Austria. Second, they would maintain political threats and pressures to attain economic concessions after reparations were paid, as was the case in Finland.

The original postwar Soviet trade agreement with Sweden, which was highly beneficial to Russia, is another case in point. This was dictated by fear of a total Soviet occupation of Finland as a prelude to further encircling Sweden and Norway. Sweden would have been compelled to continue similar unfavorable agreements if it had not been for the building of NATO strength. However, if Germany is excluded from NATO the present precarious balance of power would again be weakened, not only for Sweden but for Germany and all Europe. Competition to appease Russia would arise.

No embargo against exports of strategic goods to Communist countries could be carried out by a neutral country and unless rigid precautions were taken by the West in their trade with such neutral countries, the Communists could siphon off strategic goods, which came originally from the West, from the neutrals.

Even an atmosphere of friendly coexistence, without actual neutralization of Germany, would make it difficult if not impossible for European countries to resist political pressures for increased trade, on credit backed by the democratic governments, with the Communist world. Western businessmen with political influence within their countries, who would benefit from Communist orders would press for such trade.

Every business concern which has an order or hopes to get a Communist order, or which is owed money by a Communist power, automatically becomes a propagandist, an apologist, or a special pleader for soft treatment for that Communist power. There are many historical parallels to illustrate this. The fact that four-fifths of the money debts owed by southern interests to northern creditors at the outbreak of the American Civil War was owed to New Yorkers, made New York the most stubborn center of appeasement sentiment toward the South, and of disloyalty in the North, throughout 4 years of bitter civil war. Similarly, the great American corporations with investments in captivity in Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy were the inevitable collaborators and pressure groups within the United States in favor of appeasing Nazi Germany in the period before and after Munich.

Without a militantly anti-Communist public opinion, which is incompatible with a neutral position between East and West, the democratic governments would not be able to impose restrictions even on trade in strategic goods. Moreover, since Communist trade is centrally controlled, every Communist order or refusal to give an order to a western country can be used as part of the overall bargaining pressure. The Communists have built-in trade restrictions on all foreign trade because all imports and exports are centrally controlled.

Therefore, the trade itself would not be on a wholly equal economic basis. However, even if the trade were equal in an economic sense, it would still strengthen the Soviet political structure and military potential because their economic shortages are relatively greater than ours. They are suffering from the lack of East-West trade more than we; therefore, they benefit most from its restoration. Also, by permitting an increase of trade between the satellite states and the West the Soviets will, in the long run, be able to siphon off more from those states for the benefit of the Soviet Union than is now the case. Their former policy of isolating the satellite economies from the West proved a blunder.

Moreover, it is impossible nowadays to clearly distinguish between strategic and nonstrategic goods. The greatest Communist shortage is in food production. This makes it all the more regrettable that Canada has already agreed to a large delivery of wheat to Poland, of which 85 percent—$15 million worth—will be paid for by a loan from a Canadian bank to the Polish satellite government, guaranteed by the Canadian Government.

The next step will be the demand of American farmers to be allowed to sell American food surpluses behind the Iron Curtain, either at reduced prices or through credit arrangements similar to that of Canada. These surpluses weigh down the price of agricultural products and represent an acute political issue in the United States as well as Canada. So far, American anti-Communists have been able to prevent any surplus deal, but that would become impossible in an atmosphere of friendly coexistence.

The price of friendly coexistence

All this means that from the Western point of view any relaxation of restrictions on East-West trade in strategic goods, and credit on other trade, should only be conceded in return for political concessions from the Soviets. Since we have proved that we can sustain the economic cold war better than they can, it is folly to abandon this advantage until they make political concessions in connection with the unification of Germany and in eastern Europe, Formosa, Vietnam, etc. Aside from fully inspected disarmament, which would relieve the Soviet economic strain but would be worth it to us for the sake of peace, the West has no other bargaining assets with which to bring about Soviet political retreats.

Our greatest economic bargaining asset of all is the offer by President Eisenhower in his famous speech of April 16, 1953, to use a great part of the present cost of armament and the cold war for aid to backward and Iron Curtain countries, in return for fundamental Soviet concessions on disarmament and German unification, etc. But the bargaining power of this offer, as well as of disarmament itself, will be whittled away if we grant premature, piecemeal economic concessions in East-West trade in the name of "relaxing tensions," without removing the real political causes of tension. In short, the guiding principle of Western policy, in accordance with the facts, must be economic concessions by us only in return for political and military concessions by them. Since economic necessities have driven the Communist leaders to desire relaxation of tensions the West will betray its own security interests and the interests of peace itself, if we give one economic concession without a political or military quid pro quo from the Communists in return.

If we maintain the embargo on strategic goods plus the present credit and other re-

strictions on East-West trade, our production advantage will be cumulative. That is why any concessions now will be premature, because the Communists' crisis has probably not yet reached a point where they are willing to pay an adequate price in political terms to relieve their economic crisis. If we continue the pressure, the Communist governments will probably experience increasing political strains, discontent, and demoralization, first in the vast satellite domain, and then in the Soviet Union itself.

Moreover, this internal resistance is the greatest possible deterrent to war, in view of the immense Soviet and Chinese lines of communications. For that reason it is highly dangerous for the West to let the Soviets relieve these economic tensions before either sweeping and foolproof disarmament, or drastic concessions in Germany and Eastern Europe, or the collapse of the Communist regimes, has been achieved.

As President Eisenhower has said, the way to prevent world war III is to win the cold war. We are winning it but we have not yet achieved our objectives. To quit now would be once more to win a war and lose the peace.

Memorandum on the Geneva Conference: It Is Folly To Assume That Lifting the Iron Curtain Would Weaken the Communist Dictatorship—Western Tourists Greatly Helped Hitler and Mussolini Maintain Their Tyranny—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the second portion of a memorandum on the Geneva Conference by Mr. Christopher Emmet:

The fallacy of the Iron Curtain

Such novel Soviet gestures as relaxing the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are deceptive. They are not real concessions any more than the neutralization of Austria. Aside from the fact that they are designed to increase East-West trade, they give the Soviets a propaganda advantage. The Soviet Union had hundreds of thousands of subsidized tourists in the thirties, but that did not weaken its regime. Hitler and Mussolini never had any iron curtains toward the West. Totalitarian countries do not need outside iron curtains to retain their tyrannies, because they have built-in iron curtains within their own countries.

Obviously the Iron Curtain was a convenience to the Soviets during the period after World War II, when they were fearful of the effect of millions of Soviet troops having seen the higher standard of living in occupied Europe. But there is no reason to suppose that it was really essential. Rather it was the expression of the increasing tyrannical and fearful mood of Stalin's last years and it was probably one of his greatest blunders, similar to his refusal of Marshall-plan aid for the satellite countries. It was only because Stalin cut Russia and the satellites off completely from the West that we were able to organize our separate systems of military and economic defense, which Russia is now trying to break down.

One of the most effective forms of propaganda used by the Nazi and Fascist regimes in the thirties, and to a lesser extent by the Soviets, was their propaganda to foreign tourists. Since these tourists were not politically prepared they could not do any effective propagandizing themselves and, in any case, the people they were allowed to meet were not free to act, even if the democratic visitors convinced them of the evils of totalitarian regimes. The recent rave reports from German newspapermen about finding Soviet conditions so much better than they expected, is a case in point.

When it comes to visitors which the Communists send to the West, they only select people who are such disciplined and privileged members of the Communist system that they are not tempted to become penniless refugees, and this includes not only officials but scientists, artists, and technicians. As an added safeguard, they keep a hold on the visitors by holding their families as hostages. Every Communist visitor to the West, therefore, is a trained propagandist. Moreover, these Communist visitors are free to talk to anyone in the free countries once they are admitted, so it is a wholly unequal exchange. This is in addition to the language difficulty, for there are many more Russian Communists trained by the government to speak adequate English than Americans or Europeans who speak fluent Russian.

The Iron Curtain was of immense use in dramatizing the Soviet danger to the West, while the less visible iron curtains which remain within the Communist world today are equally impenetrable, but far less provocative. The partial lifting of the curtain, far from being a concession to the West, merely acts to repair a Communist mistake.

The West cannot, of course, prevent or appear to regret even the partial lifting of the Iron Curtain. But it can expose the fact that foreigners cannot really investigate conditions in key areas of Russia freely, as Communists can in the West, as well as the fact that the Russian people are afraid to speak to them freely. The fact that Russians who come to the West are not really free must also be constantly emphasized by the press of the free world as well as by government officials and civic leaders.

Memorandum on the Geneva Conference: The Fallacy of Assuming That Communist Aggressivenes Is Due to Fear or Misunderstanding of the West and Can Be Overcome by Making Sweeping Concessions or Offering a Security Pact—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the third section of a memorandum on the Geneva Conference by Mr. Christopher Emmet:

Pros and cons of a European security pact

The Western theory in concluding the Teheran and Yalta agreements was that Soviet aggressiveness and secretiveness toward the West was due to profound suspicion and fear, based on ignorance—not on motives of aggression, imperialism, or revolutionary fanaticism. President Roosevelt (and his advisers such as Harry Hopkins) believed that this Soviet suspicion and fear could be overcome by sweeping Western concessions and persistent Western generosity, including even the withdrawal and demobilization of America's Armed Forces, which proved Soviet suspicions to be groundless.

This policy failed. The policy of NATO and other steps toward Western defense was based on the contrary theory, that the Communist world represents a dynamic and aggressive complex of power which will expand wherever opportunity offers.

(1) The proposed offer of a security pact to the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe represents a return to the Yalta theory. Unless the Soviets really fear a military attack from the West, a security pact will be meaningless to them and its offer will not enhance our bargaining power to obtain German unification, in freedom to join the West.

(2) If this is true (as I believe it is) the only utility of offering such a pact is its propaganda value in convincing neutral-minded people in Germany, Europe, and Asia of America's peaceful intent.

(3) However, the propaganda value of this offer within the free world may be more than counterbalanced by the discouraging effect it would have on the satellite peoples, and on such disaffected Soviet elements as the Ukrainian national movement.

This is true because any such security pact would mean that the West was pledged not to send any military aid if revolution broke out behind the Iron Curtain, such as that of June 17 in East Germany on an even greater scale. In view of the East German experience the possibility of such a revolt on a greater scale in other satellites as well should not be discounted, especially if the food crisis in the Communist world should be aggravated by a bad crop year. Such a revolt might start with food riots and spread like wildfire from country to country as it did from city to city in East Germany. It might involve the revolt not only of satellite armies but of Russian Army units as well.

(4) The assurance which a security pact would give the Communists against any active allied aid or intervention if such a revolt occurred, would be worth many military divisions to the Soviets in eastern Europe.

(5) Moreover, the fear of such a revolt is now one of the greatest deterrents against any Soviet attack on the West, because of the long and vulnerable lines of communication into Western Europe. These lines are vulnerable not only to air attack but also to widespread sabotage and to western paratroopers.

(6) A pledge to guarantee the eastern frontiers of the Iron Curtain against any military attack from the west would appear to anti-Communists within the satellite countries as a guarantee of the status quo, a recognition of the permanence of their enslavement. Even now, after the experience of East Germany, only desperation would lead them to revolt as they have little hope of aid from the west. But if the security pact were signed these faint hopes would disappear, apathy would increase, and the deterrent danger of a potential revolt if the Soviet attacked the west, would be diminished. For the satellite peoples know that the west will keep its agreements, just as they know that the Communists Governments will not.

(7) It is painful to imagine the nightmare for the west, especially for the Germans, if such a revolt as that of June 17 broke out throughout Eastern Europe. We would have to stand by and see millions of our friends reenslaved and their leaders slaughtered, while western soldiers twiddled their thumbs.

(8) To sum up, a security pact would impose for the first time a counter-revolutionary position on the west, since it is the traditional right of free peoples to help friendly peoples to win their freedom. Probably, we should be willing to pay even this price if we could really insure peace in the

age of nuclear war. But we must be certain that we can get real assurance in exchange, and a security pact would not give such assurance because, since we could not trust the Soviets not to break it, it would bind us and not them.

(9) The least we must do is to insist on sweeping Soviet concessions as part of any such "security" arrangement. Also, if any such pact is agreed to, the least we can do is to solemnly declare that it does not imply any recognition of the justice of either the regimes or the frontiers of Eastern Europe, and that the west pledges itself to try to change those regimes and frontiers by every means short of war, according to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, signed by the Soviets.

Comparative Transportation Standards for American and Mexican Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it has been said that happy nations have no history and that great literature and other arts are distilled from man's divine discontent inspired by the injustices of oppression, exploitation and discrimination that harm both the exploiter and the exploited.

Last week on July 22 with little notice or debate we passed a bill—and yesterday adopted the conference report—extending the Mexican contract labor program assuring the Mexican national entering this country to do agricultural work certain standards and protections on the job and in being transported to and from the job which are not guaranteed to and, clearly, are not enjoyed by United States citizens doing the same type of work.

Today there came to my desk a clipping from the Denver Post of July 15, 1955, containing a brief article by the distinguished reporter and commentator, Roscoe Fleming, which, in its stark economy of words, challenges the conscience of everyone of us and, it seems to me, puts an obligation upon the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am a member, and upon Secretary of Labor Mitchell to investigate and to act to end such offenses against the dignity, health, and the very lives of people who, in Mr. Fleming's words, "had the bad luck to be migrant workers; and the apparent further misfortune to be American citizens."

I ask my colleagues to take the few minutes necessary to read Mr. Fleming's description, written with intelligence, feeling, and the directness of true art, stating the meager protection given Mexican migratory workers while being transported within the United States, and the utter lack of standards for United States citizens being transported to do migratory labor and his description of how the buck has been passed by the State of Colorado, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Labor Department.

Finally, Mr. President, I quote verbatim the icy irony of Mr. Fleming's final paragraph:

So it looks like these poor Americans just have to go on taking their chances, save for one possibility: They can go to Mexico and take out first citizenship papers. Then when they came back, they might be able to get the minimum protection and decent treatment here, which the United States seems unable to afford her own citizens.

Mr. President, I suggest that this challenge had best be answered, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fleming's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator says that the State of Colorado ducked responsibility. Of whom is he speaking?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is made clear in the article from the Denver Post.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may wish to reply to it later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT EMIGRATE?—CASE OF THE MIGRANT WORKERS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

Remember the open truck jam-packed with 55 standing human beings that turned over on a curve east of Denver, killing 1 baby and injuring 20 other persons? These people had the bad luck to be migrant workers; and the apparent further misfortune to be American citizens.

Recently the House extended the law which Mexico demands to protect her nationals who come into the United States to work.

Representative BYRON ROGERS, of Denver, made a valiant try to include protection for American citizens, but his amendment was gaveled out of order as not germane, since the subject was the protection of Mexican, not United States, citizens.

But read in the debate were the Labor Department regulations to protect Mexican migratory workers in the United States, and you might like to see how we take care of those people—at the demand of their Government. Summarized:

Where trucks are used, Mexican migrants can't be driven more than 14 hours in any 1 day, with 15-minute rest stops every 2 hours. Overnight rest stops must be adequate for the climatic conditions (whatever that means).

Vehicles must have adequate seats firmly fastened to the floor, with back rests, and with a minimum spacing of 18 inches. There must be protection against the weather. Tarpaulins must be not less than 6 feet above the floor, and along the sides * * * where necessary.

"All vehicles must be equipped with fire extingishers, drinking water in containers equipped with spigots, signaling devices between driver and passengers. All vehicles shall be clean, and reasonably comfortable. All workers shall be given 50 cents per meal, or its equivalent in food.

"Before the start of each trip the representative of the Department of Labor shall be shown proof of ownership of vehicle, proof of adequate insurance coverage; itinerary of route showing rest stops, food stops, and overnight stops; driver's license, State inspection certificate where available (or Department of Labor inspection report will be executed). After arrival * * * driver and passengers shall be questioned as to adherence to these requirements."

Still pretty rugged, you'd say? American citizens would never stand for such minimum standards of safety and comfort? Well, remember that American citizens in the fatal Colorado truck accident had been packed upright, so close together they had no room to move. They had traveled hour after hour that way, uncovered against blazing sun or pelting rain alike. Finally the truck skidded on a rain-wet curve, went out of control because its center of gravity was too high because the people were standing, and finally dumped them in a screaming bloody windrow in the borrow-pit.

Remember that all concerned have since passed the buck of responsibility, with the speed and skill of the Denver Bears whipping the ball around the infield?

The State said right off that it had no power to regulate interstate trucks, save only against unsafe crowding. Governor Johnson wrote the Interstate Commerce Commission demanding that it enforce minimum safety and comfort regulations, but the ICC wrote back that it had never been given any power in this regard. A United States Labor Department welfare worker came out, looked around, and left saying it was too bad, but up to Colorado. The sugar companies, for whom these migrant workers are imported by contract as "stoop" labor in the beet fields, have shrunk like violets from public notice in this connection, although vocal enough about their other benefits to the public.

So it looks like these poor Americans just have to go on taking their chances, save for one possibility: They could go to Mexico, and take out first citizenship papers. Then when they came back, they might be able to get the minimum protection and decent treatment here, which the United States seems unable to afford her own citizens.

Rabbi Milton Matz' Testimony on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the testimony of Rabbi Milton Matz, assistant rabbi of K. A. M. Temple of Chicago, at the Senate subcommittee hearing on juvenile delinquency in the city of Chicago on July 14, 1955, as follows:

WHAT CAN THE CHURCH AND SYNAGOGUE DO IN THE PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR?

Senator KEFAUVER, Senator WILEY, members of the subcommittee, I regret that Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, whose place I am taking this morning, canont be with you, as he is presently out of the city. Though it is difficult to substitute for a man with the wisdom and depth of experience of Rabbi Weinstein, I do hope that some of the insights gained in my work as a chaplain in the Air Force, and as director of synagogue and center youth programs may prove of some pertinence to the mission of this group.

First I shall read a brief statement from Rabbi Weinstein:

"The church which constantly emphasizes stereotyped warnings against theological sins and offers salvation in terms foreign to the experience of youth is not aiding, and may very well be hindering, the forces combatting juvenile delinquency. But the church which extends the warmth of family ties to the larger community of the faithful and makes explicit in meaningful terms the dignity and sacredness of the individual may very well help to give youth that sense of identification and that feeling of purposeful belonging, the lack of which often leads urban youth to gang up to do their desperate and criminal deeds. These acts of violence represent only in part a revolt against a world they never made. They are also in part a pathetic outreaching for significance in a massively impersonal society. If the church can effectively realize the content of its work and spell out in dynamic terms its doctrines of personal worth and its techniques for character growth in the image of God, it could become a mighty force in stemming the tide of juvenile delinquency."

And now, on my own behalf, I shall address myself to the question, "What can the cuhrch and synagogue do in the prevention of delinquent behavior?"

Delinquency is not a superficial, localized disease, but is symptomatic of a generalized breakdown in the proper functioning of the total community or society in which it occurs. There is no single remedy or sure-fire miracle drug which can combat the virus of delinquency. Many experts would agree that the only effective means of minimizing delinquent behavior would be through a total community approach. This would imply firstly, that the community recognize that it is responsible for delinquency to the extent that it does not maintain the facilities and institutions necessary for providing outlets and guidance for adolescents. Secondly, that the community, recognizing its limitations, earnestly endeavor to correct them through combined community action. It is my belief that only a program of this comprehensive nature can be meaningfully effective.

It is with this background in mind that I turn to the church and synagog. Religious institutions occupy a unique place in society. They exert far-reaching influence on the lives and thoughts of those who are associated with them. Unlike most other social institutions, they deal with individuals as family units. The membership unit is the family, not the individual. Finally, and most important, religious institutions are the spiritual and moral cornerstones of our society. To a large extent, they determine the ethical and spiritual morale, and consequently the behavior, of the communities where they operate. For these reasons, churches and synagogs can perform vital services in combating delinquency.

They can function effectively in three key areas. By providing maximum facilities for their own congregants, by motivating their membership to become influential in stimulating the community as a whole to united action, and by arranging to make available to the community at large their know-how in group work and adult education, and even at times their physical premises.

What activities can a religious institution provide for its own constituents which would aid in the prevention of delinquency? I would like to outline such a program. My list is not at all comprehensive. I am certain that there are many ideas to be added, many of them already functioning successfully in church and synagogue programs.

(A) The first, and by far most important, element in a successful program is that of getting the religious message across to the adolescent. This is not a simple task but it is a necessary one and cannot be evaded. Adolescents require, as do all other human beings, basic beliefs upon which to develop their personalities. The adolescent is largely plagued by his lack of decision in the area of values and beliefs. He isn't convinced that he knows what's right or wrong, what's proper and improper. He is puzzled by the "blooming, buzzing confusion" which life appears to be. He doesn't understand how he can win at the game of life, and so he rebels at the rules of the game. He is looking for an answer. He can find his answer in the street or through the agencies of religion. Religious belief, if presented in an appealing fashion in an appropriate social setting, and if geared to his intellectual and psychological needs, can go a long way in helping the adolescent youngster find his direction in life. Religious organizations, employing all the ingenuity at their disposal, must continue to underscore this vital function as a major goal of their program.

(B) Religious institutions can be and are of great service through their educational and guidance work with parents. Religion recognizes that the family is the key psychological institution in the development of the individual. The behavior of the adolescent mirrors either the harmonies or the conflicts and tensions of his home. Religious institutions can perform a vital service by helping parents and prospective parents obtain the information and guidance which can help minimize some of the tensions of family life. This can be done in a number of ways:

1. Many ministers are competent in the area of premarital and marital counseling. Their services have undoubtedly proven of great help to many. Some religious institutions may think in terms of expanding these services either through the utilization of members of their congregation who are professionally equipped to do counseling or even through the hiring of such personnel.

2. Religious institutions can perform an important service by informing their members of the guidance facilities of the community at large and by at times serving as a referral agency.

3. They can develop adult education classes and lectures dealing with the problems of family life. These programs, if maintained on a serious and competent level, may provide invaluable direction to those in the community who previously may have felt that they had nowhere to turn for guidance.

4. One of the critical problems in our culture is the disintegration of the family. Too many families are described as regarding the home as merely a place to eat and sleep in and not as a source of companionship and guidance. Too often the juniors of our country search elsewhere in vain for the guidance which they should find in their home. By sponsoring activities which involve families as units, religious institutions can take a significant forward step in cementing intrafamilial relations. Family religious services geared to children, family picnics, family sporting events, family discussion techniques can, if started early enough in the lives of the children, prove of vast help in this sensitive area.

(C) Religious institutions perform a major service through their youth programs. There are many fine programs presently in operation throughout the country. They meet one of the strongest needs of adolescents. It should be emphasized that the adolescent is most dependent on the group or gang with which he associates. He needs it for the companionship which he craves. He needs it to supply the values and orientations which he lacks. The group assumes unusual significance in his life for it can determine his future development. It is vital that the group identify itself with an institution that fosters a positive philosophy, for through this association the group will begin to accept the values and orientation of the larger institution. It is important that they be regarded and respected as an important arm of the institution, with an important function to perform. By gaining the respect of their elders they will achieve part of the self-respect which they need. Through athletic events which attract the admiring attention of adults and peers they enhance their own self-esteem. Through charitable and improvement projects, no matter how small, they take the first step toward social responsibility. Religious institutions perform a significant task in this area. They must receive all the encouragement necessary for the continuation and expansion of this work.

1. Sheriff Lohman has made the suggestion that religious institutions make their pastoral and group work facilities available to youngsters referred to them by the police. I believe that church and synagogue may be capable of very effective work in this area.

2. Disturbed adolescent behavior is often motivated by the insecurity which a youngster feels as a result of his inability to make adequate vocational plans. Assistance in the area of vocational guidance and information on vocational guidance facilities in the community would be a helpful service to adolescents. Successful guidance in this area may mean the difference between the disoriented rebelliousness of the adolescent and the purposive orientation of the mature individual.

The above program, though a partial one, illustrates the service which religious institutions can perform in the lives of their congregants. But this is only the first step. Churches and synagogues can and should play an important role in educating the community at large to its responsibilities and potentialities. They should strive to make their membership, and ultimately the community at large, aware that all socio-economic ills, whether it be poverty and inadequate facilities for the treatment of medical and mental illness, or poor street lighting and inadequate playground facilities, or overcrowded schools, all are breeders of delinquency. Religious institutions should be prepared to join with the other religious (regardless of faith) and secular institutions in their communities for the purpose of preparing that defense in depth which is so vital for the prevention of delinquency. They have the know-how and the experience to help fill some of the gaps which exist in their communities, and they have the prestige to indicate in an effective manner the potentialities for community action. And most important, they can and must provide the spiritual environment which will aid our youth in developing those positive values which shall guide them through their adolescent maze of confusion.

The Communist Calculus for World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which was delivered before the Greater

Buffalo Advertising Club, of Buffalo, N. Y. The title of the address is the Communist Calculus for World Conquest:

THE COMMUNIST CALCULUS FOR WORLD CONQUEST

I am deeply grateful for this wonderful opportunity to address the august membership of the Greater Buffalo Advertising Club. Although some highly abstract-minded economists and social scientists view the vocation of advertising as negatively productive, let me assure you that I, along with numerous others in the profession, have not been swept into the swirling stratosphere of such economic theory. In fact, I experience a double sense of affinity in being with you here today. In the spirit of the advertising vocation, my activities regarding American-Soviet relations have been thoroughly motivated by the desire to impart proper and accurate information, to sell profitable ideas, so that we might not find ourselves at the losing end of these relations. Also, in the course of this political advertising campaign it has been my privilege to know and to work with many farsighted, intellectually vigorous products of your well represented city, as, for example, the former D. P. Commissioner and lately the staff director of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, Dr. Edward M. O'Connor.

Last summer and fall it was my pleasure to lecture before our military government units and G–2, or military intelligence, at Fort Meade, Md. Part of these lectures experimented with certain ideas that would give us a more or less total and guiding understanding of the day-to-day, short-run fluctuations and changes in our relations with the Soviet Union. The experiment proved to be most successful, as measured by the discussion and the thought provocation that ensued. That perhaps is the way of a professor, in contrast to a politician, to ruffle his audience into sober thinking on issues that might have to be decided on the dreadful scale of life or death. These ideas I should like to develop here, in the simplest manner possible, on a subject that I have titled, "The Communist Calculus for World Conquest."

THE NEED OF SOUND PERSPECTIVES

There is a fundamental need for sound perspectives and clear thinking on the nature of communism and its designs, on its functional ratio of strength to the free world's, on the crucial element of time, and also on the limitations and current concepts of American foreign policy. To satisfy this need, it is necessary to achieve a balance of thought on the basic determinants and paramount variables shaping the contemporary situation. Off-hand utterances related to some one or more aspects abstracted from the total picture are easy and appear to be the rule today, as, for example, to trade or no with the Communist world, to maintain diplomatic relations with it or no, to ship surplus wheat to the U. S. S. R. or not, to coexist or else. Rationally, and I presume that is our mode of being, each of these questions represents only a part of the total picture and derives its full and significant meaning only in the light of a complete and comprehensive outlook.

It is clearly my purpose to present such a picture, one that could function as a workable pattern of thought, woven by significant, selective facts and reasoned interpretations attuned to the values of our tradition and political and moral principles. Without this picture framed in our minds, we are only given to drift from day to day, wishfully hoping for some miracle, mistakenly accepting a lull in aggression as the beginning of genuine peace, and fearfully abstaining from necessary actions in a growing self-paralysis promoted by such basically ridiculous slogans as "coexistence or codestruction." Without it, we expose ourselves to all sorts of naive and hastily concocted proposals, ranging from an invitation to Marshal Zhukov to supplying the Soviet war economy with surplus American foodstuffs.

ESSENTIALS OF THE OBJECTIVE PICTURE

In painting this picture you can view the factually supported essentials as simply propositions of thought. However, if accepted in toto, they lead to certain inevitable logical conclusions regarding the Communist calculus for world conquest and the relative soundness of American foreign policy, not to exclude the wisdom of individual concepts and proposals pertaining to different aspects of the total global situation. What, then, are these essentials which you may regard as propositions founding our pattern of reasoned thought?

First, in the current international complex the two ultimate power centers are the United States and the Soviet Union. If either is reduced, through one means or another, the decisive effect will be either the expansion of freedom or tyrannical totalitarianism. The freedom of the non-Communist world hinges on the sustained freedom of our Nation. Second, taking the power center of the United States, on the basis of accessible facts it is reasonable to estimate its current superiority in the output of nuclear weapons and a greater economic capacity for the production of essential war materials over the Russian Communist empire. This is still greater when supplemented by the capacities of other major free nations.

However, it is being generally recognized now that in our time our superiority in nuclear weapons will be substantially reduced, if not eliminated, by concentrated Soviet progress. Also, concerning war production, we should bear in mind that relative capacities belong more to a potential picture than to an actual one. For in its present utilization and distribution of resources, the Soviet Union is superior in armed personnel and in several lines of military preparedness. Frequent comparisons on standards of living between the United States and the Soviet Union are grossly misleading when the prime objectives and the nature of Red totalitarianism are borne in mind. Their standard of living is much inferior to ours, but their standard of war preparedness, by virture of resource distribution, exceeds ours.

Moreover, with the modern phenomenon of undeclared wars and the devastating scope of present weapons, the element of time necessary for wholesale productive conversion for war becomes exceedingly important. The realization of statistical capacity might fall far below par. The catastrophic effect of present weapons and the geographic relations between the two prime sources of global power render it more probable than possible that in the event of a global outbreak, we will not be fortunate to enjoy the time period for full conversion as in the two previous wars.

The third essential is the unique capacity of the United States for moral and political leadership as concerns the dependent and Communist-enslaved nations in the world. In this respect, we show in striking contrast to some of our major allies. Yet here, too, it is only a capacity that still has to be maximally realized. Except for a few, we were led to believe that the war in Indochina was merely another Communist aggression, but it remained for the French general to inform us that the issue was not so much communism as a national struggle for independence. The force of enlightened nationalism was at work, and we, the natural exponents of this patriotic force, were found wanting. It took the Communists to exploit it. Also, despite our great traditions built on principles of independence, self-government, civil and political liberties, and economic opportunity, despite the millions of dollars we pour into our information services and the Voice of America, it is an open secret that in too many quarters of the free world itself, we are a resented and even hated people. It may startle some of you, but in the Voice of America broadcasts beamed to Ukraine, the word "independence" may not be used in any circumstances, even for honest reporting of history and news.

Here, too, the time factor is of crucial importance. Our Government today has no concretely defined policy toward the Soviet Union. In a sense this is the political concomitant of the military in the time lag of conversion. Despite our almost insular stress on protective material power, the truth is that political and moral elements stand logically prior and are essentially more important than the military as efficient means to reduce the possibility of a global military outbreak. If we fail to win the minds and hearts of peoples not only in the free world but also in the Communist slave world, then no amount of dubious material superiority can save us. We have a tremendous capacity for such spiritual and psychological victory, but we have little time to translate it into actuality.

The fourth essential is a realistic view of the power center of the Soviet Union, with an unprecedented empire in vast extension from the Danube to the Pacific, embracing some 800 million people. Tragically, what many of our public leaders, educators, journalists and commentators fail to understand is that the Soviet Union, which they foolishly equate with Russia, is in itself an empire, bound by force, fear and fraud. The Soviet Union is not a nation but a forced complex of nations. It is made up of about 100 million Russians and over 115 million non-Russians constituting the non-Russian nations of Ukraine with its 45 million, Turkestan with 30 million, Byelorussia with 10 million, the Baltic countries with 6 million and others. The areas of friction, tension and centrifugal force are not only, as we are given to believe, in the so-called "satellite countries" but, perhaps more important so because of their proximity to the imperial Moscow base of the Communist empire, in the broad non-Russian periphery of the Soviet Union.

Moscow is well aware of this powder keg in its front yard, and attempts to appease the patriotic, nationalistic urges of its captive non-Russian nations. All of last year, in the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty between Russia and Ukraine, it devoted itself to the task of impressing on the Ukrainian people the fiction of their national independence and cultural freedom. It propagates such myths in the free world with amazing results. Intellectuals sent by our State Department to India and elsewhere return to report that the prevailing opinion there holds the United States as "an aggressive, imperialist nation" while, ironically enough, the Soviet Union, established and sustained by aggressive imperialism, is viewed as a monolith of happy "Soviet peoples." This should not be surprising when our highest officials indiscriminately confuse the Soviet Union with Russia, when their statements unjustly limit the goals of freedom and independence to an enumeration of only the poorly defined "satellite countries," when the radio medium of the land of the Declaration of Independence forbids the use of the term in relation to Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R.

The fifth essential to recognize is that the Soviet Union and its added empire is a totalitarian entity without the remotest relation to the idealistic implications or connotations of Marxist theory. The fatherland of supposed world communism is a terrifying, totalitarian projection of the Russian Empire of the past. It represents a technologically bolstered and reinforced totalitarianism with almost every institutional

facet an outgrowth of autocratic Tsarism. The MVD, terrorism, labor camps, iron curtains, conspiracy, Russification, genocide, collectivist serfdom, distortion and falsification of history, religious persecution, anti-Semitism and so forth have their able precedents in the totalitarian history of Russia. By all western socioeconomic standards, Russian communism is bankrupt in practice. As an ideology, it serves as a stamp of hollow doctrine within the empire and a verbal tool of deception in the free world. And this chasm between word and deed is enshrouded by the Iron Curtain, an institutional necessity to Russian Communist existence.

The frequent mention of competition between our social system and the Communist, as indicated today by the growing concept of "competitive coexistence," also crops from an insufficient or naive understanding of the chronic war economy in the totalitarian framework of the Soviet Union and its extended empire. Also, the recent play by Secretary Dulles to Russian patriots to forswear international communism may appear promising, but it runs up against all the evidence on the institutional blend of communism and traditional Russian imperialism.

Another essential is that Moscow is the source and focal point of Communist conspiracy, infiltration, and potential sabotage throughout the world. Its fixed and unalterable aim is to destroy free institutions, which is a plain corollary of the predatory bent of totalitarian politics. This also is not new. Friedrich Engels observed this bent in the Russian crusade of Pan-Slavism in the last century. But the striking contrast now to the previous crusades of Orthodoxy and Pan-Slavism is that the general and vague theories of communism afford a global scope of operations. Yet, in concrete practice, Moscow invariably exploits national and local issues for its undermining and disruptive activities. Patterned after its earliest techniques in the destruction of the independent non-Russian Republics of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, etc. in 1920–22, its apparatus exploits nationalism, colonialism, segregationism, and other goods and bads to implement the design of world domination. As in the case of nationalism, Moscow exploits it for evil ends, whereas we should be advancing it for the good.

The final essential to note is that Moscow is the fundamental power of influence, decision, determination, and dictation in the slave world, despite the nominal political differences between the so-called satellite areas and the Republics of the Soviet Union. Functionally, the satellite countries are no different in captive status from the nations in the U. S. S. R. As an alleged counterpart to NATO, recent Soviet action toward military integration in the empire was really a puppet show. The outlines of such integrated control have long been in existence, and if anything, this action may portend the nominal political incorporation of the satellite countries into the Soviet Union. The division that is observed by the National Committee for a Free Europe and the American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism, between the captive non-Russian nations in the satellite area and those in the U. S. S. R., is patently unrealistic and unsupported by historical fact. Yet millions of American dollars are spent on the premise of an unreality.

THE COMMUNIST CALCULUS IN THE GLOBAL PICTURE

If these are the basic essentials of the global picture, then we are confronted by some necessary, rational conclusions of long-run portent. As in many fields of thought, it is necessary to distinguished between short-run occurrences, like the Korean war or the Indochina affair, and determinative long-run influences measured in terms of even relatively few years. These long-run influences are shaped by the basic essentials and form the mechanical causation of the present period. In them we can discern the Communist calculus for world conquest.

If you look closely at this picture, there are really three essential and fundamental variables in this calculus. The first and primary one is the genocidal consolidation of the present Communist empire. As the remarkable findings and reports of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression show, this involves the liquidation of all nationalist and patriotic sources in the submerged nations. It means the uprooting of millions of lives, narrow indoctrination, false learning, economic, political, and military integration with Moscow at the controls. This is the springboard of Communist conquest. Given the chance to construct it, with millions of practical robots at its disposal, Moscow will have achieved its psychological basis for a reasonable expectation of success. This is its chief preoccupation today. The formation of this variable requires time which Moscow is buying with its well-planned ruse of peaceful coexistence and all varieties of diplomatic maneuver for endless talks.

The second essential variable in the calculus is a quantitative superiority in arms. Given the initial advantage of attack plus a worldwide conspiratorial network, fitted out for subversion and even atomic sabotage, Moscow does not even have to regard this variable as a necessary requisite in its expectation of success. The placement of all our hopes and confidence in the single variable of mass material power for deterrent value and retaliation might well become the illusion of the century. It would be illusory to believe that with its acutely controlled distribution of resources, Moscow could not in time achieve definite superiority. With respect to both thermonuclear and standard weapons, the U. S. S. R. can in short time achieve a close approximation to our levels of actual output. Its concentration on technologic specialization and training of engineers and technicians in the ratio of about 2.5:1 in relation to us indicate the emergence of a "Homo Technicus" rather than a "Homo Sovieticus" in the U. S. S. R. Basically, this is ominous regardless of the necessary allowances that must be made for their inferior training.

The certain development of intercontinental missiles is receiving particular stress by Moscow. Against these no airtight defense protection is possible. Such developments serve only to establish the point that a striking adequacy of arms, rather than a clear-cut quantitative superiority, is necessary to bolster further Moscow's expectation of success. But before this variable of adequacy or superiority in arms can function, that of internal empire consolidation must be assured.

The final basic variable is Moscow's fear of free world retaliation. Many regard this from our viewpoint as the cardinal deterrent to further Communist aggression, based, of course, on our relative material superiority. But it should be evident to you that if the first two variables develop progressively, then this third variable of Soviet fear of retaliation will inevitably prove to be a steadily declining one. This fear may become inversely related to their estimated ability to create regional Pearl Harbors. It should be evident, too, that the essential factor of time enormously favors Moscow, not the free world.

This calculus, if permitted to form entirely, poses the real possibility of war and defeat for us and thus the free world. This possibility will surely grow if we continue with our present policy of wait and see and passive and piecemeal responses to global Communist strategy. The present form of containment policy definitely allows Moscow to consolidate its empire. It gambles with the variable of armed superiority. It contributes to their lessened fear of mass retaliation which may well turn out to be considerably less massive than we at present anticipate. In short, in the light of this calculus, it invites war and even the possibility of defeat.

THE HOPE OF FREEDOM IS AMERICA

This rational calculus is a nightmare to many an informed legislator and executive expert. But the lot of Americans has never been pessimism and despair. There are alternative courses of action, short of war and more deterrent to further Communist aggressions on the fringes of the Red empire; aggressions that would only embroil us in sideshows prepared by Moscow for the further disssipation of our resources. Under the label of a policy of liberation these alternative courses have in part been spelled out in the specific recommendations of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression (Summary Report, pp. 6–8). This unique committee has based its recommendations on stubborn facts. Its extraordinary report should be read by you and every concerned American who is swayed by evidence and not by romantic phrases and catchwords as "peaceful coexistence," "coexistence or codestruction," and similar excuses for unreasoned thought. For the first time by any governmental body, here or abroad, this committee has delved into the facts surrounding the captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R., and shows the great weaknesses of international character that exist in this empire within an empire. It calls for the exploitation of these weaknesses in the inner fortress of the Communist empire.

The true hope of freedom is America. This hope must be extended by word and deed to all nations and peoples, including the over 115 million non-Russians in the U. S. S. R. The fire of national independence burns in their hearts as much as in those of the people of Korea, Indochina, Poland, Slovakia, and other Communist-dominated and dependent countries. To break the Communist calculus for world conquest, we must impede and prevent the consolidation of the Communist empire. To do this, we must carry a strong political warfare to the terrain of the empire. With growing insecurity within, Moscow could scarcely feel secure to aggress without. This is by far the lesser risk than that engendered by the calculus. This, in action, is the true hope of freedom for all peoples in the Communist empire. It is the rope of our own sustained freedom.

We are entering the most dangerous period in the cold war. A greatly magnified Stockholm peace plan is in the making. All evidence points to a gigantic peace offensive on the part of Moscow that reminds the careful observer of the classic observation made back in 1930 by the Russian Communist official, D. Z. Manuilski: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concession. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

As in other phases of Communist strategy, this global peace offensive by Moscow will be thoroughly calculated and staged with all varieties of political and cultural exhibition-

ism. Its twofold aim is to gain necessary time for the practical formation of the conquest calculus and, as far as possible, to induce by the opiate of peaceful coexistence the "capitalist countries * * * to cooperate in their own destruction." You can anticipate all sorts of manifestations and overtures—planned tours of the Soviet Union, moderated cultural exchanges, ballets in foreign capitals, trade fair participations, and above all interminable, but largely indeterminate, diplomatic conferences advertised in the appealing terms of "a search for peace." While the search continues with no substantial or definite results that would alter the contemporary impasse, Moscow will capitalize on the afforded time to consolidate its vast empire and attain to that relative adequacy of arms which the calculus necessitates for a reasonable expectation of success in its fixed objective of world domination.

The immediate measures of Moscow's success in waging this peace offensive will be many. One such measure will be the spread of the illusion of lessened tensions in the free world. The misleading phenomenon of the absence of any armed conflict in the world will naturally contribute to the spread of this illusion, despite the continuous nature of Communist aggression in other forms against both the currently enslaved nations and numerous areas of the free world. Another measure will be the increasing willingness of many free world representatives to enter into long-run security pacts that would guarantee the status quo—here again, despite the long broken record of Russian Communist promises and our supposed dedication to the liberation of all the captive nations in the Red colonial empire. Still another measure will be the growth of many illusory speculations on the situation in the Soviet Union, notably its increasing economic weakness, this despite the utter inapplicability of our standards of economic life to the average individual in this slave empire. Such speculation will in turn open the door to many quick moneymaking schemes to be executed in expanded East-West trade dedicated, naturally, to the noble interests of peace.

When placed against the hard, logical formula of the Communist calculus for world conquest, these anticipated developments form the illusions and thus the grave dangers of the present period in the cold war. They in no way resolve the basic problems that stand to lead to a third world war. Indeed, in the light of this rationally founded calculus, their very existence and growth conduce to the ironic outcome of a third global conflict. The growth of such illusions that make up the present opiate for the free nations, can only serve to blunt our powerful ideological weapons of independence and national self-determination against Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism. In time, verbal expressions of these powerful principles against the worst form of imperialism and colonialism that the world has seen, will offer little real hope to the enslaved peoples, including the Russian, in their struggle for independence. In time, the unimpeded application of the Communist calculus will favor Moscow and its objectives rather than contribute to what many will mistakenly believe to be a search for peace. Only an imaginative policy of liberation, one beyond the scope of mere utterance, one that can really be implemented, can stave off the coming masquerade for peace and a third world war. The Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, on the basis of evidence and careful thought, has shown the way to preserve the peace and to advance freedom. It is for you to judge whether, according to present directions, we can avoid the horrible consequences of the Communist calculus for world conquest.

The Plight of the Dairy Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] for his interest in the well-being of the dairy farmer and for his eloquent presentation on this important subject.

The dairy industry is one of the mainstays of the economy of our State. For this reason, the economic well-being of our dairy industry is of considerable importance to our entire State, and to the people of our metropolitan areas.

There are many people living in my district and in other industrial centers of the State of Wisconsin who are greatly affected by what transpires within the agricultural segment of our economy. When farm income drops, and when our dairy farmers are suffering from conditions approximating the conditions of depression, their plight is felt within our cities. Our production of agricultural implements declines, and our market for home appliances, automobiles, and other manufacturing products begins to grow smaller and smaller. Before you know it our factories begin to operate at reduced levels, employment begins to shrink, and the economic well-being of our people is jeopardized.

For these reasons, even though I do not represent a dairy or an agricultural district, I am keenly interested in the proper functioning, and economic soundness, of the agricultural segment of our economy. Similarly, I am interested in the efforts of those Members who, like my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], are earnestly searching for ways whereby our dairy industry can be restored to its former healthy state.

Now from a standpoint of a city resident, there are two chief objectives in which we are interested: In the first place, as consumers of agricultural products, we would like to see the price of farm commodities maintained at a low level, compatible with large consumption of such goods.

Secondly, we would like to see our neighbors in the agricultural areas receive an adequate income, so that they may continue to purchase our industrial and manufacturing products.

At the present time, these objectives are not being attained. Farm income has been dropping, while the price of agricultural commodities to the city consumer has been increasing. This trend must be stopped, and I believe that it can be stopped. In other words, the problem is not insoluble.

I believe that partial solution to the problem may be found through a careful study of processor and distributor costs and profits. We know, for instance, that while farm income has been dropping, the profits of food processors have jumped some 17 percent. This means that somebody in the middle is getting the gravy, and that our city consumers must pay for it. This trend is not healthy, and I have repeatedly urged that Congress look into this situation. I shall continue to press for a full-scale study of the consumer dollar—how it is spent, and who benefits most from it.

It is not my intention to enter into a lengthy discussion of other phases of this problem. I believe that some of them have been presented very ably and very sincerely by my distinguished colleagues on this floor. I would merely like to conclude my remarks by again commending my colleague LESTER JOHNSON for his interesting and informative presentation.

Hon. Lester Johnson's Efforts on Behalf of the Nation's Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, LESTER R. JOHNSON, for the industry he has displayed in the past 2 years in seeking a lasting solution to the problems facing the Nation's dairy farmers.

He has diligently served the farmers of his district and in so doing has done a real service to the dairy farmers of the entire country. By keeping their plight constantly before the Committee on Agriculture and the Congress, he has helped to alert others to the problems of dairying.

Both in committee and on the floor of this House, Congressman JOHNSON has consistently urged equality for dairy farmers and a dairy program that will bring a fair return for their labor and give consumers a quality product at a fair price.

His votes and his actions have demonstrated his genuine concern for a healthy and prosperous agriculture as the foundation of a dynamic and prosperous economy. He has represented the interests of his constituents with unfailing vigor.

In our personal associations, all of us know that he does not let pass an opportunity to promote the products of Wisconsin dairy farmers. Since my own district includes the world's largest butter-producing county, there is some friendly rivalry about the merits of the products of the Minnesota cow and the Wisconsin cow but we are surely in agreement about the merits of the American dairy farm.

While the fight for equality for dairy farmers has met with reverses in the past few years, I am confident that they have no stronger friend in Congress than LESTER JOHNSON.

The Kremlin Talks Peace While Its Satellites Scorn Their Truce Agreements in Korea and Prepare for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 28, 1955:

OUR FORGOTTEN ALLIES

Basking in the new spirit, new climate, or new atmosphere generated by the Geneva Conference, we almost forgot an important anniversary.

Two years ago yesterday the Korean armistice was signed. It was to have been the first step toward real peace in Korea. It was said then to be the first fruits of the Kremlin's new look after Stalin's death.

Two years later there is no prospect of real peace in Korea.

On the Communist side there isn't even compliance with the armistice. The United Nations members of the Military Armistice Commission recently denounced the Communists for resorting to "every possible subterfuge" to violate the agreement. Red China has continuously built up the size of military forces in North Korea—from 900,000 men at the time of the armistice to 1,200,000 now.

On this anniversary of the Korean armistice, and on the eve of high-level American negotiations with Red China, it seems appropriate to ask: "Are we in the process of forgetting Korea and the crimes committed there by the Communists?"

The United States once declared a Korean settlement to be an indispensable precondition for lessening tensions in Asia. Even before the armistice was signed on July 27, 1953, President Eisenhower warned that it must be only a first step to prompt initiation of political discussions leading to the holding of free elections in a united Korea. The only political discussions—at Geneva a year ago—ended in dismal failure.

The President also warned that any armistice in Korea that merely released aggressive armies to attack elsewhere would be a fraud. It was a fraud. It was after the Korean armistice that the Communists stepped up their attack on Indochina and also their belligerence in the Formosa Straits.

Ten years after the end of the war Korea, like Germany, remains divided—half slave and half free. At Geneva the Soviet leaders bluntly admitted they had no intention of permitting reunification of Germany for a long time. There is no sign that either Moscow or Peiping are the least interested in unification of Korea. On the contrary.

We will be more enthusiastically inclined to add to the cheering about the new climate of international relations when the Communists in Moscow and Peiping show some interest in fulfilling the wartime pledges to restore free, united, and independent Germany and Korea.

We regret that the present desire not to rock the boat precluded any official American recognition of yesterday's anniversary. It would have been appropriate and timely to remind the Communists that peaceful deeds in Korea would do more to relax the tensions they claim they want than all the words that could be spoken in Geneva in a century.

President Eisenhower has expressed willingness to deal with anyone—Soviet or Red Chinese—who shows a sincere desire for peace. At the Red China-United States conference in Geneva next week it would be appropriate and timely to ask the question: "What about Korea?"

Sponsoring of Polish Refugees in Germany, Austria, and France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest honor and pleasure that I present for publication in the RECORD a description of the operation of the Medway Plan Foundation, a charitable organization with its principal office in Woodbury, Conn., which is currently engaged in securing sponsors for assistance to Polish refugees in Germany, Austria, and France.

This very splendid foundation works in cooperation with the Polish Immigration Committee of New York. It has a long and enviable record of achievement in the field of human rehabilitation and world peace, and I commend cooperation with its most worthy work to all persons who may be interested in aiding these people who need our help so desperately.

Each year this charitable foundation, with head office in Woodbury, Conn., concerns itself with a different ethnic group abroad. Its particular interest is with the hard-core refugees—meaning those who are ineligible to enter the United States because of age, illness, and permanent disability, the most deplorable of all war victims.

Last year it was the Rumanian escapees and refugees; this year it is Polish refugees tied down in Germany and Austria and France. Medway works in association with the Polish Refugee Committee of New York, the International Rescue Committee and the Polish Refugee Union overseas. There are over 3,000 such hard-core cases who need food, clothing, or medicine. The Medway Foundation undertakes to secure individual American sponsors for each of these cases: will you, who read this, help?

The action has already started. Under the Medway plan, a sponsor sends no money to the foundation; every cent of each dollar he gives for relieving his sponsored refugee is spent by himself for such needed supplies as personal correspondence with the victim develops. Medway is a no-overhead organization—there is nothing just like it. Thousands of compassionate Americans use it. The foundation makes large shipments of supplies direct to refugee groups as a stop-gap pending placement of individual cases with American sponsors on a person to person basis.

During a 5-year existence, Medway secured the adoption of over 300 war-torn communities abroad by American cities, schools, and groups. Food, tools, clothing, hospital supplies—even motortrucks—to the value of more than $3 million was sent to the adopted towns.

During 1952–54 Medway provided special assistance to refugees from Russia and other satellite countries who reached Vienna, giving food, clothing, shelter, and hiding them from the Russian police, thus saving many lives.

In 1954 alone Medway secured individual sponsors for 3,934 hard-core cases located in Germany, Austria, and France, of which over 600 were escaped Poles in the hard-core category.

Reading the above lines, one might think that the Medway Plan Foundation is possessed of ample means, luxurious offices, and numerous personnel. In reality the foundation offices are located in the home of the president. Mr. William Montgomery Bennett, at Woodbury, Conn. Mr. Bennett, a retired industrialist and economist, donates his entire time to the foundation and is also connected with other humanitarian organizations.

Who's Worrying About the Consumer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that somewhere along the line we have somehow lost sight of John Q. Consumer, the person who pays the bill despite what type of compromise is made here legislatively.

Much has been said about the plight of the oil and gas producer. The tremendous amount of money he must invest in order to realize a productive source of this fuel commodity which is now the major source of cooking and heating means of some 25 million consumers. The arguments of those who testified before the committee, if taken as a whole, are contradictory to say the least. Some say that a healty state of competition exists in the industry and that Federal control at the wellhead would jeopardize this competitive situation by driving the small producers out of business. While others contend that only a mere handfull of the large gas and oil companies market 90 percent of all the gas that was used in 1953. Possibly the entire question does hinge about the fact of competition. Does it or does it not exist at the producing end? If it does not, then we have a situation where a few companies are free to exploit a captive market. And if that is the case I am sure that I need not remind my able colleagues that this would not only violate the intent and spirit of the Natural Gas Act of 1936.

I do not believe in unduly controlling the activities of any form of economic enterprise where the ultimate consumer is not being victimized because of his total dependence upon that industry. This is not a question of manacling the

producer; but, instead, protecting the hapless consumer who's interest we should have primarily at heart.

I feel that the question of competition and reasonable price should be thoroughly investigated by this body with a view to affording the captive consumer the protection that he would not enjoy, but which he is entitled to, under conditions which preclude an open market.

Good-Neighbor Works of John Creighton Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had called to my attention a great artist, John Creighton Murray, of Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y.

Mr. Murray made his debut as a violinist in New York in 1940 and was enthusiastically received. His career was interrupted by 4 years of service in the United States Army during which he gave more than 1,500 recitals for nearly 2 million men in uniform and was awarded the Army Commendation Ribbon.

Following his military service, he toured Western Europe and Latin America, and everywhere he has been received as a truly great artist of our day.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a translation of a letter received by me from Fernando Diez de Urdanivia, editorial offices, Excelsior, one of the well-known newspapers of Mexico City, dated July 10, 1955, in which he tells me of the good-neighbor works of Mr. Murray.

The letter is as follows:

MEXICO CITY, *July 10, 1955.*

Representative ALBERT BOSCH.

DEAR SIR: Assuming that you will be interested in the contents of this letter, it seemed to me that it was my duty as a Mexican to call to your attention a fact so interesting that it is apt to teach a profitable lesson.

The outstanding United States violinist, John Creighton Murray, has performed an impressive feat of friendship and better understanding between our two countries by way of a noble mission in the field of the arts. He has not yet given concerts in the large cultural centers nor in our more important cities; rather, he has, in a spirit of true generosity, traveled all over our Republic, visiting even rather unimportant villages. As he is an artist of extraordinary talent he aroused great enthusiasm wherever he went. Thousands of persons of all social levels applauded him fervently, and in many of the places which he visited, almost always without seeking financial gain, he left behind a deep impression and an atmosphere of friendship.

I think that missions of this nature are more beneficial as concerns international friendship than many others, because they show the interest which exists in valuable men from the United States, such as Mr. Murray, coming to our people and bringing them a message of beauty.

I beg to remain,
Very sincerely yours,
FERNANDO DIEZ DE URDANIVIA,
Excelsior, Editorial Offices, Mexico City, Mexico.

(Translated by Elizabeth Hanunian, July 27, 1955.)

Mulligan Stew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, when this administration was huckstering itself into office in 1952 we heard a great deal of reference to an alleged "mess in Washington."

Despite all the campaign piety it now appears the administration has cooked up a few messes of its own. While the Dixon-Yates pot was boiling over on the front burner, no one seemed to notice the "Mulligan stew" on the back of the stove.

As a part of my remarks, I include three editorial viewpoints as expressed by the Carlisle (Pa.) Sentinel, an independent paper published in the 19th District of Pennsylvania; the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald, an independent paper which supported President Eisenhower; and Labor's Daily, another politically independent paper which did not support Mr. Eisenhower.

The editorials follow:

[From the Carlisle Sentinel of July 25, 1955]

TALBOTT'S FOLLY

Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, has retained partnership in a New York engineering firm and has been receiving $50,000 a year, documents in the hands of the Kefauver subcommittee revealed.

Although Mr. Talbott takes the view that the matter is serious but is reconcilable, his view is highly questionable. During testimony before the subcommittee he admitted that he has been actively engaged in work for the firm while at his desk in the Pentagon, that he used Air Force stationery in his private business, that the concern is a survey type which does work for the Defense Department, etc., but that he does not consider that there is any impropriety in what he has been doing.

Federal regulation forbids anyone in the Cabinet from holding stock in, or working for any private firm. The Secretary told the subcommittee that if it does conclude his action an impropriety he will resign from the firm as of August 1 and "give" all his holdings to his partner. Although Mr. Talbott probably is not the first person of Cabinet rank to violate the Federal regulation and probably has company at the present time, he can offer no excuse for violating the law any more than can anyone else in or out of the Government.

If the subcommittee should decide to permit the Secretary to give his holdings to his partner and continue as a member of the Cabinet, the subcommittee would be condoning violations of law. No matter how good Mr. Talbott is in his position, he has proved that he is not trustworthy and should be requested to resign.

This also would be a good time for the subcommittee to investigate all the members of the Cabinet, starting with Secretary of Defense Wilson. If any of the others are found guilty of improper conduct in relations with private industry—or anything else—they also should be pressured to resign.

As mentioned, this is not the only Cabinet in which some members have and are ignoring the rules on relations with private industry, but it is too late to do anything about improprieties of former Cabinets. But there is more reason to believe that the present Cabinet is not obeying the regulation because the President has surrounded himself with men who in private life were industrial magnates and millionaires. Mr. Eisenhower has used his office to favor the big interests.

[From Labor's Daily of July 26, 1955]

(By Willard Shelton)

GIVE HIM TO MULLIGAN

The infuriating thing about the well-heeled gentlemen running our Government is the bland arrogance of their assumption that the things they do are proper and decent merely because they are the ones doing them.

Here we have Air Force Secretary Harold Talbott drumming up business for a private concern in which he shares as a partner, Paul B. Mulligan & Co.

Talbott writes letters to his partner Mulligan, encouraging him to see certain corporation executives to try to get some more business.

Talbott writes a west coast lawyer explaining that the only business the Mulligan Co. has out West is the Richfield Oil Co., and he hopes the lawyer will talk to Mulligan for an hour or so.

It is seriously suggested that people approached in this manner would have been unaware of the fact that Harold Talbott was a high administration official. Is it to be supposed that Talbott didn't realize that the approaches to the west coast lawyer, and the solicitations his partner Mulligan made to corporation executive, could not be separated—in the minds of the prospective clients—from Talbott's job as Air Force Secretary?

Talbott denies any intent of wrongdoing. He denies that he did anything wrong—although he was finally willing to "give" his partnership to Mulligan if the "gentlemen" of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee thought that would "help" the Air Force and the administration.

This is reminiscent of the wonderful statement of another well-heeled gentleman, Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, when he acknowledged that even though chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee he continued to share in the legal fees paid his private law firm by the Pennsylvania Railroad. "Everybody," announced the silver-thatched JOHN BRICKER, "knows I am honest."

Mr. Eisenhower's Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Rowland Hughes, has misrepresented and concealed facts about the Dixon-Yates contract. Sherman Adams, exalted assistant president, had the gall to intervene with a judicial hearing of a Securities and Exchange Commission examiner. Yet none of them seems to think he has done anything wrong.

What would have been the uproar if General Vaughan, Harry S. Truman's military aide, had written letters on White House letterhead drumming up business for a private partnership he held on the side?

What if a Truman Air Force secretary had spent his time drumming up private business among corporations with vast stakes in the economic and political decisions of the administration?

They would have been denounced as moral lepers, bringing into the White House and

subcabinet levels the corruption of the old Pendergast machine.

Should there be a different standard of public morality for Harold Talbott, just because he is a rich man and likes to think of himself, self-righteously, as a successful one?

Talbott belatedly remembered what he had previously denied—that the Radio Corp. of America questioned the propriety of his conduct regarding solicitations of business for the Mulligan Co. He belatedly remembered that he had got the Air Force counsel to intervene and argue with RCA officials about the propriety of his actions.

It would be a fine idea if the Senate Investigating Subcommittee, which has acted as if it wanted to sweep the controversy under the rug, would belatedly remember its own responsibilities—and send Secretary Talbott back to Mulligan.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 27, 1955]

THE HIGH AND THE MIGHTY

Secretary Talbott's position seems less and less admirable as the details of it are disclosed to the Senate Investigating Subcommittee. It appears that he not only drew $132,000 as his share of profits from a management engineering firm which did business with defense contractors but that he baldly pressured some of these contractors into using his firm's services. Whether or not this course successfully skirted the prohibitions of the conflict of interest statutes, as the Air Force Secretary and the Air Force General Counsel insist, they seem altogether unbecoming to a high Government official.

The Radio Corporation of America case pretty well tells the whole story. According to testimony before the subcommittee by Samuel Ewing, attorney for RCA, Mr. Talbott continued to press for a contract for his management engineering concern with RCA despite the strong doubts which the RCA attorney expressed as to the legality and propriety of such a contract. Mr. Ewing asserted that Mr. Talbott cited to him a list of other defense contractors doing business with the engineering concern and wanted to know "why RCA was acting so high and mighty."

Mr. Ewing and RCA deserve warm commendation, we think, for their part in this affair. Mr. Ewing's misgivings did great credit to his acumen as a lawyer and to his integrity as a citizen. No doubt, RCA, like other major bidders for defense contracts, must have felt some temptation to cajole or propitiate the Secretary of the Air Force by throwing a bit of business in the way of a firm in which the Secretary was interested. Its resistance of that temptation set an example which other defense contractors would have done well to follow.

Report on Foreign Aid to Reclamation and Power Projects in 22 Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in the past weeks, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has carried a number of articles under the catch line, "Bananas on Pikes Peak." The newspapers, magazines, and other advertising media have also brought to our attention the belief of certain organizations, and even Members of this Congress, that it is sheer folly to appropriate tax money to build the upper Colorado storage project.

We must assume that some of these Members recognize the benefits that follow from the irrigation and reclamation of arid land, and from using the water resources to produce power, because many of them have consistently voted for large appropriations to build such projects in foreign lands. During the life of the Marshall plan, the Foreign Operations Administration, and their successor, the International Cooperation Administration, the Congress has given more than $277 million to countries in Europe, the Far East, Near East, and Africa for irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power projects. Some of the countries to receive these gifts are: Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, Austro-Germany, French Morocco, Korea, Formosa, Indochina, the Philippines, Thailand, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Liberia, Afghanistan, India, Nepal, and Pakistan.

We have given Italy more than $62 million to install steam plants and turbo generators.

We have given Formosa $24,474,000 for irrigation and hydro-power generators.

We have given Thailand more than $5.5 million for irrigation and reclamation, thermal power generation, rural power and surveys.

We have given Iran $3.4 million for dams, tunnels, wells, power, irrigation, and surveys.

We have given Lebanon $1,486,000 for water investigation in the Litani River Basin, wherever that is.

We have given Pakistan nearly $8.5 million for ground-water exploration and wells.

We have given India, who has both hands out, more than $57 million to build irrigation and power dams, and to conduct water surveys.

We have given Egypt over $2.5 million to investigate its underground water and to develop a desert range program.

There are, in all, 122 projects in foreign countries which owe their existence to appropriations from our Treasury. A complete table outlining these projects appears at pages A5151 and A5152 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under extension of remarks of the Honorable WINFIELD K. DENTON, of Indiana.

We have given these countries, and many more, a blank check on the United States Treasury, with instructions to build what they need and write a check for it, assuring them that the United States Treasury will make it good. This single phase of the foreign giveaway program has cost the people of the State of New York over $25 million, the people of Pennsylvania have been clipped to the tune of $19.5 million, and Californians have added about $20 million to the pile. It is only a small part of the $55 billion foreign-aid program we have been asked to support for the last 10 years.

Now when Egypt wishes to build a dam or install a generating plant, the Congress simply opens the Treasury and makes the funds available. No extensive survey is necessary, no plan report is required, and no congressional review is needed. We do not even demand a repayment contract, because repayment is not asked; and very little opposition is heard.

But, when a project that will develop the land and conserve the resources of America is brought to the Congress, the cry begins; and we have difficulty in getting even small appropriations for investigating and developing our own ground water supply, power facilities, and underground water wealth. As a result, our domestic stability is often sacrificed on the foreign altar.

There are certain facts about reclamation that are unassailable.

Domestic reclamation project costs are repaid to the Treasury; foreign project costs are not.

Domestic reclamation projects increase Treasury income; foreign projects do not.

Domestic reclamation projects create new United States wealth; foreign projects do not.

But, in spite of these facts, the Government has spent and given away more money to build irrigation, reclamation, power, and related projects in the far-off countries within the foreign-aid sphere than it has invested in reclamation projects within our own continental boundaries. And many Members of Congress continue to vote for these foreign projects and then vote against the projects in our own United States. It is nearly impossible to reconcile these two votes.

You might as well try to grow corn on the Sphinx.

A Plea for Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems facing this Congress and the Nation as a whole has been the problem of the conservation and utilization of our water resources. It is also one of the most controversial issues we, as legislators, are likely to meet because its solution undoubtedly depends to a large degree on interstate cooperation. This, all too often, has been greatly lacking. That this cooperation is a prime need, however, is more and more clearly recognized. As Gov. Robert B. Meyner said in a recent address before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

> Where an industrial region overlaps State boundaries, I believe the States involved should pool their resources in a combined effort to assure the full development of that region. There are city, county, and State lines. But we know that some problems overlap traditional political boundaries.

Because this speech is a real contribution to a sound approach to the problem of water conservation, I should like to include it, in full, as a part of my remarks. The speech follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. ROBERT B. MEYNER, 42D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 31, 1955

Mr. Chairman and friends, I would like to express my thanks to your president, Congressman BROOKS, for inviting me to address this luncheon of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. You have an imposing agenda to cover within the 2 days allotted for your convention, and I am gratified to know that you are again giving much of your attention to the question of whether local contributions should be required to help finance the cost of deepening the Delaware River Channel from Philadelphia to Trenton.

New Jersey's position on this question is quite clear. I have informed two subcommittees of the 84th Congress that we are unalterably opposed to the theory of local interests sharing the cost of such projects. Traditionally, the Federal Government has always borne the full cost of improving our navigable waterways. I conceive this to be sound national policy, and I know of no exception to it.

It is our conviction that the benefits from a deepened channel will be general in character and will pave the way for striking new advances in the already dynamic growth of the entire Delaware Valley. In addition to producing new wealth for the valley, a greater port for ocean traffic will also yield rich dividends for the rest of the country.

Yesterday I gave to your national projects committee a brief résumé of the reasons why we believe the 40-foot channel should be treated as a public-works project, to be financed solely by the Federal Government. Rather than bore you with a repetition of these arguments—I am sure most of you are familiar with them anyway—I would prefer to discuss with you today another problem which is also of great interest to this convention. I refer to the problem of water supply. Specifically I would like you to consider the possibilities of an integrated approach, on the part of all levels of Government, to the conservation and development of our water resources.

Since the earliest days of our history we Americans have been uniquely concerned with community growth and population figures. We are interested in new homes, new buildings, new industries. We invest heavily in the agents of expansion—in roads, bridges, railways, and port facilities. Rarely do we find a town so small that it does not have an active chamber of commerce or board of trade.

This traditional accent on growth, of course, has yielded handsome dividends in terms of our development as a nation. Without it we would never have advanced so far in realizing the potentialities of the American continent.

But it has also been a sad part of our history that, as our communities become overpopulated, our available resources are strained beyond their capacity. And we have done too little to maintain and conserve them. It is time for us to learn that we cannot survive as a nation if we continue to use up our natural resources faster than nature, with scientific aids, can replace them.

I am reminded of an analogy often used by a great conservationist with the interesting name of "Ding" Darling. He would ask his audiences if they ever played going to Jerusalem, a game also known as musical chairs. In this game the guests at a party march to music around a double row of chairs. The gimmick is that there are fewer chairs than guests. When the music stops everyone tries to sit down. But, of course, somebody generally sprawls on the floor or is left standing without a chair. Then another chair is removed, the music and marching starts again, and so on until there is only one chair left.

One hundred and fifty million people in this country have been playing the same game, except that, instead of chairs, we have been using land and water. In Europe the game has been going on for a long time, and millions of people are still looking for a chair to sit on.

Finding enough chairs to sit on calls for imagination, planning, and the adoption of good conservation practices. But often the application of these practices is difficult in a big, complex, impersonal society such as ours. Today we are members of groups so large that sometimes we don't understand all the relationships in which we are involved.

I trust you will forgive me if I draw upon our own experience in New Jersey to illustrate some aspects of this problem, particularly in the realm of interstate cooperation.

The development of adequate and new water supplies in New Jersey is traditionally a function of municipal government and private enterprise. But the State also has a vested interest. The State department of health, for example, is concerned with the public health aspects of water distributed to consumers by local purveyors. And the State public utility commission requires that the purveyors deliver the water in a satisfactory quality and quantity.

The State department of conservation and economic development also has a regulatory function, inasmuch as it controls the diversion of water for the protection of all interests concerned.

But because of periodic threats of serious water shortages, coupled with our increase in population and industrial expansion, the question arose as to whether municipalities can continue to handle the problem of an adequate water supply, or whether the State should develop sources of supply to meet the needs of local agencies.

An answer to that question has been proposed in the form of legislation authorizing the construction of 2 major water-supply projects, 1 for north Jersey at Round Valley, in Hunterdon County, and the other for south Jersey, on the Wharton tract.

Part of the Wharton tract has been purchased, but acquisition of Round Valley has been delayed by the State legislature, which set up a study commission to study the need for it.

Meanwhile, there has been some agitation for direct action on the part of several north Jersey municipalities directly affected by the water shortage. Just last weekend the State water policy and supply council was informed that six municipalities would undertake to pay for the development of Round Valley if the State legislature failed to provide the necessary funds.

I am convinced that the current confused status of our water supply is, in part, a reflection of our failures in interstate cooperation. This may appear to be an unnecessarily harsh judgment, especially to those who are opposed to Federal activity in the field of water. But the record, I believe, will support my statement. Permit me to cite, as an example, the history of Incodel—the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin.

In 1936 representatives of the States of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Delaware decided that a federally controlled river basin patterned along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority was less desirable than an interstate commission which would be supposedly responsible to the States immediately concerned.

The plan advanced by Incodel would have established a four-State authority to utilize the waters of the Delaware River. The plan would have taken 15 years to complete, and its cost was estimated in 1952 at some $550 million. The prohibitive cost was one of the factors that blocked adoption of the plan.

When it became apparent that Pennsylvania was not going to approve the program, New York City decided to act. With the support of New York State, the city in 1952 asked the Supreme Court for permission to take 360 million gallons a day from the Delaware River. This was in addition to 440 million gallons which the Supreme Court had authorized back in 1931.

The neighboring States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania protested. But last year the Supreme Court granted New York City's request, with the proviso that the city must release sufficient water from its reservoirs during periods of dry weather to maintain certain minimum flows in the lower Delaware.

The Supreme Court decision also gave New Jersey the right to divert 100 million gallons of water a day out of the Delaware, provided that Pennsylvania enacted certain legislation and Congress approves the building of dams along the Delaware.

The decision gave Pennsylvania the right to build a dam in the Delaware River between Pennsylvania and New Jersey near Wallpeck Bend, and a diversion dam in the Delaware near Yardley, Pa. If and when Pennsylvania builds the Wallpack Bend Reservoir, New Jersey would have the right to utilize 30 percent of the developed water supply, provided that we pay 30 percent of the cost of the project.

The practical effect of the order was to persuade the State and city of New York that they could get along without the aid of Incodel. And the decision has left some unhappiness among its original sponsors.

With the cooperation of Governor Leader of Pennsylvania and Governor Harriman of new York, we in New Jersey will certainly give every consideration to the possibility of revising the original Incodel proposal.

Where an industrial region overlaps State boundaries, I believe the States involved should pool their resources in a combined effort to assure the full development of that region. There are city, county, and State lines. But we know that some problems overlap traditional political boundaries.

In an area where the interests of many communities are interrelated, it is only commonsense to think in terms of a broad interstate framework within which we can work out our own plans of development.

I am aware that a discussion of so broad a topic is likely to raise more questions than it does answers. But I am sure this convention will produce an exchange of provocative ideas and information which will lead to new approaches for coping with the problem.

Commemorative Stamp in Honor of Chief John Ross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp in honor of Chief John Ross.

Chief John Ross was the leader of the Cherokee Indian Tribe from 1826 to 1866. The activities of Chief Ross and his family have made an indelible imprint on a number of States of the Union. My home city of Chattanooga is founded on the site of what was known for many years as Ross' Landing. This landing was the site of Ross' store and Ross' warehouse. The store was established before 1810.

Because of the close association of Chief John Ross and the Cherokee Indians with the establishment of Chattanooga there has been a great deal of interest developed to find some means of properly recognizing his contributions to American history.

Miss Zella Armstrong and a group of interested Chattanooga citizens have purchased a statue of John Ross and plan to dedicate it this fall. Present scheduling indicates that it will be dedicated on October 3, 1955. Accordingly, my bill will provide that the first day of issue of the Chief John Ross stamp will be October 3, 1955, at Chattanooga, Tenn.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise my remarks, I include a statement covering the activities and life of Chief John Ross taken from a printed history of Hamilton County, Tenn.:

CHIEF JOHN ROSS

John Ross, principal chief of the Cherokee Nation for 40 years, is one of the most interesting characters in American history. He served his people in public life for 57 years; from the time he was 19 years of age until his death. The history of the Cherokee Nation during this period is synonymous with his history, and the continued confidence which the Cherokee people displayed toward him, even when he was humiliatted and discredited by the white men, was a tribute to his character.

His nephew, Joshua Ross, wrote the following letter which gives many details of his life and character:

"John Ross was born October 3, 1790. He died in Washington, D. C., August 1, 1866, while representing the Cherokee Nation.

"He was a grandson of John McDonald, an Indian trader who was a member of Clan MacDonald Inverness, Scotland. His grandmother was Anna Shorey, of the Cherokee Bird Clan.

"The good influence of John McDonald saved many American lives during the Revolution, and after the War, from the hands of the Spanish and English and the Indian warriors in the valleys and mountains of Tennessee.

"It is said that he saved the life of Daniel Ross, of Sutherlandshire, Scotland, who crossed the ocean when he was a boy. His mother died on the water and was buried at sea. The orphan boy landed at Baltimore, Md. When he wass a little older he joined Mayberry's Trading Expedition and set out for the Tennessee country.

"John McDonald made young Ross a clerk in the trading house which he had established, and in time gave him his daughter, Mollie McDonald, for a bride.

"Daniel Ross became a merchant and trader like his father-in-law and when his children were of school age he employed a teacher and conducted a private school for his children, the third of whom was the afterward famous chief, John Ross.

"At the age of 19 (1809) John Ross was intrusted with an important mission. He was sent by Col. Return Jonathan Meigs—United States Agent to the Cherokees—to the Western Cherokees, who were then located at the Dardenelle Rock on the Arkansas River.

"From that period to the close of his life, excepting 2 or 3 years, he was in the constant service of his people, furnishing an instance of confidence on their part and fidelity on his which has never been surpassed in the annals of history.

"In 1813 and 1814 he was adjutant of the Cherokee Regiment under General Andrew Jackson against the hostile Creeks. He was present at the battle of Te-ho-pe-ka, where the Cherokee Regiment under Col. Gideon Morgan rendered distinguished aid.

"In 1817 he was elected senator to the National Council of the Cherokee Nation. His first duty was to prepare a reply to the United States Commissioners who were present for the purpose of negotiating with the Cherokees for their land east of the Mississippi River.

"On the 26th day of October 1818, the name of John Ross appears as president of the Cherokee Senate attached to an ordinance which looked to the improvement of the Cherokee people, providing as it did for the introduction into the nation of schoolteachers, blacksmiths, merchants, and others. John Ross continued to act as president of the Cherokee Senate from that time until 1826.

"In 1827 he was assistant chief and president of the convention which adopted the constitution for the Cherokee Nation. This was the first constitution for regular government ever carried into effect by any Indians of North America.

"From 1828 to the removal of the Nation he was the principal chief of the Eastern Cherokees, and from 1839 to the time of his death he was principal chief of the United Cherokee Nation.

"William P. Ross, his nephew, said of him: 'Blessed with a fine constitution and a vigorous mind, John Ross had the physical ability to follow the path of duty wherever it led. No danger appalled him. He never faltered in supporting what he believed to be right, but clung to it with a steadiness of purpose which could have sprung only from the clearest conviction of rectitude. He never sacrificed the interest of the Nation to expediency. He never lost sight of the welfare of his people. For them he labored daily during a long life and upon them he bestowed his last expressed thoughts. A friend of law, he obeyed it; a friend of education, he faithfully encouraged schools throughout his country and spent liberally of his means in conferring it upon others; given to hospitality, none ever hungered around his door; a professor of the Christian religion, he practiced its precepts. His works are inseparable from the history of the Cherokee people for nearly half a century, while his example in the daily walks of life will linger in the future and whisper words of hope, temperance, and charity to generations yet to come.'"

Draft of a Statement Issued by the Committee for Aiding the Defense of the Bern Young Anti-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a statement issued by the Committee for Aiding the Defense of the Bern Young Anti-Communists which was furnished me by Mr. Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Rumanians. The Members will recall that these are the four Rumanians who for a short time seized and occupied the Rumanian Communist Legation in Bern last February. I understand their trial is to take place in Switzerland in the near future:

The Soviets' barbaric tyranny in Eastern Europe and their ruthless subversive methods in the free world, have not yet been able to crush the spirit of anti-Communist resistance on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The slave labor camps, deportations, mass massacres all over the Red prison of nations, the assassinations in the Katyn Forest and all the other crimes against freedom and human dignity, which are going on even today, have not extinguished that burning flame of resistance in Eastern Europe, nor has the new campaign, waged by the Soviets among the exiles, of intimidation through blackmail and murder, shaken the faith and determination of the refugees.

But this overwhelming criminal pressure brought to bear both on the captive peoples themselves and on the escapees, has driven them to the verge of despair. Two years ago the despondent people of East Berlin attacked with their bare hands the oppressor; this year young anti-Communist refugees rising in utter desperation, raided a Communist Legation in Bern, Switzerland, exposing its subversive activities. These explosions of the strangled urge for freedom should be taken into serious consideration as they are warning signals of a general situation and not just isolated cases. In fact incidents such as that of Bern, are the expression of the deep instability, misery, and tension created by the Soviet aggressive intrusion in the free countries of the Eastern part of Europe and by the shortsighted indifference shown by the free world. After long years of Soviet despotism and Western abandonment, these people are reaching the end of their tether.

Moscow is at this precise moment waging a powerful propaganda campaign to recruit among the unsettled, bitter and frustrated refugees, those desperate enough to accept repatriation with assurances of forgiveness and good jobs. The real aim of the Soviets in this maneuver is to get a corps of anti-Western, especially anti-American propagandists, as being direct witnesses of the failure of the West in dealing effectively with the problem of those who had chosen freedom. There is no doubt that the Soviets badly need new instruments of propaganda to keep down the fermenting discontent behind the Iron Curtain and to kill the ever renascent hope in the West. But neither is there much doubt that the program for handling the refugee problem is clearly inadequate.

There is therefore a most urgent need to strengthen the badly strained morale of both the enslaved and the refugees. We are upholding this cause as being of vital importance in the battle for men's minds. We must give comfort and encouragement to those who, fighting for freedom, are serving as well the best interests of the United States. Such are the young patriots in the Bern incident who courageously tore off the mask of Red diplomacy. They are awaiting trial in Switzerland and we are sure that the Swiss courts will grant them a fair trial in accordance with their laws, product of a life of freedom and normalcy. But our purpose is especially to draw the attention of the public to the tragic background of the abnormal existence of terror and enslavement in which lies the motivation of their action.

The Soviet subjugated peoples have no longer the possibility to express their will, as they are the object of the most intolerant totalitarian rule. The technically legal facade, such as constitutions on the Soviet pattern, peace treaties, diplomatic relations, etc., corresponds in no way with the rights and free will of the people. As a matter of fact the people are deprived of all normal legal channels of expressing their feelings or defending their interests. As it has happened in the significant moments of history under such circumstances, the natural inalienable rights of man are asserted by the

resistance to oppression. The people, seeing that all legitimate juridical ways of defending their liberties have been denied them, are making use of the means forced on them by the very slavery to which they have been reduced, namely passive resistance, sabotage and direct action. The incident in Bern is due to this tragic situation in which the victims of tyranny are compelled to make use of their sacred right to resist oppression.

It is tyranny, persecution and the fake legality of totalitarian conformism, which push people to insurrection, rebellion and violence. It is indeed by now established that the "law" in the Soviet orbit is the mere instrument of absolute dictatorship. The American people as inheritors of the Declaration of Independence feel deeply that the honor and dignity of the captive peoples are not in their comformity to this fake Communist legality but in their very acts of revolt and violence against the oppressor. This is the real and dramatic background which caused the action of the young exiles in Bern. Aiding in their defense by giving them our moral support, we recognize the spirit of resistance and self sacrifice which animates them and all their like behind the Iron Curtain.

We appeal to our public to give its traditional understanding to these brave young men who, in their fight for freedom, lost both home and country, and thus bring a message of encouragement and hope to all our secret allies, the captive peoples.

Polish Primate's Fate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barrer Times-Leader of July 26, 1955:

POLISH PRIMATE'S FATE

While Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty has been "temporarily" released by the Hungarian Communist regime, the fate of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski Primate of Poland, continues a mystery. A certain number of imprisoned priests and a few Bishops have been released in Poland, but the majority, and with them Cardinal Wyszynski, have not regained their liberty. Moreover, it is said that the Communist Warsaw regime is putting pressure on the Cardinal to have him adopt a conciliatory attitude toward communism.

The matter was discussed by Federico Alessandrini in Osservatore Romano in an article headlined, "Where is Cardinal Wyszynski?" The article mentions rumors about Cardinal Wysznski's severe illness and operation. Alessandrini adds that rumors also have it that the Cardinal is being subjected to pressure and cajolery in order to induce him to make a declaration that Catholicism in Poland enpoys full freedom.

In connection with the Osservatore Romano article, it is worth recalling that rumors concerning Communist efforts to break Cardinal Wyszynski's resistance reached the West at the end of the winter. At first, the Communist provocateurs are said to have made the following proposal: Primate Wyszynski will be released immediately if he goes straight from his prison to the airport and leaves for Rome, where he will take up residence. The primate categorically refused.

Now it is said they propose to set him free and allow him to return to his diocese, conditioned on his issuing a declaration that his former enunciations concerning the persecution of the church in Poland did not take into consideration the picture of Poland's reality as a whole and that now, having taken everything into consideration, he can declare that the church in Poland is not persecuted and that there is complete religious freedom.

The true reason for all these different Communist approaches lies in their fear of setting him free and of the enthusiastic reception he would get from the people of Poland. This prompted them first to suggest that he leave Poland, and now that he issue a declaration which would greatly weaken his prestige among the faithful. Incidentally, such a declaration would serve as a propaganda weapon to convince Catholics abroad religious freedom exists in Poland.

Military Program Half Finished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 10 years the military services of this Nation has suffered repeated cutbacks and reductions in the traditional benefits that heretofore had been recognized as essential to good morale and esprit de corps.

As a result, career service in the military lost much of its attractiveness for officers and enlisted personnel. Reenlistment rates reached a record low last year. Cadet and officer resignations were at a high peak.

The trend was finally reversed by Congress last year. Household goods shipping limits were increased. The Warrant Officer Act and Reserve Officers Promotion Act corrected inequities in certain ranks. Restrictions on promotions and resignations were eased. A reenlistment bonus was approved. The Housing Act gave career personnel attractive terms for buying houses, similar to GI benefits, and 11,000 new homes were authorized for on-base family housing.

This session of Congress has produced additional legislation of benefit to the services. The Career Incentive Act of 1955 gave much-needed pay increases and substantial pay adjustments at critical points in career military service. Hazardous-duty pay and other special benefits were also added. The national Reserve plan, to greatly strengthen the Reserve forces, was enacted. Seventeen thousand additional houses were authorized for military families.

The House of Representatives, to date, has passed two highly desirable bills to further improve career military service. The Survivors Benefits Act will be a major step in assuring career service. A special retirement income-tax exemption has also passed. Both of these bills await action in the Senate.

Much credit for support of this legislation must go to the various organizations interested in improving our military posture. The Retired Officers Association, Fleet Reserve Association, Navy League, Reserve Officers Association, and many such groups have been instrumental in organizing support for beneficial legislation we have passed.

But we must not stop with the job half done. Much more legislation is needed, particularly in the field of medical care for dependents and military housing. The investments we make now in building a long-range career military structure will pay off in better defense and more efficiency.

An enlightening editorial on this subject appeared in the New York Times on July 27, 1955. Under unanimous consent, I include it as a portion of my remarks:

FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Some measures to improve military morale and to increase the attractiveness of a military career have been enacted at this session of Congress. Service pay has been increased; a $254 million housing plan for 17,000 service homes has been approved, and other needed legislation has been passed.

But the "package program" envisaged by the Pentagon as an important part of the process of revitalizing the regulars and making the services desirable careers has by no means been completed. One of the most important pieces of legislation—the survivors benefits bill, which liberalizes survivors' pensions, eliminates inequities and replaces an obsolete complex of out-of-date legislation with a single law—has been passed by the House but not by the Senate. Various plans to standardize, improve and insure medical care of service dependents have been studied, but no action has been taken. A bill to eliminate a discriminatory provision of the Internal Revenue Act, which operates only against retired military personnel, is still languishing in the Senate. A bill which would credit cadet and midshipman service (at the service academies) as active duty service for longevity pay purposes has had no congressional action, athough this legislation, sponsored by the Department of Defense, simply eliminates an existing discrimination against the regular career officer.

The current session of Congress is approaching its 11th hour. Another year's delay in the enactment of legislation vital to the services can result only in the loss to the Nation of many valuable and irreplaceable officers and noncoms. The military career legislation now pending should be enacted before Congress adjourns.

Aid for FDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 24, entitled "Aid for FDA." I am calling this to the attention of the Members in order to emphasize the great need for increasing the appropriations of the Food and Drug Administration. The article follows:

AID FOR FDA

Until the Federal Food and Drug Administration stepped on the scene, Americans had none to blow the whistle on unscrupulous food and drug makers who turned out products unsafe for public consumption. Since then, however, the FDA agents have done a first-rate job of policing the food and drug industries—within the limits of their ability.

Last month, however, a 14-man citizens' survey group announced that the FDA is woefully understaffed to do the big job cut out for it. The committee, whose chairman was G. Cullen Thomas, vice president of General Mills, knew the field in which FDA works and the problems with which it must cope.

Its members urged that FDA's modest budget be stepped up threefold to fourfold in the next 5 to 10 years. Last year, Congress gave it $5,100,000. The commission urged that this sum be increased 10 to 20 percent in the new fiscal year.

Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, St. Louis Democrat, has introduced a bill that would carry out this recommendation. In the past, Congress hasn't leaned over backward to give the FDA the money it needs to carry out its job of protecting the public. The House should give the Sullivan bill the green light it merits.

Russia Spends $2 Billion on Exporting Culture, an Amount 700 Times Greater Than the Amount Spent by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Russian Government has spent $2 billion on international theater exchange since the end of World War II, while the United States has spent less than $3 million.

The Senate this week appropriated the full budget estimate of $6 million for the President's emergency fund for international affairs, a step recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Senate committee, whose chairman is the great CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona in its report to the Senate urged that hereafter this item be presented in the regular budget estimate.

I join with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, in hoping that the Senate-House conference committee will abide by the Senate's decision and provide the full budget request for the export of American culture.

I include a number of relevant articles on the success of our cultural export program to date:

[From the Saturday Review of July 30, 1955]

AMERICAN CULTURE FOR EXPORT

The conception held abroad in almost every country that the United States is undoubtedly a fabulously wealthy nation but that it lacks any of the cultural aspects of life is rapidly disappearing. That it has lasted so long has been our own fault, for until this year we have done little or nothing to put an end to it. Even a nation so enlightened as France has judged us by the motion pictures we have sent abroad, by translations of our novels, and by the more lurid aspects of American life revealed in our newspapers. Frenchmen may have admired Hollywood's lavish technique, but films have given the impression that our people live in gaudy mansions, behave like gangsters, drive around the country in enormous automobiles. Europeans may have recognized that our foremost writers deserved the acclaim they have received, but they knew the South only through William Faulkner's novels, the Middle West as it was interpreted by Sinclair Lewis and later neonaturalists, and the Far West through John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath.

Our first attempt to present a different aspect of American culture was launched in January by ANTA, the American National Theatre Academy, sponsored by our State Department, and hailed by President Eisenhower, who predicted that it would be of vast significance to the cause of friendship and understanding between the people of America and Western Europe. Most of the funds necessary for the project were raised from private sources. Known as Salute to France, ANTA offered a 2-month program—the theater, the ballet, the Philadelphia Orchestra, and an exhibition of 50 years of American art which drew an average daily attendance of 2,500 people.

"Salute to France" closed on July 7 after 2 successful months, headlined by Judith Anderson in her favorite role in Medea, the Rogers and Hammerstein musical, "Oklahoma, Thornton Wilder's The Skin of Our Teeth, the New York City Ballet directed by George Balanchine, and three concerts of the Philadelphia Orchestra conducted by Eugene Ormandy. This large and expensive enterprise has indeed exceeded the hopes of its founders. It was a magnificent answer to anti-Americanism, which as Robert Sherwood said "has drenched the people of Europe with propaganda, first by the Nazis and then by the Communists, an answer which says in effect, 'the Americans have money, they have power, but they are uncultured barbarians'."

"Salute to France" was conceived in June of last year. A letter had come to the attention of ANTA through diplomatic channels stating that the Minister of Fine Arts of France had suggested to Ambassador C. Douglas Dillon that in the spring of 1955 America might stage a great festival of the arts in Paris. ANTA was at the same time informed that our Government had no funds available for so expensive a project, but was asked politely if it would assume the responsibility of raising the necessary funds and directing the entire festival. The French Government offered to provide the necessary theatres, fully staffed, and without charge.

To the average American it might appear that since the United States Government has spent billions of dollars to revive the economy of many foreign nations, it might be induced to hallmark a few hundreds of thousands of dollars to continue a venture which has proved its value. Indeed, President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message to Congress last year proposed the establishment of a Federal Arts Commission to encourage artistic endeavors. "In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish," he said, "the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities."

It would seem to be reasonable that, if his idea is accepted by the Government, part of the necessary funds should be used to send examples of American art and culture to every country where it would be acceptable. But whether or not his suggestion is accepted, ANTA's foreign venture in Paris and elsewhere has led to worldwide cultural efforts. The Gershwin-Du Bose Heyward operetta, after a tour in Yugoslavia, Greece, and the Near East, opened in the Municipal Theatre in Rio De Janeiro on July 9, where it was received, according to The New York Times, with "thunderous applause." It was also the greatest social event of the season. Last May the Symphony of the Air ended a triumphant tour of the major cities of Japan. According to a press report a Japanese critic wrote that he did not believe there have been any musicians from abroad "who have so successfully grasped the heart-strings of the Japanese people." Thousands of people lined up at box-offices a day in advance, sleeping on the ground wrapped in quilts. The musicians were flown to Okinawa and Korea. This was only the beginning of the Symphony's Far Eastern tour, which was extended two weeks to play in Bangkok, Singapore, Colombo, Kaula Lampur, Manila, and Hong Kong. The tour was sponsored by ANTA's Exchange Program.

A conception which has in so short a time proved that other nations, aside from Russia, are eager to know more of American culture, that they will welcome our actors, dancers, and musicians, will applaud them if they deserve it and treat them handsomely in the press, should be given every opportunity to expand and to prove once and for all time that we do not deserve the reputation of being a country without culture of any significance. The day may come when Russia and the United States will exchange their art, their drama, music, and ballet. The revelation of their different cultures may prove to be a better key to co-existence than armies and atomic weapons.

[From Department of State Bulletin No. 6, July 20]

SAO PAULO, *July 20, 1955.*

To: Secretary of State.
From: McArdle.
Re Department's Circular 13, July 7.

Porgy and Bess opened Sao Paulo, July 16, overwhelming success.

Quotations critics:

O Estado de Sao Paulo: "Opening of Porgy and Bess undoubtedly marked high point of the artistic season—Porgy and Bess is the true tradition of opera, born within the theater—a miracle that would not be possible without the truly exceptional technical progress of the North American theater—if some day opera should have a rebirth, critics are beginning to realize that it will be in the United States—not only an extraordinary and unforgettable spectacle but equally a work of art—everyone has something to admire and to learn in Porgy and Bess: The musician, the scenarist, the actor, the choreographer, the poet, the technician—it is for the people; it is the richest and most imaginative entertainment one could desire."

Correio Paulistano: "A marvelous spectacle."

Folha da Manha: "The (theater) Santana is living sweet moments with the Gershwin opera."

Ultima Hora: "As we expected Porgy and Bess impressed us greatly—a spectacle not to be missed."

Noticias de Hoje (columnist): "A finished production of high-technical standard, presenting good voices and interpretations, dances, and direction worthy of unrestricted applause. What is to be lamented is the fact that Gershwin did not live long enough to ripen his art and prove the feasibility of a national opera, based on the different aspects of the life of the North American people. The deep divergence and irremediable antagonism existent between these very people, anxious for emancipation, economically and politically, and the Government of the United States, openly and rigidly subordinated to the interests of imperialist capital, does not prevent our accepting in friendly fashion, an

opera that, in spite of innumerable limitations, is undoubtedly an authentic work."

[From Department of State Bulletin No. 6, July 13]

KUALA LUMPUR, *July 13, 1955.*

To: Secretary of State.

Re Symphony of Air appearances Malaya:

Press and public loud in praise of performances and Government support cultural attractions. Letter to editor Straits Times, June 23 "will the United States give us more? I wish to thank the State Department of the United States for making possible the concerts by the Symphony of the Air for the public of Singapore. It is a pity that the American flag was not displayed behing the orchestra to remind the listeners that we were all enjoying the beautiful music through the courtesy of the United States Government. If the policy of the United States is to encourage a better understanding and good will in Asia, this was one of the important steps toward the goal. We hope that this will be only the beginning of the display of American cultural progress."

Headline Singapore Standard, June 21, "School Children Listen Spellbound to Hendl's Symphony of the Air." Malaya Mail editorial June 22, "A Welcome Visit. The visit of the American symphony orchestra to Kuala Lumpur was more than being an outstanding event in the cultural life of the town and immediate area. To begin with it was a first-hand demonstration of good international relations and was evidence, if evidence is needed that in cultural as in many other directions there is more that unites us than divides us. The orchestra itself while comprising American citizens drew on a dozen or more countries of origin evidence again that those who take a fatalistic attitude toward racial problems (which can arise as easily in the West as in the East) can prove wrong. Good as it is for growing Kuala Lumpur—growing in maturity as well as size—to have a visit of the size and importance of the Symphony of the Air yet it has to be remembered that the financial implications are by no means simple. Despite the by no means trifling charges of admission to the Chinwoo on Monday night the takings will fall very short of the expenses involved and Kuala Lumpur folk who had a good evening's entertainment must not forge the substantial subsidy which came from friendly but foreign taxpayers."

Singapore Standard, June 23. Editorial "Musical History: Musical history was made in Malaya with the performances in Singapore and the Federation by the New York Symphony of the Air orchestra during their all too brief tour of this country. The ovation which this company of 92 musicians received at every concert is a tribute to their contribution to the world of music. Music lovers, and even those to whom 'high brow' music is not so palatable, came away from the concerts wishing that they could have sat and listened on and on for many more hours." Straits Times, June 22: "Chenwu Hall rocked by lusty applause * * * Tired Hendl gives an encore." Malaya Mail, June 21: "Eastern audiences inspire musicians." Full reports and press clippings already dispatched.

[From the Dallas Times Herald of July 4, 1955]

BEWILDERED BY FAR EAST TOUR, HENDL SEES A RETURN POSSIBLE

SAN FRANCISCO, July 4.—Dallas Symphony Conductor Walter Hendl returned to America Sunday, weary from the pace of a 9-week Far East tour that took him some 40,000 miles with the famed Symphony of the Air, but jubilant over the reception given the orchestra throughout the Orient.

He described the enthusiasm of the symphony's Asian audiences as "almost unbelievable," adding:

"Music is a food for Asians—something they cannot seem to get enough of. In Japan, for instance, we could have played to full houses every night for a year's time. It was the same wherever we went."

NINE COUNTRIES

Hendl said that the symphony drew audiences numbering from 4,000 to 20,000 in 9 Asian countries—Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore, Malaya, and Ceylon.

"Five thousand children came to hear us in Colombo, Ceylon," he said, "and some of them had come as far as 250 miles by bus.

"In Seoul, Korea, 14,000 Koreans came to hear us. Another 3,000 crashed police lines and nearly turned over my car, trying to get autographs. I had to change clothes and sneak out in disguise later. And this had to do with music, not just me. The fourth clarinet player got the same treatment."

WEST MEETS EAST

Hendl said the symphony played standard Western symphonic music throughout the Far East tour bringing it to Asian audiences for the first time in a majority of cases.

He said that in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya, for instance, a city he described as a "fabulous place—a city in the middle of a jungle"—the symphony played Beethoven, Brahms, and Tchaikovsky, "and the audience went wild."

Hendl said he was just beginning to put the Far East tour—his second in 2 years—into perspective.

POWERFUL VOICE

"But here is something I have got out of it," he said. "In the East—the Orient—the making of music is just beginning. I believe that in the 20th century the arts will establish themselves as a powerful voice in the understanding of peoples.

"In the making of music, we were friends. There was a closeness there that I believe has not been established over the diplomatic tables."

Hendl said that a return visit to Asia was very possible late in the summer, before he opens his seventh season with the Dallas Symphony, the second week in November, but the idea has not yet thoroughly jelled. He would travel alone in that event and conduct Asian symphonies.

CHAUTAUQUA NEXT

First, however, he is booked for 24 summer concerts at Chautauqua, N. Y., July 16 through August 26.

Hendl arrived at Travis Airbase, north of San Francisco, from Japan early Sunday and then motored to San Francisco where he planned to spend "at least a couple" of days. He said he had not yet made specific arrangements but would probably head eastward to Dallas later in the week.

"First," he said, "I have to get some sleep."

[From Time magazine of July 18, 1955]

SYMPHONY IN THE AIR

Back in the United States last week was a 92-man team of ambassadors to the Far East. Behind the Symphony of the Air lay a 42-concert tour of Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaya and Ceylon that endowed the United States with musical glory and cultural good will, and provided the indefatigable 92 with 8 weeks of experiences that will give them anecdotes for years.

They flew the 30,000 miles mostly aboard Military Air Transport Service and Air Force planes. Unpressurized cabins brought ear trouble. There was a running gag of one violinist asking his neighbor, "How did I play tonight? I couldn't hear myself." One flight, between Tokyo and Seoul, ran into a storm so Wagnerian that everyone but Director Don Gillis became violently ill. Gillis, with an oxygen tank but no mask, dashed up and down the plane spraying groaning musicians in the face with oxygen. "It may or may not have helped," he says.

UNSTUCK

Far Eastern atmospherics were punishing to Western instruments—and instrumentalists. The glued parts of viols and woodwinds regularly came unstuck; humidity snapped the strings of three violas during Beethoven's Eroica in Ceylon. The heat could untune a piano half a tone in 2 hours and rot a dress suit in a matter of days. In Bangkok, with a temperature of 105° onstage and no fans, United States Ambassador John Peurifoy came backstage to insist that the men take off their white jackets. After that they often played in shirtsleeves, delicately abandoning suspenders in favor of belts. In Manila an enthusiast presented them with sport shirts decorated with pictures of Maestro Arturo Toscanini, who trained the orchestra (as the NBC Symphony), and left in the spring of 1954.

As the tour progressed, the musicians, in Panama hats, sport shirts, and shorts, began to look less and less like a symphony orchestra. Most of them bought cameras and camera equipment in the PX's; some went about festooned with 3 cameras. So avid was the search for souvenirs that the airplane pilots would kid them: "Just tell us the next time you guys are going to buy another 2,000 pounds of stuff so we can get lighter by feathering the props."

CONVERTED

Everywhere the reception was enthusiastic—even from people who had never heard live Western music, e. g., the Okinawans, who kept moving their heads to see where each new sound was coming from. In one community, between Kobe and Osaka, Conductor Walter Hendl, 38, stepping outside between numbers for a breath of air, discovered hundreds of Japanese who had been unable to get in standing with their ears pressed to the wall.

"I'm going back," said Pianist Hendl last week. "Probably before the end of this year I'm going back by myself. Whatever I am capable of contributing to Eastern culture in the way of Western music, I want to contribute. The tour we just concluded clearly affirms something I've always believed: that the greatest of music, which transmits the greatest of human messages, is understood everywhere."

Wheat or Controlled Acreage for Feed and Seed Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include letters of Secretary Ezra Taft Benson and Mr. Peterson relative to growing wheat on controlled acres for the purpose of feed and seed without being subject to the penalty provisions of the present agriculture act:

SECRETARY BENSON ISSUES STATEMENT ON WHEAT QUOTA VOTE

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 26, 1955.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today issued the following statement concerning the action of wheat growers in approving marketing quotas on 1956 production in the national referendum of June 25:

"Approval of marketing quotas on 1956 wheat production by more than the required majority of wheat growers voting in Saturday's referendum means that the level of support for next year's crop will be at not less than 76 percent of parity, or $1.81 per bushel, national average. To be eligible for this price support, farmers are required by law to plant within their acreage allotments. While approval of marketing quotas will undoubtedly result in substantially smaller 1956 wheat production than otherwise would have been the case, the problem of accumulated wheat stocks remains an extremely serious one. The United States wheat carryover on July 1 of this year is estimated to be a record 1,030,000,000 bushels, with virtually all of it owned by the Government. The indicated wheat harvest for 1955 will bring total supplies to a level high enough to meet domestic demands, plus foreseeable exports, for more than 2 full years.

"In this situation, the Department will continue its several programs aimed at achieving maximum practicable exports of wheat and flour.

"In order to improve the quality of wheat produced and reduce controls over production and utilization, the Department intends to:

"1. Undertake to place in effect upon the 1956 wheat crop appropriate discounts in price suports for certain designated varieties of wheat, especially those suitable primarily for feed purposes, in an effort to improve the quality of the wheat crop.

"2. Continue efforts to secure favorable congressional action authorizing the Secretary to broaden the noncommercial wheat area. In this area growers are not subject to acreage control. Supports are set at 75 percent of the rates within commercial areas.

"3. Continue efforts to secure favorable congressional action on legislation now before the Congress to exempt wheat growers from marketing-quota penalties if all the wheat produced on their farms is used for feed or seed on the farms where produced.

"4. Request legislative extension of special durum acreage provisions for the 1956 crop. Despite the excessive stocks of wheat, available supplies of durum wheat, used mainly for spaghetti and macaroni, are expected to continue short.

"5. Give special consideration in the months ahead to programs which will further encourage farmers to make needed adjustments in their pattern of land use. This would be both on land ill-suited to crop production and on better lands where it would be advantageous to shift a part of the acreage to hay and pasture. The program now being developed for the Great Plains is an example of this."

At a meeting in Algona, Iowa, on October 7, 1954, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson made the following remarks regarding the question of production controls for wheat which is grown by farmers for feeding on their own farms:

"You may have read recently of farmers who protest acreage limitations on the production of wheat which they are growing for feed. Many of these farmers want no price support on their wheat or other crops; they feel that they should be permitted to grow wheat for feed on their own farms without acreage limitations and without penalty.

"I am sympathetic to this point of view, but the law is clear and its constitutionality was upheld in Wickard against Filburn (317 U. S. 111 (1942)). When marketing quotas for wheat had been voted, those who harvest wheat in excess of their allotments are subject to penalty, whether they sell their wheat in the market or whether they feed it on their farms. I have pledged to administer the law, and I shall do so to the best of my ability.

"I urge farmers to comply with the law as it now exists.

"But when Congress next convenes, I hope they will review this provision of the law which was enacted about 13 years ago. It has been the law ever since. In preparation for any review by Congress I am seeking advice on what changes are practical so as to permit the production of wheat for feed, wthout penalty, if no wheat is sold and farmers do not desire price support on other crops.

"It is the objective of this administration that farmers be permitted to operate their farms with a maximum of freedom. It was this objective which led me to recommend the relaxation of the total acreage allotments to help meet drought conditions. We will enlarge the area of freedom and responsibility in the operation of our farms whenever this can be done without impairing the effective functioning of our farm programs."

JULY 1, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On June 25 the wheat farmers of the United States voted to continue marketing controls as provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The Department of Agriculture believes that the law could be amended to improve the wheat program in certain instances and therefore recommend congressional action as follows:

1. We recommend that the present exemption of durum wheat be extended 1 year. There has been a shortage of this type of wheat and the liberalized allotment will help meet the need for increased production. Public Law 8 signed by the President February 19 was for 1 year only.

2. We aagin recommend enactment of the legislation that is now before the House Agriculture Committee that will exempt wheat growers from marketing quota penalties if all of the wheat produced on their farm is used for food, feed, or seed on the farms where produced. This "feed wheat" provision would remove a program inequitay and permit greater freedom of operation on those many farms that do not produce wheat for sale. S. 46 has been passed by the Senate.

When passed by the House we recommend including food use along with feed and seed. There are farms and institutions where wheat is produced and milled locally for consumption on the farm or in the institution where grown.

3. We recommend legislation that will authorize expansion of the non-commercial wheat areas beyond the 12 States now in this classification. This would provide greater flexibility in "marginal" regions where wheat is not a major crop. There are bills now pending that include this provision.

4. We recommend that the Congress give consideration to legislation that would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of not to exceed 100 million bushels annually of low grade wheat for feed at prices 10 percent above the support price for corn.

Closely associated with the above recommendations, but not needing legislation, is the Department of Agriculture's study of the effect upon 1956 wheat crops if discounts for price supports for certain designated varieties of wheat, especially those suitable primarily for feed purposes, are put into effect in an effort to improve the quality of the wheat crop. These discounts, as well as quality premiums recognized in the past, can be imposed by administrative regulation and legislation is not necessary. However, we would welcome legislation such as is now pending in S. 2125.

Also, the Department is moving ahead with a program to encourage farmers to make needed adjustments in their pattern of land use. This could be on both land ill suited to crop production and on better lands where it would be advantageous to shift a part of the acreage to hay and pasture. This will be helpful in carrying out the long-range program in the Great Plains as well as other programs.

The Bureau of the Budget advises there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 22, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to invite your attention again to the urgent need for immediate consideration by your committee of H. R. 1834 and other bills to exempt certain wheat producers from marketing quota penalties under the Agricultural Act of 1938 in cases where all of the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, commencing with the 1955 crop.

As you know, the Senate on March 28 passed S. 46, which is identical with H. R. 1834. It is my understanding that these measures, together with several other bills which seek to accomplish similar ends, have been referred to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture under the chairmanship of Representative CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma. It is my further understanding that the subcommittee has decided to take no action on any of the bills at this session but to hold hearings on them this fall.

May I respectfully suggest that an intolerable situation is developing with respect to assessment of wheat marketing quota penalties? With certain exceptions, farmers who produce wheat in excess of their quotas are subject to marketing penalties currently set at $1.13 per bushel. Penalties have already been collected from many farmers who exceeded their 1954 production quotas. However, instances where farmers are refusing to pay, necessitating suits to collect penalties on the 1954 wheat crop, are being reported at an increasing rate.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that there may be as many as 1,500 cases this year, involving production of wheat in 1954, which will require legal action. Unless suits are filed to collect these penalties, it appears certain that there will be many more violations in 1955 which would normally come up for legal action sometime after completion of the 1955 harvest.

In many cases farmers who seek to avoid penalties plead that their wheat was not sold in interstate commerce, that they did not want price support, and that all of the wheat was used for feed or seed on the farm. Under the holding in *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111 (1942)), the farmer is liable whether the wheat is fed or sold if he exceeds his acreage allotment unless the planted acreage of wheat does not exceed 15 acres or an acreage from which the normal production does not exceed 200 bushels.

Another unusual example which has come to our attention involves a monastery in Georgia. The monastery has followed the policy of producing the wheat necessary for food at the monastery. None of the wheat is sold. The amount required for 1954 was in excess of the marketing quota. The monastery now finds itself liable to the Government for a penalty of $1.13 per bushel on the excess.

I doubt that Congress contemplated situations such as this arising under the penalty provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938. I would strongly recommend that the legislation now before your committee be amended so as to exempt additionally from marketing penalties producers who grow wheat for food consumption on the farm.

I have said on many occasions that I believed the present law should be amended

along the lines of the bills now before your committee respecting marketing quota penalties on wheat where the poduction is consumed entirely on the farm. I have urged you as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture to give consideration to this problem. I do so again now, emphasizing that the growing number of court cases arising from this section of the law is creating a most serious situation.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter of March 4, 1955, to you as chairman, setting forth the Department's position in this matter. I am also enclosing a copy of my letter of July 1, 1955, to the Speaker of the House, in which I recommended action on the proposed legislation.

In view of the broad interest in this question, I am taking the liberty of making this correspondence public immediately upon delivery of this letter to you.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

MARCH 4, 1955.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of January 27, 1955, for a report on H. R. 1834, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes.

We favor enactment of this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to correct a situation which has arisen in connection with marketing quota operations for certain wheat producers who desire to use their entire output for feed and seed on the farm where produced, and who do not want to participate in the wheat price support program.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, wheat producers subject to marketing quotas who harvest wheat in excess of their acreage allotment are subject to a marketing penalty on their farm marketing excess (unless they avoid or postpone the penalty by storage or delivery to the Secretary), whether they sell their wheat on the market or whether they feed it on their farms. The law is clear on this point and its constitutionality was upheld in *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111). Thus, farmers subject to quotas on their crop are forced to curtail their operations or pay the penalty if they fail to do so.

Production of wheat for feed is, in general, confined to small farms in the feed deficit areas.

Existing legislation exempts certain of these farms from marketing quota restrictions. For example, quotas are not applicable to any farm on which the wheat acreage does not exceed 15 acres or on which the normal production of the wheat acreage is less than 200 bushels. Also, marketing quotas are not applicable to any farm in any State which has been designated by the Secretary as outside the commercial wheat-producing area. Any State for which the wheat acreage allotment is 25,000 acres or less may be so designated by the Secretary.

H. R. 1834 broadens these existing exemptions to include those farmers in the commercial wheat-producing area who harvest more than 15 acres, who use all their wheat on the farm where grown for feed and seed, and who do not desire wheat price support. Insofar as this latter group of farmers is concerned, wheat marketing quota restrictions impose special hardships.

Accordingly, although the consumption of wheat on farms where grown does affect interstate commerce, the proposed exemption relating only to farms on which no wheat is removed would appear to be desirable. Such farms constitute only a small portion of all farms which produce wheat and the proposed exemption, although creating some new problems, would not unduly hamper the administration of the wheat-marketing quota and price-support programs with respect to farms from which wheat is removed. This would not be the case, however, if the exemption with respect to feed and seed were to apply to farms on which wheat is produced both for home consumption and sale.

Enactment of this bill would be another step toward achievement of our objective—that farmers be permitted to operate their farms with a maximum of freedom. At the same time, it would remove the dissatisfaction of some small wheat producers with the program as it must be operated under present legislation.

The bill, if enacted, would become effective with the 1955 and subsequent crops of wheat. It would in no way relieve or otherwise affect the liability for marketing penalties incurred by farmers under the 1954 wheat-marketing-quota program who fed or used for seed on the farms where produced their entire 1954 wheat crops.

As indicated above it is recognized that there will be certain administrative difficulties in putting the provisions of the bill into operation, but we believe it will be possible to develop adequate safeguards.

Additional administrative expenses would be incurred in carrying out the provisions of the bill, if enacted. It is believed that such increases might be absorbed from funds appropriated for administering the wheat-quota program. However, a detailed analysis of the costs involved will be required before a definite cost estimate can be submitted.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,
Acting Secretary.

House Resolution 137

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again call the attention of my colleagues to House Resolution 137 calling for an investigation of the participation of the United States from 1945 to 1947 in the forced repatriation of anti-Communists.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter received by me today from Mr. S. Sidney Bromberg, 109 Grand Avenue, Englewood, N. J., in which he points out the reasons that he feels that action by the United States is necessary:

JULY 27, 1955.

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH,
Congressman from New York,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOSCH: I thank you for your kind letter of July 21. Permit me to add a few suggestions that would throw more light on the subject of forced repatriation of Russian nationalists after the Second World War.

We all know by this time that the Kremlin dictatorship not only deprives its subjects of all intellectual and spiritual freedom, but also imposes acute economic poverty, exploitation, and physical and moral degradation.

Let me give you here only a few examples of Communist exploitation which should rather be called robbery.

The Russian people pay 9 rubles for a kilogram (2.21 pounds) of sugar, the production of which costs the Soviet Government 83 kopeck (100 kopeck equals 1 ruble), which makes 1130 percent profit for the Communist government. A pair of boots is sold in Russia for 160 rubles, while its production costs the government 7 rubles, 40 kopecks. A kilogram of wheat flour is sold to consumers for 6 rubles, 70 kopecks, while the government pays to the peasant 13 kopecks for it, which gives the Kremlin 5,150 percent profit.

The average monthly earnings of a Soviet citizen is from 600 to 800 rubles. These few figures concerning main articles of consumption illustrate the terrible conditions of life in Communist Russia, and they are getting worse daily.

Former Premier Georgi Malenkov had a plan to produce more consumer goods at cheaper prices, but the rest of his associates decided it was wrong.

It would mean letting the peasants work the land individually as they were doing for ages, and receive a reasonable price for his grain, meat, and wool, which would mean much less income for the government, with its bureaucratic apparatus consisting of millions of Communist officials, political police, spies, and snoopers all over the world, as well as a standing army of four to five million with its costly armament.

In such a case the Kremlin could not maintain its communistic system—at least for some years. It would inevitably collapse, its leaders would lose control over the enslaved, suffering people, and most likely would lose not only their power, luxuries, and dreams of world conquest, but also their lives.

The mass of the Russian people also know that real improvement of their lot is impossible without the downfall of the entire Communist system.

Thus the idea of "strengthening the hands and the hearts of the people behind the Iron Curtain" may mean only to help them abolish the Communist system.

To do that they have millions of men who already have suffered from the cruelties and injustices of communism, who are ready to risk their lives to unshackle their fatherland which they love.

Under the Kremlin's system of minute political controls, some of the Russians who have the ability for leadership would need material help to quit their jobs to give their time to propaganda, organization, and traveling. Most of all they would need the assurance that help would come systematically, uninterruptedly from what the Psalmist called "understanding hearts"; and that there would be no slackening until the revolutionary job is accomplished.

Most likely such revolutionary activities would result in the formation of a military junta similar to that of Egypt, Iran, or Guatemala, until a constituent assembly is called, which is the dream of the Russian people to put the country on a democratic basis.

Let us look at the source from which the enlightened, patriotic, bold and determined leadership of the Russian revolution can come. It is the same source that supplied them in the past—in the revolt of the soldiers in the fortress of the Cronstadt in 1921, in the formation of the Russian Army of liberation under Gen. Andrei Vlasov in 1943, and in the strikes of Vorkuta and other slave-labor camps in 1953. It is the patriotic elite of the Russian people, which is naturally limited in numbers.

And they had their fingers badly burned in the years 1945–47, by the actions of only a few Americans who at the time failed to understand and sympathize with the Russian liberation movement

It can be said that they did not act from evil motives. But to the Russian soldiers and officers who were forced to board the trains for a trip to a firing squad or forced labor camps, the motives of responsible American officers did not matter. Nor did it matter to General Vlasov and his 12 collaborators who were given over to the Kremlin dictators to be hanged in Moscow.

Nor does it matter to the followers and admirers of General Vlasov, who now have numerous organizations in Russia and among the Russian emigrees including the United States.

They have no assurance that similar lack of understanding will not repeat itself. That's what holds them back from starting anew their assault on the criminal Kremlin bunch that hold a third of the world in abject slavery and the rest of it in mortal danger of utter destruction.

Although only a few Americans are responsible for the tragic collapse of the Russian revolutionary movement of 1945–47, as members of the democratic America, we are all responsible for the acts of crime or folly of the few.

Only by publicly repudiating their acts can we regain the confidence of the best self-sacrificing elements of the Russian people who, as Christians, for such they are, could forget and forgive, and start their activities anew, to remove the Kremlin conspiracy.

Only the Congress can speak for the American people. This is why a congressional investigation or resolution on forced repatriation of Russians and their satellites is so necessary and urgent now.

I personally believe that Senator McCLELLAN'S subcommittee that showed itself efficient and prompt, could do it best and quickest.

If you find the arguments in this letter justified, wouldn't you Congressman BOSCH, bring it to the attention of other Congressmen and Senators?

Sincerely yours,

S. SIDNEY EROMBERG.

Blue-Gray Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a letter I have received from Marlan O. Walter, commander, Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is self-explanatory.

I believe the Pennsylvania VFW has an excellent idea, one which I endorse completely. I have asked the Office of the Legislative Counsel to draft the proper bill to carry out this idea and plan to introduce it as soon as it is completed. I shall welcome the cosponsorship of my colleagues from Pennsylvania and from all other States.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Millersburg, Pa., July 27, 1955.

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIGLEY: The department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, believes the last survivor of the Confederate Army and the last survivor of the Union Army should be laid at rest, side by side, in Gettysburg National Cemetery and their eternal resting place appropriately marked by a suitable monument representing all the men of both those glorious Armies that would symbolize the peace, friendship, and unity that evolved in our Nation because of their sacrifices.

What we propose as a final resting place in the solitude of the hallowed ground where they never will be alone would be our Nation's grateful, final, and most beautiful tribute to those millions of Civil War men whom we all so revere.

We do not believe the survivors or members of the survivors' families will object to their burial in the consecrated earth of Gettysburg. What greater honor could any man receive than that which we wish and propose to be bestowed upon the last two men whose youthful courage surpassed their years?

We want them to know while still they live the esteem in which they are held by their countrymen; that when they hear the last echoing taps they will know they will be laid at rest where men rededicated themselves "with malice toward none, with charity for all * * *."

"* * * let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle * * *."

Here is the final opportunity for the Nation to do all these things.

Let us consecrate ourselves to this noble work.

All Americans feel the last survivors of both Armies belong to all the families in our Nation; that they are our living heritage.

We have buried unknown soldiers to symbolize the sacrifices of all servicemen. Let us set aside a plot at the crest of a gentle, rolling hill in Gettysburg for all the men of the Civil War and let the last two survivors symbolize the sacrifices of all the men in Blue and Gray.

Let us feel toward them as did Grant when he learned that Lee's men were starving. Let us show the friendship Grant immortalized when he ordered every man in his Army with 3 rations to give 2 of them to Lee's men.

What we propose would tangibly express at home what the President at Geneva said we stand for abroad—friendship and unity. It would have a powerful psychological impact upon governments and people throughout the world.

The burial plot and monument we suggest would crystallize and symbolize the friendship that emerged from the crucible of that war.

We feel sure the last survivors would want it that way.

We ask you as patriots, many of you who are descended from men who fought in the Civil War, and as veterans yourselves, to meet with your leaders. Then the entire Pennsylvania delegation sponsor a resolution with all the gentlemen from the South to carry out the purposes we have outlined, before this session ends.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

MARLAN O. WALTER,
Department Commander.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address of Hon. Dewey Short, Member of Congress, Seventh Missouri District, Before the Postgraduate Medical Assembly of South Texas, at the Shamrock Hotel in Houston, Tex., on Tuesday, July 19, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address by the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, before the Postgraduate Medical Assembly of South Texas at the Shamrock Hotel in Houston, Tex. I believe that every Member of the Congress will be as impressed as I was with the reasoning of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri concerning many of the medical problems that confront our Nation and the Armed Forces today.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is with some trepidation that I appear before this distinguished gathering today. I have tremendous respect for doctors, not only doctors of medicine, doctors of osteopathy, doctors of philosophy, doctors of dentistry, but also for doctors of divinity. But rarely in my life have I appeared before a group who quite rently would probably have very cheerfully cut my throat—and who possess the skill to do the job neatly.

I am referring, of course, to the recent extension of the Doctors' Draft Law which passed the House and was signed into law on June 30.

In my own small way, I undoubtedly have contributed to the potential displacement of some of you for a 2-year period.

It is an unfortunate, discriminatory piece of legislation, this Doctors' Draft Law, but I want to assure you that it is absolutely essential.

Perhaps it is the penalty you share for belonging to a very select organization. As physicians and surgeons you hold an extremely responsible position in our economy. You have studied long and hard; you have met the best competition and only the finest survive.

And because your services are so much in demand, it was necessary for us in the Congress to enact legislation to compel you to serve in the Armed Forces even though you are beyond the regular draft age.

Now I want to discuss this subject with you today because it is important not only to you and your colleagues, but also to the civilian population and our armed services.

Statistically, we had no choice but to extend the Doctors' Draft Law. The draft age has been reduced to 46, from the old age of 51, and from what I can gather from the facts that have been presented to us, doctors will be taken up to that age during the next 2 years.

We eased the situation with regard to physicians and dentists who are now over 35 and who previously applied for a commission in the medical or dental corps and were rejected for physical reasons, but we could not make that provision retroactive for those now serving on active duty. That also is discriminatory—for the doctor who was able to stay out of service, and who meets the criteria of this amendment, will not have to serve, while the doctor who is now serving on active duty who otherwise could have met the criteria, must remain on active duty until he completes his obligated period of service.

Wherever we turn in this whole manpower problem, we face inconsistencies and discrimination; even the regular draft act is discriminatory. Some must serve and others are deferred. Those who are healthy must go; those who are disabled remain behind. Those who are engaged in essential industry are deferred; those who are not, must serve.

This whole idea of compulsory service is repugnant to me and always will be, but I am also practical enough to realize that our Nation must possess an armed force capable of defending this Nation should that occasion arise. And the health of our armed services must be paramount in our thinking.

One of the serious problems that we face in this Nation is a shortage of doctors; and as far as I am concerned, there is a maldistribution of practicing physicians.

I do not believe that our medical schools are adequate in size to graduate the number of doctors that our economy requires. And unfortunately, since we are all human beings the natural tendency of many physicians is to go to larger cities where the patients are in a small area and where the level of income is high enough to justify charging reasonable fees.

That means that we have areas in this country that are inadequately staffed with doctors. And as far as I can see, that situation will remain with us and grow worse unless we take positive steps in increase the input of medical students and the output of medical school graduates. I would like to see that accomplished with as little Federal interference as possible.

It is not my purpose to deliver a sermon, but I would like to give you some of my ideas with regard to this whole problem of medical care.

Obviously, we cannot continue the doctors draft law for an indefinite period. Therefore the armed services must find a procurement method other than the doctors draft law.

Now so long as we have the regular draft law in effect we will be able to obtain a fair share of medical school graduates, since anyone who is deferred for any reason under the regular draft remains liable for induction up to age 35. But we can't depend entirely upon medical school graduates as a source of doctors for our armed services because then we would be depending entirely upon young men who have just completed their internships. The armed services need specialists and experienced physicians just as much as any other group of people. But we are not attracting experienced physicians and specialists in our Armed Forces on a career basis. And that calls for a little self-analysis.

Why aren't we getting more doctors to make a career of the armed services? Is it economic?

Yes, partly. It is a little hard to compare a major's pay with the $15,000 net income annually of the average practicing physician in the United States.

But I don't believe it is entirely economic. Pay is not everything. I think it may also involve the dignity of the profession, the constant changes of station, and perhaps to some extent, the unintentional subjugation of professional initiative.

I am convinced that the average doctor has a unique personality of his own: a rugged individualist—if you will. He has to possess that sort of personality, otherwise he would never have had the courage and stamina and determination to spend 4 years in college, 4 years in medical school, a year of internship, and 2, 3, and 4 years in residency training before he considered himself qualified to practice medicine.

And I suppose the average physician is not willing to enter into a form of regimentation in which his own personal attainments and ability will not be rewarded in proportion to his achievements. I believe that, too, may be a factor in this medical procurement problem in the armed services.

I don't know the full answer, although I can assure you that it is being studied carefully with a hope that some solution can be found. Basically, the medical situation in our armed services is one of supply and demand. So long as the demand exceeds the supply, the attractiveness of service life will undoubtedly take a back seat to the normal civilian life where the physician is his own boss.

The ultimate solution to the whole problem of supplying doctors for our Armed Forces and also for the civilian economy is a substantial increase in the number of doctors.

While the doctors draft law was under consideration in the House and in the Senate, Members of Congress were besieged with telegrams and letters from doctors urging the elimination of the doctors draft law. The contention was made that if dependent medical care were abolished and all other persons now entitled to medical care from service doctors were denied this benefit, there would be no need for a doctors draft law.

Well, I want to discuss that subject because it is of fundamental importance to you and to the Armed Forces. The number of individuals who are theoretically entitled to medical care from service doctors is large. But when you compare the actual statistics of medical care furnished to persons other than service personnel it soon becomes apparent that the existing legal entitlement is not being abused. As a matter of fact, if all medical care were abolished for all personnel now entitled to medical care from the armed services other than armed services personnel and their dependents, we would only be able to eliminate about 40 of the 10,000 physicians now serving on active duty with the armed services and the Public Health Service. And if we abolished all dependent medical care in the United States, we would only eliminate an additional 581 doctors from the armed services and the Public Health Service.

The next contention was that the ratio of physicians to armed services personnel is unrealistic—too high. It is now approxi-

mately 3.044 per thousand and you will hear statements made that this is so much greater than the civilian population that it obviously can be substantially reduced.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, medicine in the armed services is not confined solely to treating servicemen who are ill. Sometimes we all overlook the very basic reason that we have an Armed Force. We constantly strive to impose upon our armed services the same business standards that apply to the United States Steel Corp., General Motors, Humble Oil, and countless other groups in the country. But you can't compare a producing corporation with an insurance policy. Our Armed Forces exist so that those corporations and the people who work for those corporations, and the doctors and dentists and veterinarians, and small-business owners, and farmers, and railroad engineers, and students, and mothers and fathers, and everybody else in this United States, can continue to live in freedom. Of course, maintaining our Armed Forces is costly. Fantastically expensive. And, of course, there is waste. Of course, there is duplication, unnecessary transportation, administrative mistakes, poor decisions, bad buying, but we are dealing with an organization which employs almost 5 million people, an organization that spends 65 cents out of every Federal tax dollar, an organization that spends between forty and fifty billion dollars annually, an organization whose expenditures exceed the income of 18 of the largest corporations in the United States.

The Armed Forces isn't a business operation. It exists for the sole purpose of preserving this Nation. And in order to preserve this Nation we have to have men mentally and physically fit to perform all types of duty.

We have to have doctors who know how to prepare for the medical support of an amphibious operation. We have to have doctors who know all of the medical problems of logistical support of a land operation; we have to have doctors who are familiar with the human physical limitations in the problems of space; we have to have doctors who are experts in field sanitation, preventive medicine; and all of our doctors must have some conception of what a military organization is, how it functions, and what their responsibilities would be if they were called upon to take command of a medical battalion.

So, all the time of a doctor in the Armed Forces is not confined to the treatment of people who are ill; perhaps some doctors spend most of their time treating patients, but when that doctor is serving in that capacity another doctor is studying a supply problem, or a study involving the results of underwater demolition, or the proper way to treat victims of nuclear warfare.

So, it is not quite fair to our armed services to compare the ratio of physicians to the civilian population and then conclude that the ratio in our armed services should more nearly approach that ratio. The problem in our Armed Forces is to keep our people healthy and not wait to treat them after they are sick.

I am not trying to defend poor administration, for I would be the first to admit that there are undoubtedly a few places in the Armed Forces where improvement can be made in the proper utilization of physicians and their skills. And I can fully appreciate how a pediatrician feels when he is called upon to leave his own practice only to end up in a dispensary treating the children of service personnel. And that, of course, leads me to the various problems of dependent medical care.

Now, traditionally we have provided, on a space and facilities available basis, medical care to the dependents of service personnel. But I don't know of anything that would more adversely affect the morale of our Armed Forces than to eliminate this entitlement. On the other hand, it is obvious that we cannot continue in good conscience to draft individuals and ask them to treat the dependents of our service personnel. The number involved is not great—581 is the approximate figure, but even if we eliminate 581, that would be 581 less doctors over the age of 35 who would have to be ordered to active duty. So there we are on the horns of a dilemma. Can we jeopardize the morale of our Armed Forces to the extent of eliminating dependent medical care in order to alleviate to some extent the situation with regard to the drafting of doctors over the age of 35?

Well, obviously the answer for the next 2 years is that the Congress was not willing to jeopardize the career attractiveness of many thousands of experienced men in order to reduce to just a small extent the number of physicians who will be required to serve in our Armed Forces who are now over the age of 35. But we recognize the fact that we must find a solution to dependent medical care. Obviously, we are again on the horns of another kind of a dilemma. For if we abolish all dependent medical care in the Armed Forces, then many of the physicians who now are willing to stay in the Armed Forces until reaching retirement age will leave, since the present diversification of their practice may well be reduced to such an extent that they will prefer to leave the armed services and surrender the years of service they have built up toward retirement.

The average service doctor in a period of several years of service will treat service personnel who are basically healthy—perhaps an appendix now and then, a few bad colds, pneumonia, broken arms, broken legs, perhaps now and again a case of tuberculosis or a heart condition. But if the service doctor is treating just service personnel, he is not going to have much experience in gynecology, pediatrics, geriatrics, and many of the other types of medicine that are found in younger or older age groups.

So, what is the answer to that problem?

I am not sure that I can give you the answer, although I can give you a few personal observations. First of all, I think it is incumbent upon us in the Congress to adopt some type of group health-insurance program. In this way the dependent will be assured of medical care by civilian physicians even though the dependent is separated from the service member and in an area where no service facilities are available. On the other hand, unless some adequate program can be worked out in overseas areas, the dependents will continue to expect treatment from American doctors. It is possible that this can be worked out on a contract basis, but in some areas the only doctor available will be a service doctor, and he will be expected to treat dependents as well as service personnel.

Now whether this group program will supplement the present system or be a substitute for the present program, is the question. I would suspect that unless some method can be found to procure more doctors for the Armed Forces this system, if adopted, will at least for the time being, have to be a substitute rather than a supplement to the present system.

If we procure more doctors from the civilian economy on a career basis, at least we will eliminate the readjustment necessary in local communities throughout the Nation where practicing physicians are called into the service. In other words, if a doctor on his own initiative decides to make the service a career, his patients will usually have sufficient advance notice to make all the adjustment necessary, but when a doctor is taken from a community for a 2-year period with the full intent of returning to that community, there is often a void that cannot be filled. And at that point, the civilian community suffers.

If dependents are in an area where there are civilian physicians available and if they can go to civilian physicians under a health insurance program, that will ease the situation, to a very limited extent, but to some extent with respect to the number of doctors required in uniform.

On the other hand, it will give the dependent a benefit that she does not now enjoy and that is a year-round entitlement to medical care and not just on a space and facilities available basis.

To me, it is the only practical solution to the immediate problem and yet we have had no experience on this large a scale upon which to base such a program. While it is easy to criticise the Department of Defense and the Congress for failure to take action on this problem now, I think from what I have said here today you can see some of the ramifications. If we abolish all dependent medical care, we reduce the attractiveness of service medicine. If we continue to draft doctors, we not only disrupt the individual doctors, but in many cases, the local community in which he is practicing.

We must solve this medical problem in the armed services, not only for the immediate future, but for the years ahead.

I want to mention that considerable progress in medical manpower utilization has been made by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Dr. Berry, and his assistant, Dr. Cushing, with the cooperation of a medical advisory committee and I am convinced that there is today a much better utilization of medical personnel than ever existed before. Some further progress can be made but I am afraid that insofar as the number of doctors required is concerned, we have just about reached the minimum.

I mentioned earlier that I considered the average physician to be a rugged individualist. I realize that that may be an unpopular term in this present day and age. Perhaps it is wrong to depend entirely upon one's self for a livlihood; perhaps I am living in the dark ages, but I cannot help but feel that all of the notable achievements of this century, and the past centuries, can be attributed to men and women who felt an obligation to their nation, their families, and themselves. They did not feel that being born entitled them to dependence upon the nation for a livelihood and for the better things in life.

We have become an extremely security-conscious people in the past few years and while much progress in social fields has been made, I sometimes wonder if it is not being made at the cost of the loss of individual initiative. And yet some of the social gains have been brought about by necessity, as well as public demand.

And very possibly, the next large field will be that of medicine.

I know it is unnecessary for me to tell you that socialized medicine, or any other name that you may wish to call a program of free medical care, is on the horizon. I can think of nothing that would do more to stop the progress of medicine than for this Nation to engage in a program of national socialized medicine. On the other hand you, as doctors, have made this Nation health conscious; you have stressed medical examinations, early treatment, danger signs, annual X-rays, and as a result you have made every person in this country extremely aware of the necessity for prompt and adequate medical care. As a result the health of the Nation has prospered. The average age of men and women of this country has increased and this in turn has increased the national income. But having started this very desirable awareness of the need for proper medical treatment, it is incumbent upon you as

private citizens, as advocates of the free enterprise system—yes, as members of a capitalistic team—to meet those demands through the free enterprise system. If that demand is not met by you as private practicing physicians, or by you as groups of private practicing physicians, then it will be done for you by the Federal Government.

That is the history of this Nation and nothing you or I can say will stop it. It is only what you and I do to fill the needs of the people through the free enterprise system that that system will continue to exist as we know it.

It is for you to decide as leaders in your communities, as men respected and loved by your patients, your friends, and your neighbors, as to where and how and when we are going ahead. It can be done by direction of the Federal Government or it can be done through the free enterprise system and the cooperation of the Federal Government, but as sure as I am standing here today, it will be done.

You will have to make the choice—and I believe I know what your choice will be.

In Expression of Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his meeting with the Honorable Herbert C. Hoover, Jr., the Under Secretary of State, His Grace, Archbishop Mampre Calfayan, primate of the Armenian Church in North America, presented the following scroll of gratitude:

IN EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE

On the happy occasion of our meeting with representatives of the Secretary of State, and on behalf of the Armenian Church in the United States under the venerable Holy See in Etchmiadzin, with 48 authorized parishes and approximately 100,000 parishioners, may we again voice our expression of gratitude for the freedoms and opportunities granted us as citizens by birth or by naturalization; reiterate our devotion and loyalty to the principles of our Republic; and pledge to resist any and all enemies, both from within and without, which with aggressive intent, may seek to attack our beloved country.

While many Americans of Armenian origin are bound by ties of blood and sentiment with their brethren in their ancestral homeland in Armenia, the attachment is one of filial kinship. On behalf of my flock in the United States I can assure the Secretary of State that there can be no doubt whatsoever as to the loyalty of my people, in time of peace or in time of stress. The spirit of allegiance has taken root deep in our hearts. We are Americans. Our loyalty is unreservedly bound to the best interests of the United States, now and forever.

Our divine ministry commands us to seek the ways of peace and not those of war. We therefore pray for the fulfillment of the devout wish of our President Eisenhower, "to live in peace with all the world, to commune with them, to learn from their culture as they may learn from ours * * * so that our sons may stay at home, the products of our toil may be used for our schools and roads and churches, and not for guns and planes and tanks and ships of war."

Respectfully presented on this 19th day of July 1955 in Washington, D. C.

Archbishop MAMPRE CALFAYAN,
Primate of the Armenian Church in North America.

Bishop's Sermon at Ruma Details the Dignity and Duties of the Religious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Most Reverend Albert R. Zeroweste, D. D., bishop of Belleville, Ill, delivered a sermon at the Ruma, Ill., Motherhouse. Ruma, Ill., is located in my congressional district, and I am happy to include in the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Bishop Zeroweste's sermon.

The sermon follows:

"You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and have appointed you that you should go and bear fruit and that your fruit should remain." (John 15: 16.)

Right Reverend Monsignori, Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers, Reverend Mother, Dear Sisters and Beloved in Christ:

We extend congratulations to all the participants in today's beautiful ceremony. Your hearts are filled with joy and gratitude as you offered to Christ your mind, your soul and whole being and thus became His brides. The young women just beginning this dedication of self look forward with trust knowing that those who have gone before them have found joy, peace, and contentment with Christ. Those who have completed 25 or 50 years in the religious life have already experienced the lightness of Christ's burden, the sweetness of His yoke.

Since we have not here a "lasting city but seek one that is to come," we do not expect perfect happiness on this earth. Our Divine Master has told us that if we would come after Him we should take up our cross daily and follow Him. But, in spite of the daily crosses the true religious finds a happiness and peace that the world cannot understand nor enjoy. "Peace, I leave with you, my peace I give to you; not as the world gives do I give to you." (John 15: 17.) Do not let your hearts be troubled or be afraid." (John 14: 28.) "In my Father's house there are many mansions." "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." (John viii: 12). "No one comes to the Father but through me." These familiar words of the Divine Master reecho in your mind and heart today. They are the words of divine truth, they are the words that gave you strength to take the important step and they are the expression of Christ's companionship with the true religious.

Frequently you have meditated upon your dignity and duties as spouses of Christ. And like all who are called to His service you have at times been disturbed by doubts and questions. You asked yourself, why should I have a religious vocation? Why should I be privileged to be a bride of Christ? Am I worthy of such companionship? The words of Christ: "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," have reassured you, and you are worthy because Christ wants you, because Christ loves you.

It is important to remember this fact in the daily practice of your spiritual life. Christ wants you, Christ has called you, you are working for Christ and with Christ. You, therefore, never perform any action or fulfill any duty alone. Christ is your constant companion. He is with you in the classroom, at the bed of the sick, in the corridors of your convent; He sits beside you at your desk and kneels beside you at your prayers; you do not walk alone, but Christ walks with you.

There is a movie on vocations called God's Career Women. I suppose many of the Sisters have seen it. It depicts the life of a young woman from the day she enters the convent to begin her training in a religious order. It shows her in her work, her prayers, her daily spiritual exercises and at recreation. The title, however, to my mind, may be confusing. In modern usage the career woman has an entirely different connotation than our idea of religious career women. In the religious life one must abandon all careers as the world understands a career. A career for God, yes; a career for honor, glory, success or worldly recognition, no. This does not mean that a religious should not use her natural talents; it does not infer that she refrain from giving her best efforts in fulfilling the tasks assigned to her. It does, however, demand that the ego be submerged in the Christus; the bride, hidden behind the personality of her divine spouse. A true religious must even be forgetful of self. The religious vows themselves signify the submission of self to God and to our lawfully constituted superiors. True, it is not an easy undertaking but this submission of ourselves to Christ is absolutely necessary for a complete and happy religious life. One can succeed only when she has forgotten self for Christ and takes as her motto the words of St. Paul: "I can do all things in him who strengthens me." (Philippians iv: 13.)

When a religious learns this secret of abandonment of self, she has acquired the secret of success; then she is truly Christ's career woman. Remember there is no career of any religious except the career of becoming a saint. All other occupations, tasks or accomplishments are only rungs on the ladder leading to this end. "We build the ladder by which we rise; from the lowly earth to the vaulted skies; and we mount to the summit round by round, 'For this is the will of God your sanctification.'" (Thessalonians iv: 3.) "The Lord is faithful, who will strengthen you and guard you from evil." (2 Thessalonians 3: 3.)

The Master has spoken to you: "Come, follow me." You heard His voice and accepted the invitation. You have replied: "I have come; I have left father, mother, home, relatives and all things. You, my spouse, are my way, my truth, my life. Without you, dear spouse, I can do nothing."

Frequent meditation on the exalted dignity of your calling and the richness of the spiritual life will not only stir anew your gratitude for the privilege of being Spouses of Christ but will also quicken your desires to share with others the joy that is yours through religious life.

So each day walk along the way of the cross, the road of sanctity. It is not an impossible journey because Christ invites you and He never asks of us the impossible. "You therefore are to be perfect, even as your Heavenly Father is perfect." (Matthew 5: 48), Christ has invited you, you have accepted the invitation and now you put yourself completely in His care. He offers grace, light, and strength; He draws and guides you along the labyrinthine ways. He is pursuing you, asking you to love Him and to give yourself in return with docility, trust, and generosity.

Recall how much Jesus has loved you, how He has favored you in calling you to the religious life. In gratitude, you must now become a saint—there is no other way to serve. And remember that putting on Christ is the

work of a lifetime, but a work that must be done each day because from the first day you begin your work as teacher, nurse, or in any other activity you must begin at once to form Christ in others.

I need not emphasize the important role of devotion to the most precious blood in your striving for sanctity. You are dedicated in a very special manner to the precious blood. Christ's mission on earth was to shed His blood for man's redemption. This He proclaimed when He instituted the Holy Eucharist. "And taking a cup. He gave thanks and gave it to them, saying: "All of you drink of this; for this is my blood of the new covenant which is being shed for many unto the remission of sins." (Matthew 26, 27, 28). His blood seeped into the earth in the Garden of Olives; during the scourging it was scattered on the walls of the pagan court; it left a trail from Pilate's court to Calvary; it covered the hands and clothes of the executioners and claimed at least one of their number. And the last drop was drained from His body when one of the soldiers opened His side with a lance, and immediately there came out blood and water." (John 19: 34.)

The prodigality with which Christ shed His blood from the beginning of His Agony until His death on the cross is one of the mysterious aspects of His passion, especially since we know that one drop of His precious blood had power to redeem countless worlds. This profuse shedding was another proof of this boundless, infinite love.

As members of this community dedicated to adoration of the precious blood, be generous as Christ was generous. I assure you then you will reach the heights of sanctity and you will walk worthily in the vocation to which you have called.

We wish to congratulate the parents and relatives of these brides of Christ. They also have been generous with Christ in giving their own back to God. Remember that the Divine Master cannot be outdone in generosity. Your reward will be exceedingly great.

We priests share in the joy and happiness of this moment in a special manner. The pastors of these young women are particularly pleased because one or more among their spiritual children have been chosen to this exalted vocation. The rest of us know that our schools, institutions of charity will continue because there are young women to follow in the footsteps of the Holy women who aided Christ when He trod the wine press of sorrow alone.

Let all unite in a hymn of praise and thanksgiving to the triune God on this feat day honoring the precious blood of the Second Person of the Most Blessed Trinity.

Blinded Veterans Association 1955 Achievement Award Goes to Houston, Tex., Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD a news release of the Blinded Veterans Association, Inc., which tells of an award for achievement by that organization to Mr. Criss Cole, a blinded veteran of World War II. Since he was blinded by a Japanese grenade on Tarawa during World War II, Mr. Cole has completed all work required to obtain a bachelor of science degree and a bachelor of laws degree from the University of Houston and is now a practicing attorney in Houston and a member of the Texas State Legislature. The story of his achievement and his personal triumph over his handicap is an inspiring one which I commend to all Members of Congress. It follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., August 7.—A 37-year-old former marine, who was blinded by a Japanese hand grenade during the bitter fighting for Tarawa in World War II, has been given the 1955 achievement award of the Blinded Veterans Association in recognition of his personal accomplishment and his service to the community.

The veteran, Criss Cole, of Houston, Tex., who is currently a member of the Texas House of Representatives, received the award last night at a banquet held at the Hotel New Yorker, the final function of the association's 10th annual convention, which opened on August 2.

The BVA achievement award is presented annually to a blinded veteran who has been especially outstanding in his chosen field of employment and in his adjustment to daily living as a blind person.

Despite his blindness and the fact that economic circumstances prevented him from obtaining much formal schooling before the war, Cole went through college and law school after he was discharged from the Marines. He became a successful candidate for the State legislature and now engages in the private practice of law between sessions.

Criss Cole was born in Sawyer, Okla., in 1918, and is 1 of 10 children. His family moved to Sims, Tex., when he was 2 years old, and he was raised in this farming community. With so many mouths to feed, it became necessary for Cole to leave school in the ninth grade in order to help his father on the farm. At the age of 18 he joined the Civilian Conservation Corps and spent 20 months in Colorado and California.

In October 1940 he enlisted in the Marine Corps and served overseas in Iceland, New Zealand, Guadalcanal, and Tarawa. On November 23, 1943, he was totally blinded when a Japanese hand grenade exploded in his face on the beach at Tarawa.

Cole was returned to the United States and received medical treatment at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, being discharged on August 1, 1944. He then went to Houston, Tex., to look for a job.

For him, the year 1945 proved momentous. He was engaged by the Reed Roller Bit Co. as a bench worker and shortly after that married Joanne Spica, whom he had met while he was a patient at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital.

In January 1949, the Veterans' Administration authorized Cole to enter training to become a lawyer. The veteran passed a test entitling him to the equivalent of a high school diploma from the Texas State Board of Education and began his prelaw studies at St. Thomas University in Houston.

Two years later, he transferred to the University of Houston, where he completed his work for a B. S. degree. He was awarded an LL. B. degree from the same university in May 1954, and was named the outstanding law student of the year by his fellow students.

Cole was admitted to the bar in May 1954, and opened an office in downtown Houston. At the same time, he became a candidate for election to the Texas House of Representatives.

Without a campaign manager or financial backing, and making no promises, Cole entered the campaign with a two-point platform: (1) improvement of conditions at State mental institutions, and (2) a rehabilitation program for juvenile delinquents.

He was elected by an overwhelming majority that November.

Cole is active in church and civic affairs. He is deeply interested in the vocational rehabilitation of the disabled—both veteran and civilian—and devotes much of his time to addressing business groups, stressing the value of utilizing this source of productive manpower. He acknowledges the fact that loss of sight is a severe disability, but points out that the more efficient use of other faculties and resources enables a blind person to carry on a normal life. His own example demonstrates that a disability need not be a handicap.

He enjoys fishing and horseback riding and particularly likes to take his two sons Dennis, 8, and Warren, 6, on picnics and to the zoo.

The citation accompanying the BVA Achievement Award reads as follows: "For exemplifying the principles of initiative, independence, and self-reliance to which the Blinded Veterans Association is devoted."

The Newman Prize of $100 which accompanies the award was also presented to Cole. This prize is contributed annually by Nathan Newman, New York businessman and longtime friend of the BVA.

The three judges for this year's Achievement Award were Dr. A. Duane Beam of Grosse Point Farms, Mich., a prominent ophthalmologist who was in charge of eye casualties at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital during World War II; C. Warrend Bledsoe, Chief of Blind Rehabilitation, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.; and Peter J. Salmon, Executive Director of the Industrial Home for the Blind, Brooklyn, N. Y.

In addition to Cole, the judges cited the following blinded veterans for their outstanding achievements: Alexander R. Bishop, Talladega, Ala., instructor, Alabama School for the Blind; Norbert L. Cormier, Newington, Conn., Veterans' Employment Representative, Connecticut State Employment Service; James F. C. Hyde, Washington, D. C., legislative analyst, Bureau of the Budget; Edmund Jemison, Basom, N. Y., social worker, Genesee County (N. Y.) Department of Welfare; Thomas J. Kennedy Jr., Baltimore, Md., owner and operator of an office supply company; Harry J. Kosmala, Chicago, Ill., vending stand operator; Fred Krauss Jr., Broomal, Pa., employment interviewer, Pennsylvania State Employment Service; Julius Morris, New Britain, Conn., attorney; Leonard M. Pawlak, Milwaukee, Wis., medical dictation transcriber, VA Hospital, Wood, Wis.; Lawrence L. Peets, West Arlington, Vt., bookbinder; Earle G. Ramsey, Brevard, N. C., attorney; and Stuart D. Rawley, San Gabriel, Calif., cabinetmaker.

Nominations for the BVA Achievement Award were solicited from Veterans' Administration Regional Offices throughout the country as well as from BVA's local chapters.

Statement by Oscar L. Chapman Presented Before the Committee on Agriculture on Legislation To Amend and Extend the Sugar Act of 1948 as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in view of my intense interest in our relations with our good neighbor, Mexico, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following statement by Oscar L. Chapman

presented before the Committee on Agriculture on legislation to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended:

I am appearing here on behalf of the Association of Sugar Producers of Mexico, which has a very vital stake in the legislation now pending before this Committee. This opportunity to appear and testify is most sincerely appreciated by the association and by the many thousands of our good friends in Mexico who depend upon their sugar industry for their livelihood.

On June 17, I filed in the House of Representatives, a petition on behalf of the sugar producers of Mexico, which was duly received and referred to your committee. This petition states the affirmative case of the Mexican sugar producers. In order to save the time of the committee, I respectfully request that the text of the petition be incorporated in the record. I shall confine myself in my statement to some brief, but, I believe, extremely important comments on the legislation proposed by the executive establishment.

At the very outset, I wish to make it absolutely clear that we have no quarrel whatsoever with the proposal to grant relief to the domestic sugar industry as exemplified by H. R. 5406 which is now before you. I say that in the full knowledge that that bill would have the effect of lowering the quotas that would otherwise accrue to Mexico in 1955 and 1956. Certainly the Congress has an obligation to look after the best interests of the United States first, and to foster such a domestic sugar industry as it deems consistent with those best interests. We consider it entirely inappropriate for any foreign principal to seek preferential advantage for itself by attempting to influence that judgment.

Mexico seeks only to obtain a fair share of that portion of the United States market which is to be allotted among foreign producers after the domestic producers have been taken care of. In that regard, Mexico insists that it is entitled to equal consideration, on the merits of its case, with all other foreign producers.

Unfortunately, the proposal submitted by the executive departments does not reflect equal consideration on the merits. In fact, it is so grossly discriminatory and inequitable as to be shocking.

The essential evil of the proposal of the executive establishment is that it perpetuates a system which ignores present day equities and relies solely on ancient history. Under this bill, foreign quotas are not allotted on the basis of the needs and merits of 1955, but essentially on the basis of the quantitative distribution of the market as it existed in 1934. Thus no matter what has happened in the ensuing years in terms of economic and political relations, the lion's share of the market is reserved for the few suppliers who happened to be there first. No matter how efficient a new producer is, he is substantially excluded from the United States market.

Under this proposal, Cuba, beginning in 1957, is arbitrarily granted 60 percent of the total increments in foreign quotas. The remaining 40 percent is to be prorated among the full-duty countries in accordance with their average shipments during the period 1951 through 1954. This system guarantees that Mexico, for the duration of the act, must take a subordinate position to Peru and the Dominican Republic since she obviously shipped less sugar to the United States than they did during the base period. And why did she ship less than they did during the base period? Because under the current act she was not allowed to ship more. Moreover, Mexico was not allowed to ship more because during a previous base period she was similarly restricted.

This represents a kind of economic Shintoism which is entirely inconsistent with the professed international trade policy of the United States. The State Department itself has insisted, in the trade councils of the world, that where quantitative restrictions on imports must be adopted, there should be provision for making adjustments to meet special situations and to recognize current exigencies.

Surely at long last there must come a time when such a legislative scheme must be reexamined in the light of present-day realities and when reasonable adjustments must be made. That time is long overdue. This outmoded approach to foreign-sugar quotas should not be carried forward into the new legislation which you are now considering.

I can readily understand the reluctance of the executive departments to recommend a cut in the present quota of Cuba or any other country below what it presently enjoys, even though its relative share of the present market could not be justified by objective economic criteria. There is a natural tendency to try to make adjustments as painlessly as possible and to leave intact that which a country now has. That, however, is not the major defect of the executive proposal. The overriding evil of the bill is that it not only preserves the quotas accumulated under the historic base-period system, but it projects that system into the allocation of the future growth of the market. That is carrying history too far.

Under the bill proposed by the executive establishment and under H. R. 5406 for that matter, no foreign country would be cut 1 ounce below its present deliveries. Certainly this alone should eliminate any economic dislocation which might be feared. Beyond that, however, as we compute it, the executive proposal would have the effect of freezing participation of foreign countries in the future growth of the market as follows:

Foreign participation in future growth

	Percent
To Cuba	60.0
To Peru	18.4
To the Dominican Republic	11.6
To Mexico	4.0
To all others	6.0

Even if it should be assumed, giving due deference to history, that no foreign country should be called upon to give up 1 pound of the tonnage it now ships, by what magic can it be concluded that the Dominican Republic is entitled to participate in the future growth of the United States market almost 3 times the extent of Mexico, or Peru 4½ times. Why should Cuba be given a share in the future growth of our market 15 times greater than that allowed Mexico? I submit that this cannot be justified by any reasonable standard.

The Assistant Secretary of State told this committee: "The decision concerning the relative shares of the foreign supplier should, of course, be made on the basis of standards which can be applied as uniformly as possible among the various countries."

I am certainly in favor of uniform standards. I would like for the committee to judge on the whole record whether there has been a uniform application of standards in the position taken by the executive departments.

Frankly, I am quite weary, and I am sure some of you are, of being told that the entire export trade of the United States may collapse if Cuba's stranglehold on the United States sugar market is not maintained.

If export trade is to be used as the basis for justifying Cuba's position, surely it should be worth some consideration with regard to Mexico.

The fact is that Mexico's purchases from the United States last year amounted to $628 million and exceeded those of Cuba by $200 million. Moreover, Mexico's purchases from the United States last year exceeded the combined purchases of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Peru by $51 million.

In 1954, Mexico's purchases in the United States were more than 6 times those of Peru and more than 12 times those of the Dominican Republic.

The State Department also told you that most of the countries which sell sugar to the United States have an unfavorable trade balance with the United States. They wish to buy an increased volume of our export products but are able to do so only by increasing their sales here.

Compare Mexico's unfavorable balance last year of $299.8 million with Cuba's of $26.9 million, and Peru's of $300,000. The Dominican Republic had a favorable balance of $20 million.

Because of its unfavorable dollar situation Mexico was forced to undergo a devaluation of the peso in 1954. That devaluation caused grave injury to Mexico's economy and another would have irreparable economic consequence.

It would be well for this committee to consider too, just where the trade ties of the competing claimants lie. Seventy-five percent of Mexico's export trade is with the United States, as compared with about 61 percent for Cuba, 51 percent for the Dominican Republic, and 38 percent for Peru.

In face of all these facts, why should Cuba be entitled to participate in the future growth of our sugar market 15 times the extent of Mexico or Peru 4½ times or the Dominican Republic 3 times? It is difficult for the Mexicans to understand and I submit that it must be difficult for anyone to understand. In fact it outrages the sense of justice and fair play.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Mexico has never before come to the United States for an increase in its sugar quota. This is the case even though as our good friend and next door neighbor and our only foreign supplier in a position to ship sugar overland, the United States is her natural and logical market. Mexico comes now, reluctantly, because there is no alternative.

Mexico has restricted its production. It has greatly increased its domestic consumption of sugar. Over the last 14 years sugar consumption in Mexico has doubled. Today Mexico consumes domestically 80 percent of its annual production. Mexico does not appear here seeking to become a great export country. It seeks only that small measure of relief to which it is equitably entitled, which is vitally necessary to sustain its domestic sugar industry.

As you know, Mexico has been substantially shut out of the United States sugar market. In 1953, as a result of the International Sugar Agreement, Mexico's ability to sell on the world market was drastically curtailed. The United States exercised a dominant influence on this agreement. Meanwhile, the United States has been subsidizing Mexico's competitors who have huge export surpluses and who use this subsidy to depress the world market price for sugar. All of this adds up to ruin for the Mexican sugar industry if no relief is available at the hands of the United States. That is why Mexico now comes to the United States as the only available source of relief. Having come here it fully expects just and fair treatment in comparison with all other foreign countries.

Mexico asked in its petition and in its representations to the State Department for a sugar quota equivalent to 2 percent of United States consumption. This is fair and reasonable in the light of Mexico's stature as a sugar producer second only to Cuba among Latin American suppliers and in the light of her trade relations with the United States.

Even if, in the interests of preserving to other foreign countries their present shipments, this should not be granted, at the very least Mexico would expect that it would be given a participation in the growth of the market bearing some reasonable relationship to the merits of its case. At the very least it would be expected that the 45 percent of increments in the United States sugar market which is allotted to foreign countries would be distributed among those countries on the basis of such considerations as (1) purchases from the United States, (2) trade balance with the United States, and (3) trade ties with the United States as compared with the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared no suggested amendment showing what this distribution of the increase in the foreign portion of the United States sugar market would amount to according to such standards as I have suggested. Until these hearings opened the Mexican sugar producers had no idea that the executive departments would ignore their representations and would suggest a formula relying solely on history and denying any consideration of the merits of the individual cases presented. With the permission of the committee I should like to supply a suggested allocation of the annual increment in sugar consumption among the foreign suppliers.

The bill proposed by the executive establishments is bad legislation. It is bad because it makes no attempt to deal with the problem of foreign sugar quotas on its merits. In fact, it represents an attempt to side-step the problem and avoid having to deal with it on its merits. Such legislation can usually be counted on to create more problems than it avoids.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Mexico has always been a good friend and good neighbor of the United States. The Mexican people are following these hearings with keen interest because of the vital importance of the outcome to the economy of Mexico. Mexico seeks no special favors here. It seeks only that its case be considered on its merits by any and all reasonable standards in comparison with the case of each and every claimant and that an enlightened and fair determination be made on that basis.

The Mexican sugar producers and the Mexican people are confident that they will receive full and fair consideration from this committee and I want to thank you again for your patience and courtesy in hearing me.

Those Swiss Dolls and Southern Maryland Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun of July 28, 1955.

The editorial follows:

THOSE SWISS DOLLS AND SOUTHERN MARYLAND TOBACCO

Mr. David Rosenstein, president of the National Association of Doll Manufacturers, has protested to President Eisenhower because of those Swiss dolls he bought in Geneva last week. As a publicity stunt, Mr. Rosenstein's protest has some merit. It enabled him to get some free space about domestic dolls.

But if the dollmakers of the United States cheer him, there is one group of patriotic Americans who won't. The tobacco growers of southern Maryland are mighty glad the President spent the equivalent of $21 in Switzerland. To that extent he undoes the harm he perpetrated when he raised the tariff on Swiss watches.

Watches are a major source of United States dollars for the Swiss. They use them to buy the things we grow and make over here. Maryland tobacco is one of their largest purchases. Last year they bought nearly 6,000,000 pounds of it for about $3,000,000, most of which went into the pockets of southern Marylanders.

If the higher tariff keeps the Swiss from getting dollars through the sale of watches, they can hope to improve the situation a little by the sale of dolls. President Eisenhower's chance purchase means just that to the Swiss. Maryland tobacco growers will get the point, no matter what Mr. Rosenstein's association may think.

A Vote Based on Misgivings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the legislator's task is always easier and pleasanter when he can cast his vote on the basis of strong, affirmative convictions.

Sometimes, unfortunately, it is necessary for him to base a vote on his misgivings, and even worse, to be forced to choose between opposing misgivings.

Yesterday I voted, along with 66 other Republicans, against the Harris natural gas bill. This bill—which passed the House 209 to 203—would exempt producers of natural gas from Federal rate regulation. In doing so I was compelled to choose between opposing and serious misgivings.

On the one hand were the basic misgivings which I have with respect to Federal controls, particularly price or rate controls—including my fundamental distrust of bureaucratic control of the free-enterprise system, opposition to the malicious anti-business bias so often exhibited in Washington since 1933, and a fundamental belief that competition rather than government is the best economic policeman.

On the other hand, on this particular issue, I have serious misgivings as to whether, in the case of production of natural gas, competition can be an adequate policeman of rates and an effective guardian of the interests of the consumer—both the home user and the industrial user of natural gas.

State control of rates charged for natural gas sold by producers and gatherers in the field to pipeline companies for interstate distribution is barred by court decisions. Moreover in this case the competition is between buyers—the pipeline companies—and not between the sellers—the producers. Competition between buyers tends to increase the price to the buyer, and therefore to increase the price to the ultimate consumer, and so is not an effective policeman, as is the case when the competition is between sellers.

Federal rate control is generally accepted by all parties to this dispute as necessary and unavoidable so far as the pipeline companies are concerned. Even the Harris bill, which seeks to remove the producers from rate control by the Federal Power Commission, contains a provision designed to limit the amount which the pipeline companies could pay the producers. But there was deep divergence of opinion as to whether the provisions in the bill provide an adequate restraint on prices which can be paid to producers and passed on to the consumer. And there were serious doubts as to whether these provisions offered safeguards against a markup in the price of the accumulated natural-gas reserves of the pipeline companies—a markup which could yield a rich bonanza to these companies.

The closeness of the vote in the House indicated the grave uncertainties, pro and con, in this highly controversial issue. It is worth noting that the bill was reported out by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by a margin of only one vote. Moreover the Rules Committee voted to send the bill to the floor of the House by only one vote. In every instance, there was a sharp cleavage of sentiment among both Republicans and Democrats.

Since the basic principle of Federal rate control of the cost of natural gas to the ultimate consumer is generally accepted as necessary and sound, and since there was serious doubt in my mind as to whether adequate control and protection of the consumer against price gouging is provided in the Harris bill, I resolved my conflicting misgivings in favor of what I believe to be the legitimate interests of the consumer.

During the campaign last year I repeatedly said that I was deeply concerned about two kinds of human greed—the greed for unconscionable financial gain and the greed for political and governmental power. The issues posed by the Harris bill controversy touched on the human possibilities of both kinds of greed. Striking a balance of proper controls on each of these kinds of greed is a difficult, trial-and-error process.

The So-Called Refugee Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the agitation in behalf of the so-called Refugee Act, precipitated by President Eisenhower's requests for still greater leniencies, unmasks the act for what it is: a fraudulent gesture of political hypocrisy.

For all its purported humanitarian aims, the act is a crudely concocted piece of old-fashioned pork-barreling on an international level. By itself and in combination with the proposals for revision it represents a clear and dangerous attempt to circumvent the carefully constructed legislation which now stands as this Nation's basic policy on immigration.

The people of the United States were duped when they were told of its need. The fact is that during the past 3 years, immigration pressures from the outside

have continuously diminished, and the conditions upon which the displaced-persons laws of 1948 and 1950 were predicated have all but disappeared.

A recently released State Department report states bluntly that despite the broadest interpretations as to qualifications, there are not enough applicants to us up even the visas provided for originally in the Refugee Act—a total of 209,000. There is no mass of starving, tortured humanity pounding at our doors.

DEMAND FOR VISAS REDUCED

Let me cite a few excerpts from the State Department report issued by the Administrator of the refugee program, Scott McLeod:

In Germany, he reports:

East German escapees, constituting the largest single bloc of potentially qualified aliens in West Germany, have the same working rights as West Germans. Greatly improved economic conditions in Germany will reduce the demand for visas under the act as many refugees are being integrated into the local economy.

Not only the regular immigration quota for people born in Germany—which is 25,000 a year—is open and visas are currently available, but preference portions of every immigration quota for Eastern European countries are open just as well.

Of the 2,000 visas allocated for Polish refugees residing in England, only 250 have been applied for.

In the Netherlands "the initiative shown by the Dutch Government in repairing the flood damage and in caring for the inhabitants of the flood areas, plus full employment, make it difficult for applicants to qualify as refugees."

The improved conditions that have enabled these peoples to become adjusted and integrated should be a source of tremendous pride to the American people. This has come about almost wholly as a result of the $38 billion which we have provided, in a genuine humanitarian endeavor, to promote recovery abroad.

The Senate and House conferees on the refugee bill, at the time of its enactment, stressed that it was not to be considered a "mandate to issue the full number of visas. These are maximum limitations, not quotas to be filled." But instead of taking satisfaction in the fact that the crisis has ended, the sponsors of the new recommendations are expressing great concern now that the goal of 209,000 additional immigrants may not be met. The refugee act as a consequence is being transformed into a grotesque Cinderella's shoe.

To justify the changes, the President explained that a "number of the provisions of the act require amendment if the act's objectives are to be fully met."

Let us examine some of the proposed changes and see how they would destroy even the limited safeguards of the original law.

The act of 1953 established a genuine hardship test for qualification as a refugee and requires that the prospective immigrant is not firmly resettled and is in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life. It clearly did not wish to provide a better bet for persons who merely felt they could improve their lot in the Eldorado of America. The amendment proposals would upset this test completely.

Under the act of 1953, provisions for immigrant status, with the subsequent privilege of becoming citizens, were extended to 5,000 alien residents who lawfully entered the United States before July 1, 1953, and who cannot return to their homelands because of the peril of persecution. The demand that they had entered the country legally would seem a small enough one in exchange for the privilege conferred upon them. The amendment bills, however, would eliminate this requirement and bestow this privilege on any alien, including the ship jumpers and those who have simply sneaked across the border.

Closely allied to this is another proposal to eliminate the present requirement for complete information regarding the 2 years immediately preceding the application for entry of each prospective immigrant. Such a change would strike at the heart of our security system. Refugee camps in Germany are permeated with Communist agents ordered by the Soviets to adopt new undercover lives in Europe and America to carry out underground activities. Only the most careful scrutiny of past records can bring about the detection of these agents. Eliminating this provision in the 1953 act would prove of inestimable aid to Communist infiltration tactics which we have now begun to combat with increasing success.

When I was in Berlin recently, the Chief of the United States Counter Intelligence Corps, entrusted with the responsibility for the security investigations under the Refugee Act, was appalled at suggestions that the 2-year requirement be dropped. He recommended instead that it be extended to 5 years.

WOULD BECOME PUBLIC CHARGE

The act of 1953 specified that each prospective immigrant be sponsored by a responsible citizen, or citizens, who would guarantee that the new arrival would not displace someone else from a job or home. The obligation would rest solely upon the sponsors. Interestingly enough, there has been a notable lack of such sponsors. In the new proposals, sponsorship could be undertaken by approved organizations. In the case of public or semipublic agencies, the immigrant would automatically become a public charge, a situation which immigration laws throughout our history have been designed to prevent.

Another measure includes the Presidential recommendation to suspend the health requirements of our immigration laws to permit the entry of persons afflicted by tuberculosis, one of Europe's most rampant diseases. "We in the United States no longer regard tuberculosis with dread," the President declared. The United States Public Health Service lists it as one of the Nation's most fearsome killers, with an annual death toll of around 25,000. We have been battling this scourge with tremendous expenditures of money and medical talent. It has cost us untold wealth in the form of men and women lost to productive labor through its ravages. Are we now to import it deliberately?

The welfare of this Nation, in regard to augmenting our population from outside sources, is, I believe, best served by the diligently constructed immigration law, of which I am proud indeed to have been a coauthor together with the late and beloved Senator McCarran. This law provides the best coordination of our responsibility to ourselves as a nation and of our responsibility to the rest of the world. It permits us to remain of the same fiber that proved over the last stormy half century too tough to be subverted or conquered by any brand of totalitarianism.

The enactment of that law stands as an accomplishment which should not be subjected to partisan and demagogic ventures which can result only in the defeat of our purposes both here and abroad.

Clearing the Record of the Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Dr. Robert E. Cushman, professor of government, Cornell University, which I wish to have printed in the RECORD for the purpose of correcting an error which occurred in report of the Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations. I am very glad to present this for Dr. Cushman for the purpose of clearing the record and overcoming the injustice which came about by reason of the error in printing. I express my regrets to Dr. Cushman:

MARCH 28, 1955.

Hon. B. CARROLL REECE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REECE: I am writing you about what I suppose you would call in Congress a point of "personal privilege."

To identify myself, I am Robert E. Cushman, a professor in Cornell University, and I directed the substantial study of certain civil liberty problems for the support of which the Rockefeller Foundation made an initial grant of $110,000 in 1948. This was one of the grants which was scrutinized and commented on by your committee in its study of tax-exempt foundations.

In the printed report of your committee (House Rept. 2681, 83d Cong., 2d sess., December 1954), an obvious mistake has been made with respect to my name, under which a total of six citations appear.

At the bottom of page 263, my name appears, with an initial item relating to a quotation from me made by Judge Edgerton (United States court of appeals, District of Columbia) in his dissent in the Barsky case. This is entirely correct.

Beginning at the top of page 264, however, appear five citations which do not belong under my name. Living as I do in an upstate New York city, it has taken me some little time, and quite a little outside help, to track down what seems to have caused this mistake. It seems probable that you intended these five items to be listed under the name of Mrs. Hallie Flanagan Davis, now professor of drama at Smith College, and that

the name was somehow lost in manuscript or proof. For example, my photograph does not appear in the December 23, 1940, issue of the Daily Worker (as the last citation states), while hers does. The Daily Worker on that date reviewed a book of hers, and printed her picture in connection with the review. The four other items listed on page 264 also appear relevant to Mrs. Davis. In the first two citations in particular, not only does her name appear (while mine does not) but she was Director of the National Theater project under WPA, while I have never in my life had any connection with the theater or any theater group.

To anyone who has ever gotten copy ready for the printer, or dealt with printer's proofs, it is clear what must have happened here. At some stage in the process the name Davis must have been dropped out, leaving these five citations under the immediately preceding name, Cushman. It will probably take someone in your office only a very short time to check back and verify all this. This is an understandable mistake, and I am entirely sure that it was through either error or accident that these items are attributed to me, when they clearly relate to another person.

I am sure you will agree that I am entitled to have this error in the committee report corrected, and I am also sure that you will wish to make the correction.

I have no desire for any publicity or fanfare about this matter. If you were to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement roughly to the effect that an error in the committee report had been brought to your attention, and that the items beginning on the top of page 264 of the report do not belong under the name of Robert E. Cushman, but under another name, I should feel satisfied. I feel, however, that fairness demands that such a correction should appear in an official Government document, so that I can refer to that correction if criticism arising out of the original erroneous citations are directed against me.

I have given this matter no publicity. It seemed to me only courteous and fair to bring it first to your attention. I do so in the belief that you will wish to make the correction, in some appropriate form, to which I am clearly entitled.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1955.

Mr. ROBERT E. CUSHMAN,
Department of Government,
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

DEAR PROFESSOR CUSHMAN: I have your letter of March 28 and I shall be glad to request permission to insert the correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the House convenes after the recess.

Of course I regret any typographical error in the citation in the report that attended to put you in a bad light.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

CARROLL REECE.

Greetings to Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to send greetings to the country of Pakistan and to their Prime Minister, the Honorable Quaid-e-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah on the occasion of the anniversary of independence of that nation, August 14, 1947. I wish to extend my salutations to the people of Pakistan today because the Congress will have adjourned before the date of the event.

Pakistan has demonstrated its dedication to the ideals of democracy and from its birth as a new nation has drawn inspiration from the United States in its efforts to resolve its problems. Through a positive policy designed to promote better understanding and closer cooperation between other nations and themselves, Pakistan has received substantial aid from the United States and has drawn closer to the American people.

Under the inspired leadership of Quaid-e-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah the Pakistan nation achieved its goal of independence. I wish to applaud the success of Pakistan's efforts in the attainment of the high ideals which they have set for themselves and wish for them continued progress in the future.

I could not conclude without noting the great role Mohammed Ali played in Bandung in setting the record straight as regards Chou En Lai and Red China. I also would like to point out that Mohammed Ali is one of the principal exponents along with the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, in presenting a plan for relaxing tensions between Red China and the United States. Finally, my greetings to the Ambassador from Pakistan, His Excellency Syed Amjad Ali.

Freight Rate Controversies Involving North Atlantic Ports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, there have recently come to my attention remarks made on the floor of this House by my colleague from Clinton, Mass., dealing with the port of Boston and its freight rate relationships to other ports on the eastern seaboard, including my constituent port of Baltimore.

I am greatly disturbed by my colleague's statement that he intends to make his views known to the Interstate Commerce Commission and urge the elimination of alleged discriminatory rate by putting the port of Boston on a parity with every other port on the northeastern seaboard and that he proposes to render every assistance in his power to that end.

I have always considered the Interstate Commerce Commission to be an independent quasi-judicial body, reaching its decisions in rate controversies only on the record made before it in formal proceedings, without regard to sectional or political considerations. To my mind, Congress in establishing the Commission, appointed it to act as steward of the transportation policy of the Nation as a whole as we have expressed it. Our constitutional powers in that respect have been delegated since 1887 to the Commission and since its establishment we have always considered it to be the body best qualified by training and experience to determine such matters.

My constituent port of Baltimore has an equal stake with the port of Boston or any other port of the United States in the foreign commerce of our great Nation. For myself and for my colleagues in Maryland, I desire to express our confidence and that of our constituents in the ability of the Commission to decide the freight rate controversies now before it involving the North Atlantic ports in an unbiased manner in the national interest. Rather than acquaint the Commission with our personal views as to the merits of these controversies we shall observe the normal channels of presentation of Baltimore's case through testimony, briefs, and oral arguments on a formal record.

The Valley's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by William G. Zetzmann, New Orleans, La., member of executive committee, Mississippi Valley Association, before the annual convention, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., June 1, 1955:

THE VALLEY'S PROGRAM

There is a truism that coming events cast their shadows before.

Today, I am going to try to point out a few shadows which are forecasting the greatest era in inland waterway transportation not only in this country but anywhere in the world.

One of those shadows was seen a few weeks ago when a new type of barge came up the Mississippi River to St. Louis. It was loaded with liquid sulfur just as it came from the ground pumped into the barge. This was not just an ordinary barge, but one built on the same principle as a thermos bottle, and it held the temperature of this liquid molten sulfur at 260 degrees Fahrenheit.

Several of these barges are being put into service to move this sulfur from its source to the place where it will be used by industry. Heretofore, liquid sulfur had to be converted to its powdered form, then loaded into barges and gondola cars and transferred to the place where it was to be used. It then had to be reconverted to its liquid form to be used by industry. The economic advantage of this type of transportation is so obvious that I'll not go into that further.

A few weeks ago, a small shipyard at Blair, Nebr., up the Missouri River some 1,500 miles from tidewater, launched two refrigerated barges for the armed services.

Recently in St. Louis, a new type of towboat with four screws and shallow draft—the most powerful vessel of its type in the world—was launched for service on the Missouri River. In spite of its very shallow draft, this boat has 3,600 horsepower and

on its maiden voyage up the Missouri River, it moved some 11,000 tons of steel against a current that for many years defied practical navigation.

The postwar years have seen the development of vessels capable of transporting cargo without reloading from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other West Indies ports, even from Alaska, direct to the inland river ports in the Mississippi Valley.

Each year since the end of World War II has seen the volume of traffic on the inland waterways climb spectacularly. The Mississippi River carried 37 million tons of freight in 1943, 57 millions tons in 1948, and 80 million tons in 1953. Undoubtedly, this record will be broken by both 1954 and 1955.

The Gulf Intracoastal Canal handled 25 million tons in 1943, 30 million tons in 1948, and 43 million tons in 1953.

The tonnage on the Warrior-Tombigbee practically doubled in 10 years.

The tonnage on the Tennessee jumped from 2,800,000 in 1943 to 7,119,000 in 1953.

The Ohio River records 36 million tons in 1943, 42 million tons in 1948, and 62 million tons in 1953.

The Illinois records 6 million tons in 1943, 12 million tons in 1948 and 20 million tons in 1953.

Thus goes the story on all the navigable rivers of the United States.

In my hometown of New Orleans, the barges last year brought in a recordbreaking 42,185,000 bushels of grain as compared to the previous record of 36,747,000 bushels set in 1953. These receipts included 17 million bushels of corn from the Corn Belt, 12 million bushels of soy beans and almost 11 million bushels of wheat. All of the grain producing States have a very direct interest in what happens to us in New Orleans.

These are but a few of the portents which promise that the next half century belongs to the inland empire.

It is in this inland empire that industry is now locating in ever increasing numbers. The South and the midcontinent area of the United States are building the future security and economic stability of our Nation.

I sincerely believe that the last half of the 20th century belongs to the midcontinent and the southern area of the United States. What we do with it, or what we fail to do with it is our responsibility.

What has been accomplished and what the future holds can be traced directly to the fine teamwork which has been developed out there. It is organizations such as the Mississippi Valley Association, working with the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and other groups, that has brought about the tremendous development of both natural resources and industry. Evidence of this cooperation is the fact that I am a member of the executive committee of the Valley Association and treasurer of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress—contemporary but cooperating organizations.

This fine teamwork is predicated on the realization, to paraphrase Mr. Donne, that "no section of the valley is an entity unto itself alone, but that the success of all depends upon the cooperation of all."

We, of the Mississippi Valley Association, are well aware that the interests of every community we serve are interdependent with those of every other community in our area, and that each water development project is an integral link in the mighty chain that builds this area. We are dependent, gentlemen, one upon the other.

We have been unable in the years gone by to draw a fine line between a flood control and a navigation project. We made no progress whatsoever in the 17 reclamation States until we, who were primarily interested in navigation and flood control, recognized the rights of the irrigation interests west of the 97th principal meridian. Now 55 percent of the great Missouri Basin project is complete.

One of the responsibilities which we, in the Valley Association, accept is the task of bringing home to our people everywhere this interdependence one upon the other. We recognize that the New Orleans Tidewater Channel is of the greatest importance to the port of Chicago, for example, as is the improvement of the Cal-Sag Channel to the port of New Orleans. We know, as a matter of practical politics, that we who live in New Orleans cannot obtain the New Orleans Tidewater Channel without the help of such communities as Chicago. We have tried very hard, and we think successfully, in giving to the city of Chicago our support for the Cal-Sag Channel.

Through this program we have impressed upon the people of the Missouri Valley that they have a stake in the locks on the Ohio River and the improvement of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway just as the people of the South will benefit from the multiple-purpose program in the Missouri Basin.

We in Louisiana are using water today that was stored in the Missouri Basin. Our water level at New Orleans was raised considerably during the drouth of last summer, because of water released as far up as Montana on the Missouri River was made available. The use of these surplus waters benefited not only navigation, but they were vital to the municipal water supplies and for pollution abatement and water for industry all along the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers from Fort Peck in Montana to New Orleans in Louisiana.

There is a direct corollary to this program of ours. You in the National Rivers and Harbors Congress can tell the valley story to the people who are interested primarily in the ports of New York, Boston, Baltimore, and other ports on the Atlantic coast; San Francisco, Los Angeles and other ports on the Pacific coast. We think you would be doing a great service to those ports by impressing upon them that they have a stake in the Mississippi Valley, as well as our concern with all tidewater ports.

The Mississippi Valley Association endored 53 water resource projects in the present session of Congres. Certainly, I do not have the time to go over each of these with you. May I briefly call your attention to 3 of them?

The Cal-Sag project is a navigation project authorized by Congress in 1946. It connects Lake Michigan with the Inland Waterways System of the United States. The present channel is obsolete and inadequate. It is crossed some 28 times by low bridges. When it is improved, we will have a proper and adequate water outlet in the great industrial areas around the Great Lakes down through the heart of America and this, of course, is of interest to all of us.

The second project that I would like to mention is the Old River project. If any project can be called a No. 1 project for the Mississippi Valley Association, this is it. We have taken an active part in the authorization and initial appropriations for Old River. Had nothing been done, we believe that the Atchafalaya River, with the help of the Old River, would have completely stolen the Mississippi River by not later than 1965. This would have been a disaster not only to New Orleans and the cities between New Orleans and Old River, but it would have been a disaster to all of America. Congressmen and Senators from all over the United States came to the rescue and helped pass legislation to prevent this disaster.

The third and last project that I want to mention to you today is the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet Channel. New Orleans is the second largest seaport in the United States based upon dollar volume. The proposed New Orleans Tidewater Channel will cut some 40 miles off of the route from our city to deep salt water. It will bypass some 110 miles of dangerous fog-bound river water, and will make a saving of approximately $1,500 per trip for oceangoing vessels coming into our ports. I wish I had time to discuss with you the tremendous job we have before us in rebuilding the obsolete, inadequate locks on the Ohio River. We have more than enough work to be done to keep all of the water-resource organizations in America very busy.

Last year, the President of the United States addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. It was at this meeting that he made what I believe to be his first official statement to the effect that sound water-resource projects should be considered as capital investments rather than current expenditures by the Federal Government.

We, in the Mississippi Valley Association, have urged this philosophy for many years, and out of its recognition in Washington will, I am confident, come a policy which will expedite the orderly and economical completion of the water-resources program in which we all have a common stake.

When this program is complete, the shadows that I have mentioned earlier will have fulfilled my prophesy that the last half of the 20th century belongs to the midcontinent area. Undoubtedly that program that I prophesied will bring to us problems about which we have not as yet even dreamed. It is going to be a lot of fun to be alive and take a part in the development of America in the years immediately ahead of us.

Good Roads Lobbied Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, being 1 of 29 Republicans to have voted for the so-called Democratic highway bill, I felt left out in right field. However, the philosophy that motivated my vote for both the Republican and Democratic highway program is ably set forth in today's lead editorial from the New York Times. The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times of July 29, 1955]

GOOD ROADS LOBBIED AWAY

The House, in a depressingly irresponsible action, has defeated all legislation to accelerate highway construction. It repudiated the good sense and sound financing of its Public Works Committee by rejecting the Democratic highway bill by a vote of 292 to 123. The committee, with great political courage, had agreed by an impressive majority to match spending with taxation in a single package. The House spurned such fiscal responsibility. It also defeated the Republican bill for long-term bond issues for roadbuilding by 221 to 193. So the public gets nothing except a stunning disappointment.

How did this come about? Speaker RAYBURN said: "The people who were going to have to pay for these roads put on a propaganda campaign that killed the bill." The Democratic floor leader, Representative MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said: "Everybody wants a road bill but nobody wants to pay for it." He had a "sneaky idea that the truckers of the country played an important part" in defeating the bill. Yet only the other day American Trucking Association denied that it was trying to kill the pay-as-you-build program, its president

saying that truckers had been the first to state their "willingness to pay tax increases to support the program."

Nevertheless, from the time House Members began to talk about specific user-taxes, such as on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires, instead of just the abstract virtue of spending $50 billion of Federal and State money in about a decade to build and improve highways, it has been obvious that the lobbyists were hard at work.

The recognition of need for greatly increased Federal investment in highways has been general and bipartisan. The Presidential Clay Committee charted a $101 billion Federal-State program for the decade ahead, on which Mr. Eisenhower relied in urging congressional action. The Senate, while rejecting the President's financial plan on May 24 by 60 to 31, was insistent on some highway action at once and of substantial outlay. It rejected recommittal of the Eisenhower bill, and passed the Gore bill by a voice vote.

The House Public Works Committee, with several Ways and Means members sitting in, spent many weeks developing a revenue base that would avoid adding to the public debt, or the evasion of this by setting up an independent highway corporation to issue bonds, and also escape the costliness of high interest charges.

It is interesting to note that this committee, which spent so much time on the problem, stood 22 to 6 for imposing taxes to pay the bill. But when the House showdown came, 128 Democrats opposed the Democratic bill and only 94 Democrats supported it. The Democrats were overwhelmingly against what they viewed as fiscal unsoundness in the Republican bill; only 7 voted for it, while 214 of them voted against it, in a fine show of righteous indignation against heavy borrowing. But when it came to the final test of responsibility—the voting of taxes to accompany spending—128 Democrats couldn't rise to the occasion, and neither could 164 Republicans.

President Eisenhower, expressing his deep disappointment, and rightly arguing that "contention" over methods of financing should not be permitted to deny our people "these critically needed roads," has called for reconsideration before Congress adjourns. The House Republican leader, Representative MARTIN, believes a compromise could be worked out at this session "if we really want to do it." But the Democratic leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, says the House Members are anxious to adjourn, and in his opinion "there's no chance of getting the bill up again." We wouldn't want to interfere with an early homecoming for these House Members, but they shouldn't count on too cordial a welcome if they give up this easily on a highway bill. There are a great many people, including voters, who are willing to pay for good highways—even if the lobbyists aren't.

Greetings to Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to send greetings to the country of Indonesia and to especially extend my best wishes to President Sukarno on the occasion of the celebration of their anniversary of independence, August 17, 1955. I salute Indonesia today because the Congress will not be in session on the date of the event.

Ten years ago, on August 17, 1945, the Indonesians proclaimed their independence from the Dutch, and only after several years of hard and bitter struggling they received international recognition which they so richly deserve.

Under the colonial regime, Indonesian economy was characterized by production of raw materials for the benefit of their colonial exploiters. Under Dutch rule the average Indonesian laborer earned less than 3 cents a day; the country's death rate was one of the highest in the world, with the same situation prevailing in reference to infant and child mortality. Out of every 3 children born, only 1 on the average had hope of surviving beyond the age of 18. In addition to these deplorable facts, the health, sanitation, and educational conditions left much to be desired. Indonesia suffered from high incidences of diseases and over 93 percent of the population was illiterate.

What is the record since Indonesia gained its independence? The Indonesians have taken significant steps forward in the economic development of their country. Because of better maternal and child care, disease preventive and curative measures, the death rate has declined considerably. In respect to education and literacy noteworthy progress has been made. The Indonesian Government can point with pride to the fact that after a few years of independence half of the people can now read and write, whereas formerly this group constituted less than 8 percent of the population. The Indonesians are aware of the importance of educational development to the whole problem of economic development and to the attainment of the ideals of democracy.

To promote the development of the country the Indonesian Government has undertaken a program of gradual industrialization of the island and in keeping with this project many new factories have been established. The purpose of this program is to balance the economy by decreasing the country's dependence upon the export of raw materials. It is well known that underdeveloped countries which rely upon the export trade for the great portion of their income prosper or suffer according to the fluctuation of prices of raw materials on the world market.

The Indonesian Government reports that production is increasing in all areas and substantial gains have been made in agricultural production. Comparison of production statistics for tin, petroleum, bauxite, rubber, fish, and other food crops for the past decade with the figures for the colonial era reflects notable increases.

Mr. Ganis Harsono, press attaché of the Embassy of Indonesia, briefly delineated the more pressing problems facing the new state on the morrow of independence:

Right after the independence we had to start everything from scratch. The army, the navy, the air force had to be established. Diplomatic relations with the outside world had to be made overnight. The budget was almost nonexistent, and the new state was heavily burdened by a $1 billion debt to the Netherlands, made by the previous colonial government. Cities damaged by the war had to be reconstructed. With being complacent, the result of 5 years' hard work was not bad indeed. At this point, we still have not overcome our growing pains. Difficulties are there, but we are sure we can cope with them.

Through hard work and sacrifice the Indonesian people are forging ahead, overcoming gradually almost insurmountable barriers. To date they have made small, but insignificant achievements. Such gains along the road to economic development are indicative of the thinking of the Indonesian Government and the people, and while they are small, they can go a long way to raise the standard of living of the Indonesians.

I wish to applaud the efforts which the Indonesian people are putting forth in the achievement of their goals of economic development and wish for them continued progress and success in their endeavors. Finally, I wish to extend my greetings to his Excellency, the Ambassador from Indonesia, Mokearto Notowidigdo.

Amending Natural Gas Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideraiton the bill (H. R. 6645) to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this pending amendment is the important amendment of the day. It is in the public interest and would provide a degree of protection for the consumers who have invested billions of dollars in gas-household appliances and equipment. I come from an oil-producing area and am, therefore, interested in the gas producers, as well as, in the gas consumers. I represent the second largest oil-producing district in the Illinois oil fields. I am sincerely interested in the welfare of the producers, but I am also interested in the welfare of the consuming public.

The phrase "reasonable market price" is ambiguous and the meaning definitely uncertain, which would make it ineffective from the standpoint of practical application. In my opinion and, I believe, in the opinion of the majority of the committee, "reasonable market price" has no meaning and would merely serve as a favored-nation clause for the payment of the highest price in any gas-producing field.

Most of us have tried to determine what a reasonable market price is. We have done considerable research on it. We have looked in dictionaries. We have inquired of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission and we have asked all of the oil authorities what "reasonable market price" means. We have been unable to find a clear defini-

tion. We have found many interpretations as to what "reasonable market price" does not mean, but we have been unable to find what "reasonable market price" really means. And there is no interpretation in the section on definitions in this bill to clearly define the phrase "reasonable market price."

Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]; and if his amendment is adopted on the floor, I will support this legislation, because I believe that we can accomplish considerable in eliminating the administrative difficulty by removing the producers from direct control of the Federal Power Commission. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, it merely substitutes "just and reasonable price" for "reasonable market price." Surely no one who is remotely interested in the welfare of our consumers could object to this amendment.

If I have time, Mr. Chairman, I want to read you what Chairman Kuykendall, of the Federal Power Commission, had to say about the term "reasonable market price." He says it is important for the Commission to know the interpretation of this wordage. He said:

I would suggest that the term "market value" is a new phrase which does not have any particular usage in the utility regulatory field that I know of. I would suggest either the use of "just and reasonable price" or "fair and reasonable price," as Mr. O'HARA has suggested.

I appeal to you to adopt this amendment.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Crouse-Hinds Co., of Syracuse, N. Y., one of the foremost manufacturing concerns in this country and whose labor-management relations have been outstanding throughout the years, conducted an essay contest among its employees on What America Means to Me. Much interest was manifested and 100 excellent essays were submitted, out of which 13 winners were chosen. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the essay selected for first prize, written by Virginia Keonjian, a native of Russia who has lived in this country about 9 years:

I was not born in America but I've been in this country about 9 years. Yet from the very first day of my arrival, and particularly from the day I received my American citizenship, this country symbolized to me various things, all equally important and dear to my heart.

Upon looking back to my life in Communist Russia, I ask myself "What was I?" A government-owned slave who could be put in jail for a day's absence from work. It was in America that for the first time in my life I felt like an individual, a person, a human being, not just a number.

Here I am not isolated from the rest of the world as I was in Soviet Russia, because now I can follow events through the press and radio free of Government censorship.

My mind is not controlled by anybody. I can read and study whatever I wish according to my personal inclination.

In America I can attend the church of my choice and not be frowned upon by the Government for worshipping God.

My son can attend school where he is taught truth, not propaganda. As an honor student he has the opportunity to receive one of the most outstanding scholarships in this country to pursue his education in a college of his choice.

Only here in this country can I sleep without fear of being awakened at night and arrested without charge. My rights are protected by laws equal for all.

America gives me the right to have my own home, car, and personal property which cannot be taken away, because I elect my Government and it protects my interests as an individual.

Many other things which some people born here take for granted are of greatest value to me. They are best summed up by the wonderful word freedom—the most precious of all my possessions today.

Sermon by Rev. John F. Streng, in Commemoration of the Centennial of Nemaha County, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon which will be delivered by the Reverend John F. Streng, D. D., pastor of St. John Lutheran Church, in Beatrice, Nebr., in commemoration of the centennial of Nemaha County, Nebr.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, it is with the humblest feeling of appreciation and gratitude that I am permitted to return to my native soil for this sacred hour. It is a holy moment, replete with overwhelming memories. How dear to my heart are the scenes of my childhood when fond recollections present them to view. Here in Nemaha County, Nebr., near the county seat of Auburn, by the grace of God and the kind foresight of providence, I was born and reared. This evening, let me pay humble tribute to the God of our fathers, whose almighty hand destined my birthplace to be among the loveliest people of this Nation. Nestled a few miles west of this city, on the fringe of the hickory grove, still stands the white church with the tall spire. And beneath its sheltering dome sleep, among others, my sainted parents. God bless them, who above all indelibly implanted in my mind respect for God and country. Sincere thanks also to the patient public-school teachers and other public leaders who made it possible for us youngsters in the early decades of this century to dedicate ourselves so freely to a good life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And thirdly, my grateful appreciation to the members of the centennial committee under whose careful supervision this service and ceremony was conceived and arranged.

We are come into this happy and holy hour to give thanks to Almighty God for the religious freedom He has given and still preserves to us. We are yet too close to pioneering days to regard ourselves so cultured that the faith of our fathers should have become outmoded by modern methods. Please believe me, that I shall not dare to affront God's rich blessings or the everlasting glory of pioneer parishes, by being so presumptuous as to think that we could do justice to their labors over the century in a fleeting 20 minutes. Religious freedom is the backbone of all our agricultural, industrial, moral, commercial, and spiritual progress. Religion is the foundation stone for which our fathers fled European straitjackets to seek the Promised Land, where they might worship God according to the dictates of their conscience.

Here in Nemaha County the settlers found open prairie and lush land and clear river water to build an empire second to none. Here they used the God-given forest and forage to hew logs for homesteads and houses of God. Here they tilled soil so rich in mineral deposits that in the early days Nemaha County crops were the talk of immigrant, industrialist, and implement dealer. The green carpet of this lovely spot attracted poet and peasant, farmer and factory worker, commercial and church leaders. Lest we forget, religious convictions and ideals were fundamental to the growth and expansion of the great Middle West. The first 100 years of progress are now commemorated by a grateful population looking both backward and forward. A long list and line of contributions to scientific, artistic, civic, humanitarian, intellectual, musical, historical, and spiritual progress bear glorious evidence of a marvelous heritage whose possibilities and promises are still unfathomable and unlimited.

The appreciation of every man's religion, race, and private opinion are memorialized in the many different monuments, one of which are the various churches that have thrived here. Those interests in the early religious history of this county must begin at Brownville, the metropolis of pioneer days. In January 1854, Rev. Joel Woods, one of the original proprietors of Brownville, organized the first Christian church in Nebraska Territory. The Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in June 1858, as was also the Congregational Church. In October of the same year the Presbyterian Church was organized. In this same year the Baptist Church came to Nebraska. Also the beginnings of the Lutheran Church were made in the same year at what was then known as Feming, Nebr., long since disappeared and now known as the Old Stone Church, near the Timber Creek Lutheran Church, southwest of Auburn. The Episcopal Church held its first services in the fall of 1863, and the Roman Catholic Church was established in 1870, when the cornerstone was laid by Father Curtis of Omaha. This is a totally incomplete sketch of the beginning and forerunners of the strong churches of various denominations in the county today. Some consecrated layman or laywoman of this county would reap the rich reward of a God-pleasing monument to the future by writing an authentic history of the march of the Christian religion in Nemaha County. It would be a source of never-ending inspiration to many to see these banners go. Today every city and hamlet and countryside has its church. Nationalties are blended to enrich and fertilize the common cultural heritage. Rare indeed is even the country school in which prayer is withheld and religious tenets deemphasized. Today's public-school teachers and private tutors and Sunday-school teachers alike share the God-given responsibility to remind their generation that this is a nation under God—a nation with liberty and justice for all.

It is indeed appropriate to remember this day the journeys of our spiritual fathers and

missionaries as they traversed Nemaha County, preaching, teaching, reaching flocks without a shepherd. Like an ever enlarging city of God, the panorama of religious citadels rising on the fruited plain, evokes awe and inspiration. From township to township the church has ministered to the people in the name of Jesus Christ, Lord of Lord and King of Kings. Like a mighty army moves the church of God, and both carefully kept church records and county court proceedings of incorporations bear witness to its strength in the course of empire. As we retrace God's steps and bind together loose cords we see again what God hath wrought in knitting together a people of many tongues into one strong race.

We gather together to seek the Lord's blessing as we begin to commemorate a century of loyalty and devotion. Your fathers and mine helped each in their way, known or unknown, to contribute to today's enormous spiritual wealth. God-fearing pioneers built a solid series of temples that embrace the loftiest ideals of our American way of life. Through mutual understanding and fellowship, through sheer faith, hard labor, progressive thrift, kindly tolerance, good industry, friendly neighborliness, this county ranks among the foremost among more than 90 others. The strong radiant, vibrant heart of a healthy Christian America beats in the rural communities and the small cities where people still plan and pray together.

This is an hour to voice our gratitude to God for His army of noblemen and women of yesteryear whose struggle and sacrifice makes this week's gatherings possible. The early settlers could not fathom the enormous riches that should come from this black soil, filtered and deposited here from great underground watersheds embedded in the western slops of this commonwealth. But they were courageous sturdy folk who brought with them a unique assortment of skills and crafts, and an undeniable industry for work. Here they establish their homes, schools, and churches. With their own hands they carved out a temple of liberty that stands unmovable today.

Because they had a mind and will to work honestly and for long hours, they made a name for themselves which lives in loving memory. They gave an account of their God-given talents and time by the sweat of their brow and the stint of hard labor. They did not ask that economic security be guaranteed nor did they gather in town hall meetings to agree on the amount of grants, loans, and subsidies they were entitled to. They honored the authority of God and government. They were so grateful to be permitted to worship God in their own way that they freely shared His bounty. They were so happy to become American citizens that they proudly wore a red-white-and-blue ribbon in the coat lapel, and sang the national anthem with heartfelt assurance.

In a hundred years an untamed wilderness has become a paradise. God showered material, cultural, and spiritual attainments upon them lavishly. America possesses more churches, temples, and synagogs dedicated to the service of God than any other nation. One hundred and seventy-eight years ago the American Constitution was adopted proclaiming the inherent rights of man as God-given. No government grants them nor can it withhold them; it can only safeguard them for the people. No one can take away what belongs to God. These fundamental truths must be told to every generation. We must patiently explain the glories of our land to children's children. We must arouse every citizen to a personal responsibility in the community, county, State, and Nation. Our glorious independence has become an interdependence, for all nations have become neighbors through global communication. We must teach American youth to be self-reliant, reliable, conservative, tolerant, unselfish, honest, God-fearing. Let us thank God for the Christian leadership of all public officials from the President of the United States to the local township leader.

Let us develop an ever stronger public spirit of civicmindedness and moral leadership. We are our brother's keeper, regardless of what his religion is, for we are all made in the image of God, and we shall all have to account for our stewardship of life before Him. There can be no future without religious vitality. Armies, navies, and the air force, do not make a nation strong if moral courage is lacking. The freedom of the individual is ordained of God, and therefore the foundation of national strength.

The Holy Bible begins: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." Let us never forget that this is God's world and all that is therein is His to have and to hold forever. The preamble of our American Constitution begins: "We, the people." Thank God for the wisdom He gave to our forefathers for this priceless introduction. There is not one word about powers and rights of any ruler or President or Congress or lawmaking body.

As we celebrate the centennial prepared by our fathers from the day they set foot on this soil, let us remember that their integrity and industry make this celebration possible under the guiding hand of God. Three fundamental supports have made our Nemaha County great: Faith in God, faith in our Constitution, faith in private enterprise.

So let us begin the second century. Let freedom ring o'er hill and dale. Let the people enjoy the nobility of sons of God and sons of the soil. Let the simple truths instilled into children in the little white country school, the city schools, public and private, and the Sunday church school, be guarded as a sacred trust. Let the law of the land and gospel of the Lord be the two tablets of righteousness that shall serve as the foundation upon which future generations shall build. As we part with the past, we say: "Well done, good and faithful servants. Thanks be to God for all His benefits." As we walk into an unknown future, we proudly hail its dawn saying: "As for me and my house we will serve the Lord. I pledge allegiance to the Flag and to the Republic for which it stands; one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." May God grant it. Amen.

The North American Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days remarks have been offered in this Chamber about an air carrier combine known as North American, and a recent 4-to-1 decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board revoking its operating authority.

The charges against this carrier are most serious. They all are based on the basic issue of repeated, wilful violation of the laws of the United States. These are not minor violations. They constitute the first and only instance, in the history of civil aviation, of such long continued operation of a full-blown scheduled airline without the award of a certificate of public convenience and necessity by the proper Federal regulatory agency.

Attempts have been made to justify this on the grounds of pioneering of air coach, on the ground that the law should be changed, and apparently through political pressure.

None of these grounds authorizes the flying of a scheduled airline. The law says that authority can come through award by the CAB, and in no other way.

I hope no attempt will be made to pressure the Board, and I trust that it will continue to render its decisions objectively, judicially, with the firmness of its convictions.

I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial of July 25. It is from a publication which has often shown its sympathy for nonscheduled carriers, and which has, so far as I have been able to determine, never been charged with being dominated or improperly influenced in this matter. I consider the writer's remarks helpful in distinguishing between the claims of the deserving and the undeserving, among nonscheduled air carriers:

[From Aviation Week of July 25, 1955]

THE NORTH AMERICAN CASE: A MOCKERY

The airlines are a federally regulated industry. If the established economic and technical regulations that govern operations of the air-transport industry are not enforced chaos would soon result.

Thus the Civil Aeronautics Board had little choice in reaching its 4 to 1 decision to revoke the operating authority of North American Airlines and order this airline to stop its illegal operations immediately. The Board was in unanimous agreement on the issues that North American Airlines was violating the Civil Aeronautics Act and that it must be punished for these violations. In filing a minority report, Member Joseph Adams took issue with the majority only on whether the punishment proposed for North American was too severe and whether the public would suffer from lack of a competitive fare yardstick.

GUILTY ON FOUR COUNTS

The Board found North American Airlines guilty on four major types of violations that taken together made revocation of operating authority inevitable. The Board also found that the 4 principal individuals involved in the case had illegally acquired control of 4 irregular carriers (Twentieth Century Airlines, Trans National Airlines, Trans American Airways, and Hemisphere Air Transport); merged the properties without Board approval, and operated a single integrated carrier without a certificate of public convenience and necessity as required by law for this type of operation.

It is worth repeating some of the things said by the Board majority on this North American Airlines enforcement case.

"When we cut through the web of intercompany dealings and technical devices employed by the respondents it is perfectly clear that the respondents have attempted to make a mockery of the Board's regulations and to operate without regard for the requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

"No amount of pious protestations by respondents can now obscure the fact that they deliberately embarked upon an involved scheme to operate a regular scheduled transcontinental air-transport business without a certificate of public convenience and necessity or other appropriate operating authority. * * *

"And now with the same degree of legal legerdemain employed in constructing the North American combine, respondents have resorted to a multiplicity of technical legal arguments in an attempt to escape the consequences of their unlawful activities."

North American Airlines has been operating what it candidly admits is a scheduled air coach service on high density traffic runs such as the transcontinental and New York-Miami routes. In 1954 North American flew 329,476,000 passenger-miles with a fleet of 7 DC–6, DC–4, and DC–3 aircraft. This compares with 7,275,000,000 coach passenger-miles flown by United States certified carriers during the same year. North American was interested only in the high density traffic routes where by price cutting it could skim some of the cream from the existing air transport market. It had no responsibility to serve less profitable points that are part of the public convenience responsibility shouldered by certificated airlines. And North American displayed no interest in serving anything but the richest route segments.

North American officials know that their operations violated the law. They blandly contended that the law should be changed and ignored it while pursuing their cream-skimming operations, confident that CAB inertia, legal maneuvering and political pressure would stave off the inevitable day of reckoning until the principal individuals involved had made their fortune.

There are many people and organizations in aviation today, including certificated carriers and airline manufacturers, who do not like the Civil Aeronautics Act and are actively working for its change. The legislation proposed by the late Senator Pat McCarran and now by Senator WARREN MAGNUSON have provided a proper means of affecting changes in this law. However, we know of no other aviation organization except North American Airlines which contends that it should be exempt from existing laws while seeking to have them changed.

FUTURE ISSUES LOOM

By taking firm action against North American Airlines and forcing it to face the consequences of its deliberate flouting of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Board has cleared the way for consideration of the genuine problems concerned with the future expansion of air transport without blurring this picture by an enforcement problem.

These issues include developing an effective method of entry into the air transport business. No industry as dynamic as air transport can effectively close the door on new ideas or new methods of exploiting its potential services. The role of irregular or nonscheduled carriers in the overall transport picture needs sharper definition that will also provide real economic opportunity. The Board must exhibit more sensitivity to public convenience and the public's future needs and less concern with precedent and tradition in charting new regulatory courses for the continued growth of air transport.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Government Clinics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, every other year during adjournment it has been my custom to hold a government clinic in each of the 38 county-seat towns in my district. These meetings are not political, but merely question-and-answer periods to give folks an opportunity to visit with their Representative, ask questions about government, and to render a report of my stewardship in Congress.

The first hour is devoted to school students, entitled "Youth Wants To Know." The last hour is for adults who may attend. Following is the schedule of clinics for the first 2 weeks:

Monday, September 19: Scottsbluff, 2 to 4 p. m.; Kimball, 7 to 9 p. m.

Tuesday, September 20: Sidney, 2 to 4 p. m.; Bridgeport, 7 to 9 p. m.

Wednesday, September 21: Harrisburg, 2 to 4 p. m.; Alliance, 7 to 9 p. m.

Thursday, September 22: Harrison, 2 to 4 p. m.; Chadron, 7 to 9 p. m.

Friday, September 23: Rushville, 2 to 4 p. m.; Myannis, 7 to 9 p. m.

Monday, September 26: Valentine, 2 to 4 p. m.; Ainsworth, 7 to 9 p. m.

Tuesday, September 27: Springview, 2 to 4 p. m.; Bassett, 7 to 9 p. m.

Wednesday, September 28: Butte, 2 to 4 p. m.; O'Neill, 7 to 9 p. m.

Thursday, September 29: Bartlett, 2 to 4 p. m.; St. Paul, 7 to 9 p. m.

Friday, September 30: Greeley, 10 to 12 a. m.; Taylor 2 to 4 p. m.

The meetings will be held in the county court house unless otherwise indicated. The public is invited.

Defense of the Bern Young Anti-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a draft issued by the Committee for Aiding the Defense of the Bern Young Anti-Communists. This group which is now being prosecuted by the Communist conspiracy is making a life sacrifice for curtailing the future spread of Soviet tyranny:

DRAFT OF A STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR AIDING THE DEFENSE OF THE BERN YOUNG ANTI-COMMUNISTS

The Soviets' barbaric tyranny in Eastern Europe and their ruthless subversive methods in the free world, have not yet been able to crush the spirit of anti-Communist resistance on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The slave labor camps, deportations, mass massacres all over the Red prison of nations, the assassinations in the Katyn forest and all the other crimes against freedom and human dignity, which are going on even today, have not extinguished that burning flame of resistance in Eastern Europe, nor has the new campaign, waged by the Soviets among the exiles, of intimidation through blackmail and murder, shaken the faith and determination of the refugees.

But this overwhelming criminal pressure brought to bear both on the captive peoples themselves and on the escapees, has driven them to the verge of despair. Two years ago the despondent people of East Berlin attacked with their bare hands the oppressor; this year young anti-Communist refugees rising in utter desperation, raided a Communist Legation in Bern, Switzerland, exposing its subversive activities. These explosions of the strangled urge for freedom should be taken into serious consideration as they are warning signals of a general situation and not just isolated cases. In fact incidents such as that of Bern, are the expression of the deep instability, misery and tension created by the Soviet aggressive intrusion in the free countries of the Eastern part of Europe and by the shortsighted indifference shown by the free world. After long years of Soviet despotism and Western abandonment, these people are reaching the end of their tether.

Moscow is at this precise moment waging a powerful propaganda campaign to recruit among the unsettled, bitter and frustrated refugees, those desperate enough to accept repatriation with assurances of forgiveness and good jobs. The real aim of the Soviets in this maneuver is to get a corps of anti-western, especially anti-American propagandists, as being direct witnesses of the failure of the West in dealing effectively with the problem of those who had chosen freedom. There is no doubt that the Soviets badly need new instruments of propaganda to keep down the fermenting discontent behind the Iron Curtain and to kill the ever-renaissant hope in the West. But neither is there much doubt that the program for handling the refugee problem is clearly inadequate.

There is therefore a most urgent need to strengthen the badly strained morale of both the enslaved and the refugees. We are upholding this cause as being of vital importance in the battle for men's minds. We must give comfort and encouragement to those who, fighting for freedom, are serving as well the best interests of the United States. Such are the young patriots in the Bern incident who courageously tore off the mask of Red diplomacy. They are awaiting trial in Switzerland and we are sure that the Swiss courts will grant them a fair trial in accordance with their laws, product of a life of freedom and normalcy. But our purpose is especially to draw the attention of the public to the tragic background of the abnormal existence of terror and enslavement in which lies the motivation of their action.

The Soviet subjugated peoples have no longer the possibility to express their will, as they are the object of the most intolerant totalitarian rule. The technically legal facade, such as constitutions on the Soviet pattern, peace treaties, diplomatic relations, etc., corresponds in no way with the rights and free will of the people. As a matter of fact the people are deprived of all normal legal channels of expressing their feelings or defending their interests. As it has happened in the significant moments of history under such circumstances, the natural inalienable right of man are asserted by the resistance to oppression. The people, seeing that all legitimate juridical ways of defending their liberties have been denied them, are making use of the means forced on them by the very slavery to which they have been reduced, namely, passive resistance, sabotage, and direct action. The incident in Bern is due to this tragic situation in which the victims of tyranny are compelled to make use of their sacred right to resist oppression.

It is tyranny, persecution, and the fake legality of totalitarian conformism, which push people to insurrection, rebellion, and violence. It is, indeed, by now established that the law in the Soviet orbit is the mere instrument of absolute dictatorship. The American people as inheritors of the Declaration of Independence feel deeply that the honor and dignity of the captive peoples are not in their conformity to this fake Communist legality but in their very acts of revolt and violence against the oppressor. This is the real and dramatic background which caused the action of the young exiles in Bern. Aiding in their defense by giving them our moral support, we recognize the spirit of resistance and self-sacrifice which

animates them and all their like behind the Iron Curtain.

We appeal to our public to give its traditional understanding to these brave young men who, in their fight for freedom, lost both home and country, and thus bring a message of encouragement and hope to all our secret allies, the captive peoples.

Questionable Characters in the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently a strange, strange practice, and I might add strange thinking, has grown up in connection with Federal employees.

In recent years there seems to be a feeling among certain individuals and groups that not only has an applicant for a Federal position a right to a job, but that once employed, the job is permanent. This is especially true in connection with those holding jobs who are associated with or subscribe to left-wing thinking.

Many others, especially some born abroad, seem to feel that the privilege of citizenship carries with it a right to subsistence from the Federal payroll together with job security, while they think and talk about how much better are the systems of government in other countries, especially in the land from which they came.

The Saturday Evening Post of July 30, 1955, carries an article which should clarify the thinking of some. It reads as follows:

LOYALTY BOARDS CAN ERR, BUT WE STILL NEED THEM

It now appears that sooner or later this country will be treated to a congressional investigation of the Government's security and loyalty programs. President Eisenhower has withdrawn his objections to such an investigation, and several influential Democratic Senators are breathing fire on this issue, doubtless hoping to deprive the Republicans of some of the political capital which they have accumulated from the Hiss case and other evidences of Soviet infiltration during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Like other programs devised under emergency conditions, the Government's efforts to bar spies and subversives from Federal employ has not worked out perfectly. Undoubtedly, some individuals have been unjustly pilloried as Reds, although the left-wing propagandists have been hard put to it to produce many heart-rending examples of such injustice. It will be tragic if investigation is conducted along political lines, with too little attention to the primary reason for the existence of any loyalty program at all—namely, that the Communist espionage system has succeeded in penetrating our bureaucracy and will continue its efforts to do so.

Perhaps the most explosive issue likely to be developed during the investigation will be the question of the right of suspects to be confronted by their accusers. In its opinion on the dismissal of Dr. John P. Peters from the United States Public Health Service, the Supreme Court refused to rule on this issue, declaring that a ruling on the right of confrontation would "present serious and far-reaching problems in reconciling fundamental constitutional guarantees with the procedures used to determine the loyalty of Government personnel." But this question will have to be decided sometime. Surely, it cannot be beyond the resources of legal exegesis to resolve any apparent conflict between the rights of individuals and the necessity to protect the United States from outside subversion.

Unless we reconcile ourselves to the end of the FBI as an effective investigating body, we must continue to protect the anonymity of FBI agents in security cases. Even Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, one of the prime movers for a congressional probe, declared, "If protecting sources of information represents a compromise with traditional American concepts of justice and fair play, it is a price which we should be willing to pay in times of national peril for an effective securtiy program." No effort to square this circle will be convincing if it dwells too much on the distress of accused individuals, many of them by no means whiter than snow, and ignores the security of the country. Grudge informers and poison-pen gossips can be eliminated by competent administrators.

A startling example of the sentimental approach to the security problem was the recent award of $5,000 by the Fund for the Republic to the officials of a Pennsylvania library who had refused to dismiss their librarian for having invoked the fifth amendment before the Senate's Internal Security Committee. President Robert M. Hutchins of the fund described the stand of the library trustees as "a courageous and effective defense of democratic principles" and implied that the librarian had been the "special target of self-appointed censors and amateur loyalty experts."

The anouncement as summarized in the New York Times gave the impression that the librarian had invoked the fifth amendment when asked whether she had been a secretary in a Communist-front school in Massachusetts. But the central question which the librarian refused to answer was: "Are you now a member of the Communist Party?"—"now" being May 21, 1953. After conferring with her counsel, the librarian replied, "In answer to that question, I decline to answer that question upon the ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me."

For all we know, the lady in question was not a Communist when she was asked this $64 question. There is no sense in punishing people for past errors or for their opinions. But, inasmuch as she refused to say whether or not she was presently a Communist, it is difficult to expect "self-appointed censors and amateur loyalty experts" not to get red in the neck. Although there is no occasion to yield to the extremists who see a Communist behind every lamppost, it would be equally dangerous to accept the view that there is no reason to fear Soviet espionage at all. To strike a proper balance we should like to see Dr. Hutchins give some of his foundation's money to the broadcasting company which refused to fire Winston Burdett for helping expose Communist infiltration instead of making that essential task more difficult. An even better candidate for an award would be Whittaker Chambers, who exposed the Communist conspiracy when to do so was to risk serious reprisals.

Perhaps these episodes have only a secondary bearing on the obligation of the Federal executive departments to set up a better loyalty program and of Congress to investigate the existing one. But they do suggest the kind of pressure under which those concerned with this problem must labor. Lest the whole controversy bog down into a series of recriminations and sob stories, it would appear to be the duty of somebody high in the Eisenhower administration to demonstrate in easy to understand terms the need for a loyalty program, the feverish effort by the left wing to destroy any loyalty program whatever, and the steps which may be necessary to iron out inconsistencies and defects.

East Texan Ernest L. Kurth, One of Nation's Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on the subject East Texan Ernest L. Kurth, One of Nation's Builders, together with a newspaper article and an editorial on the same subject attached to the statement of the Senator from Texas.

There being no objection, the statement, with the attached article and editorial, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST TEXAN ERNEST L. KURTH, ONE OF NATION'S BUILDERS

(Statement by Senator JOHNSON of Texas)

On Monday of this week one of East Texas' most respected and beloved citizens, a constructive builder all his life, observed his 70th birthday.

I refer to Mr. Ernest L. Kurth, of Lufkin—Mr. East Texas in person.

As lumberman, manufacturer, business executive, financier, and far-seeing civic worker, Mr. Kurth has made a deep and lasting imprint on Texas and, indeed, on the whole South. No better example could be found of that tribe of men who have built our Nation and brought it to its present stature in the world.

Ernest L. Kurth has always looked to the future. Characteristically, he spent his 70th birthday at work on big projects of importance to many people.

I am proud to join his thousands of friends in saying "happy birthday" to a man I am proud to know as a Texan and as a personal friend.

I attach hereto an editorial from the Houston Chronicle and a news story from the Dallas News on Mr. Kurth's birthday, in order that all Senators may gain some idea of the career of this man who is truly a giant among men.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News of July 25, 1955]

NEWSPRINT PIONEER—KURTH TOO BUSY TO MARK BIRTHDAY

(By Robert M. Hayes)

LUFKIN, TEX.—The man who gave Texas a new industry—the manufacture of newsprint—will observe his seventieth birthday anniversary Monday.

But Ernest L. Kurth, head of the Angelina County Lumber Co., the Southland Paper Mills and a key figure in at least a score of other enterprises, won't have time for any

special observance. In fact, he won't even be in Lufkin. He's in New Mexico on a business trip.

His friends say the 70-year-old industrialist has no thought of slowing up. On the other hand both his lumber mill and paper mill are in the midst of a $15 million expansion and modernization program.

Kurth, described by Gov. Allan Shivers as "Mr. East Texas" was born at Kurth Station near Corrigan in Polk County on July 25, 1885. He was educated in the Lufkin public schools and at Southwestern University, Georgetown. Soon after his graduation he went to work as a bookkeeper for the Angelina County Lumber Co., then owned by his father, J. H. Kurth. Today he is recognized internationally as an authority on timber production and forest conservation.

Kurth's success in bringing a newsprint mill to Texas is typical of his achievement in many fields.

Some 15 years ago when the United States was still largely dependent upon foreign importations for its supply of newsprint, Kurth heard of experiments being conducted by a Savannah, Ga., chemist, Dr. Charles Holmes Herty, to produce newsprint out of Southern pine.

Herty and a fellow scientist, Francis Patrick Garvin, discovered that southern yellow pine did not, as previously thought, contain too much pitch or resin.

Kurth saw the possibilities of the Herty-Garvin idea. If it worked it would mean the profitable utilization of millions of cut-over lands in East Texas which at that time were of little value.

After getting pledges from southern newspaper publishers to take 50,000 tons of newsprint in the first 5 years of the planned mill, Kurth undertook the task of getting the project financed. Prospective investors were dubious, some of them told Kurth frankly they thought he was crazy.

But the Lufkin man never gave up. Largely through his efforts the money was pledged and in 1939 the mill was completed with a single unit. Since then it has been twice expanded and another expansion is under way. In spite of his many business activities, Kurth has always found time for community problems. He is active in his local chamber of commerce and has served as president of the east Texas Chamber of Commerce. Hundreds of east Texas youngsters owe their education to Kurth scholarships.

Several years ago Kurth was named "man of the year" as the outstanding Southern industrialist. More than a thousand business leaders from over the Nation gathered in Lufkin to pay their respects to him.

It was about that time someone coined what probably is Kurth's most descriptive title: the titan of the tall timber.

E. L. KURTH, EAST TEXAS LEADER, ATTAINS 70 YEARS OF ACHIEVEMENT

On Monday, July 25, Ernest L. Kurth of Lufkin will observe the anniversary of his birth 70 years ago in a now nonexistent village in Corrigan in Polk County. His parents moved into Angelina County while he was still a child and there his father established a sawmill outside Lufkin.

Today, the son of that founder is known throughout the Nation as the pioneer who first envisioned the manufacture of newsprint from yellow pine and who established and now heads as president the Southland Paper Mills of Lufkin.

Earlier he had attained his stature as one of the leaders of the Texas lumber industry as president of the Angelina County Lumber Co., a position he retains.

Texas has produced many giants. She has sent her sons into the world of banking, commerce, and industry to reflect the glory of their native State. Not so with Ernest L. Kurth. He chose to remain in the region where he was born whence, through his industry, his vision and his imagination, his fame has radiated into the world he eschewed. His name today is as readily known in Wall Street or in Washington as it is in the streets of Lufkin.

His eminence was achieved through no accident. It is the result of a determination and a genius for hard work plus a refusal to permit handicaps which might halt ordinary men to thwart him. The same vigor that marked him in his prime guides him today. And so, in the evening of life, when most men are looking forward to retirement, Ernest Kurth is planning for the future. His two huge plants are presently under expansion in a construction program that will cost more than $15 million.

Ernest L. Kurth is a giant of whom Texas can justly brag.

Merry-Go-Round on the Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 30 of this year, I introduced a bill which would authorize immediate construction of power deevlopment works on the Niagara River. As anyone can see from a mere reading of the bill, it was completely nonpartisan and noncontroversial in character. Its sole purpose was to break the disastrous stalemate which has plagued this essential project for the 5 years since February 1950 when a treaty with Canada made the project possible.

Canada did not waste its opportunity. It has virtually completed the project which will permit it to generate $60 million worth of hydroelectric power per year—plus our equal United States share, until we are in a position to use it. And we have not even started, as the 5-year-old argument of who shall own and operate the power project on this side of the border, continues to stymie its development.

My bill was designed to break that log jam without offending anyone. It did not determine who would own and operate the project—but provided only for an immediate start on construction, on a neutral basis, so that the 4 to 5 years it would take for construction, could be utilized for the settlement of the arguments and the project would be finished when the arguments were settled, and not just beginning.

Over $300 million worth of much-needed electrical power for defense, industrial, and domestic use has run wastefully over the falls since the treaty was signed in 1950. Three hundred million dollars worth will run over the falls before the project is finished, if it were started today. Twenty million dollars worth has run over the falls since I introduced my bill.

It seemed impossible last March that this bill could fail of passage—and yet almost unbelievably, it looks as though neither it nor any other bill for redevelopment of the Niagara will be passed this session of Congress. Even if it passed next session, a year from now, we will have to watch $60 million worth of power run over the falls between now and then.

The Young Men's Republican Club of Erie County, N. Y., promptly recognized the overwhelming merit of the Radwan bill when they passed a resolution last June urging its immediate enactment. So also did the Buffalo Evening News when it editorialized last May:

> Only Congress can settle (this deadlock), and the signs that it will bestir itself to do it this year are none too encouraging. * * * All of which attests the supreme economic folly of stalling any more years before even getting the project under construction on our side. Whether or not Congress can make up its mind which party should operate the development, once built, there is no good reason why the actual construction cannot proceed at once * * * If the Harriman-Moses group and the private-enterprise advocates can muster their forces for an immediate showdown this year, well and good. But if nothing more than another deadlock results, we simply will have wasted valuable construction time. Whether as immediate insurance that something will get started, or as a deadlock-breaker to be passed later in the session if it develops that neither the private nor public-power advocates can have their way, we think the Radwan bill deserves to be taken seriously and supported as an alternative approach by all those who are sincerely interested in getting some kind of Niagara power development expedited.

The anticipated deadlock has occurred, as I feared it would.

Not a single argument was advanced against the merits of my bill. The strongest statement against it was that it was unnecessary, because one of the permanent bills, calling for construction and operation would be passed this session. Well, they have not been. Only the Lehman bill stands a chance of passing in the Senate, and no one expects it to pass the House, at least this session. If and when a permanent bill is passed, it will be subject to time-consuming litigation.

A recent article in the Buffalo Evening News is headlined "Power Use in Buffalo Area Hits New Peak for Summer." It is a fitting obituary for what has happened to Niagara power this year. But come January 1, I shall press for the only sure-fire solution to this deadlock—immediate passage of my bill for immediate construction of the project. Let us stop this merry-go-round on the Niagara.

Apologies Are Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the atention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the July 29, 1955, issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

APOLOGIES ARE NOT ENOUGH

The Bulgarian Government has expressed its "sincere regret" for the shooting down of an Israeli airliner with a loss of 58 lives, including 13 Americans. But this is emphatically a case in which apologies are not enough. As the British Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, R. H. Turton, said in the House of Commons: "I can't envisage any circumstances in which a civil airliner on a civil flight can be legitimately shot down."

The question of how to deal with incursions by planes of one nationality into the "air space" of another has been a source of friction between East and West for many years. Usually, the incidents involve military planes, and usually the "defending" Communist aircraft are themselves outside of Red airspace. The basic evil, however, does not stem from the character of the planes involved nor the precise position in respect to national boundaries. It is the fact that Red planes and antiaircraft shoot first and ask questions later.

If there is to be peace in the skies, some more civilized method of regulating air traffic will simply have to be accepted by the Communist regimes. The alternative is the special alerting of all Western military planes in the neighborhood of Red borders, with orders to shoot if threatened and, presumably, the convoying of all civil aircraft flying similar routes. The West can no longer condone murder in the air, even if it is accompanied by Communist crocodile tears.

There are methods available of exchanging recognition signals, of conveying warnings to planes off course, of escorting them in the right direction. If genuine violations of airspace become too common, redress and correction can be obtained through diplomatic channels. But when peaceful travelers on their lawful occasions are shot down in flames, no words, no payment, are adequate requital.

There should be an international convention drawn up to provide a code of international behavior in the air, with appeal to the International Court of Justice or some similar tribunal in case of violation of boundaries. But no piratical attacks will be tolerated.

Were the Facts on the Beria Death Given the President by Zhukov the Same as Those Given the Congress Over a Year Ago?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of Thursday, July 28, 1955, reference is made to information given the President at Geneva by Zhukov.

One wonders whether the facts on the death of Beria, former NKVD chief under Stalin, were the same as those to which I referred in my extension of remarks reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 154 in the issue of January 12, 1954. Both articles follow:

THE MAN WHO SENTENCED BERIA

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, Monday, January 11, 1954)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, can the man who sentenced Beria give us a clue to what might happen in Russia? Liquidation of the Bolshevik clique by the professional military?

Reports indicate Beria was sentenced to death by the man he made eat crow in 1945–46, General Konev, Soviet opposite number to Gen. Mark Clark, on the allied commission in Austria. Konev, proud, old-time professional, took his orders from Zheltov, bullnecked Beria hatchetman in Vienna.

Konev, short, well liked by his troops, was friendly to the West. He didn't last long in Vienna. Zheltov saw to that. Then, the tables turned. Stalin died (?), Beria is tried. Konev sentences him. Where's Zheltov?

Does this mean that the professional military of Russia has had its fill of the crumbums in the Kremlin? Does it spell a better break for the Russian, his wife and family—for all the men and women whose kin spilled blood in the hopes of a better tomorrow? One wonders. One hopes. One prays.

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1955]

KREMLIN FACTS GIVEN PRESIDENT BY ZHUKOV

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—President Eisenhower has received an amazing personal briefing on inside Kremlin secrets from Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov.

The President revealed at his White House news conference today that the Soviet Minister of Defense had offered him a first-hand account of what had been going on within the inner barriers of the Iron Curtain.

General Eisenhower did not outline in detail the report Marshal Zhukov made to him. But he implied it had been a persuasive account, particularly in the stress it laid on the current doctrine of collective leadership.

The President referred specifically to the four at Geneva—Marshal Zhukov, Marshal Nikolai A. Bulganin, Soviet Premier; Nikita S. Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party; and Vyacheslav M. Molotov, Foreign Minister. All of these except Marshal Zhukov are members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

ZHUKOV PLAYS LEADING ROLE

It seemed clear from President Eisenhower's account that Marshal Zhukov was playing a leading role in the present leadership of the Soviet Union. It also was plain that the President placed considerable credence in Marshal Zhukov's report, particularly so far as collective leadership was concerned.

As the President described this system, a method of rule by committee or junta has been substituted in the Soviet Union for the one-man dictatorship of Stalin.

General Eisenhower said that the new system had been demonstrated under working conditions in Geneva, where he noted the Soviet group of 3 or 4 men had conferred constantly and produced a common viewpoint.

The President—as has been his consistent practice—spoke with some warmth of Marshal Zhukov as his old friend and postwar military associate in Berlin. He left little doubt that Marshal Zhukov's intimate picture of what was going on behind the scenes in the Soviet Union—and what had gone on there in recent years—played a major role in the administration's current appreciation of the Soviet's "new look" as something more than skin deep.

SEVERAL CONVERSATIONS HELD

The President had a number of conversations with Marshal Zhukov in Geneva. He indicated, however, that the principal briefing he had received was in the course of a private 2½-hour talk that apparently covered the whole scope of Soviet affairs from Marshal Zhukov's personal fortunes to the present policy of the Soviet Government.

The President was asked how he had got along with Marshal Zhukov. He replied with a smile that he had got along excellently, of course, and went on to emphasize the good manners and good personal relationships of the Geneva discussions.

Naturally, he noted, his relations with Marshal Zhukov were colored by their 6 months of association in Berlin—cooperative work in Berlin, was the way he put it.

He explained that Marshal Zhukov had been desirous of talking about the general situation in the Soviet Union, about his own personal life, and about the course of Soviet developments.

The President assured Marshal Zhukov that he would regard the conversation as completely confidential and that it would not become a part of the official records of the conference. However, Marshal Zhukov replied that General Eisenhower was perfectly free to repeat any part of the conversation, that he had not come to talk in secrecy.

The general purpose of the conversations was to impress upon him the deep desire of the Soviet Union for peace, President Eisenhower said.

The discussion went on to many topics, among them the question of collective leadership, the President added. This particular subject occupied about an hour of Marshal Zhukov's time, he said.

While the President gave no more than general hints of the nature of his talks with Marshal Zhukov it is possible on a basis of what is known—and not known—about the Soviet political situation to reconstruct some of the ground they must have covered.

The President implied that Marshal Zhukov had brought him up to date on his own personal situation in the Soviet Government.

While the concept of "collective leadership" began to be emphasized by the Soviet press within 2 or 3 weeks after Stalin's death it is not believed to have been firmly established until after the trial and execution of Laurente P. Beria, head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Marshal Zhukov's briefing could hardly fail to cover the surprising events of last February when George M. Malenkov was deposed as Premier and Marshal Nikolai A. Bulganin was named as his successor. The marshal, morever, hardly would be able to describe "collective leadership" in realistic terms without explaining the nature of the relationships which now exist between himself and Bulganin, Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Molotov, and the other leading members of the Soviet Government.

Pledges and Hedges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the Democratic Digest of June 1955, entitled "Pledges and Hedges."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSURE AGRICULTURE ITS "FAIR SHARE"

THE PLEDGE

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income and it must be a policy of the Government to help * * *achieve this goal * * *" (Eisenhower, Kasson, Minn., September 6, 1952.)

THE HEDGE

"Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson said today 'farmers are not sharing fully in the prosperity which the Nation as a whole is enjoying'." (United Press dispatch, April 12, 1955.)

ASSURE RIGHT TO FACE YOUR ACCUSER

THE PLEDGE

"* * * If we are going to continue to be proud that we are Americans, there must be no weakening of the code by which we have lived; by the right to meet your accuser face to face * * *" (Eisenhower, November 23, 1953.)

THE HEDGE

"He [Eisenhower] believes it would not be possible in every case to let Government employees who are tagged as security risks face their accusers." (United Press Dispatch, March 16, 1955.)

WELCOME "TENS OF THOUSANDS" OF REFUGEES

THE PLEDGE

"We have promised that our country will welcome tens of thousands of refugees from the terror of enslavement." (Eisenhower, Boston, Mass., September 21, 1953.)

THE HEDGE

"Only 821 immigrants were admitted under this [refugee relief] act in fiscal 1954, and the rate of entry has not increased materially." (Congressional Quarterly, March 28, 1955.)

THE ROLE OF THE SEVENTH FLEET

THE PLEDGE

"I am issuing instructions that the Seventh Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China." (Eisenhower state of the Union message, February 2, 1953.)

THE HEDGE

"Our Government was prompt * * * in June 1950 to direct our Seventh Fleet to defend Formosa from possible invasion from the Communist mainland." (Eisenhower message to Congress on Formosa resolution, January 24, 1955.)

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

THE PLEDGE

"Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that 'America practices what it preaches,' General Eisenhower said Saturday night. * * * Admission of the two Territories is 'in conformity with the American way of life granting them self-government and equal voice in national affairs." (Denver Post, September 17, 1950.)

THE HEDGE

"President Eisenhower maintained his stand against Alaskan statehood at present. He told a news conference there are national security considerations that must be catered to before he could remove his objection to statehood for Alaska." (United Press dispatch, March 16, 1955.)

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESIDENT

THE PLEDGE

"Here I must repeat something that I have often stated before. The ultimate responsibility for the conduct of all parts of the executive branch of the Government rests with the President of the United States." (Eisenhower, March 4, 1954.)

THE HEDGE

"But remember this: Stassen had to stand responsible [for hiring Ladejinsky] and Stassen, if something would turn up to show that his judgment was wrong, then he [Stassen] was the one that was held responsible." (Eisenhower, January 12, 1955.)

Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able and helpful article on chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Act by the Honorable Clarence W. Allgood, referee in bankruptcy, United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama.

The article is reprinted from the July 1955 issue of the Credit World, and was originally an address by Judge Allgood for a joint conference of districts 3 and 4 of the National Retail Credit Association held in Birmingham, Ala., on April 19 of this year.

No one speaks with greater authority on the subject than does Judge Allgood, based on his outstanding record in the use of chapter 13 as a means of reducing bankruptcy cases in Birmingham. Judge Allgood's record has been acclaimed throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH CHAPTER XIII OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT?

(By Clarence W. Allgood)

After consulting a number of the members of your fine organization, we have chosen as the subject of my talk to you today: What's Wrong With Chapter XIII. Considering our successful experience in this district with wage-earner amortizations, you might well conclude that this is a strange approach for your speaker to take. And the statistics are indeed impressive: Debtor petitions have been filed in the Birmingham district since 1933, and a large majority of these cases have been successfully concluded; $11,719,.50 has been paid to creditors since October of 1933; thousands of our families have been saved from bankruptcy and financial ruin; and we have significantly reduced wage-earner bankruptcies to a minimum. Despite these accomplishments, chapter XIII is not being used as widely as we originally hoped, and we still have our troubles.

FORESIGHT OF AUTHORS OF ACT

In the beginning, utilizing the meager experience gained from a few cases filed under sections 12 and 74 of the old Bankruptcy Act, and the special procedure molded here in Birmingham, the authors of chapter XIII did a truly remarkable job. I am constantly reminded of their foresighted wisdom. The few amendments and suggested amendments, together with the relatively few reviews or appeals from decisions of referees and district judges, fully demonstrate the fundamental strength of this section of the Chandler Act as it was originally enacted.

Due largely to the efforts of the National Retail Credit Association, each year finds more and more chapter XIII cases being filed in other judicial districts; however, progress has been slow, and the percentage of failures has been entirely too high. Many referees, conscientiously and sincerely, do not believe in the use of wage-earner petitions. They feel that bankruptcy is the proper remedy for a wage earner in serious financial difficulties. Some feel that the administration of debtor cases has a tendency to make a collection agency out of the court. Others feel that a referee should not be required to assume the combined roles of guardian and father confessor to a lot of improvident individuals who give them a bad time with their trials and tribulations * * *

If, for whatever reason, the referee is not sold on this type case, neither the lawyer nor the credit man will get very far in trying to promote the use of chapter XIII as a means of reducing the number of bankruptcies in his district. If the referee is unsympathetic, the credit man's only hope is to sell him a bill of goods on giving debtor cases a trial. We feel that in trying to get our cases properly set up with proposals, fair to the debtor and reasonable to the creditor, on a basis that will ultimately insure the creditor payment in full of his account and rehabilitate the debtor to the extent that he will again become a good credit risk, we are doing a constructive job that will greatly benefit our community, and, in itself, justify all the worries and headaches that we encounter in our work—and I assure you that they are numerous.

* * * * *

PROVISIONS OF SECTION 656

Section 656 (b) of the Bankruptcy Act provides that "Before confirming a plan, the court shall require from each creditor proof that the claim filed by him is free from usury under the laws of the State in which the debt was contracted." This provision makes many of our creditors in the loan business very unhappy with us. In most cases, as unsecured creditors, they find that it takes, at best, many months for their claims to be paid. When, under our State laws, they are allowed no interest, and when, in many instances, they are required to credit their claims with interest paid on previous loans, you cannot expect them to like it. Nevertheless, here again, although we cause loan companies in our territory to lose at least a quarter of a million dollars a year in interest, we find the group as a whole giving us their full cooperation. They work with us splendidly, and I am sure that most of them realize that while we cut them out of a lot of interest, we more than make up for it in the number of principal claims we save for them.

Even if the referee is able and willing to do his part, we still have an even greater problem in the trustee, or supervisor, as he is called in many districts. The act provides for the appointment of a trustee in each case whose duties shall primarily be the collection and disbursement of payments by the debtor as provided for in the plan submitted by the debtor to his creditors and confirmed by the referee. If the trustee does a good job, the referee's job is made immeasurably easier. If creditors receive their money regularly and promptly, creditor resistance is reduced to a minimum, and people who find themselves with unmanageable financial problems are encouraged by credit managers and employers to file wage-earner petitions. We find that a large number of these people who come into our court do so upon the advice of some credit manager of one of their creditors and to whom they have gone to discuss their account. On the other hand, I have known of cases where a creditor has agreed to sell an individual on the condition that he file a wage-earner petition. I cannot say that I approve of the procedure, but it does happen.

PROVISIONS FOR COMPENSATION

The act provides that the trustee shall be compensated by payment of 5 percent of moneys paid to creditors, plus his actual and necessary expenses. This in itself causes many problems. In a district where only a few cases are filed the return is so meager that it does not justify the services of a full-time man. In many such districts attorneys are appointed, but, with rare exceptions, this arrangement is not satisfactory. Nor does

the appointment of more than one trustee to serve in a district prove wise; it always works a hardship on both referee and creditors.

* * * * *

It is my opinion that, while it is vital to the success of debtor cases to keep the costs of such cases to a reasonable figure, the cost should never be so low that an individual could file a wage-earner petition and, in effect, group and refinance his obligations at a lesser cost than he could arrange through regular credit resources. While payment by the debtor of costs and attorneys' fees does in some cases work a hardship on some creditors, it would prove, in the long run, a far greater hardship if costs were to be eliminated or reduced to such a low figure that it would encourage the filing of cases by those who do not absolutely need to do so.

EXPERIENCES OF OTHER DISTRICTS

On the other hand, we knew of districts where chapter XIII cases have been discouraged and almost eliminated by excessive attorneys' fees and costs. We have never put the full cost provided under the act on these cases and our scale of attorneys' fees, beginning at a minimum of $15 per case and scaled upward in proportion to liabilities listed and time spent on the case, is, we think, very reasonable. The referee always sets the fee and in many cases we provide in the confirmation order for payment of these fees along with creditors—in some cases, after creditors. In such cases the same order is made as to court costs. We think it only fair that if payment of attorneys' fees is to be made out of its order of priority costs should be treated in the same manner. The act calls for payment of costs first, attorneys' fees next, and then creditors. To do this in all cases would, at times, make the plan offered to creditors unworkable and unreasonable; for that reason we frequently modify the rule. Attorneys do not object, and we do not believe that the Administrative Office of the United States Courts will seriously do so. The law definitely should be changed to allow the referee to order payment of costs and attorneys' fees in debtor cases along with creditors or even after creditors have been paid, if, in his judgment, he feels that the case justifies it. The biggest complaint we have from creditors is the delay in receiving disbursements due to the necessity of paying costs and attorneys' fees before creditors, and, in cases where dismissal is necessary before all creditors are paid due to failure of the plan for any reason, creditors take the loss.

EMPLOYERS' COOPERATION WITH COURT

In our district most large employers cooperate fully with the court and make deductions from the employees' earnings for the court payments. These deductions are usually remitted to the court by monthly payment which has to be posted to each debtor's account and then disbursed to creditors in accordance with the confirmation. Many of the employers prefer to send the debtor's entire earnings to the court and do so promptly upon receipt of a proper court order. This, of course, requires the debtor to come to the court for his pay day, and the supervisor's office must make a check to the debtor for the balance of his wages, over and above the court payment. While this plan is more complicated and expensive to handle than the deduction plan, we always go along with the employer and use either plan that he might prefer. In many cases where the employer does not make deductions we allow the debtor to make his payments direct and a surprisingly large number of them do so promptly. The supervisor has a rule that if a debtor who is making his payments into court direct, misses one monthly payment without excuse, the debtor's entire check is then ordered into court.

* * *

Our main problem has always been the subsequent creditor—what to do with him? We have tried everything in the book and nothing does the job. Weinstein in his analysis of the Bankruptcy Law of 1938, prepared for the National Association of Credit Men, in discussing Section 658, states: "This is a new provision. The plan which is conclusive upon all parties binds not only the past creditors but is equally effective against subsequent creditors." For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the plan, the court is given exclusive jurisdiction of the debtor, his property, and his future earnings. If a subsequent creditor, in his efforts to collect his account, interferes with the debtor's earnings to the extent that the debtor cannot make his payments to the court, or in any way places the debtor's employment in jeopardy, such creditor can be enjoined and restrained. We started out adhering strictly to this procedure. We soon found that this not only caused the court to do a large amount of extra work, but also worked a severe hardship on many innocent creditors. The small grocery man who could not afford credit reports, or at least thought he could not (a new credit report always pays for itself); the doctor called in an emergency who most certainly would not be expected to inquire whether his patient was in the court; and many other such creditors, were, we thought, being unduly penalized by restraining orders, which, in effect, forced them to wait without payment for a year or more. We then adopted procedures which enabled the debtor to amend his petition adding the subsequent creditor, requiring the debtor to increase his payments into court to take care of the creditors added by amendments. We soon found a few creditors taking advantage of this procedure to the extent that they actually solicited people who were in the court, knowing that if the debtor did not pay them direct, they could threaten garnishment proceedings against him or actually garnish his wages, thus causing him to file an amendment and include them in the case. Then, some of our debtors, finding that they are comparatively safe from garnishment while in the court, apparently go out and buy anything and everything they can. The amount of credit that some of them are able to get while they are in the court amazes me.

* * * * *

We have found from bitter experience that neither restraining orders nor amendments are a complete solution to the problem. Each case is different and no set rule can be adopted that will fit every case. We have reached the conclusion that we should use restraining orders in cases where we find creditors selling debtors indiscriminately. In other instances, where the debtor is largely at fault, payments are increased to provide payments for the subsequent creditors. In some cases this finally reaches a breaking point and the debtor's payments cannot be further increased. We then find it necessary either to enjoin any additional creditors or to allow them to file claims to be paid after prior listed creditors. A few of these cases get completely out of hand and there is no proper solution. We could, of course, dismiss the case or convert it to bankruptcy; however, both of these courses are highly objectionable to us. We make every effort to see that this type of debtor is forced to pay his creditors in full. Debtors who are not honest, or those who turn out to be chronic credit seekers, when this becomes known to the court, are placed on a list and we refuse to confirm any further wage earner petition for them. This also applies to debtors who have proved to us in the past that no feasible plan can be worked out for them. It is my thought that an amendment to the act would be in order which would prevent a debtor who has had a case dismissed for failure to comply, from filing a new petition for a period of at least 1 year. We have a local rule of court to this effect. Due to the fact that this rule is local it was thought wise to provide that such cases could be filed only with the approval of one of the referees. This puts an unnecessary burden on the referee and should not be included.

FEW COMPOSITIONS REQUESTED

While the act provides for them, we have few compositions. We do not encourage them as we feel that very few cases justify a plan that would not, in time, pay all creditors in full. Occasionally we have a wage earner trying to pay, out of his earnings, debts accumulated through a business failure. In these cases where the debts are completely out of reach, we feel that a composition is in order. They are few, however. I do not recall confirming more than three cases last year where a composition, or scaling down of the debts, was a part of the plan.

Section 606 (8) which prevents a wage earner whose income is in excess of $5,000, from filing a debtor petition, should be increased to $10,000, or removed entirely. In my opinion, this section should be completely deleted. Why discriminate? If a man is a wage earner and in financial difficulties, he is in trouble regardless of what his income might be. Why force him into bankruptcy because he has an income in excess of $5,000? By agreement with creditors we have confirmed many cases which would have been barred by this section, and they work out better than the average case. * * *

You can readily see from what has been said that, insofar as the act itself is concerned, we find nothing fundamentally wrong, and not too many changes that are really needed. Our trouble is primarily in the administration of the act.

It has been my extreme good fortune to serve under district judges and with referees who have been learned in the law and at the same time have had a thorough and sympathetic understanding of wage earner amortizations. Their combined efforts have enabled us to combat bankruptcy in north Alabama with marked results.

The following statistics compiled from our records demonstrate clearly that the successful employment of chapter XIII results in a reduction of wage-earner bankruptcies. For 1938, the first year in which chapter XIII was in existence, cases filed under the chapter constituted 33.8 percent of all cases filed—66.2 percent, or 2,200 cases were filed in the bankruptcy division. Each year from 1938 to 1949, with one exception, saw an annual reduction in bankruptcies and an increase in the use of wage-earner petitions.

In 1939 only 52.7 percent of the cases filed were bankruptcies.

In 1940 another reduction to 42.6 percent.

In 1941, 38 percent of the total

In 1942, 37 percent of the total

In 1943 (a year of low total filings) the percentage of bankruptcies increased to 42.8 percent of the total; however, in 1944 we again find a decrease to 34.8 percent and in 1945 a further decrease to 33 percent of the total cases filed. The reduction in 1946 was to 28 percent; in 1947, 20.7 percent; in 1948, 12.2 percent; and in 1949, 10.3 percent of the total cases filed were bankruptcies, the balance being debtor cases. Since 1949 the bankruptcy cases have leveled off to between 9 percent and 11 percent of the total of all cases filed, the balance of cases filed being debtor cases. This represents a reduction in the bankruptcies and other cases from 2,220 in 1938 to a level varying slightly above or below 600 cases a year—this during a period when bankruptcy cases generally are showing a great increase. Considering that this

figure of 600 bankruptcies a year includes both individual bankruptcies and asset cases, it is apparent that the wage-earner bankruptcies have been brought to an irreducible minimum, obviously about one-sixth or one-seventh of the number that would be filed if chapter XIII filings had not arisen to replace them.

Quite often misinformed individuals refer to Birmingham as the Bankruptcy Capital of America. No more incorrect statement was ever made. We feel that the record made in Birmingham in the use of chapter XIII is one to be proud of. For a large industrial district, made up of seven counties, one of which is recognized as one of the poorest in the State and designated as a disaster area, the percentage of bankruptcies by wage earners is far below the average for such a similar district.

Collaboration Between Local and State Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the July 25, 1955 issue of the Baltimore Evening Sun, entitled "For Cooperative Federalism."

This article, by William B. Pendergast, concerns the recent study and report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I was privileged to serve, and I therefore commend it to my colleagues for their thoughtful consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM—COMMISSION ADVISES COLLABORATION WITH LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

(By William B. Pendergast)

During the early stages of the work of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which reported recently to President Eisenhower, it was generally anticipated that the final report would run along the lines indicated by the following propositions:

1. The National Government is too big and too active.

2. State and local governments are withering because of action on the part of the National Government. Activities which should be performed by the less inclusive levels of government have been wrested from them by the Federal Government, and their revenue sources have been preempted by the Federal tax collector.

3. From the foregoing findings of fact, the conclusion follows that the restoration of our traditional Federal system can be accomplished only by a retreat by the National Government on a number of fronts—curtailment of activities performed at the national level, reduction of Federal assistance to State and local governments, and abandonment of some types of Federation taxation (the Federal gas tax being the most likely choice for repeal).

The report that has been made, subscribed to by all but 2 of the 25 Commission members, has little of the flavor of these propositions. The majority of the Commission does not find our Federal system in peril from big Government at the national level. The weaknesses in the system which are given greatest emphasis are weaknesses for which State or local governments are responsible. The report does not find that the National Government has elbowed State or local governments out of fields of activity in which they were rendering satisfactory service. On the contrary, it strongly implies that, when activities have been shifted to the national level, the shift has resulted from inability or unwillingness of the smaller jurisdictions to respond to popular demand for governmental action.

In the field of taxation, there is recognition that the magnitude and the variety of Federal taxes spell difficulties for State and local governments. Yet, the emphasis is placed not on these difficulties but on the failure of most State and local jurisdictions to make the most of their revenue potential.

The prescription offered by the Commission for strengthening American federalism is not a dismantling of Government in Washington and a wholesale transfer of its activities to States and localities. In very few fields of activity does the Commission recommend withdrawal by the National Government. It calls for elimination of the cash grant-in-aid (but not the donation of agricultural commodities) for the school-lunch program. It urges that direct national administration of the technical assistance given to soil-conservation districts give way to State administration under a Federal grant-in-aid in States which wish to have a part in the operation of this program and which can satisfy the Department of Agriculture that they are ready to play their part.

These recommendations are counterbalanced by others calling for increased Federal activity in such areas as civil defense, highway construction, and public health. If all the recommendations made by the Commission were carried out, no net reduction in the volume of Federal activity or in the weight of Federal taxation would follow from them.

Though the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations does not advise abandonment of any sizable sector of the ground now occupied by the National Government, it does urge that further extensions of national activity be made only after it has been established by careful inquiry that State and local governments are unable or unwilling to render some needed public service. In effect the Commission is not attempting to reverse the direction in which American federalism has been going; it contents itself with posting a "Go slow" sign for the future.

Some will find it hard to reconcile the Commission's endorsement of decentralization with its failure to recommend that the Federal Government unburden itself of a substantial part of its present responsibilities. But decentralization need not mean complete abdication of a field of governmental activity by the National Government. It can be achieved by admitting the States and their local subdivisions to partnership of some sort in a number of fields in which the National Government now goes it alone.

In general, it can be said that the majority of the Commission had as their goal the achievement of as much decentralization as is compatible with the social and economic realities of the mid-20th century. They did not believe that the way to decentralize successfully is for the National Government merely to pull out. Many suggestions—none of them novel—were made for the invigoration of State and local institutions and procedures. But the keynote of the report of the Commission is its plea for greater cooperation among all levels of government as the method of attaining and maintaining decentralized political institutions and processes. The report urges broadening and deepening the areas in which Washington works in harness with Phoenix and Sacramento, Hartford and Richmond. It calls for alertness on the part of the National Government to avoid conducting its activities in such a way as to impose hardship on State and local governments. On the positive side, it recommends admitting representatives of the lower levels of government to national councils when policy affecting them is framed, and wider use of State facilities in the execution of national policy.

The Commission does not translate its general exhortations for a more cooperative federalism into specific recommendations at many points. There is little in its report to indicate what type of cooperation should be employed in given situations or in given activities. Perhaps the most important concrete recommendation looking toward its goal is one for the creation of agencies responsible for devising new forms of intergovernmental cooperation and extending and perfecting the old forms. The recommendation referred to advocates the creation of permanent machinery headed by a special assistant in the Executive Office of the President to give continuing attention to intergovernmental relationships.

Throughout American history the belief has been widely held that nation and states are jealous competitors and that one can gain strength only by the enfeeblement of the other. Closely allied with these beliefs has been a feeling that the preservation of a Federal system requires the building of a high fence separating the domain of the national Government from that of the States to prohibit trespassing. The report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations should hasten the passing of this school of thought. Basically what it preaches is the doctrine of cooperation. It argues that all levels of government in the United States exist to promote the welfare of the people. It concludes that with mutual support and assistance, all are better able to contribute to the achievement of their common aim.

(EDITORS NOTE.—The author of this article was assistant director of research for the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and is a member of the Department of English, History, and Government at the U. S. Naval Academy.)

Crowded Days for George Bender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by one of our colleagues, which appeared in the Clevelander of July 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROWDED DAYS FOR GEORGE BENDER

(By Larston D. Farrar)

When exuberant GEORGE BENDER, one of Cleveland's most noted native sons, squeaked through to victory in the hot Senate race last year, Republicans from coast to coast cheered. He had performed a feat that seemed almost incredible, considering how the Democratic tide rolled through New York, Pennsylvania, and even sloshed over into Michigan, where a veteran Republican

Senator, Homer Ferguson, became part of the flotsam and jetsam.

The Democrats, chagrined at the loss of an expected Senate seat, turned to jeering. They referred to "laughing boy BENDER," and "giggling GEORGE," and said that he would make a clown of himself in the Senate as many of them had said he had become in the House of Representatives by perennially plugging for the late Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, for the Republican presidential nomination. (Senator BENDER gained national fame in two presidential elections by leading the Taft band that played I'm Looking Over a Four-Leaf Clover, and many Democrats said that proved he should be in a circus).

But those who had watched GEORGE BENDER at work for years in Ohio were less surprised than people outside the State. His fellow-Ohioans—friend and foe alike—knew that underneath the curly pompadour and behind his smiling—almost puckish—countenance, there was a determined mind at work, and plenty of pituitary fluid to give him the energy that modern politics demands.

A PERSONAL VICTORY

Also, they knew, he had had to measure his financial resources in thousands of dollars, instead of millions, as many winners in other years had done. They realized that his victory, however narrow, was more in the nature of a tribute to his long years of activity and his tremendous capacity for friendship than because of other major political considerations. GEORGE BENDER always has won personal victories since he first entered politics. He has been a party man, particularly in late years, but there were times when he ran one way and the Republican Party ran another. He won and the party lost, and he steadily built a bigger and bigger following. Finally, he took over the party—in Cuyahoga County, at least—by dint of his own skill and hard work, helped by friends who were imbued with the same ideas of government as he held.

His interest in public affairs began when he was in high school—when Theodore Roosevelt visited Cleveland in 1912. GEORGE was one of the youngsters privileged to meet with Theodore Roosevelt, and when "Teddy" said he was planning to run for President again, GEORGE enlisted in his cause and became a zealous school-boy orator for that famous campaign. From that time, young BENDER went everywhere and did everything to learn the art of politics. In 1920, he ran for the State Senate and, at 23, became one of the youngest men ever elected for that body.

THE MAN FOR THE OFFICE

In 1930, he sought election to Congress from his home district, but lost to a veteran Democratic Congressman by a very small margin. In 1938, when Robert A. Taft first was elected to the United States Senate, GEORGE BENDER was at his side running for Congressman-at-large. The two men had met—and had become friends—in the Ohio Senate, and GEORGE had lent every effort to Taft's election.

Again and again, GEORGE BENDER ran for Congress and won. Only in 1948, when a Democratic tide was running, were his hopes dashed. But in all those years—as chairman of the Cuyahoga County Republican Central Committee—he was a powerful figure in Cleveland and in Ohio, and it was taken for granted that, when the office of Senator Taft was vacated by death, GEORGE BENDER was the man to hold high the Republican banner.

Surprisingly agile and fit for a man of 58, Senator BENDER today looks very little older than he did in 1938. A few more gray hairs fleck his temples, and he is not quite as bouncy as he once was but GEORGE BENDER still enjoys remarkably good health. He is 5 feet, 11 inches tall, weighs a normal 210 pounds ("I haven't gained or lost weight for years") and his blue eyes are clear as ever.

Senator BENDER's life today is crowded—and it's all work, although he enjoys every moment of it. He hasn't had time for golf, fishing, or other recreation for years, preferring to spend his time in building his political and business fences and keeping them in good repair. Long years ago, he founded the George H. Bender Co., general insurance, in Cleveland, and it has become one of the leaders in the general insurance field there. At the same time he has been rearing a family—two lovely daughters, both now married, who live on the 14-acre Bender estate at Chagrin Falls.

He meets regularly at breakfasts with the Ohio delegation in Congress, and he also spends an inordinate amount of time sitting in committee meetings. Lately his has been the voice of an outraged and long-suffering public on the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, which has delved into graft and corruption in connection with operations of the Quartermaster Corps. Time and time again Senator BENDER has expressed in short, ugly words the feeling of revulsion toward the graft payers and the graft getters in high places, thus making his name known to millions of other people over the Nation who feel as he does.

"I've always known that political life was demanding," he said recently. "But life in the Senate takes far more study and energy than even in the House of Representatives. My day is not my own from morning until late evening. I strive to do all that is required of me, as does every other Senator, but I am certain that they agree with me that it isn't possible for a man in this building to do everything he ought to do."

Senator BENDER gives the impression—whether speaking to a large audience or to a friend in his office—that he has great inner reserves that have helped him in his steady rise to fame and fortune, and on which he draws for the carrying out of his duties today. It's not surprising, therefore, to learn that GEORGE BENDER began his life and lived his early years in a large family headed by religious parents. He was 1 of 5 boys, all of whom have made their mark in the civic life of Cleveland. They were reared in the vicinity of 40th near Woodland, and their parents took the boys to the Congregational Church across town for morning church services and to the closer Presbyterian Church for evening services. GEORGE later became an elder in the Presbyterian Church. But when he married and had a home of his own in Cleveland Heights, he and his family attended the Church of the Savior (Methodist), where he became a steward. A vital interest in the things of the spirit always has served as one of the inner resources on which GEORGE BENDER has called in either political victory or defeat.

To those who want to know what kind of a Senator GEORGE BENDER is making, the answer is ready: He is making the good showing that his House service presaged. He is outstripping his fellow freshmen Senators in work and he is revealing a far-above-average capacity for leadership.

To many in Ohio, this will be no news. They keep up with GEORGE BENDER through his weekly newsletter, This Week In Washington, in which he clarifies many of the national and international issues that cry for his simple expression. His "Question of the Week," carried as the last item in this newsletter, has captured its own audience. Newsmen have quoted it more than once, and people have smiled, or sobered, depending upon the question. Some of the typical questions asked are: "Now that the Democrats have renominated Stevenson, who will be his running mate?" "Can the Four Power meeting be held in Hiroshima?" "Whatever happened to color TV?" "American families are paying 20 percent of their income for debts. Are you paying your share?" Have you booked your passage in an atom ship, plane or submarine?"

If you can answer these questions, don't send the replies to him. GEORGE BENDER already is overworked. But he has the drive to go on. Clevelanders can be proud of GEORGE. They may yet be even prouder.

WHO IS LARSON D. FARRAR?

Mr. Farrar has been covering news from Washington, D. C., for the last 13 years. He is employed by the American Press magazine as its Washington correspondent.

He first came to Washington in 1945 as Washington correspondent for the Gannett newspapers. He has written for many magazines and trade papers, including the Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post. Before becoming a Washington correspondent, he was associate editor of the Nation's Business and was secretary of the chambers of commerce in Corinth, Miss., and Johnson City, Tenn.

Capital Transit's Death Would Profit Wolfsons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and timely article entitled "Four Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars Last Ride—Capital Transit's Death Would Profit Wolfsons," written by S. Oliver Goodman, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR MILLION FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS LAST RIDE—CAPITAL TRANSIT'S DEATH WOULD PROFIT WOLFSONS

(By S. Oliver Goodman)

The latest liquidation offer of the Wolfsons is the simple and very profitable way for them to get rid of their Capital Transit Co. headache, informed observers pointed out last night.

Louis E. Wolfson, the Florida financier and CTC chairman, yesterday estimated that liquidation of the transit system would yield stockholders not less than $10 a share.

This presumably is a net figure, after an estimated cost to the company of about $5 million for removing streetcar tracks and repaving the streets.

Neutral sources place the yield to stockholders at more than $16 a share and base their estimate on figures in the company's balance sheet as of December 31, 1954.

Stockholders' equity is put at a conservative $20,967,912 figure. Less the $5 million cost of track removal, there still would be an equity of nearly $16 million.

Divided by the 960,000 outstanding shares, this would mean that shareholders should realize about $16.66 a share.

Of the remaining equity of $16 million, the Wolfsons still own approximately a 28-percent interest, or a neat $4.4 million.

As previously reported, the Wolfsons in their 5 years of CTC management already have reaped more than $5.3 million in dividends and sale of stock, while still holding

a 28-percent interest in the company. All this came from an original investment of $2.2 million in 1949.

Liquidation of the company would be right up their alley. Their 28-percent interest in CTC at current market value is worth about $2.7 million—but in liquidation about $4.4 million.

Neutral sources also point out that the book value of CTC assets probably is far under what actually could be realized in liquidation.

In liquidation, observers emphasize, properties such as the M Street headquarters building and land, plus bus garages, would bring a fancy price in today's real-estate market.

Liquidation apparently has been an objective of the Wolfsons for many months.

Back in the spring of 1954, the Florida financier was quoted by a Senate subcommittee as follows:

"I have a responsibility to see that stockholders of Capital Transit Co. get a fair return. If there is no fair return, then I will have to take other action to protect their equity. If necessary, I will even go so far as to liquidate the company. I'll protect the shareholders, within the limits of the law, in spite of anything—including Congress and the Public Utilities Commission."

Many months ago a local investment banker told this newspaper's financial editor that Capital Transit Co. is worth more dead than alive—to the stockholders.

South Dakota Paces the Uranium Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared, entitled "South Dakota Paces the Uranium Industry," together with some material relating thereto.

There being no objection, the statement and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA PACES THE URANIUM INDUSTRY

Mr. MUNDT. At this time I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the newest development of America's rapidly growing uranium mining industry. I am referring to the groundbreaking ceremonies held recently at Edgemont, S. Dak., for construction of a $2½ million uranium-processing mill—the first in the Nation to be built outside the Colorado Plateau area.

And I should like to comment, in particular on vision, patience, and perseverance shown by the citizens of Edgemont and the surrounding area in South Dakota's Southern Black Hills. Only a couple of years ago the vision of South Dakota's uranium possibilities was tenaciously held by the handful of pioneer prospectors from Edgemont who laboriously worked their claims and constantly explored the ever-expanding limits of known uranium-bearing ore deposits.

Their patience through these early years of prospecting, and their perseverance in spite of all subsequent obstacles, has now resulted in construction of this new processing mill. Surely this will stand as a monument to the untiring efforts of many, many people in the Black Hills area of western South Dakota and eastern Wyoming.

To further document the tremendous progress of this new uranium mining industry in recent years, I want to place in the RECORD two specific items.

The first is an editorial appearing in the Hot Springs Star, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., which comments on the future potential of uranium development in the Black Hills.

The second item is an article entitled "Black Hills Seen as a Top U-Ore Producer" as written by LeRoy F. Holst, public relations director of the Edgemont Mining & Uranium Corp., and as published in a recent issue of the Uranium Information Digest.

[From the Hot Springs (S. Dak.) Star]

A BRIGHT FUTURE NOW EVEN BRIGHTER

Friday, June 23, is destined to be a memorable day for Fall River County—in fact for all of South Dakota.

It is on that day that Gov. Joe Foss will break the ground and construction of the uranium processing mill at Edgemont will begin. We are among those who believe that uranium mining and processing are destined to become vital forces in South Dakota's economy—not only in the southwestern section of the State but in other parts as well. With the surface barely scratched, the mining industry alone brought added prosperity to this area, and it is noticeable not only in Edgemont, but in Hot Springs and other nearby cities as well. With new and richer fields being uncovered every day, with new mining corporations being formed almost weekly, and now with construction beginning on the processing mill, the bright future we have to face in this area becomes even brighter. As the prospectors, the miners, and the stockholders continue to prosper, so will we all, from this new-found source of wealth.

Already new jobs have been created, and with the development of the mill we may expect that trend to continue. More jobs will mean more people, and hand-in-hand will come additional business for all of us, as well as the development of new enterprises.

The battle for the location of the uranium processing mill was a long and a bitter one with every resource in Wyoming used to promote the location at Newcastle. There is no doubt but what the known rich ore-bearing fields of the Edgemont area and the established stockpile had its effect on determining the location of the mill, but not to be forgotten are the efforts of the people of the county and the State who recognized this new industry for what it is and expended time and energy in selling the Edgemont area. Of no little consequence in the blessing of this enterprise were the efforts of Senators Mundt and Case, Congressman Berry and Gov. Joe Foss. Theirs was the selling job at the top level and the proof is with us Friday of their accomplishment.

This, it is said, is the land of opportunity. In the uranium story there certainly is the proof, as much of what was once thought to be barren, rocky hillsides, are found to be rich, carnotite-bearing ore bodies with a potential of millions of dollars. Yes, the future is a bright one for southwestern South Dakota.

In Edgemont they say, "Like the horseless carriage, uranium is here to stay." Of that there is no doubt. The ground-breaking for the mill at Edgemont Friday serves as a welcoming celebration, not only for the mill but for the entire new industry that is uranium. It is as important to Hot Springs as it is to Edgemont, and this city should turn out en masse.

BLACK HILLS SEEN AS A TOP UNITED STATES U-ORE PRODUCER

(By Leroy F. Holst)

With the uranium potential of the carnotite-rich Edgemont area, in the Southern Hills, supplemented by that of the radioactive lignite deposits to the north, operators of the Black Hills feel that these age-old geological formations may well prove to be one of the Nation's top sources of uranium.

Although the Northern Hills ore occurs in such vast quantities that engineers use acre-feet for measurement, instead of tons, and the average grade for the field has been estimated at 0.40 percent, it may be some time before operations will be feasible. Classified as a coal reserve by the Department of the Interior under Public Law 585, this agency and the AEC are holding conferences to determine whether new legislation is required to handle uranium mining or whether this can be done by administrative ruling.

The AEC is confident that a process will be developed to satisfactorily and economically procure uranium from lignite, according to Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, and that a plant will be constructed in Harding County to handle uranium production for the commission. With 10 companies doing exploration and development work in this area, a recent core drilling on one of 1,500 claims revealed a 2-foot vein which assayed 7.16 percent.

Operators in the Edgemont area, however, have surmounted most of their problems and, with half a dozen mining companies in production, continuous stockpiling at the Edgemont buying station was one of the major factors favoring this city's apparently successful bid for a 200-ton processing mill.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, and Congressman E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, were active in presenting Edgemont's case before the Commission, based on the substantial uranium potential of the area, ideal transportation facilities, and the stockpiling at the buying station.

Contract for the mill is being negotiated with Mines Development Inc., of Denver, who will finance construction and operation of the plant. Cost of and location of the mill will be disclosed as soon as the contract is signed.

Upon completion, the mill will have approximately 100 employees and will process 200 tons of ore a day. With continued stockpiling from the area's producers, the mill will have a considerable reserve which may preclude any shutdowns.

Art Ludwig and E. J. Brockman, pioneer prospectors and operators of the Edgemont area, have been active in exploration, development ,and production since early in 1952. Watching the transition of the Edgemont area from cattle country to a highly important center of the uranium industry, they have a justifiable pride in the roles they have played in this dramatic metamorphosis.

In the late spring of 1952, the partners hit the well-known jackpot.

With a steady stream of ore, which assayed as high as 0.50 percent, on its way to the nearest processing mill at Rifle, Colo., their income climbed steadily. Expansion of old operations began and new ones were started with installations of modern mining equipment.

A new strike was made last summer which received nationwide publicity. Called the Gould Strike, it is located in the Chilson Canyon area about 12 miles northeast of Edgemont and may well prove to be one of the richest carnotite ore-bearing properties in the Black Hills. With but 10 of the lease's 960 acres drilled for exploratory purposes, some assays show uranium oxide content as high as 2 percent.

Reorganization of the Edgemont Mining Co., Inc., was effected last October with the issuance of 3 million shares of common stock for public offering. The entire issue was oversubscribed within 24 hours and it is now being traded on the open market. The officers of the new organization, Edge-

month Mining & Uranium Corp., are: E. J. Brockman, Edgemont, chairman of the board; Art Ludwig, Edgemont, president; Ray C. Ludwig, of Englewood, Colo., executive vice president; Walter D. Jorgensen, Aurora, Colo., secretary-treasurer with William W. Schoonmaker, and Harold D. Stickney, Edgemont, directors.

Included in the firm's expansion plans are purchases, totaling $225,000, of new equipment and $75,000 earmarked for airborne reconnaisance of all its properties, to ascertain the most profitable sites for new operations.

Edgemont Mining & Uranium Corp., has interests in approximately 2,400 acres in Fall River and Custer Counties, located in the southern Black Hills of the southwestern corner of South Dakota. Holdings of the company have grossed approximately $400,000 to date.

The ore body on the Gould lease is being mined by the Pictograph Mining & Uranium Co., Inc., under a profit-sharing contract, made in June 1954 to run a maximum of 2¼ years.

The Virginia C group, which comprises six lode mining claims, is under lease to EMU to August 1957 with option to extend to 1962. One of the largest producers in the Black Hills, the ore shipped from the Virginia C operation has averaged 0.30 percent uranium oxide and 0.75 vanadium oxide. Both stripping and underground operations have been used at the C.

Another of Edgemont Mining's large producers is the Lundberg lease, situated about 1 mile northeast of the Virginia C, which covers 11 claims. These claims are leased to March 1957 and renewable for an additional 5 years. About 50 percent of the tonnage produced and shipped from this property was strip mined from surface deposits ranging in thickness from 1 to 6 feet. Present production is being mined from a sandstone bed about 1 foot thick and averaging 0.24 percent in uranium oxide.

The Pilsner group, comprising 16 lode claims owned by Edgemont Mining, is the only property of the corporation in Custer County. Production on the Pilsner holdings has been accomplished through stripping operations and the ore has assayed as high as 0.33 percent uranium oxide.

Comprising a full section, the Taylor lease is held by EMU under two 5-year leases, dated September 1952 and May 1953, with options to renew for an additional 5-year period. Sixty of the 640 acres have been explored by drilling and bulldozing and many carnotite deposits have been found in many areas of the entire northern half of the section.

Averaging 0.20 percent, the ore from this property has been produced from an ore body just a few feet below the surface. Discontinued during the winter months, operations will be resumed in late spring. Because of the shallow stripping, production costs on this operation have been low, averaging $5 per ton of ore.

The Cradall group of 4 lode claims, of approximately 80 acres, is an Edgemont Mining & Uranium Corp., owned property. Assessment work in March of last year resulted in a shipment of strip mined carnotite ore from surface deposits, which assayed 0.26 in uranium oxide and 0.43 percent in vanadium oxide. The corporation plans extensive exploratory drilling and development of this property during the summer.

One other property, the Hamilton lease, is held under a 5-year lease by the corporation with option to renew for an additional 5 years. Three miles north of the Virginia C, very little exploratory drilling has been effected on this lease but the 5 claims of 100 acres show great promise.

Pictograph Mining Co., another pioneer mining operation in the Edgemont district, was reorganized and incorporated early this year as Pictograph Mining & Uranium Co., Inc. The holdings of the new corporation include the original carnotite discovery site in the southern hills. Known as the Pictograph claim, this property is located in the Craven Canyon area of Fall River County. Within 4 years, this discovery has certainly changed the economic picture of the Edgemont district. With a total of 4,500 acres, all in Fall River County, Pictograph is planning exploratory drilling on an extensive scale, to start late this spring.

One of the properties adjoins the well-known Virginia C mine and the corporation holds great expectations of rich production from this holding. Officers of Pictograph Mining & Uranium Co., Inc., are: Matthew J. Brown, president; Lawrence Rhodes, vice president; Marvin Cummings, secretary and treasurer; and Art Ludwig, director.

Sodak Uranium & Mining Co., Inc., was incorporated under the laws of Delaware on November 15, 1954, with the following officers: C. J. Ortmayer, chairman of the board; Clyde R. Boyle, president; W. E. Haldane, vice president; Paul H. Russell, secretary and treasurer; with directors Jack O. Jones and Munroe F. Pofcher completing the directorate.

Formerly a partnership, in which Ortmayer and Boyle were interested, the new corporation plans considerable expansion of its exploratory drilling program, previously carried on by the partners. During 1955, Sodak expects to complete 100,000 feet of drilling in the Edgemont area as well as in Butte and Cooke Counties, Wyo. The corporation has approximately 16,000 acres in these 3 regions and, with 2 additional drills on order, the expanded program should be under way in the near future. Sodak also plans additional surveys by airborne reconnaissance in South Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado.

The Black Hills Uranium Corp. was incorporated in January of this year by pioneer prospectors and operators of the area, who make up the new corporation's group of officers. They are: Roy E. Chord, president; Eugenia Chord, vice president; Charles M. Weber, secretary and treasurer; and Gordon Kamerer, director.

Although properties of the corporation have not been completely explored, a substantial tonnage has been mined and a very considerable tonnage remains to be mind, as evidenced by drilling data and over 50 surface exposures.

At the present time, Black Hills has two operations which have been in continuous production, Hold Up No. 15 and Hot Point No. 3, with the ore assaying 0.24 percent uranium oxide. The corporation also has Kados No. 3, Hot Point, Nos. 1–2 and 7, High Pockets No. 6, Green Slipper No. 5, Shamrock No. 4, and Clarabelle, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Most of these will be under production by the end of the summer.

Mining operations and reconnaisance on the corporation's Red Canyon and Craven Canyon holdings have been under the supervision of Carl Bayes, consulting engineer of Urbana, Ill., and this spring will find much exploratory activity on Black Hills Uranium Corp.'s properties.

The corporation's claims were recently involved in a claim-jumping suit that was given widespread publicity. Judgment in the suit, heard in the district court at Hot Springs, S. Dak., in January, was in favor of the plaintiffs, Roy E. Chord and the Black Hills Uranium Corp.

The first load of carnotite ore to be sold from South Dakota was taken from Hot Point No. 2 and shipped to Rifle, Colo., by Roy Chord on January 28, 1952. This test load averaged 0.75 percent uranium oxide and, like most of the ore in the Edgemont district, was very low in lime content.

Mining Research Corp., headed by Clifton W. Livingston, president, was formed to conduct research on in-situ leaching of uranium ores and to develop processes for treating low-grade uranium ores. The corporation acquired leases in the Edgemont area from various landowners and consolidated its holdings in a block comprising approximately 7,000 acres. In association with Shannon Oil and Freemont Oil Co.'s Mining Research Corp. also acquired nearly 100,000 acres of unexplored land in the Carlyle, Aladdin, New Haven, Hulette, and Missouri Buttes areas along the outcrops of the Fall River, Fuson, and Lakota formations, on the north west flank of the Black Hills uplift.

The rapid development of the Edgemont district forced the corporation either to abandon the research program it had consistently pursued, or to restrict itself to research. Accordingly, milling agreements were entered into with Edgemont Mining & Black Hills Uranium Corp. These agreements affect the major portion of the ore reserves of the district. A study was then made, covering the economic factors that determined the proper location for an Edgemont mill. As a result of this survey, the best available mill site was purchased. The services of E. C. Bitzer, former metallurgical consultants to the Atomic Energy Commission, were obtained, and Knowles & Associates, of New York City, were engaged to undertake the preliminary design of the mill.

An agreement was then entered into with Climax Molybdenum Co. in which Livingston Metals Corp. (to be controlled by Climax) was formed for the purpose of constructing a mill at Edgemont, if a satisfactory contract could be secured from the Atomic Energy Commission. Land acquired in the Black Hills by Mining Research is included under the Livingston Metals agreement.

Rosebud Oil, Inc., on February 1, 1955, took over 76 full claims in the Edgemont mining district, held by the McLeod Mining Co. A South Dakota corporation, capitalized for $50,000, Rosebud has 900 acres of proven oil properties in Weston County, Wyo., with 11 producing wells. The corporation has far-flung uranium properties, with 1,900 acres under lease near Santa Fe, N. Mex.; 650 claims in Grand and San Juan Counties, Utah, and 111 claims in Harding County, in the Northern Hills.

Rosebud has outlined considerable exploratory drilling on the former McLeod Mining Co. claims this spring. A Dry Forks Canyon mine, in the Moab district of Utah, was opened the latter part of March.

The McLeod Co. was under profit-sharing contract to Edgemont Mining to work EMU's Freeze Out No. 4 mine, in the Pilsner Group, until weather conditions precluded further operations, on February 1. Rosebud will resume work on the contract as soon as weather permits, according to word from the firm's headquarters at Huron, S. Dak. Ore from the Freeze Out No. 4, located about 22 miles from Edgemont, has averaged 0.20 percent uranium oxide, with occasional assays of 0.33 percent.

Sacred to the Sioux for centuries, their Paha Sapa, or Black Hills, were to be forever kept free of white settlement under the famous treaty of 1868. Nullification of this treaty, drawn up between Agalala Sioux Chief Red Cloud and the Federal Government, was affected through the steady encroachment of the whites, following discovery of gold on French Creek, in 1874. Much blood was shed, as a result of this gold, climaxed by the Custer massacre on the Little Big Horn, June 25, 1876.

Today, producers in the Black Hills continue to mine and sell, to the Government, exceptionally high-grade ore, samples of which have run as high as 12.67 percent (chemical assay by AEC) in uranium oxide.

Are We Losing Japan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the July 17 issue of Parade magazine, a very significant article written by our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, appeared under the heading, "Are We Losing Japan?" This article is a brief, concise, and factual analysis of what has happened in Japan from the point of view of Communist subversion and long range planning during the approximately 10 years since V–J Day.

The author of this article has had long experience with tyrants and tyranny and knows from his hard, cold experience gained as chief prosecutor at the Nurnberg trials, the dangers which Red colonialism presents to our free way of life. Congressman DODD points out that "we have the ability, the courage, and the know-how to save Japan from being neutralized or, worse yet, turned against us, but time is running out." This highly informative article will be of interest to all the Members of Congress because Congressman DODD indicates what we ought to do with what time we have left if we want to save Japan from going neutral or being turned against us.

Under leave obtained, I insert the article in the RECORD:

ARE WE LOSING JAPAN?

(By Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut; member, House Committee on Communist Aggression)

The United States is in real trouble in Japan. The onetime enemy we had counted upon as the chief bulwark of freedom in the Far East is drifting farther and farther from the free world camp, closer and closer to the Communists and the neutralists. This was apparent in the recent Japanese election, when an assortment of leftwing, Communist-directed parties picked up enough seats to defeat our hope of Japanese rearmament. Now we are confronted with a rising tide of anti-Americanism, plus Russian-Japanese conferences that may drive a deeper wedge between the two nations.

Shocking things have been going on in Japan since World War II ended—things that have been kept from the American people by military government and censorship. As a result, our position on the critical Asian front is in jeopardy.

On the basis of personal conversations with informed Government officials abroad, testimony before congressional committees, and statements of Japanese, here are the facts as I see them:

Japan could be completely paralyzed within 24 hours by a Kremlin-called general strike.

Of 5 million organized workers, 3,500,000 are under the control of Communist-dominated unions. They are all in key industries and are directed by Moscow-trained experts.

Communists influence in education ranges from nearly 100 percent control of elementary-school teachers to 10 percent of the university graduates.

Japanese Diet (parliament) members who have been wooed and won on visits to Red China would take a neutral or anti-American stand in a crisis.

Japanese prisoners of war held for years by the Reds were given super-Communist training and are one of the best trained party cadres in the world.

All these Communist gains were scored while our Army of Occupation controlled Japan. How? Responsible members of government say the infiltration began when we permitted Russians aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* for the signing of the Japanese surrender. That was the signal for Kremlin-directed agents to move in. They have made their biggest strides in the fields of labor, education and propaganda.

Under the noses of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his staff, the Reds wormed into the labor unions on the pretext of broadening the base. This "broadening" process has now reached the point where 70 percent of organized labor is Communist-dominated. Only the farmers have resisted, and even with them the Reds have made headway. Their left wing "Japan Farmers' Union"—partly through confusion with the conservative "Old Japan Farmers' Union"—now has almost half a million members and rivals the older union in numbers.

The most tightly controlled Red union is the Japanese Teachers Union. Its devoted members, with practically complete control of the schools, drum into children the lessons of the party line: Japan wants peace—but the United States is an enemy of peace and the Chinese Nationalists have "sold out" to the enemies of peace.

The teachers further use their positions to electioneer, instructing children to urge their parents to vote for left-wing, pro-Communist candidates. This tactic helped the Reds gain strength in the recent Diet elections.

In the propaganda field, more than 20 of Japan's most popular and widely read publications are sponsored, published, owned or controlled by Communists. Thus, the two primary sources of education—schools and the press—are under Kremlin control.

Can we halt Japan's leftward drift, or even reverse it? What is the best the United States can hope for in Japan?

We can control the Red threat only by meeting it where it began—on the local level. Our propaganda program in Japan—and throughout the Far East—should be improved and increased. Truth is our strongest weapon. We should present it so that the teeming millions of Asia can understand it .

There is a vague hope that the recent upheavals in Moscow may reflect themselves in a struggle for control of the Japanese Reds. But that is wishful thinking. We need a positive, vigorous program that will help bring about economic recovery in Japan with resulting financial and political stability. Something must be done right now to take up the slack in heavy industry created by the recent election loss of the rearmament program.

A JAPANESE MARSHALL PLAN?

If the Marshall plan could meet and defeat communism in Western Europe, a similar plan can do it in Japan. We must start thinking and working now toward the day when Japan will be able to take her place in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

Another weapon in our battle for Japan is the tariff. Recently, Congress gave President Eisenhower the power to lower tariffs over the next 3 years. Perhaps, in the great need to rehabilitate Japanese economy and trade, he will find that special measures must be taken to defeat Communist expansion there.

And the turbulent political situation in Indochina also affects Japan, for that country long has been Japan's breadbasket. Now that half of Indochina has gone to the Communists and the other half is menaced, the problem of Japanese communism is tightly tied to the problem of communism in Indochina. The fall of southern Vietnam to the Reds might nullify all the progress made in Japan since the war.

I believe that we have the ability, the courage, and the know-how to save Japan from being neutralized or, worse yet, turned against us. But time is running out. While we mark time, Communist propaganda goes unchecked and the Red octopus spreads its tentacles ever farther into the economic and social life of Japan.

The Future of the Natural Gas Exemption Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has been forced to make its decision on the natural gas exemption bill (H. R. 6645) under unusual circumstances, the question as to its future is an important one—not only to Members of the House, but to the producers of this gas, who have waged such a vigorous fight to be exempted from Federal regulation, and to the scores of millions of users of this gas.

In my opinion, it is crystal clear that so far as the opponents of this bill are concerned, a battle was lost by the thinnest of margins, but the war can and should be won.

When a controversial bill of this nature is first defeated by the legislative committee on a vote of 14 to 14, after weeks of hearings and executive sessions, that is significant.

It is even more significant that, upon reconsideration, the bill was reported by the committee by the margin of only a single vote, 16 to 15, with the full committee voting.

I think everyone here is fully aware of what followed, culminating in a hearing before the Rules Committee almost on the eve of adjournment, after weeks of jockeying for position. Yet a rule was reported, again by a 1-vote margin, 6 to 5.

The haste with which floor consideration was scheduled after the rule issued indicated considerable confidence that the House would pass the bill by a safe margin.

It must have been most disappointing that the motion to recommit was defeated by only 7 votes, 210 to 203, and very discouraging that on final passage the margin of victory was only 6 votes, 209 to 203.

These exemption efforts have been before the House committee and the House for years but no defeat has been accepted by the producers who apparently are determined to have their way.

It will be recalled that in 1950 an exemption attempt passed the House by a 2-vote margin, 176 to 174. Whether this accounted for the fact that no move was

made to override the Presidential veto which followed is a matter of opinion. But it cannot be disputed that it did not end the determined drive for exemption from regulation. It would be folly to assume that the House action this week would have any such effect.

I do not believe that any useful purpose would be served by reviewing the arguments pro and con. They are set out fully in the majority and minority reports of the House committee and in the debate in the House on July 28, which will be supplemented by any debate in the other body where the bill is considered there. It was finally and conclusively shelved for this year today, just as was predicted frequently during the House debate. In the light of this, and particularly of the repeated statements during the House debate that adequate information was not available, it seems more regrettable now than it did before the vote on July 28 that the Members of the House were not given the benefit of the results of the Harris resolution, amended by the Wolverton resolution, for an investigation of the facts.

Therefore, two immediate courses of action seem to be vitally important.

First, Members of the House can make a most important contribution toward an ultimate and sound solution of this vexing and complex problem by securing the fullest possible reliable information as to the situation in their respective areas. I believe that such information would be welcomed by the House committee, irrespective of the fate of the Harris-Wolverton resolutions at the hands of those who control such matters.

Second, I hope every Member of the House will see to it that any action directed toward increasing the prices of natural gas to the users of such fuel in his area is examined as fully as possible and the results reported promptly to the House committee. Again, I feel confident that such information would be welcomed by that committee.

I am certain that the vast majority of Americans want and will demand a fair, open, and intelligible solution of this problem by Congress. That cannot be brought about unless all the available and pertinent facts are presented. Certainly the industry has a very real obligation to make that possible.

The Smog Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles and the whole of southern California is confronted with one major problem which so personally affects every man, woman, and child living in the area that I believe the average man on the street, if asked to name the one problem he considers most serious in Los Angeles as it affects him individually, would reply without hesitation "The smog problem."

Smog, the result of a complex and little understood air pollution, has descended upon southern California like a plague blotting out the usual sunny skies which were the pride of all Californians a few short years ago. It has come, most experts agree, as a result of the tremendous expansion of population and industrial growth with all the increases in motor vehicle traffic, waste disposal, and other necesary community processes which, unless properly supervised and controlled, can contribute to the serious contamination of the air such as we are now experiencing.

I sponsored H. R. 3680 in the House to authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct an intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects upon the health and welfare of the people of air pollution, and to develop effective methods for its prevention and control. Senator THOMAS KUCHEL sponsored a similar bill in the Senate.

Because the Senate acted on this legislation before the House considered the bill I introduced and other House legislation relating to this subject, the Senate bill was brought to the House floor for consideration and passed, becoming Public Law 159 of the 84th Congress.

This legislation which I sponsored and supported is the first major step on a nationwide scale toward solving the smog problem and eliminating one of the most serious threats to the health and well-being of the people, not only in southern California, but in all parts of our Nation. It also definitely establishes the responsibility of the Federal Government to join with State and local governments in the fight to control and eliminate dangerous air pollution.

Under the provisions of the Smog Act, a 5-year program of research has been established which will be carried on for the entire period under the supervision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The act also includes an appropriation of $5 million a year to carry on the meticulous research necessary to determine the causes of air pollution such as smog, and its effects on the health of the people, as well as to develop methods to control and eradicate dangerous air pollution. The total appropriation for the 5-year period will total $25 million.

This is an incidental expense when consideration is given to the enormous benefits to each and every citizen which can result if we solve the problem of effective control and elimination of air pollution. In fact the county of Los Angeles alone has reported appropriations of more than $2½ millions toward research in its effort to control air pollution since 1947, and is now maintaining more than 200 employees in this work at an annual cost of nearly $2 million.

The program set up under the Smog Act will make possible technical and financial aid for a joint effort by the Federal Government and the States and local governments and will provide for the collection and dissemination of information resulting from research which will be valuable to local agencies in their efforts to eliminate pollution from the air.

It is my hope that as a result of the scientific research and exhaustive investigation which will be carried on in all parts of the Nation under the new program, we will finally find an effective method of controlling and eliminating smog and other conditions caused by air pollution.

When the problem of air pollution is finally solved, we will have overcome one of the most serious threats to human health and welfare which has resulted from the tremendous expansion of both population and industry in this atomic age of the 20th century.

Treasury Department Report Relating to Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, due to the wide interest in the tax treatment of cooperatives, I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated July 26, 1955, which I have received from the Secretary of the Treasury, wherein he sets forth some problems which have arisen relative to the tax treatment of cooperatives and his suggestions for meeting these problems:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, July 26, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Recent Court decisions have made it clear that certain tax legislation which the Congress enacted in 1951 is not working out as the Congress intended.

Public Law 183, 82d Congress, 1st session (now embodied in secs. 521 and 522 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) eliminated the tax exemption of cooperatives which had existed previously. A study of the legislative history of this law shows that it had the clearly intended objective of taxing all cooperatives' income in the year earned, either to the cooperative or to the individual member.

Prior law had permitted cooperatives to accumulate necessary reserves tax free. In the 1951 law the Congress removed the allowance for tax-free reserves and provided that cooperatives were to be taxed on earnings at the regular corporate rates. However, in computing taxable income they were allowed deductions not only for cash distributions to their patrons but also for allocations made to patrons of their proportionate shares of the income of the cooperative. The allocations could take any of many forms, including certificates of beneficial interest, and promissory notes with or without due dates or interest.

In taking this action in 1951, the Congress apparently relied on rulings of the Internal Revenue Service that patronage allocations were taxable to patrons when made, regardless of their form. Accordingly, the 1951 act made no specific reference to the taxa-

bility of refunds in the hands of patrons. Congress apparently assumed that the rulings of the Internal Revenue Service were valid, that cash refunds would be taxable currently to the patrons in full, and that noncash allocations, in whatever form, also would be taxable currently to the patrons at face amounts.

It thus was intended in 1951 that the cooperative income should be taxable as it was earned either to the cooperative itself, or to its members. Such income was to be taxable to the cooperative as a corporation unless paid in cash or otherwise allocated as patronage refunds, in which cases it was assumed to be taxable to the patrons or members.

However, several courts now have held that when allocation certificates issued to patron-members have no fair market value, they are not properly includible in the taxable income of the patron-members when issued. Notwithstanding the nontaxibility of these allocations to the members, they remain currently deductible by the cooperative under the clear terms of the 1951 act. It therefore is possible for cooperatives to take current tax deductions for certificates which are nontransferable, nonredeemable, and noninterest bearing, and not taxable to anyone. Cooperatives thereby may retain earnings, for indefinite periods of time, with no liability for income tax by either the cooperative or its members. Thus, the 1951 act has failed to accomplish its purpose and, contrary to Congressional intent, in at least some instances cooperatives may retain earnings with no tax imposed either on them or their members.

The general plan of the 1951 legislation, to tax all income from cooperatives' operations as it is earned either to the cooperative or to its patron-members, might now be made effective by appropriate action of Congress in the following manner.

It could be provided that cooperatives could take deductions in computing their taxable income only for (a) cash distributions and (b) noncash allocations issued in such form or under such circumstances as would make them currently taxable to the patron-members receiving them, and (c) the amount deductible by the cooperative itself should not exceed the amount so currently taxable to patron-members.

This would not interfere with the proper function or financing of cooperatives, but would make it certain that all income is taxed in one place or the other as it is earned. The traditional handling of cooperative affairs would not be impeded.

Some difficulties are involved in requiring patron-members to pay tax currently on noncash allocations. Where the patron-member gets no cash distribution, he may not have funds to pay the tax. The Internal Revenue Service has received numerous complaints from individual patron-members who object to paying tax on noncash allocations. Many people naturally consider only cash receipts and expenditures in making their income-tax returns.

These difficulties can be eliminated by the adoption of a withholding system comparable to that on wages and salaries. The tax could be withheld at the bottom rate for individuals (now 20 percent). As in the case of wages and salaries, refunds automatically would be made to those entitled to them and additional taxes paid by those subject to higher tax rates. Withholding at source would help both patron-members in payment of their taxes and the Treasury in its enforcement and administration problems.

The preceding changes would implement the intent and purposes of the act of 1951. They would make it sure that noncash allocations would be taxable, and that tax would actually be paid on behalf of the recipients. Further wholly-tax-free additions to the capital of cooperatives would be prevented.

Cooperatives still would be able to retain for their business use the entire amount of their earnings, subject only to the 20 percent withheld and paid on the tax liabilities of patron-members, by allocating all earnings to their patron-members in the form of taxable certificates. At some appropriate time your committee may desire to undertake a careful study to determine whether or not this result is in the public interest, in view of the alleged competitive situation existing between cooperatives in competition with corporate businesses which can expand their activities by retained earnings only after paying tax at the full corporate rate, or by sale of securities to the investing public.

The Treasury Department will be glad to be of such assistance as we can to you and your staffs in any consideration that you may give to the various aspects of this subject.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The Promise of International Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have spoken of the great promise of a linkup of international television—spanning the continents through the miracle of video.

I had long been in favor of the Congress doing all that is possible to spur global television work. The educational, cultural, economic, political possibilities which would accrue from joining of the continents through video are so exciting and promising as to require that we do everything possible toward this end, particularly in view of the continued East-West struggle for the allegiance of men.

I was pleased to see in the May 1955 issue of the Reader's Digest a very interesting article describing pioneering work which has been performed toward this end—work toward which our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], has contributed greatly, and which I, personally, on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have been glad to help along to the extent that it is possible.

I ask unanimous consent that this Reader's Digest article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOBAL TV IS ON THE WAY—AN AMERICAN ENGINEER PIONEERS AN AROUND-THE-WORLD ELECTRONIC NETWORK

(By A. E. Hotchner)

Seven years ago television on an international scale was only a dream in the mind of engineer William S. Halstead. Today it is a growing reality. Judging by current progress Europe will be TV-linked to the United States within the next few years; before too long an international network will girdle the earth.

Some of the units which will make up this global chain have already emerged. The anchor station of Japan's Nippon Television Network, which Halstead helped set up, celebrated its first anniversary a few months ago with an estimated audience of over a million viewers. An experimental station in Thailand will soon be transmitting programs. Last summer a network of eight European countries operated successfully over an experimental 4-week period. Seven million Europeans saw Pope Pius at the Vatican, a Belgian ballet, Queen Elizabeth reviewing the naval reserve. The integration of these networks with others yet to be established will eventually provide a worldwide TV system.

In setting up United States engineered TV in other nations, Halstead was in what amounted to a technical race with the Soviet Union. The system used in Russia is different from ours, and when a nation adopts one system, its sets, in normal operation, cannot pick up images beamed by the other.

"Back in 1947," Halstead says, "Henry Holthusen, former consultant in establishing the Voice of America, talked to me about how Russia was getting the jump on us in TV. Japan had already adopted the system used in Russia and some European countries; her neighbors were expected to follow. This was vitally important to the United States, for television is more than a medium for education and entertainment—its relay systems can also provide telephone, telegraph and, in time of war, radar and other military services."

Today microwave relay carries sounds and TV images across this country by FM radio beams which, unlike the AM waves of ordinary radio, are static-free and seldom fade. The one drawback to microwave transmission is its short range. However, a system of relay towers has, since 1951, provided a transcontinental microwave network which carries not only television, but telegrams, phone calls, and news photos.

In 1948 such a system was still a vision. Long-distance FM relays were being experimented with and some had been set up, but on a limited scale. Halstead was then a consulting engineer for the Rural Radio Network of New York State, trying to see what he could do to improve radio reception in the mountainous upstate region.

For weeks Halstead and a crew of engineers hauled portable test equipment to the mountaintops. "From this experience," he says, "we discovered the fallacy of an engineering shibboleth that FM towers had to be within line of sight—usually about 60 miles—to afford proper reception." These mountaintop relay stations gave perfect reception for distances of 100 miles in all directions. There was no reason, Halstead decided, why this system could not do for television what it had done for radio.

Remembering his talks with Holthusen, Halstead now wondered if by using the New York mountaintop system, he could bring TV to a mountainous country like Japan. He got a topographical map of Japan and plotted it.

Holthusen was enthusiastic. He took a leave of absence from his law practice, and with Halstead's plans in his brief case, went on a round-the-world trip. He found that before their plans could be adopted they had to lick the problem of who would look at television in countries where only a few could afford TV sets.

Mass viewing in public places, Halstead decided, was the answer. "At strategic places throughout a city like Tokyo," he told Holthusen, "large TV sets can be put up. Mobile units on trailers can be parked in front of outdoor audiences."

Halstead and Holthusen outlined their ideas at a meeting with Senator KARL MUNDT and other Government officials. The first step in making global television possible, they said, was to induce other countries to install American-style TV. Then by using

long-range relay stations a global network would be feasible, for Halstead had discovered a startling geographical fact: he had drawn a path around the world, starting from New York and going through Canada, across Greenland and Iceland, on to Scotland via the Faeroes and Shetland Islands, then across Europe, Southern Asia and Pacific islands to Japan, and across the Pacific via the various island groups to San Francisco. At no place on that path is there more than 290 miles between land masses. And the newest relay methods give TV beams a range of at least 300 miles.

A report of Senator MUNDT's speech in the Senate, describing Halstead's plan, was carried by the wire services. One of Japan's leading publishers, Matsutaro Shoriki, read it and invited Halstead and Holthusen to Tokyo to present their ideas to Japanese business leaders. "You must show us," he pointed out, "why we should change the TV system we already have."

Halstead outlined four reasons why the American way was better. First, the system used in Russia and some European countries produced an irritating flicker. Second, American TV sets cost less than Russian and European sets, which offered small screens, while we had 27-inch receivers available. Third, interest in television was spreading throughout the Orient, which meant that Japan could open up a new industry. Fourth, in the event of a military emergency, Japan could be linked to the United States in a vast radar warning screen that would stretch across the Pacific and be of enormous value to both countries.

Television in Japan was Government-owned. Shoriki and his group favored private ownership. After furious debate in the Diet, Shoriki's forces won and in 1952 the Nippon Television Network received its license. In 1953, under supervision of Halstead's engineering firm, anchor station JOAX went into operation.

In parks, public squares, and railroad stations, huge throngs gathered to watch large-screen TV sets. Among the programs' sponsors were beer companies, rice concerns, and kimono manufacturers. The cost of a 17-inch set dropped from $550 to $200. (Halstead estimates that Japan now has 40,000 sets. Seventeen Japanese manufacturing concerns are producing them—another aid in Japan's economic rehabilitation.) Halstead's overall plan provides 18 mountain-top stations which will eventually bring TV to all Japan.

The Japanese success has attracted widespread attention. Last October, Thailand appropriated about $12 million for a Halstead-planned national radio-and-telephone relay network. Later this will include TV. While making TV-reception tests in Mexico, Halstead completed plans for a nine-station Caribbean network that would link the Americas. He and Holthusen also have provided the Turkish Government with a plan which may swing them to United States television instead of the system previously favored. By putting mountain-top stations in only four regions, Halstead's system would provide television to most of Turkey.

India is considering Halstead's plan to erect its first TV station at Allahabad. Its programs will be devoted almost exclusively to education, including teaching the population in the outlying villages to read and write. Ultimately a TV network may serve all India. Prof. Humayun Kabir, India's Secretary of Education, says, "We fully expect that television will advance the cultural level of rural India 500 years."

Halstead's interest in electronics goes back to his boyhood in White Plains, N. Y. By the time he was 17 he had built one of the first ham radiotelephone stations in America. In 1923, as a student at Haverford College, he set up the first student-operated campus broadcasting station in the United States. Later he worked in the office of the Army's Chief Signal Officer, and in the late thirties was one of the pioneers in developing FM radio and telephones for trains and boats.

He is now president of Unitel, Inc., a global television enterprise. One of his current projects is a system of North Atlantic relay communications, called NARCOM, which will link the United States with Europe. Halstead estimates that the relay stations, equipped with their own powerplants, should cost around $60 million. The idea of an international relay network such as NARCOM, joining the free nations of the world, has been endorsed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Overseas Information Programs; Congress has authorized a Commission on Governmental Use of International Telecommunications.

One problem still to be solved is the establishment of a single broadcast standard in place of the four now used in Europe. France, for example, broadcasts both a 412-line picture and an 819-line; Holland, Belgium, and Germany use 625 lines; England uses 405. The United States standard, on the other hand, is 525 lines. Since a TV set designed for one standard cannot receive pictures broadcast on a standard with more lines, this means complications.

Though it is possible (as with last year's eight-nation network) for a TV station to receive images on one standard, convert them to a new standard and rebroadcast, this requires expensive extra equipment and picture quality is lost in the process. But in spite of such technical difficulties, David Sarnoff, head of RCA, thinks that a North Atlantic TV system will probably be an actuality within 5 years.

Need for a High School Textbook on Democracy and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address, Need for a High School Textbook on Democracy and Communism, by Dr. Kenneth Colegrove, professor emeritus of political science at Northwestern University, which he made at Queen City Club, Cincinnati, on June 8, 1955:

The trustees of the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education as well as myself are grateful to the thoughtful citizens of Cincinnati for arranging this luncheon to discuss our project for a high school textbook comparing democracy and communism.

The purpose of our discussion this afternoon is: "Why should we have such a textbook?" The answer is two-fold. First, communism is today the greatest danger to Democracy. Second, there is no high school textbook on the subject.

When parents ask school boards to teach in the public schools the dangers of Communism, two objections are generally raised. Parents are told: "There is no textbook, and the schools cannot teach such a course without one." If parents persist, they are often told that the curriculum is too crowded.

The initial purpose of the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education is to remove the first of these two objections.

The second objection, namely, the answer that the curriculum is too crowded, has unusual significance. Many Americans have come to believe that the cause of the overcrowding of the curriculum has resulted from the overemphsis on progressive education. There has been, they believe, too much insistence on new forms of social play at the expense of history, language, arithmetic and elementary classroom discipline. Homework has been somewhat belittled, if not actually discouraged. At the same time, a climate of socialism has pervaded many of our textbooks. All of this seems to have been done in the name of mass education.

The decision regarding the curriculum of the public schools should rest on the American principle that the American people have the right and the duty to control the public schools. It is true that the people in a school district should seek the advice of an expert. The superintendent of schools in each school district is the professional expert to be consulted. But we should never forget that, in American tradition, the public schools belong to the people in each State or each school district, and not to the superintendent, nor to the teachers, nor to the politicians, nor to any self-constituted authority.

American tradition is thus contrary to the practice in Italy, Germany and Soviet Russia, where the administration of education belongs to the central government and is subjected to bureaucratic control from the national capital.

There is a movement in the United States today which could result in centralizing American education. This movement could easily result in taking the public schools out of control of the people in each school district. It would give us Federal supervision of public education.

Fortunately, the public schools are still legally in the hands of the people. One of the many utilitarian reasons supporting the continuance of the American principle of local control of elementary and secondary education is the need for reminding parents and grandparents of children regarding their responsibility for maintaining the public schools. The salaries of school teachers should be sufficient to attrack competent educators. The school buildings and apparatus should be modern and adequate. Again, there is the problem of moral guidance and juvenile delinquency. Discipline is one of the toughest problems of the public schools. Unfortunately, parents are now throwing too much responsibility upon the public schools. There should be, in this field, complete cooperation between parents and the school authorities.

I wish to refer again to the second objection against teaching a comparison of democracy and communism in the public schools. This objection is the claim that the school curriculum is now too crowded to introduce a new course comparing democracy with communism. The high school curriculum is indeed overcrowded. But if the people in each district want to change the curriculum, they have the power to change it, and the schools will loyally accept this decision.

At this point I wish to explain the use of the term "democracy" in the title of our textbook on Democracy Versus Communism. Personally, I would prefer to call our American Government a "Representative Republic." This is more in keeping with the thought of the fathers of the Constitution. But after hundreds of talks with schoolmen, politicians, and scholars I am persuaded that any textbook or new course in the curriculum under any other name than "democracy" would have little or no chance of adoption in the American school system. Whether all of us like it or not, the term "democracy" has become so embedded in the public school instruction that it is useless

to attempt to promote the adoption of a substitute symbol. By the use of the term "democracy," however, our textbook will seek to show our boys and girls that American democracy means a Representative Republic, governed by a Constitution and Bill of Rights, which citizens, Presidents, Congressmen, and judges will respect and must obey.

Many people today are saying that communism is no longer a danger to the United States. This is what the Communist Party wants them to believe and say. Many well-meaning liberals thus become unconscious agents of the Moscow Presidium. They spread the propaganda that the Communist danger has passed. They remind us that the 11 top Communists were placed behind prison bars; that a thousand Communists and subversives have been expelled from the Federal Government; that scores of Communists have been driven from the schools and universities; and that the labor unions have been widely improved. As a result, they tell us that communism is now dead in America.

All this the Communist Party wants us to believe as a conclusion to the subject in order to cause us to relax our guard. But we should remember that the Communist Party never gives up, never admits defeat. The Communist conspiracy still seeks to destroy America. Hidden Communists and subversives still remain in Government, mass communications, education, and labor unions. Communism, internally and externally, is a growing, not a declining, menace to the American people.

I know that some of our guests at this table have had personal experience with Communists or subversives in Federal Government. They understand that what has occurred and is occurring is unbelievable, unless one has actually witnessed it.

Permit me a personal observation. When I served as consultant in the Office of Strategic Services in Washington during the Second World War, I, with many others, witnessed the operations of pro-Communists and other subversives in the Federal Government, tending to betray our country. Our protests fell on apathetic ears.

After the war, when I served in General MacArthur's headquarters in Japan, I witnessed an amazing situation. Month after month, pro-Communists whom I had known in Washington, were sent out to Tokyo to aid in the "democratization" of Japan.

General MacArthur had little part in selecting all of his 3,000 civilian personnel. For choosing the personnel of the occupation of Japan, the War Department depended largely on the advice of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which, as the McCarran subcommittee in the United States Senate subsequently showed in 1951, had long been captured by Communist agents and fellow travelers. Controlling the Institute of Pacific Relations, these agents used this research institution to spread propaganda to hoodwink the American people, to staff Federal agencies with pro-Communists and to guide the State Department into the promotion of foreign policies favorable to Soviet Russia. A large part of General MacArthur's civilian personnel was selected by this pro-Communist-infiltrated Institute of Pacific Relations.

Thanks to the alertness of General MacArthur, the dozens of these pro-Communists sent to Japan by the War Department were able to do little damage. General MacArthur was the first top-ranking American statesman in 1945 to resist Soviet Russia. Alone, he balked the attempt of Stalin to occupy with Soviet troops a large section of the Japanese isles. As to the pro-Communists sent out to Japan, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby (chief of G–2 or Army Intelligence) spotted practically every subversive in the occupation personnel. They were boxed into restricted posts and eventually sent home.

Today many people say that all this belongs to the past; that the Communist danger is over. Such views ignore realities. There is evidence that some Communists, pro-Communists and Marxian Socialists are still in Government employ, in the schools, in labor unions and in mass communications. In spite of false propaganda for "peaceful coexistence," the United States and the Western democracies are still face to face with one of the most ruthless dictatorships in the history of mankind. This dictatorship is bent on the destruction of constitutional government everywhere. Our foreign policy confronts a Soviet conspiracy which expects to destroy our constitutional government.

Part of the tactics of the Communist Party today is to educate the young folks to the use of violence. At the same time the Moscow dictators expect to edge the American Nation into "creeping" socialism, then into Marxian socialism and finally into the revolution and the Communist dictatorship. Socialistic planned economy is indeed the road to Soviet serfdom. That road can begin right in the heart of America.

There are many things that the United States must do in order to resist this Communist conspiracy. We must build up our national defense. We must encourage other republics to defend themselves. But internally we must do more. The Communist dictatorship is determined to capture by propaganda the minds of our boys and girls.

Thus, our public schools should teach our youth exactly what communism is. The schools must show the menace of communism. To fail to do this will be treason to our sons and daughters and their children.

There is no question in my mind that the 1,200,000 loyal schoolteachers in the United States are able and willing to teach the difference between democracy and communism. There is no more loyal and devoted group of public servants in this country than the great group of teachers in our primary and secondary schools. Many parents are unaware of the devotion that their children's teachers bring to their daily work. Many parents have little knowledge of the sacrifices, often beyond the call of duty, which they render on behalf of the pupils entrusted to their care.

The teaching of the menace of communism should be twofold. First of all, communism is a competitor of our representative democracy; therefore, representative democracy must also be studied. Second, the achievements of the American Nation must be explained. The devastating results of communism must be compared with the achievements of democracy. American democracy can well stand such comparison.

Our textbook must make crystal clear (1) That American democracy means a representative government which supports liberty and free enterprise; (2) that communism means lack of freedom; it means brutality and the police state; and (3) that communism seeks to destroy all freedom in all countries. The textbook should call attention to such facts as that Communist education teaches schoolboys and girls to denounce their own parents for any deviation from the party line, which denunciation causes their fathers and mothers to be sentenced to slave-labor camps.

It is necessary to teach these things in high school, since not more than 25 percent of the pupils who enter high school ever go to college. This teaching should become a part of our so-called mass education.

Our textbook on democracy and communism must follow the best pedagogical methods. It must avoid rigid indoctrination. It must be accurate in its statement of facts. It must refrain from forcing conclusions upon pupils. It must present facts and principles, and allow pupils to form their own conclusions. It must not inculcate hatred of other nations as does Soviet education. It should teach sympathy for and understanding of all peoples. It should not ignore the spiritual values in American tradition.

In teaching democracy, this textbook should remedy the defects of many other textbooks. It should not only explain and defend the United States Constitution, but also it should defend all the constitutional freedoms—not merely freedom of speech, the press and religion. Among other rights, the textbook should explain and defend our constitutional liberty to acquire and possess property.

How many parents examine their children's textbooks? The number of such parents is surprisingly few. If they inspected these textbooks they would find that their boys and girls go through public school without adequate instruction regarding one of our constitutional liberities, namely, the right of property which is the foundation of our free enterprise system.

The Institute plans to publish also a teacher's guide. This handbook for teachers will have a twofold purpose. The first purpose is to assist teachers in teaching the textbook. It will give them educational aids for the classroom and broaden the teacher's knowledge of the subject. The second purpose is to protect the loyal teacher from attack by Communists and Communist sympathizers who smear a teacher as a Fasicist or a Nazi if she says anything against the Soviet Union. Such a teacher, if called before a school board on charges, can say: "You see, I am instructed on page so-and-so of the teacher's guide to say these things about Soviet Russia." In almost every community Communists, pro-Communists and Marxian socialists are lurking to brand any honest teacher with fascism or nazism who says anything detrimental about Soviet Russia, communism or Marxian socialism.

Many millions of dollars have been spent on many worthy privately financed projects devoted to education of opinion leaders such as editors, teachers, and newsmen in "liberterian" economics and American free enterprise. Many millions more have been spent in disseminating articles and speeches written by these opinion leaders among the workers in industry and among the voters generally. This has all been needed and is all to the good.

But it is not difficult to visualize how tremendously more effective these efforts would be if they could reach a more intelligently informed mass audience who had been exposed in high school to a basic course showing the empty promises of communism and socialism as compared with the actually delivered benefits of American constitutional democracy. How much more effective such efforts would be if our 2 million loyal teachers and ministers of the gospel had a dependable and objective source of information on this subject, such as the proposed textbook should provide.

Some guests at this table may wonder why the task of publishing a high school textbook on communism has fallen upon a small organization like the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education. The answer is significant. None of the great school textbook publishing companies now care to publish such a book. Considering the time and extensive research involved in creating a good product, it would involve a considerable financial risk. If not compiled with precise objectivity and truthfulness, it would be banned by those in the educational field who determine the selection of textbooks.

If the textbook of the Institute is a success, undoubtedly many publishing houses will hasten to imitate the Institute. But a beginning has to be made. The Institute proposes to make the beginning.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I pay a tribute to the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education? As Daniel Webster said of Dartmouth College, this institute is a small institution, but it merits our profound respect. Its record has no blemish.

In comparison with many of the foundations, it is a very small institution. While the great foundations operate on billions of dollars, the institute has no capital assets whatever. Nevertheless, with all the wisdom and wealth represented in the great foundations, none of them has come forward with a project to tell American boys and girls about the evils of communism.

It has remained for this small institute to supply the vision and patriotism necessary to undertake the task of publishing this much-needed textbook and to initiate the effort to place the subject in the high-school curriculum.

I am proud to be associated with the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education. The fact that such statesmen as Robert A. Taft and John W. Davis were intimately connected with its founding led me to accept the assignment of preparing its textbook. John Marshall, the president of the institute, is a statesman of vision and intellectual honesty. Its trustees are well known to you. Many have rendered great services in the fields of diplomacy, public administration, and education.

As for myself, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say this. After some 30 years of service in public and college education, and after service to my Government in various capacities at home and abroad, I am happy to end my career with the development of this high-school textbook. I am writing it for the boys and girls of America. I am writing it, gentlemen, for your sons and daughters and for your grandchildren.

Far Western Growth Makes Utility History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Far Western Growth Makes Utility History," delivered by Mr. James B. Black, chairman of the board of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., before the 23d annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute, at Los Angeles, Calif., on June 14, 1955.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 2⅔ pages, at a cost of $214.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAR WESTERN GROWTH MAKES UTILITY HISTORY

(By James B. Black)

It is a pleasure and a matter of pride for us here in the West that we are privileged to be your hosts. There is significance in the selection of California for this 23d annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute, for nowhere did the electric industry gain an earlier start, and nowhere has its growth in this postwar decade been greater.

You would be surprised, I suspect, if you were not greeted here in California with a little regional tub-thumping. We seem to have acquired a reputation for a certain lack of reticence about our natural attractions and our accomplishments. At any rate, the California Electric Light Co. began serving arc lamp lighting customers in San Francisco from the industry's first central station in September 1879. That was a few months before Thomas A. Edison applied for a patent on his first incandescent lamp, from which our industry has grown.

It would be tempting to dwell on details of our development over the past 75 years if there were time. The unceasing growth of the Pacific Southwest has reached such proportions in the postwar decade, however, that it is pertinent to review this recent period. In the great tradition of the industry, the utility companies of our region have been in the forefront of this growth and we believe have served it well.

In the light of what is now fact, it is a little difficult to recall that at the end of World War II there were many alarmed predictions of a severe slump in the war-stimulated economy. Here in the West it was questioned whether there would be jobs to sustain the vast new population, or whether it would melt away. It is fortunate for the region that the utility companies took an optimistic view and at once prepared to build new capacity as quickly as we could, for each year since 1945 tens of thousands of newcomers have arrived to settle in our midst.

The Pacific Southwest is the fastest growing region of the United States. Never has the Nation witnessed a greater migration of population than the movement into this area in recent years. The postwar rate of population increase in Arizona, Nevada, and California has been more than half again as fast as that of the country as a whole, while California in a single decade jumped from fifth to second most populous State in the Nation. The State's gain for the 12 months ending July 1 is estimated at 560,000 inhabitants. Optimists place California first among the States in population by 1965.

This record growth naturally has brought about substantial changes in our economy. Agriculture retains its top position with an annual value in the 3 States of $3 billion. From a dominant role, however, it has given way to a balanced economy marked by large and growing industry.

Residential construction in our area is phenomenal. During the postwar decade it has represented about 17 percent of the national housing construction for less than 8 percent of the national population. If you flew into Los Angeles you may have glimpsed from the air how new suburbs have spread in all directions. Houses now cover tens of thousands of acres of former farmland. There is of course a chain reaction from this construction on business of all kinds.

Commercial and industrial construction is hardly less notable. It is a development with national significance that the West now has a population large enough to support all types of commercial and industrial enterprise. For example, a growing steel industry is established, and our aircraft and electronic industries can be counted among the leaders of the Nation. New commitments were made throughout California, Arizona and Nevada during last year alone for more than 1,200 new plants and expansions totaling almost half a billion dollars in value.

I hope you will bear with me for resorting to statistics. Having undertaken the topic Far Western Growth Makes Utility History, I find no other means of working, as we used to do in geometry, toward a "Q. E. D.." The figures that pertain to our own industry, however, impress even those of us who have had a part in making them.

Since World War II our investor-owned utility companies here in the Pacific Southwest have added nearly 1,400,000 electric customers to their lines, about a two-thirds increase in nine years.

Kilowatt hour sales and the area peak load, to which both investor-owned and other systems contributed, have more than doubled since the war. Last year area sales reached a level of 38 billion kilowatt hours and the area peak load served was 8 million kilowatts.

Now let us look at how generating capacity has been increased. In nine years more than 5 million kilowatts of dependable capacity has been added in our region. Last December the total dependable capacity in the 3 States was nearly 10 million kilowatts, double what it was at the end of the war. Nor is this all. Construction already planned for completion before 1960 amounts to more than 5 million kilowatts additional.

I need not emphasize in this assembly that construction on such a huge scale could not have been undertaken without the confidence of both individual and institutional investors and the assistance of the investment bankers. The investor-owned companies of this area have been almost constantly in the market for new capital. Together we have spent a total of nearly $2 billion on electric plant since the war, and to finance this construction have successfully marketed nearly $1½ billion of securities. My own company for all purposes has raised over $1 billion of new money since the end of the war. Our combined achievement reflects a confidence of investors in the future of our region and the companies as a group in which we of the industry take legitimate pride.

At the close of 1954 ownership of the companies was vested in more than 386,000 stockholders, a gain of 142,000 in 9 years. A high degree of local ownership of the stock is characteristic. Again referring to Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for example, nearly two-thirds of our 217,000 stockholders are Californians, and they own about half of our outstanding stock. Such widespread ownership of the stock of utilities under regulation truly is public ownership in the highest sense.

In this connection you will recall the much-repeated claim of government power zealots that the investor-financed utilities are not capable of providing alone all the power the country needs. They have sought to foster a belief that here in our area we must be dependent in major degree on government hydroelectric projects to supply demands for energy. The record of the industry in this region of greatest growth in the United States refutes this specious claim. In my own company's service area the Federal Government from 1945 through 1954 added only 300,000 kilowatts of installed capacity. In the same postwar period we have installed 2½ million kilowatts in an expansion program on which we have spent, for all purposes, $1½ billion. In terms of total capacity, our system alone has almost double the kilowatts installed in Federal plants in the Central Valley and Colorado River developments combined.

Before we leave the subject of power expansion in this region, note may be taken of a change in the character of total resources. Historically we have been known for our hydroelectric development, and at the end of World War II the area had twice as much dependable hydroelectric capacity as it had in steam. Today steam capacity exceeds hydro by more than a million kilowatts, and over the years the preponderance of steam will grow.

We have turned to steam partly because steam plants could be built more quickly to meet the rapid growth in demand. More significantly, relative costs per kilowatt of steam and hydroelectric capacity have be-

come moving targets going in opposite directions, and we have had to draw a fresh bead at every step in our expansion. While steam plant efficiencies have been steadily rising, the quality of remaining hydroelectric sites has progressively declined. In our territory, for instance, about a third of the total hydroelectric potential has been or is being developed and another third is actively projected for development in the next 10 years. The remaining potential beyond that is of doubtful economic value. There will, therefore, be increasing reliance on steam generation to meet future demands.

The early development and substantial growth of hydroelectric generation in California sprang from the elaborate system of mining waterways constructed during the gold rush. These same waterways stimulated the practice of irrigation, which has had such profound effect on the development of the West. Electric pumping for irrigation had been tried successfully in California by the early 1890's. This was the real beginning of farm electrification in America.

In the past 15 years irrigated acreage in Arizona, California, and Nevada has increased by more than one-half, primarily through electric pumping. In California nearly three-quarters of all irrigation water is electrically pumped. Underground water tables have dropped markedly and it is recognized that pumping is an inadequate answer to the increasing problem of supply. Under the sharp spur of necessity, large new conservation projects are being advanced. The most comprehensive development of water in California can be achieved if our Government and private agencies willing and able to share the financial burden become working partners in these projects.

Partnership is not a new concept here in the West. In the course of irrigation and water storage development in my own company's service area, a pioneering partnership arrangement grew up between us and irrigation districts and other Government agencies, going back to World War I. In some cases the company has installed powerplants at the water conservation projects of these public agencies and has paid for the use of falling water for generation. In other instances the company, by contracting to purchase the power output, has helped finance construction by assuring a market for the power generated by project plants. A current example is our cooperation to help finance the Tri-Dam water storage project of two irrigation districts through a 50-year agreement for company purchase of power from the project plants. Aside from our cooperative participation in water development, we have 57 reservoirs of our own with a storage capacity of nearly 1½ million acre-feet of water which is used not only for power generation but also for irrigation and other beneficial purposes in the central valley.

Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives are a minor factor in California, Arizona and Nevada. Among the more than 1,000 cooperatives in the United States there are only 16 active organizations in the 3 States, and in Pacific Gas & Electric Co. territory there is none. The reason there are so few is that the major work of extending service to rural areas has been done by utilities of their own accord. Electricity has always been available to more farms than used it. And I have always found our low rates disconcerting to the promoters of REA's.

In California there has been no real grassroots demand for the Federal Government to go into the commercial power business. Such agitation as there has been was inspired in Washington and has been abetted by the ambitions of a few local groups and politicians to thrust Federal power upon an unreceptive people. It must be said, however, that their clamor has been furthered by unfamiliarity in the East with conditions in the West. Water, not power, is the problem in the West. Those who have made the need for water a vehicle to promote Government ownership and distribution of electric power seek to rule, not serve.

Construction of Hoover Dam on the Colorado River marked the entry of the Federal Government in large multiplepurpose water development projects in the West. The concept, policies and operation of the Boulder Canyon project are in striking contrast with those that have since prevailed in other Federal projects.

In authorizing the Boulder project, Congress required that before any money could be appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior must have executed contracts for the storage and delivery of water for irrigation and domestic use and for generation of electrical energy. These contracts were to provide revenues at least adequate to cover expenses of operation and maintenance, and repayment, with interest, within 50 years, of the project cost, with the proviso that a longer period was permitted for the repayment of $25 million allocated to flood control.

The full realization of the potentialities of the West will require continuing development of our water resources wherever feasible, including development by the Federal Government as well as by State and local agencies. Where economical, byproduct electric power should be developed on these water projects in order that the cost of water and the burden on the taxpayers may be reduced to a minimum. Most emphatically, however, such power should be made to add to, and not subtract from, the project's feasibility. It should be marketed through existing power systems for maximum benefit to the project and the largest possible number of taxpaying consumers.

The investor-owned utility companies of California, Arizona, and Nevada paid a total tax bill last year of $138 million on their electric properties alone. My company paid $79 million, and on all of its operations paid $104 million. For many years we have been the largest property taxpayer in California. Also for a number of years, taxes have been the largest single item of cost in providing service to our customers. Last year taxes charged to income absorbed a quarter of every dollar of gross operating revenues. They exceeded wages and salaries paid to all operating employees by $47 million and exceeded by $46 million the dividends paid to the 217,000 stockholders whose invested savings make possible the existence of the company.

In contrast with the heavy burden of taxes borne by investor-owned utilities, Government power installations are almost wholly exempt from taxation. Those who hawk their deceptive ware of "cheap public power" cannot honestly dispute this fact. It is little wonder that with a tremendously unfair tax advantage the Government is often able to undercut its own citizens in the marketing of power. Instead, the wonder is that so many taxpayers allow themselves to be misled.

There can be no moral justification for burdening the taxpayers of the entire Nation with the construction of unnecessary, tax-free electric systems to serve a privileged few. Exempting Government power installations from taxation discriminates between citizens. Further, it denies to local governments and schools the tax support they would receive if the power installations were built by power companies. Government power should be taxed equally with the investor-owned utility industry. Such taxation would end forever the myth that Government power is cheap.

Substantially different from the Hoover Dam operation is the Federal Central Valley project, which lies within the service area of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Advocates of a socialized electric industry made of it a major testing ground. Fortunately, they failed in their ultimate objective.

The Central Valley project is primarily a water project. It was created to develop and store water in the area of plentiful supply in the northern part of our State and to make water available to the fertile lands to the south. The project was designed also to control floods, aid navigation and control salinity in the rich delta region of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. Powerplants at the project's Shasta and Keswick Dams have a total dependable capacity of 300,000 kilowatts of byproduct power. Nothing in the enabling legislation, either Federal or State, contemplated that this power should be used to launch the Government in a commercial power business. That, however, was no deterrent to bureaucratic policymakers who descended on California during the project's construction.

In keeping with our long-established policy of cooperation, Pacific Gas & Electric Co. until 1951 provided a market for the CVP power near the point of generation at Shasta Dam. Our purchase there gave the project power its highest value and yielded maximum return to the project. In 7 years dating from 1944, when power was first produced, our payments discharged all operating costs and provided $38 million net toward repayment of the project costs. Had this arrangement continued, the charge for water to farmers could have been cut in half and still all costs would have been repaid within the period established by reclamation law.

Despite these advantages, unneeded Government transmission lines were built to transmit the power to project pumps at Tracy, 200 miles distant from Shasta Dam. Repeatedly we exposed the obvious purpose of bringing CVP power within range of customers served by the company and pointed out the damage that would result to the project and the water users.

This unnecessary transmission system, involving fixed charges on the additional investment, added operating costs, and line losses over a distance of 200 miles, reduced the Central Valley project's net revenue by $2 million a year from that realized from sale of power near the dam.

If all firm commercial power from the project were delivered to preference customers through our system under an exchange agreement instead of being sold to the company at Tracy, there would be a further loss to the project of $2,700,000 a year.

If the Bureau of Reclamation were to build an independent electric system, complete with steam generation, as it proposed in the past, and were to sell all of its power direct, the loss would grow by another $2,400,000 a year.

The total loss to the project, the taxpayers, and the water users from such a commercial power operation, even if successful, would be about $7 million a year. Here, indeed, is an enlightening glimpse of the lengths to which advocates of tax-subsidized electric systems have been willing to go.

We have now before the people of California and before Congress a proposal to cooperate in the development of the Trinity River, one of the major undeveloped water resources of the State, as a part of the Central Valley project.

The Trinity is in the extreme north of California, and much of its water runs waste to the sea. For many years Californians have talked of and planned to carry some of that water into the thirsty interior valleys. Legislation is before the present Congress to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to bring the dream to reality by a system of dams and tunnels through the Trinity Mountains. Byproduct electric power would be developed to help finance the water project. The Bureau estimates the overall cost at $219 million, including power facilities to be built and operated by the Bureau.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. more than a year ago offered to purchase the falling water of the Trinity project and to build and pay for

the power facilities in a partnership arrangement with the Bureau. Early this year we made such a proposal formally. A month ago the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, after the appearance of company representatives, amended the Trinity project bill. The amendment enables the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate for the sale of falling water for power generation on this project.

Our partnership proposal to the Bureau of Reclamation would save the Federal taxpayers $50 million initially in capital outlay, and we would pay $3,500,000 a year for the falling water. That amount is its full value based on the present cost of alternative steam power. We would develop half again as much power capacity as the Bureau proposes to build. Furthermore, we would pay taxes amounting to $1,400,000 a year to the Federal treasury and $1,300,000 a year to State and local governments. Over the project repayment period our payments for water and in taxes would yield $171 million more net revenue to the Federal, State and local governments than would construction and operation of the project and its power features entirely by the Federal Government.

Clearly, our participation will make possible the construction of this needed water project with the least cost to taxpayers and maximum benefits to water users.

Approximately 200 California organizations, including statewide farm and business associations, labor unions, irrigation districts, boards of county supervisors, city councils, and civic organizations have endorsed construction of the Trinity power facilities by local enterprise. It is quite evident that the more our partnership proposal is understood by the public the more support it wins.

In this connection, let me recall for a moment the terms in which President Eisenhower reaffirmed the partnership principle in his state of the Union message to Congress last January:

"At the foundation of our economic growth," said the President, "are the raw materials and energy produced from our minerals and fuels, lands and forests, and water resources. With respect to them, I believe the Nation must adhere to three fundamental policies:

"First, to develop, wisely use, and compare basic resources from generation to generation;

"Second, to follow the historic pattern of developing these resources primarily by private citizens under fair provisions of law, including restraints for proper conservation; and

"Third, to treat resource development as a partnership undertaking—a partnership in which the participation of private citizens and State and local governments is as necessary as Federal participation."

These principles should not fall on our ears as something new and strange. They are wholly in the American tradition.

If they needed to be spelled out by the President, it is only because the Nation has strayed so far from its historic path.

America was not built by government. It was built by the energies of a self-reliant people who long ago learned the lesson of cooperation. It was built by a people who created homes in the wilderness through log-raising bees, who pushed across the western plains in organized wagon trains, who began the reclamation of arid lands by their own efforts, constantly demonstrating their capacity to fend for themselves. Today's problems are but a projection of such experiences on a vastly greater scale.

Government as a partner enlarges and strengthens the abilities of its citizens. Government as a remote and bureaucratic overseer can only weaken and subject its citizens to a demoralizing control. It is not a coincidence that the only areas of potential power scarcity in the United States are those in which the Government has assumed to itself a dominant role.

The administration's policy seeks to restore local powers that had been yielded too weakly and to unleash energies for the progress of the Nation. I believe an awakened people welcomes and will embrace this opportunity to regain a measure of self-direction that had been all but lost. I am certain the electric utility industry will continue to shoulder the responsibility of cooperating to the fullest for the common good.

This year the electric industry enters the final quarter of its first century of service to mankind. Its growth has been marked from the beginning by continuing technological advance, ever-increasing efficiency in operation, steady improvement in service and continued reduction in real costs to our consumers.

My own experience of 43 years began in the period when the automobile and the airplane were just beginning to be significant factors in our civilization, and when our industry was making its first great forward surge. Many of the wonders of the electrical age that are commonplace today were only dreams then.

Now we are working in a new area of development—nuclear power—which promises in this next quarter century to unfold as a further remarkable achievement of our industry. We also are investigating anew the potentials of harnessing solar energy for beneficial use.

Less than 10 years ago the possibility of applying nuclear energy to commercial generation of electricity still was in the realm of laboratory speculation. Today the industry is moving ahead rapidly in the search for means to make it economically competitive with conventional methods of generating power.

We are mindful, however, that the efficiency of conventional plants is improving, and that when and if atomic plants become economically feasible, in perhaps 10 years or so, they must complete with the more efficient conventional plants of that day. The latter will continue to be an important source of new generating capacity for the foreseeable future.

Cost and operating data which can be obtained only by construction of large plants will be necessary for evaluation of the economy of the nuclear-electric plants.

As most of you may know, my company has been engaged with others in the study of nuclear-electric power since early in 1951. Our nuclear power group has made a proposal to the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a 180,000-kilowatt nuclear power-plant. The plant would be owned by the Commonwealth Edison Co. and would be a part of its system. Details of its financing are well advanced. It will be built without Government subsidy. Other companies are making similar progress in this field.

We believe that if nuclear power does become competitive, it will fit into existing integrated power systems in the same manner as new and more efficient conventional plants are added today.

Those of us who are becoming senior citizens in the utility field have passed through some exciting and occasionally trying times in the past quarter century. We have experienced war, depression, attempts at planned economy, inflation and the incessant attack of the socialist ideology on our industry. We have been a whipping boy for cranks, crackpots, demagogues, and even men in high office. We have navigated some heavy seas.

I am confident that our own achievements and our diligence in doing our job of public service have brought us through this period stronger in character and higher in public esteem.

As we look to the future we can't help feeling that today we may be witnessing along with our own lengthening shadows, the advancing twilight of the threat of socialism. The siren song of the promiser of pie in the sky no longer is on the Hit Parade.

There is heartening evidence of a public reawakening to the realities of the facts of American life. Young applicants for employment today seem less preoccupied with the adequacy of our pension plans and the state of our vice presidents' health, and more interested in the opportunity for solid advancement based on individual effort.

There is a rebirth of faith in the wisdom of our forefathers; renewed pride in our American philosophy, our creed of individual dignity and integrity and in the accomplishments of men who have forged our Nation's history.

Two contributions to our national life from the State of Tennessee hold considerable current public attention. I submit that for future generations of Americans, the better yardstick of the two, by far, is Davy Crockett.

Dedication of General John J. Pershing Plaque

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks as made in Los Angeles, Calif., on July 25, 1955. The occasion was the dedication of a memorial plaque on Pershing Square, in that city, honoring Gen. John J. Pershing, after whom the square was named.

The program was under the sponsorship of Woodmen of the World Life Insurance Society, of Omaha, Nebr. It was holding its national convention in Los Angeles at the time, under the leadership of its president, Farrar Newberry.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA AT DEDICATION OF GENERAL JOHN J. PERSHING PLAQUE, PERSHING SQUARE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JULY 25, 1955

The American people are grateful for the safe return of our President Eisenhower to the Nation's Capital. They are grateful, too, for his most recent efforts in the incessant search for peace, which has been pursued by him and his administration so capably and persistently.

While there are optimistic statements on the outcome of the Geneva Conferences, it is much too early to properly appraise them. This inability to judge so early is something which thoughtful people had in mind even before Geneva talks started. We were told, and rightly so, that a readymade, beribboned, and complete solution to the world's ills could not and would not be expected. It will still be a long, torturous process before the goal is reached.

In spite of all this, great gains were made in Geneva.

First, leaders of the nations at the conference recognized the terrific force of the universal, common desire for peace held by the rank and file of the peoples of the world. These leaders recognize that their people

expect and demand that something be done by them. They have responded to this desire for peace.

Our President was right when he stated that he came to Geneva with something more powerful than the Army, Navy, and Air Forces which he commanded in Europe 11 years ago. This something was the good will of America, the great hopes of America—the aspirations of America for peace.

Secondly, the Geneva talks proved that there is foundation for some hope that war is not necessarily inevitable. There is hope that the leaders of nations will realize and act upon the stern truth which every thinking individual knows, to wit: the futility of armed conflict, and the fact that everyone loses and no one gains from it.

Geneva in itself may not have solved much. It does lay foundation for much. It will be followed by further conferences on lower levels where further progress can be made.

President Eisenhower acted and spoke boldly. It is heartening to know that he did so fully aware of the dangers of meeting with Soviet Russia's leaders, who have so often in the past proved themselves to be unreliable, deceitful, and treacherous. They must be and will be dealt with accordingly.

But the stakes of gains toward peace are so great, that every avenue and hope for peace, however faint they may be, should be fully and thoroughly explored and pursued. We can be confident that they will be in the same stable and capable and farseeing fashion which has characterized our foreign policy under President Eisenhower to date.

America's position in world leadership which exists, whether we like it or not and whether we strive for it or not, was a long time in formation. One of the big features of that growth was our entry into World War I and the military successes which this country had in it.

General John J. Pershing whom we honor here today was one of the most potent of all the personalities who were active in that period. His ability and leadership did much for America's standing in the eyes of the world. When we consider our fortunate position on the world scene it is fitting that we give General Pershing due credit and that we honor him as we do.

The placing of historical markers serves several purposes. Among them are these: to inform, to remind, and to inspire.

Today as we dedicate this plaque honoring Gen. John J. Pershing, there is a wealth of material for fulfilling all of these purposes, for this general is one of the most outstanding of Americas. His life and works arouse not only feelings of gratitude for service rendered in time of crisis, but admiration for the variety and duration of his activities for his country.

This great patriot died at the age of 88 in the year 1948. His life span had then covered more than one-half of the duration of our Republic under the Federal Constitution. And what a jampacked, thrilling, and significant life was packed into those fourscore and 8 years.

It was exclusively a military career. His first taste of the art and the hellishness of war was at the age of 4 when he stood in the doorway of his home in Linn County, Mo., and watched the sweaty, weary, blood-streaked men stagger home from Appomattox. Seventeen years later, he entered the United States Military Academy at West Point. He remained in active military service continuously and without interruption until his retirement in 1924, a period of 43 years.

This career from cadet to commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces, to Chief of Staff, and to the General of the Armies sought a wide range of activity. He led his men through almost every kind of campaign: Indian wars in the Southwest, the Moros in the Philippines, against Pancho Villa in Mexico, and finally as Commander in Chief of the AEF in Europe against the German Armies. The slogan of "Join the Navy and see the world" was not in Pershing's case considered the sole property of one branch of the armed services.

Perhaps the first time he came in wide and popular notice was in 1914–15 during the Mexican border troubles. He was sent out after Pancho Villa after a number of raids by the illusive and colorful figure. Pershing caught up with the culprit, only to get orders to let him go. It was this campaign which did much to result in his appointment as head of the AEF.

In addition to the service in the Spanish-American War, in the Indian hostilities in the the southwest country of the United States, in Mexico, in the Philippines, in Hawaii, and other places, he was assigned and served briefly in Europe as early as 1908 as observer of the Balkan military activities.

The background, training, and experience which he got in the military field campaigns, as well as teacher at West Point and the University of Nebraska, and as administrator at desk work in Washington and elsewhere, all built up to qualifications which served in mighty good stead in later years.

In 1905 and after his brilliantly effective Moro campaign in the Phillipines, he was promoted by President Theodore Roosevelt from captain to brigadier general over 862 officers. This brought about a great storm of comment and criticism even though some of his contemporaries were similarly promoted: Gen. Leonard Wood, for example, who was promoted over 91 seniors; Gen. J. F. Bell over 1,031 seniors; William Crozier over 493 seniors, and others. Later events, of course, justified the choice and preference thus extended.

All of his powers and talents were called for to full limit when he assumed command of the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe. His first great trial and battle was not with the enemy, but with the generals and the military forces of the Allies. They wanted the American soldiers to serve as replacements within the Allied Forces rather than as a force of their own. This was stubbornly resisted by General Pershing because he knew that the effect of such a policy would be disastrous upon the morale of the men and to the place of our Nation in the eyes of the world. He stubbornly held out until the American forces were trained and mobilized in full force at which time they entered the conflict under their own flag, although under the supreme command of Marshall Foch.

After the war he served as Chief of Staff at home and was made General of the Armies. Even after his retirement from active service in 1924, he continued his role of adviser and counselor in military affairs and one of the biographers states:

"His service to his country was beyond measure; the strategy of today's United States Army is, in large part, his concept."

It is so fitting that the Omaha Woodmen Life Insurance Co. with its home offices in Omaha, Nebr., should sponsor this significant and meaningful occasion of dedication. Pershing shortly after his graduation from West Point was assigned to the University of Nebraska as professor of military science. Those were tough years for any military organization and especially so in the Middle West, but he breathed new life into the classes and into his drill companies. Shortly after his arrival in Nebraska, National Competitive Drills for college military organizations were held in nearby Omaha, the home office city of Omaha Woodmen Life Insurance Society, incidentally. With great effort he assembled enough support from faculty as well as his student body to enter a drill company into that competition. That company won the Omaha Cup and a cash prize of $1,500. While in Nebraska University he attended classes in the law school and graduated law school in the year 1893 there. It had beeen one of his early ambitions to study the law and this was fulfilled in Nebraska's capitol city. It is significant to note that during all the years which followed, he maintained his legal residence in Lincoln, Nebr, at 1748 B Street.

One of the memorials to his affiliation with and affection for Nebraska is the "Pershing Rifles" which has its national headquarters at the University of Nebraska in Lincoln. It is a national honorary military society founded in 1894.

There is another reason why it is fitting that this occasion should be under the auspices of the Omaha Woodmen Life Insurance Society. This great patriotic and fraternal orgnization has long had its policy the honoring of great Americans and the encouragement and promotion of the study of American history.

In the past it has honored notable Americans such as Presidents John Tyler, Zachary Taylor, Andrew Johnson, James K. Polk, and William Howard Taft by suitable placement and dedication of plaques and markers. Two other generals have been similarly honored. Namely Grenville Dodge and Nathan Bedford Forest.

The leadership of the Omaha Woodmen Life Insurance Society is to be highly commended for the patriotic program which they have developed and which they are following so well. The membership of this great organization is likewise to be commended for supporting this program so enthusiastically and so loyally. The entire Nation is the recipient of a great deal of benefit as a result.

In the name of the public generally, I extend our thanks together with our appreciation.

The Right To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have before me a very fine editorial entitled "The Right To Live," published in the Southern Cross. The editorial was sent to me by one of Idaho's distinguished students and philosophers, a man who is interested in other States as well as in his own State. The editorial and the facts appearing thereafter have to do with the dilemma of the tuna fishing industry as it exists today.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred, and a postscript to the editorial. I commend the editorial and the postscript to the reading of Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial and postscript were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southern Cross of June 30, 1955)

THE RIGHT TO LIVE

The first of man's inalienable rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence is the right to life and this must include the right to make a living. At the present moment around 1,500 families in the city of San Diego are in grave danger of being deprived of this right. We refer to the families of the tuna fishermen.

Tuna fishing has been for a long time an important part of San Diego's economy. The industry has had its ups and down, periods of high prosperity and periods of depression. In the thirties it began to thrive. Then came the war for which the United States Government requisitioned most of the tuna boats. (It is well to remember that with the boats went the greater part of the crews, voluntarily, including a number who were over draft age.) When the war ended the boats were returned to their owners and compensation paid for their use.

Then came 4 years of prosperity, with good fishing and good prices for fish, ending in 1951. During this time the merchants of San Diego as well as those in the boat buildings and boat repairing business benefited mightily from the fishing boom. In fact, it was the fishermen's willingness to risk their savings—a thing for which they are sometimes criticized—in new and bigger boats, which made possible the growth of this multi-million dollar industry in our city.

In 1951 a depression set in, which did not greatly worry the fishermen at first. (They know their life to be a hazardous one and fishing to be a precarious means of livelihood). First there was scarcity of fish; then the canneries became overstocked and were forced to assign a quota to each boat; then fish caught by foreign boats began to arrive in San Diego, underselling the catch of the American boats. Our fishermen do not wish to exclude Japanese fish entirely; they merely ask that it should not be allowed to come here in such quantity as to cripple and ultimately destroy the local fishing industry.

This is the present situation. Our Government permits Japanese frozen tuna to enter this country in unlimited quantities. Because of low wages and the low cost of living in Japan, this imported fish can be delivered to San Diego canneries for $70 a ton less than the same quality of fish caught by American fishing boats. (The canneries are now asking the fishermen to accept $40 a ton less than is specified in the present contract but, even at this price, the Japanese boats will easily undersell the local ones).

Under prevailing conditions San Diego fishermen cannot continue to make a living, even if they use every possible means of economizing. It's a question of retaining or losing this means of livelihood.

Most of the boatowners have debts contracted in the building or repair of their boats. When the debts cannot be met the boats are sold by auction—who would want to buy one under present circumstances?—and the owners are liable to lose their homes, their savings, everything they have, to meet their obligations. Since fishermen are seldom qualified for other work, this means that their right to live will be taken from them.

POSTSCRIPT TO ABOVE EDITORIAL

This is written to clarify certain points on which inquiries were made by readers of the Southern Cross editorial.

The present tuna fishing crisis is not just an ordinary depression such as the industry has experienced from time to time. It is something unique. This is the first time that it has been threatened with extinction through foreign competition, a competition rendered formidable and unfair by low wages and a low standard of living. Men who speak with authority on Japan's economic planning tell us that the Japanese are building a fleet of tuna clippers which by 1958 will supply the full demand for this product on the American market. Unless the United States Government gives some form of protection against this ruinous competition, the tuna fleets of San Diego and San Pedro, representing an investment of more than $100 million, will have passed into history within 3 years from today.

In the early thirties, when the whole country was suffering from a major depression, the tuna fishermen of the Pacific coast endured the common lot of their fellow countrymen. But the investment in the industry at that time was small, probably not more than $3 million. Besides the fishermen felt that, when the whole national economy was in the doldrums, there was no reason why they should not suffer with the rest. The situation is quite different now, when the Nation in general is prosperous and the threat of destruction to an American industry comes from foreign competition which could be regulated by our Federal Government.

The tuna fishermen do not ask that foreign tuna be excluded from the United States or that a prohibitive tariff be imposed on it. They merely ask that a quota be placed on it, so that it cannot capture more than 35 percent of the American market. American boats would then have the remaining 65 percent, and competition with salmon and other kinds of canned fish would keep the price at a reasonable level and protect the consuming public.

The objection is raised that, when the industry was booming, tuna fishermen squandered their money. Some of them did but these were the rare exceptions. The worst offenders were kids of from 20 to 25, who were still unmarried and had no family responsibility. The big money went to their heads and they had to let the world know about it. But the same thing would have happened to young men of that age in any other occupation or profession if they were making more money than they knew what to do with. Old heads seldom grow on young shoulders.

It is well known the world over that sailors are free spenders, and fishermen are no exception. The average trip for the medium and large tuna boats takes about 10 weeks, during which there is little opportunity to spend money. Only those who know nothing of human nature will blame the fishermen if they make up for lost time when they reach the home port. The merchants of San Diego, at least have no reason to blame them.

Even so, by far the greater part of the money made on tuna fishing went into the building of new and bigger boats. In this sense we may say that the fishermen were gamblers but it was their willingness to risk their savings that made possible the growth of a multimillion dollar industry on the Pacific coast. If they had saved their money putting it into gilt-edged bonds instead of reinvesting it, the whole Pacific Coast would have been poorer in consequence. It would be a sad day for America if the pioneering spirit were to disappear from our national life, to be replaced by a desire for sheltered security.

The question is sometimes asked: Why do not the canneries and boat owners get together and impose a quota on foreign tuna, without asking for Government intervention? The trouble is that the canneries which handle the catch of American tuna boats are in competition with other canneries, on the east and west coasts, which handle only the tuna brought in by foreign boats. In order to meet this competition they have to can a large percentage of the foreign fish. This is the reason why our tuna boats are held in the harbor for an average of 70 days before unloading. (This adds to their overhead expense as refrigeration has to be constant and guards kept on the boats.)

The canneries are now asking the boat owners and the fishermen to accept a $40 a ton reduction below the current price for tuna. Most of the owners and fishermen would be glad to agree to this, if given a guarantee that their boats could unload immediately on arrival at the home port. But no such guaranty is given. They still face the probability of having to wait an average of 70 days before unloading. This means that a boat, even with luck, cannot expect to make more than two good trips during the year, whereas three trips a year are necessary to make any profit whatever. (The fisherman who has no investment in a boat may make a living for a time, while the boat is losing money fast.)

People who hear about the large amount of money paid by the canneries for a load of, say, 300 tons of tuna, and who know nothing about the cost of running the boats wonder why every fisherman is not a millionaire and in a position to retire at the age of 35. In addition to the fuel bill, which is always high, there are charges for insurance, taxes, and payment for the right to fish demanded by foreign governments in those waters the tuna fleet fishes. Within a few years after it is launched the average boat will require repairs, which may run into thousands and sometimes tens of thousands of dollars. Not infrequently all the profit of a good trip is eaten up by the repair bill. Finally there is the cost of depreciation which must be met from profits.

It is well to remember, too, that not every trip is a good trip. The world outside of the fishing community usually hears about the full loads, but seldom hears of the trips that bring home only a half or a quarter load. Since January 1, 1955, not more than 10 percent of the San Diego tuna boats have been making a profit on the money invested in them. (The Japanese competition became serious in 1951 and has become progressively more crippling since then.)

A final point: The tuna fleet of San Diego and San Pedro provided an important and sorely needed auxiliary to the United States Navy in World War II. If another war comes in the Pacific—which God forbid—it will be needed again. Needed but not available, if the present crisis wipes it out.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The People of the United States Stand on the Threshold of Great Danger and Possible Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, as we approach adjournment of this 1st session of the 84th Congress, the people of the United States, swept up in a wave of boundless optimism and almost pathetic hopefulness, and nearly hysterical in their efforts to wish themselves into a peaceful world situation, stand on the threshold of great danger and of possible disaster.

Factually, there is no foundation for this synthetic optimism. Therefore it seems proper to soberly review recent developments and to examine our own posture in this uneasy world.

Let it be clearly understood that no fault is found with the President's pronouncements at Geneva concerning the desire of the American people for peace.

Because it can never be said too often, it may be considered unjust to remind ourselves that this same declaration has been made over and over again by other Presidents of the United States and by every responsible official of this country since the close of World War II.

The enemies of peace in the world would now have it appear that until the President spoke at Geneva, there was actually a warlike intention on the part of the people of America. Nothing could be further from the truth.

All of us are happy too that the President of the United States in Geneva again assured the world that we have no aggressive plans against the people or the property of any other nation. It is good that this was said again and certainly it can only help us.

But the Communists are already suggesting that until these statements were made at Geneva, they and others really believed that America was planning an attack somewhere in the world.

The Communists have never actually feared an attack by the United States because they know the true character of this Nation.

What the Communists really fear is that the United States and her friends are prepared to defend themselves.

It is the building of our defense system and of our alliances, starting several years ago and continuing to the present time, which has caused a change in tactics on the part of the international Communist conspirators.

This is the outstanding fact in the international situation and this is the only thing that can honestly be said to be a change.

If those responsible for our security and for our relations with other nations understand and bear this outstanding fact in mind, there is some reason to hope that we may enter a period in which there is no shooting and ultimately a time when there is neither war nor fear of war.

There are signs, however, on the horizon that the aggressive Communists are using our good intentions for their own evil purposes.

Recently I tried to warn the Members of this House and the American people of grave danger.

Because this may be a last opportunity to speak in this forum until next year, duty compels us to make a record of our fears, and conscience requires that we speak up before it is too late.

Parenthetically, and on the subject of frank talk, my colleagues will recall that on July 11, 1955, I suggested in this House that there has been a studied effort made to silence all in this Congress, and indeed outside of it, who have been bold enough to make suggestions and criticisms with respect to our foreign policy.

A distinguished Member of the other body, who has been acting as trial balloon man for the national administration in foreign affairs, within the past week may have unintentionally made more difficult the release of American citizens now held in Red Chinese prisons by suggesting that after Congress adjourns conversations should be conducted on the Foreign Minister level between the United States and the criminal Red Chinese Government.

This statement may very well encourage the Chinese Communists to hold onto our prisoners in the belief that they can raise the ante and increase the ransom.

Within a few days, another Member of the other body, well-known for his unfailing support of the national administration and its foreign policy, approached the height of folly by suggesting that we bomb the Chinese mainland with bags of wheat, thus potentially supplying the Chinese Communists with a tremendous propaganda weapon in the form of accusations against us concerning poisoned food and germ warfare.

It strikes me that the national administration has been attempting to muzzle the wrong people in Congress, and it should take a long careful look at the recklessness of its own highly touted friends.

I believe that there is a powerful element in the United States which wants to bring about the admission of Red China to the United Nations, and the recognition of the Red Chinese government by the United States of America. This must not happen.

In the past 18 months these people have made progress with respect to their aims without the full knowledge of the American people.

In the disastrous Berlin conference, held in the early winter of 1954, the United States agreed to meet with the Red Chinese at Geneva. This was the opening move toward a kind of diplomatic recognition.

At the Geneva meetings the representatives of the United States, Mr. John Foster Dulles and Mr. Walter Bedell Smith, did business with the Red Chinese Communists on the question of Indochina and of Korea, and did not discuss the plight of innocent Americans who were held in Red Chinese jails.

Now, more than a year later, on the wings of new optimism generated at Geneva, an American Ambassador, U. Alexis Johnson, is scheduled to meet next week with a Red Chinese diplomatic official in Geneva.

We have been told that our American Ambassador and the Red Chinese official will talk about the release of the American prisoners, but in addition, according to the State Department, about other practical questions involving Asia.

Now no one can object to conversations about our citizens who are prisoners, but everyone should object to a discussion of other practical questions involving Asia before every last American is home free.

Thus, we have taken the second giant step down the road of diplomatic recognition of the wholly aggressive, warmaking criminal Red Chinese government.

A distinguished Member of the other body, to whom I have referred above as the trial balloon-man for the foreign policymakers of the national administration, has twice within a period of 4 months, and as recently as this week, suggested that the United States and the Red Chinese should meet on a foreign minister level. And thus we have moved still further down the road toward official diplomatic recognition of the Red Chinese government by the United States.

Some idea of the extent to which we have strayed from right reason, good taste, and sound judgment may be obtained when we consider the outrageous suggestions of the past several days that the President or the Vice President or some other leading national representatives of the United States make an official visit to Red Russia.

To compound the nonsense and further mislead the American people, it has even been suggested that the Russian

Communists be officially invited to make a state visit to Washington.

This would be like the mayor of Chicago inviting Al Capone and his mob to the Chicago City Hall for an official visit and party during the lawless gangster era of the late twenties, and it would have the same effect on law and order and peace.

All of us who are concerned should speak up now before it is too late.

Likewise, we want our leaders to know that it is not enough to piously pronounce that we have not forgotten about the plight of the captive Eastern European nations which are occupied at this hour, through force and violence by the Russian Communists. The forced and continued occupation of these countries is naked aggression in violation of the United Nations Charter and all of the agreements made during and since World War II.

On March 22, 1955, I introduced a resolution—House Resolution 183—in this House which requested our Secretary of State to instruct the United States representative to the United Nations to draw up and present a resolution to the United Nations naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against the captive satellite nations.

This resolution passed through the House Foreign Affairs Committee by a large majority and today it is bottled up in the House Rules Committee at the request of the national administration and with the acquiescence of and concerted action of people on both sides of the aisle of this House.

So that this matter will be made a part of the permanent RECORD of this day, let me report that I have been told by both Republicans and Democrats who maneuvered this legislative shutoff that it was necessary to do so because they believed that if this resolution reached the floor of this House, it would be overwhelmingly approved by the membership.

This is not the climate in which free representative government flourishes.

To place shackles on truth and freedom can only result in dishonor and slavery.

But this is the atmosphere in which we are living.

Unless we mend our ways, historians may say of us that as we opened up the secrets of nature and of science, and as we lived in unparalleled material wealth, we lost the struggle and fell in our own ruins, because we turned our backs on truth and we compromised our honor.

This need not be the awful verdict of history for within our reach and our grasp is the opportunity to lead the world to a better day of peace built on truth and honor and freedom.

But the path will not be easy and the journey will be long and difficult. To those who lead us I respectfully suggest that the great leaders of the past have not flinched from the truth of hard decisions in times of peril. This is the true mark of great leadership.

May Almighty God give our leaders of this hour the same courage of their convictions.

Let's Give President's Highway Program a Green Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, editors of the Nation in their editorials in the daily press are expressing deep disappointment over the failure of this Congress to give a green light to President Eisenhower's expanded highway program in order to provide the Nation more, better, and safer highways.

The editors and the people generally are and should be disappointed. The failure of the Congress to provide for safer highways in effect sentences several thousand Americans to die needlessly each year in traffic accidents, who, were better highways provided, would live out longer lives.

Testimony before the Public Works Committee during the road hearings was to the effect that the President's highway program, at a minimum, would cut the death and accident toll on our highways by at least 10 percent. This means that 3,500 to 4,000 American lives a year would be saved if adequate highways were provided. Also, that the million Americans now injured in traffic accidents each year conservatively would be reduced by at least 100,000.

This great unnecessary waste in life and limb, with its misery, pain, and wasteful costs, which if stopped or even lessened by better roads, would more than pay for the cost of building these better and safer highways.

President Eisenhower showed himself a great humanitarian when he, after the defeat of the highway bill, told Congress and the country that he "devoutly hoped" Congress would reconsider the action by which it scuttled the much-needed expanded highway program.

Editorials in newspapers coming into the Nation's Capital indicate the editors of the Nation agree with the President and not with the Congress which has turned a deaf ear to the President's humanitarian pleas for better and safer roads.

Appended here is a typical editorial deploring the failure of Congress to act affirmatively on the President's highway program.

The editor of the Herald Tribune, of New York City, writing on the failure of the Democratic Party to act on highway legislation, editorially said:

RED LIGHT ON ROADS

The Democratic Party climbed to marvelously high moral ground to wage its battle against President Eisenhower's highway program. Its members were a little unaccustomed to the altitude. All through the legislative session, however, they managed to make noises indicating that its provisions for extrabudgetary financing were deceptive and conveying the impression that—perish the thought—a spendthrift had found his way into the White House.

It would be funny if we didn't need the roads so badly.

President Eisenhower's program recognized that highway construction had never recovered ground lost during the war and that this fact, combined wtih annual gains in the number of vehicles registered, was bringing us face to face with a real emergency. Automobiles are basic to the American economy, and if roads are not provided for them to operate on every one is going to suffer.

The President's plan was for a massive effort to catch up, financed in part by the issuance of $21 billion in bonds that would not be part of the national debt, and that would be paid off by the revenues from certain taxes.

Although the Democrats opposed it on the aforesaid moral grounds, one suspects that the proposal's really fatal flaw was that it was too good, that the opposition couldn't bear to help the President solve the problem so cleanly and get the credit for it.

At any rate, their counterproposal was for vastly more of the same old Federal aid, accompanied by increased taxes on fuels, tires, and heavy vehicles. The only trouble was that their own members didn't have what it took to stand up against the vocal opponents of the new levies and the whole business collapsed—and much to the leaders' surprise—on the floor of the House.

All of which leaves the country stalled in the traffic, with plenty of time to mull over how to vote next time.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Supplemental Appropriations, 1956

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a matter of regret when it becomes necessary to answer unwarranted statements made by a colleague and especially those of a personal nature.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], during hearings relating to purchase and sale of electric power by REA cooperatives, asked to be heard. Tentative dates were set for his convenience but he did not appear. Finally he sent in a written statement which precluded personal interrogation or reply. As the statement criticized me by name I submitted an answer showing the fallacy of Mr. JENSEN's criticism. The committee printed both Mr. JENSEN's statement and my reply in the published hearings.

Later, the private utilities, known in Missouri as the Power Trust, which had twice brought suit in the Federal courts against the farm REA cooperatives and against which the courts had both times handed down decisions in favor of the farmers, had Mr. JENSEN's statement printed as a private pamphlet and widely distributed through the mails and otherwise at their expense.

On June 15, 1955, during debate in the House, Mr. JENSEN held one of these trust-printed pamphlets aloft and shouted:

> I would like to have someone stand in his place and deny a single thing in that statement.

I immediately rose and asked:

> Will the gentleman also include the reply made to it? All that I ask is that the gentleman put in immediately following his statement the reply to that statement.

Mr. JENSEN refused to put in the reply and gave me no opportunity to answer. And when I got the floor and asked to have the reply included in the RECORD, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, standing beside him, objected, and it was impossible for me to answer the charges against me in the pamphlet.

Not only was I denied an opportunity to reply but when the transcript of the colloquy was delivered to Mr. JENSEN that afternoon he did not submit it to me and the Government Printing Office messenger did not submit it to me. Although I have served here on the floor for many years that is the only time I was not allowed an opportunity to check my remarks in any colloquy made on the floor in debate.

I was personally attacked and not allowed to reply and was denied an opportunity even to read the transcript before it went to the printer.

The Committee on Appropriations had several bills coming before the House and I dismissed the matter from mind. Everybody knew BEN JENSEN.

But for the third time, on July 26, 1955, he appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, and without notice to me, and in my absence, again put the trust-printed and trust-distributed statement, criticizing me, in the record of the hearings.

There is a point, Mr. Speaker, at which tolerance ceases to be a virtue, and I am today taking the time to lay before the House and the country the statement which the enemies of REA who brought suit to wreck the farmer REA cooperatives paid to have printed and paid to have distributed. Both the Power Trust and Mr. JENSEN approved its distribution through the mails but Mr. JENSEN has refused my request to have it printed in the RECORD.

Here it is:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BEN F. JENSEN

I have spent considerable time going over part 2 of the printed hearings on the central section of the public works appropriations for fiscal 1956. The first half of this record, pages 1 to 56, which was made the evening of May 5, 1955, is filled with misleading and questionable statements and testimony. I cannot stand idly by and permit real facts and issues to be hidden, and I want to register an emphatic protest against the members of the House and Senate committees being called gullible. It was entirely uncalled for and ill becoming of Mr. CANNON, the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee of the House, to make such erroneous and insulting remarks about any Member of Congress, let alone members of his own committee. All the misleading statements and testimony point to an attemped buildup to justify an appropriation to activate a series of contracts that were designed to further the empire building of power-hungry bureaucrats; contracts that should never have seen the light of day.

Let's look at the record, to see how these contracts were developed and just what they were supposed to do. First of all, we have to go back to 1946 when Douglas Wright, Southwestern Power Administrator, presented to Congress his grandiose scheme to create a gigantic Federal power empire with nearly 15,000 miles of transmission lines, and 770,000 kilowatts in steam plants, at an estimated cost, as of November 1945, of $200 million. At today's costs this would be nearer $300 million. Think of it, 15,000 miles of transmission lines, enough to go more than three-fifths around the world and enough steam plants to generate nearly 4 times the potential energy of all the multipurpose projects whose output SPA is now marketing? Wright even went so far as to tell the committee that he should have the whole program or none. Congress refused to go along with this fantastic proposal. The House committee at that time said in its report, "The committee does not favor the initiation of a power-development program in this area the cost of which would approximate such an enormous sum."

There can be no doubt that SPA under Douglas Wright has had through the years a burning and insatiable obsession to obtain, without regard to method, the consummation of this "comprehensive plan of power distribution" whereby he would build a gigantic power empire.

This is evident when, after the turndown by the Congress of the plan for widespread transmission-line construction and steam-plant installations, the scheme was developed by having the G. and T.'s act as cat's-paws to obtain by the back door what Congress had denied through the front door. These fantastic "lease-option" takeover contracts were dreamed up by SPA and Interior. It is apparent that the REA cooperatives were sold a bill of goods in some instances and in others were coerced into signing the contracts. Had the REA's taken the time to fully analyze the fine print in the contracts or to read between the lines they would have realized that they were being used as cat's paws and would get burned in the process.

As has been testified to by REA cooperatives officials the REA Act provides that REA funds could not be used to construct lines to serve towns of over 1,500 population, nor to serve any person that is receiving central-station service. Now would it be morally and legally proper for SPA to take over these lines constructed by REA funds, which under the law cannot be used by the REA cooperatives to serve towns of over 1,500 population or persons now receiving central-station service, and for SPA then to serve such restricted loads? I do not think the REA cooperatives are today hankering to be a party to that kind of a deal and never were. It was a reprehensible action by SPA to try to get by subterfuge that which is contrary to law, and which has resulted in a great detriment to the cooperatives and the farmers.

There can be no question but that SPA put this "takeover option" in the generating and transmission co-ops' contracts for the purpose of making possible the acquisition by spa of that proposed great network of major transmission lines to be constructed by the G. and T. cooperatives. This was but another step toward the goal of building an electric empire.

The SPA surely knew that the proposed rates would not provide for full repayment of that portion of the investment cost of the multipurpose projects, properly allocable to power, and for operation, maintenance, administration, and other costs of the overall power and transmission system. The law, quite properly, provides for the necessary revision of rates to assure payment of these costs, so SPA, after the G. and T. lines were built, would be free to raise the rates to whatever was necessary. All protestations of Mr. Wright to the contrary notwithstanding, it now appears quite likely that power rates for SPA power will have to be raised a substantial amount, rates which may well be as high as 8 mills per kilowatt-hour of power delivered to the G. and T. cooperatives. The ultimate cost to the G. and T.'s member cooperatives will be dependent on the additional G. and T. cost of delivering the power to such member co-

operatives. Rates of 10 to 13 mills per kilowatt-hour may occur. (Later I will discuss the project costs, cost allocation, and lack of proper basis for the original SPA rate and proposed method of power disposal.)

Managers of several of these G. and T. cooperatives sat in my office some time after the committee in fiscal year 1954 had refused to approve funds for implementing these "lease-option" contracts, and let me say here and now, they were far from unhappy. They said they knew they would now be in a hole, so to speak, for a while but at least they would be able to keep control of the facilities which they had borrowed REA funds to construct. They had no wanted to sign away their property. It was also admitted that there was a question as to whether they had the legal authority to enter into contracts signing away the G. and T. property without formal and legal approval of the member cooperatives.

Now let's read between the lines of the "lease-option" contract and see just what can and would happen to the REA cooperatives in regard to costs. As is now evident, the 5.6 mill rate which SPA had promised could be given to the member cooperatives is as fleeting as the morning mist when the sunlight of truth shines upon it. Of course, SPA had very generously written into the contracts that the cooperatives could make other ararngements for a power supply if they did not want to pay any increase in rates resulting from a periodic review. That was so nice of SPA. But remember the G. and T.'s had been nailed to the mast by the insidious part of the contracts which provided that SPA could take over and own the cooperatives' transmission lines at any time by paying off the balance of the REA debt or by paying $10 to the REA's at the end of 40 years when such debt had been paid up. It can readily be seen that the REA cooperatives would be at the mercy of the SPA—it would be a question of take it or leave it. While all the questionable aspects of the contract were contributory, this "option" proviso was one very good reason for the language put in the committee report in fiscal year 1954, denying use of funds to implement the lease-option takeover contracts.

The then REA Administrator certainly had read the REA Act and knew the limitation on the use of REA loan funds with respect to not being available to construct transmission facilities to serve towns of over 1,500 population or to serve persons receiving central-station service. Surely he was aware that SPA intended to use the REA lines they proposed to lease for these prohibited uses.

It seems to me that he and his Deputy Administrator, who signed some of these contracts were very derelict in their duty and have been guilty of approving questionable loans for the REA cooperatives to construct facilities way beyond their needs and present ability to use or to pay without great difficulty.

The REA Administrator and his Deputy could hardly have failed to realize that the G. and T.'s would be saddled with an excessive burden if Congress refused to provide the funds required by SPA to pay the lease and operating and amortization expense on the G. and T. lines.

Now one would think, having gotten the cooperatives and the farmers into this untenable position, that the parties primarily responsible would use some effort to get them out, but no, we find several of these key figures in the forefront in trying to reinstate the old contracts and to counsel against any other proposal to get the G. and T.'s out of the predicament. Surely the G. and T. representative now knows full well that Mr. Wright has not been trying to find an alternate solution, apparently hoping his original scheme can be reinstated. Former Federal employees are now working on these matters, evading the moral if not the legal restrictions on handling matters they previously handled or obtained knowledge of while in Federal employment. Of course, that is something for their own conscience and possibly the courts to decide.

Let me make it clear here and now that I am a friend of the REA as is every Member of Congress and I know full well the needs of the farmers for adequate electric service at reasonable rates, because I was brought up on a farm. But let us look at this canned dialogue between Mr. Wright and Mr. Cannon reiterated over and over in the May 5 hearing referred to above. Were or are the distribution cooperatives in the SPA area so bad off in comparison to many other areas of the United States as Mr. Wright and Mr. Cannon would have us believe?

Let's take Missouri, for instance, and the four REA cooperatives purchasing power from the Union Electric Co. Incidentally, the Union Electric Co., far from having a monopoly on the service of electric power throughout the State of Missouri, as Mr. Cannon so emphatically proclaimed or inferred, only serves 4 percent of the area of the State and its 2 subsidiary companies an additional 20 percent or a total of 24 percent of the area of the State. I would hardly call this a statewide monopoly when 10 other private utilities operate in the balance of the State.

The REA published record for fiscal year 1953 shows that Union Electric Co. in that year sold 165 million kilowatt-hours to 4 REA's in Missouri; 13,500,000 kilowatt-hours at 9.4 mills, 67 million kilowatt-hours at 8.7 mills, 73,400,000 kilowatt-hours at 8.2 mills, and 11,100,000 kilowatt-hours at 9.7 mills.

An analysis of the loads served by these four cooperatives and the relative price per kilowatt-hour paid in 1953 by the farm and nonfarm residential customers of these and other cooperatives is very revealing and is discussed below.

The first cooperative, in addition to buying from the Union Electric Co., also purchased electric energy from the Arkansas-Missouri Power Co. (5,860,000 kilowatt-hours) and the M. & A. Electric Power Cooperative (3,865,000 kilowatt-hours) at 11.8 mills per kilowatt-hour. Of the total power purchased, 8,150,000 kilowatt-hours was sold to farm and nonfarm residential users at an average rate of 486. mills per kilowatt-hour, while 14 million kilowatt-hours was sold to commercial and industrial customers at an average rate of 15.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. In effect, all the power purchased from the Union Electric Co. was delivered to commercial and industrial customers instead of to the farmers.

The second cooperative sold a little less than 10 million kilowatt-hours for farm and nonfarm residential use at 40.3 mills, 5,700,000 kilowatt-hours to commercial and industrial customers at 26.1 mills, 28 million kilowatt-hours for service to Fort Leonard Wood at 10.6 mills, and 16,700,000 kilowatt-hours to other REA's for resale at about 9.6 mills.

The third REA purchasing power from Union Electric resold 17,150,000 kilowatt-hours for farm and nonfarm residential service at an average rate of 32.0 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The fourth REA, in addition to the purchase from Union Electric, purchased 51 million kilowatt-hours from the Southwestern Administration at 5.3 mills and generated 6,300,000 kilowatt-hours in its own plants. Of the total supply of 133 million kilowatt-hours, 9,500,000 kilowatt-hours was sold for farm and nonfarm residential service at a rate of 32.4 mills per kilowatt-hour, 10,700,000 to commercial and industrial users at 26.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, 86,700,000 kilowatt hours to other REA's at 10.1 mills, and 24 million kilowatt-hours to other utility systems at 14.4 mills.

As to whether the cooperatives in Missouri are paying excessive prices to the private utilities, comparison can be made to the rates charged the REA's in the State of Nebraska, where there can be little question that a statewide public power monopoly exists that pays no Federal taxes. Yet we hear no cries of anguish from our distinguished chairman over this monopoly. The Nebraska Public Power system sales to REA's in fiscal year 1953 total about 300 million kilowatt-hours at rates varying from a low of 8.6 mills to a high of 9.2 mills in Nebraska proper and 12.6 for 1 sale made to a South Dakota cooperative. Union electric rates to REA's also can be compared with the rates charged by the Dairyland Power Cooperative, an extensive generating and transmission cooperative operating in Wisconsin and other adjacent States. This G. and T. cooperative generated and sold 369 million kilowatt-hours to member or other cooperatives at an average rate of 13.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

It can easily be seen by the above figures or by an examination of the REA statistical reports that the Missouri distribution cooperatives and their farmer customers are not as bad off as some folks would have you believe. In fact, they compare favorably with numerous other sections of the country and are much better off than in many of the other States.

There is considerable evidence that the cost of power to the distribution cooperatives is a relatively small part of the rate paid by the farmer. Whether the wholesale cost is 5 mills or 10 or 12 mills seems to have little bearing on the average price paid by the farmer as shown by the following figures based on a 1953 REA published report and taken at random therefrom:

State	Price per kilowatt-hour paid by REA for energy purchased	Average charge per kilowatt-hour by REA's for farm and nonfarm residential service
Arkansas	5.2	46.8
	5.4	37.7
	10.1	45.9
Delaware	12.2	35.4
Idaho	10.0	28.5
Illinois	8.4	51.5
	8.5	30.0
Iowa	13.0	32.4
	14.3	31.5
Kansas	5.7	41.9
	7.6	37.7
Minnesota	17.4	39.8
Missouri	10.1	53.0
	7.4	26.2
Nebraska	9.1	31.2
	7.0	38.4
New York	11.1	36.0
	11.0	35.5
North Dakota	15.3	40.0
	5.2	45.6

As has been pointed out the wholesale price of electric power is a small part of the price the farmers are paying for the electric power they use. An analysis of REA reports show that the number of customers per mile of line in Missouri is relatively high yet the kilowatt-hour use per customer is comparatively low. Testimony has been given that most of the REA rates to the farmers in this area provide for the minimum used to pay 8.1 cents per kilowatt-hour for 40 kilowatt-hours per month or $3.24, while a farmer using 250 kilowatt-hours per month would pay only 3.6 cents per kilowatt-hour or $9. If this is the case, then adding as much as 4 or 5 mills to the wholesale cost of power would add but 16 to 20 cents to the monthly bill of a minimum user and $1 to $1.25 to the monthly bill of the farmer with a 250-kilowatt-hour use. In either case it would appear that there is an attempt to make a mountain out of a mole-

bill as there is no doubling of the farmers' costs as has been inferred.

When I analyze the operations and costs of REA over the country I cannot see the justification for the numerous statements or inferences that the G. and T. and other REA cooperatives in the SPA area on the verge of going bankrupt and will do so if the rates are raised above the existing SPA rate. Surely if other areas can pay higher wholesale costs and operate efficiently in the black there should be no reason why, with proper and efficient management, the Missouri and other SPA area cooperatives should operate in the red. Of course, if there are drought and other economic conditions which have made it impossible for some of the less prosperous farmers in the SPA area to pay their bills, among them the electric-light bill, that is not a matter to be solved by subsidizing their electric-light bill by from $2 to $15 a year with Federal taxes paid by the folks in my district or in any other section of the United States.

Let us examine this lease-option business a little further. Suppose a Federal act permitted the REA to loan money to a farmer to construct a powerplant on his farm for his use only. Now along comes SPA and says, "We have some hydropower that is available part of the time which we can sell you at a price that is less than you can generate it yourself in your proposed small plant and you are entitled to buy some of it. Now, SPA continues, you borrow enough money to build a plant many times larger than necessary for your own use. After you construct the plant, we, SPA, will lease, operate and take the entire output of the plant. We, SPA, will pay all operating costs, interest, and principal payments on the loan and sell back to you whatever power you need for your own use, at a very low price, less than you can get elsewhere. Of course, you will have to give us, SPA, an option to pay for and take over the plant at any time, and we also reserve the right to raise the rates later on. (This latter item is, of course, soft-pedaled.) Now, the reason we, SPA, want to do this is to be able to serve electric power to town A which you, by law, cannot do, and to serve Farmers Brown and Jones up the road a bit, who now get power from company B, you, of course, cannot legally sell them power directly."

Now I ask each of my colleagues, how can we justify aiding and abetting this sort of thing. Is it not time that we consider the moral and legal aspect of our actions? Are we not guilty of compounding a felony when we, by our appropriations, permit by subterfuge, the doing of those things prohibited by acts of the Congress? I, for one, think it time to set an example at least for the young people of our Nation, and show them that we have a moral and spiritual obligation to uphold the law of the land and the precepts of our forefathers who fought to establish the freedom we enjoy today. If we continue to permit the further illegal extension of these Federal bureaucracies soon we will find our cherished freedoms gone.

I want to call attention to the fact that under the lease-option contracts SPA was to pick up the entire check for operation, maintenance, replacement, interest, and repayment of the transmission facilities, and would pay for the entire output of the G. and T. steam-electric plant regardless of whether SPA could find a market for such energy. Then SPA was to turn right around and deliver back to the member cooperatives of the G. and T.'s all the power they might need at an average rate of 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour; note the year, 1946.

There can be little wonder that Mr. Wright, the SPA Administrator, testified, "I think they would have one of the best contracts any group of REA ever dreamed of in their fondest moments." And why not, with Uncle Sam picking up the check and delivering power at less than cost.

I am sure the farmers themselves in SPA area do not want subsidized power rates at the expense of the other taxpayers of the Nation. I say again and say it advisedly they were pressured into these contracts in question.

The bait used by SPA was the low rate promised, which could not be justified on the basis of proper cost figures, cost allocations, and the amount of hydropower for sale, according to information provided me by expert rate engineers who have no personal interest in this matter.

The farmers are well able to run their own systems as has been proven and I am sure they would like to continue to run their own business. The G. and T.'s are of course in a difficult position, having been enticed into expanding their facilities considerably beyond their needs for the near future.

Now what power and what energy do we have available from these multipurpose projects in the SPA area? First there is the installed capacity of the generating units, and second, the electric energy that such units can produce from the available water. As has been testified to time and time again these projects have a variable supply of water and on the average can only operate at full capacity a portion of the time varying up to about 30 percent of the time, with the average around 20 or 25 percent.

How can such power best be utilized? It has been explained to me, and the records through the years have disclosed that the greatest value for this variable or peaking capacity and energy is realized when it is used by utility systems, public or private, that are large enough to use all the capacity and energy to serve the peak portion of the loads.

SPA knew this to be true, but as there were very few public bodies or cooperatives which had generation or other sources of power large enough to permit using more than a very small part of this peaking capacity, SPA knew it had to be sold to the existing major utilities who could readily absorb it and who had offered to take all such power and pay a rate sufficient to assure repayment of all costs of the power and to pass on any benefits to the preference and other customers. SPA, knowing that this was disposing of the power under sound business principles, nevertheless knew it would not permit SPA to create the power empire it envisaged. Therefore, SPA would not agree to such a logical use of the power, claiming that it all had to be sold directly to the preference customers. Of course it strayed quite a little way from this precept when it made the contract to sell under a long-term contract a major portion of the power from Bull Shoals Dam for use by an industrial customer. Certainly this does not jibe with the SPA "line" that the power must be sold to preference customers.

Many statements have been made and much testimony given about the legal rights and obligations of SPA to assume a utility responsibility to supply all the electric energy requirements of the so-called preference customers. Here again it is my firm conviction that Mr. Wright and the other proponents of his plans for a Federal power empire are in an untenable position.

Let us look at the act that resulted in SPA being set up.

SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1944

"Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

If you will note, there is continued references throughout this section of the act to "such power and energy," "such energy," "power and energy generated as such projects." Note particularly the preference language which says "preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives." I maintain that the intent of the Congress is crystal clear, that the act only provides for the disposal of power generated by the multipurpose projects. There is no reference whatsoever to any other power. Surely if the Congress thought it had constitutional authority to authorize Interior to construct steam plants or to purchase steam power for resale it would have spelled out that intent in clear language.

It is realized, of course, that those persons want for obvious reasons to promote their dream of a Federal power empire are trying to read into the language of the act meanings that are not there and were never intended to be there. Mr. Wright would have you believe that because the available power and energy is not of the type to supply the normal requirements of the potential preference customers he has on obligation to obtain other power to supplement the surplus hydropower and energy. He will have you believe that definitive court action has proclaimed that right. There is no question, in my mind, nor should there be in the mind of any clear-thinking person, that the right of the Federal Government to purchase steam electric power for resale or to construct steam electric generating stations to make power for resale has not been argued on its merits all the way through to the Supreme Court of the land. Until that is done, it is poppycock for Mr. Wright or anyone else to say that this issue has been settled and the legal right to do these things are clear. In my estimation this also applies to TVA the Bureau of Reclamation and all other Federal power agencies.

It it were not so serious, it would be humorous to see the mental gymnastics and warped thinking of the protagonists of Federal electric-power empires go through in trying to justify actions that clearly have no legal authority. One of the farfetched arguments used in an attempt to justify SPA rights to construct steam plants or purchase electric energy from others for resale was given back in 1946 in the hearings on the fiscal year 1947 Interior Department appropriation bill, page 71, in an opinion presented by the SPA Chief Counsel, which was supplemented by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 quoted previously contains the proviso that "the Secretary of the Interior is authorized from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and

related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperative and privately owned companies."

It is impossible for me to believe that anyone could argue without tongue in cheek that the authority "to construct or acquire transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy to be generated at said projects available to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies," confers the authority to construct steam plants or to purchase electric energy for resale. To claim as did the SPA, Chief Counsel, that the term "related facilities" was meant to or can properly be used to cover steam electric plants is farfetched to say the least. Claims that steam electric power is needed and required by law in order to be able "to market the hydropower on a businesslike basis, and to make such power and energy available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms" are other examples of the fuzzy thinking of so many Federal power proponents.

There has been much loose talk about the tremendous need for additional power in the area and at the same time statements are made that SPA power cannot otherwise be sold without integration with the G. and T. facilities and steam plants. These misstatements are so obvious that they do not merit answering. In all the testimony and discussions that I have seen to date there has not been any discussion as to what happens when the growing electric loads of the REA's and other preference customers use up all the presently available capacity. Has a real analysis been made as to just what the loads of the G. and T. cooperatives and their member cooperatives amount to as of this date and what are the estimates of future loads, I think not. Full information also is lacking as to just what loads are presently receiving central station service, and so forth.

Rough approximations given seem to indicate the G. and T. cooperatives in the SPA area may have total peak loads of about 87,000 kilowatts which is slightly over the capacity of their steam plants. I understand that REA estimates for these 5 G. and T. cooperatives show an expected load of 214,000 kilowatts by 1965. On this basis it will be 10 years before the 130,000 kilowatts of SPA hydro capacity now being held for these 5 G. and T.'s will be fully utilized. Transmission capacity may have been overbuilt to an even greater extent.

Pamphlets that have been mailed to me which say that by taking the SPA hydro and adding it to the G. and T. steam it will produce more power and more revenue than by integrating the SPA hydro and G. and T. steam with the private utility systems facilities. Now this is a good trick if you can do it, but it sure sounds like a shell game to me.

Now, let's be specific and get away from generalities, which I dislike. I have reliable information that the G. and T.'s have 85,000 kilowatts of steam and SPA was supposed to have 195,000 kilowatts of peaking hydro contracted to the G. and T.'s, or which would give a total of 280,000 kilowatts available to the G. and T.'s. With an average load factor of the REA load of around 50 percent would require, for a peak load of 280,000 kilowatts, 100,800,000 kilowatt-hours of energy for a 30-day month. I am told that the hydro peaking carries with it 150 hours of firm energy per month for each kilowatt, or a total of 29,250,000 kilowatt-hours. Adding the 85,000-kilowatt steam-plant output at 90 percent load factor (this is on the high side) would give an additional 55,080,000 kilowatt-hours, or a total of 84,330,000 kilowatt-hours. This is 16,470,000 kilowatt-hours short of supplying all the load. Where are the G. and T.'s going to get the balance? If there is an increase in the load factor above 50 percent (which is quite probable) there will be an additional 2 million kilowatt-hours short for each percent above 50 percent.

On the basis of 130,000 kilowatts of hydro allocated to the G. and T.'s together with the 85,000 kilowatts of steam there would be a deficit of about 2 million kilowatt-hours for a month having a peak of 215,000 kilowatts.

The pamphlet Local Power Partnership in Reverse put out by the Central Electric Power Cooperative and Western Farmers Cooperative, and sent to Members of Congress, is a prime example of some of the irrational thinking and misleading and erroneous figures being used to try to persuade the Congress to reactivate the lease-option contracts between SPA and G. and T.'s The pamphlet is so replete with questionable figures and statements that I will take time to point out only a few. I am sure this pamphlet could not have been written by the clear-thinking farmers of the area, but must have been prepared by some of the same people who got the G. and T.'s into their present predicament.

I have already referred to the erroneous statement that SPA must obtain energy from steam generating plants to be able to sell the capacity available from the hydro plants. This is of course so patently false as to not warrant denial.

On page 7 of the pamphlet referred to, is a table that purports to show power and revenue available to SPA with and without the G. and T. contracts. This is the most misleading and unwarranted tabulation that could be imagined. First is the column headed "Power Available Without G. and T. Contracts" and the revenue purported to be derived therefrom. SPA firm capacity is shown to be 170,000 kilowatts.

The G. and T.'s in the February hearings reported the SPA dependable capacity to be 378,000 kilowatts. At the present time only 130,000 kilowatts of SPA hydro capacity are reported available to the G. and T.'s. Such capacity is said to carry a firm energy commitment of only 150 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt per month. If SPA sells the 130,000 kilowatts of peaking power to the G. and T.'s and the G. and T.'s use their own steam to carry 85,000 kilowatts of base load, the G. and T.'s then could carry a total of about 215,000 kilowatts without reserve. On the other hand if SPA were to buy the output of the G. and T. plants as proposed under the lease-option contracts and then resell the steam and the hydro combined back to the G. and T.'s it would produce the same results and would not add one kilowatt of dependable capacity to the load-carrying ability of the two systems. With an annual potential generation of less than 700 million kilowatt-hours from the steamplants it is difficult to understand how the firm energy can be increased by 836 million; in fact there is no increase whatsoever in the energy available to the area. The revenue comparison is even more fantastic. Without the G. and T. contract the revenue is shown to be based on a 5.6 mill rate for firm energy and 1.25 mills for nonfirm energy, while by some legerdemain, the power if used under the G. and T. contracts is to bring in revenue based on 7.16 mills for firm energy and 1.50 mills for nonfirm. This sleight of hand alone accounts for over $2,500,000 of the purported increase in revenue. Deducting the cost of generating the steam energy and the cost of leasing and operating the G. and T. transmission lines, which together cannot conceivably be less than 6 or 7 million dollars, in revenue, it can be seen that there will be a substantial annual deficit instead of the implied gain of $7,057,970. Of course the pamphlet does not say the purported gain in revenue is a net gain yet if the author had wanted to be honest this would have been made clear and he would not have used a different rate with or without the G. and T. contract and would have shown for both cases all the other costs to be incurred.

Two other statements in the pamphlet follow:

"Opponents to rural electrification have stated that SPA could construct transmission lines and do just about anything it wanted to out of this fund, thereby obviating the will of Congress. This interpretation of the continuing fund is not correct. Under the broadest language of the continuing fund, SPA could use it for only three purposes—namely (1) to take care of emergencies, (2) to purchase power, and (3) to make payments for rental.

"The restoration of the continuing fund of SPA would make it possible to restore the partnership arrangement without any annual appropriations by the Congress. It will not cost the taxpayers because the continuing fund is provided out of the operating revenue of SPA."

Now, does it matter whether SPA constructs transmission lines direct, or arranges for their construction through the medium of lease-option contracts paid for out of the continuing fund. The net result is the same. It is specious reasoning to say otherwise. To say the use of money from the continuing fund will not cost the taxpayers is just doubletalk. There can be no question that present rates will not repay cost of power projects and operating costs. So far no figures have been given to conclusively show that it will not cost more to generate power in the G. and T. steam plants and deliver it 200 miles away to member cooperatives than the rate to be charged.

Now let's talk about the rates for SPA power. Mr. Wright attempted to lay the blame for rate increases on the rise in construction costs of the multipurpose projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The inference was left by Wright and Chairman CANNON that the Corps of Engineers were incredibly mistaken in their estimates. The corps was able the next day to present the real facts, showing that the figures presented by Wright were full of errors.

The following excerpt from a report relative to SPA's Comprehensive Plan for Power Development that was filed by a nationally prominent engineer in the fiscal year 1947 hearings (p. 338–339) seem to indicate that SPA had no sound base for the power rate it was setting up:

"Although the Flood Control Act of 1944 requires the authorized agent for the Secretary of the Interior to base rate schedules on the cost of producing and transmitting hydroelectric power, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power, the authors of the report (the SPA Comprehensive Plan for Power Development) have developed a rate schedule which fails entirely to consider such costs. The excuse is given that 'cost figures' are not available at this time for proposed reservoir projects in a number of river basins, and the cost figures that are available even for authorized projects are subject to change as the design of the several projects is developed and the construction is carried out."

"It is believed that for the purposes of the report which is dated November 1945, the authors, representing a governmental agency, would have available to them the cost estimates prepared by the Army engineers for the proposed projects on the Arkansas River (survey report on Arkansas River and tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma, dated December 1943) and on the White River (survey report on White River and tributaries, Missouri and Arkansas, dated May 1945). The projects proposed under these two survey reports added to existing and presently au-

thorized projects in the region will account for about 90 percent of the total annual average energy output utilized and studied under the subject report. It is to be admitted that final 'as constructed' cost figures will be different than the estimated costs and it must be understood that the estimated costs must be continuously reviewed in the light of ever-changing construction costs in order that a true economic analysis can be made. However, it is believed that the use of such estimates as do exist, corrected where necessary to reflect trends of advancing construction costs, provide a sound and, in fact, the only means of determining the cost for the production of hydroelectric capacity and energy and most certainly would result in compliance with the terms of the Flood Control Act of 1944. If the above-mentioned statement in the SPA report is accepted and no determination made of the estimated cost of hydropower until projects were completed, Congress would certainly be confronted with requests for appropriations, without any means of knowing whether or not the projects were sound."

Five years later in 1952 we still find the SPA trying to maintain a fictitious rate based on untenable cost allocation. It is only too clear that SPA and not the Corps of Engineers is responsible for the use of an erroneous rate base with the resulting need to raise SPA rates. This also is indicated by the following material taken from the House committee print No. 23 of the 82d Congress, 2d session:

"The conflicting solutions of the problem of allocation of costs of 12 dams in the Southwest are noteworthy. The Interior Department, acting through the Southwestern Power Administration, is the agency of the Government designated under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 to dispose of excess electric energy produced at projects built by the Corps of Engineers in Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri.

"In January 1952, the Secretary of the Interior filed with Federal Power Commission for rate approval a long-term contract for sale of a block of power from the 12 dams. Accompanying this were studies including the proposed allocation of costs for the 12 projects. The Federal Power Commission then requested the construction agency, the Corps of Engineers, to furnish its views on the amounts of costs and annual charges properly chargeable to power for the 12 projects. The estimates of the Southwestern Power Administration and of the corps as to the amounts which should be allocated are set forth in detail on pages 409 to 415 of the subcommittee hearings and are summarized in table 1 of this report. The Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission, generally agreed with the methods used by the corps in allocating these costs.

"The total project construction cost was agreed generally to approximate $750 million. Including interest during construction, the total project investment was estimated at approximately $776 million. The Southwestern Power Administration recommended an allocation to power of $218 million while the Corps of Engineers recommended $418 million.

"One difference between the two computations came from the Southwestern Power Administration's failure to include interest during construction, an item amounting to over $24 million in the Corps of Engineers' allocation to power.

"Interest during construction is a valid part of the cost of the project to the Government and, therefore, should ordinarily be included in any computation of total investment costs. If exact figures are not available at the time an allocation of cost is made, a reasonable estimate could always be made subject to later revision.

"The other differences can best be understood by an examination of the different cost-allocation methods used for the 12 projects involved. Detailed statements appear on pages 406 to 426 of the published transcript of subcommittee hearings, Study of Civil Works, part 3.

"It can be seen from table 1 that the difference in allocated costs creates a large difference in the annual power charges. The greater percentage of difference in annual costs as compared to the allocated total cost comes from the fact that Southwestern Power Administration has chosen 100 years as the amortization period while the Corps of Engineers has chosen 50 years. The annual charges developed indicate that the Southwestern Power Administration can justify power rates which are less than one-half of those that would appear sound based on the methods advocated by the Corps of Engineers."

The present proposal of the G. and T.'s is not to reactivate the fantastic lease-option takeover contracts but to substitute what would be entirely different contracts and in addition they want to change existing contracts with other SPA customers to "substantially equalize the rates to all SPA customers in the area." This means, of course, to raise the rates to the other customers to pay for the required subsidy. The $64 question may be, How will the other customers react to such a deal?

Surely the Congress will not want to appropriate money for nebulous contracts without knowing the terms, effects, and cost thereof. I for one think the logical thing to do would be to extend a moratorium to these G. and T. cooperatives for say a couple or more of years. This would give them time to build up their loads and/or to make arrangements for greater utilization of the facilities through interchange contracts between themselves and the other utilities of the region. This to my notion would be preferable to a continued direct subsidizing of the G. and T.'s. There is one fact that I think the G. and T.'s should realize by now which is, that there is no possibility of the member cooperatives obtaining energy from SPA at the old rate of 5.6 mills, and that even under the lease-option contracts a rate of 8 to 10 mills was inevitable under the required rate review provision of the contract.

It also appears quite clear to me that the G. and T.'s could make some rate adjustments for justified increases in wholesale power cost and that this could be passed on to the member cooperatives. Some slight increase in cost to the farmer might be necessary, but on the basis of the rate structure reported it would appear that a concerted effort to increase the kilowatt-hour use per customer might result in lower unit costs for energy that would more than offset the increase in the wholesale rate.

In any event, I believe the Congress is ill-advised to appropriate any funds at this time to implement or reactivate any lease-option contracts. An independent investigation and report by a board of prominent and competent engineers is indicated in order that a complete professional true story on the matter be made available to the committee.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is the reply they have been keeping out of the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN CLARENCE CANNON

When Mr. BEN F. JENSEN, a member of the Appropriations Committee, requested permission to appear before the central section of the same committee, I gladly granted the request since I deemed Mr. JENSEN had some facts that he thought would be helpful to the central section. Mr. JENSEN did not appear before the committee and after some delay he submitted a written statement and requested it be placed in the record. I granted the request for the same reasons I had previously granted permission for him to appear in person.

Now let's take a look at some of the matters in his statement. First, he has gone to the graveyard to dig up some dead horses. The old comprehensive plan of SPA has been dead for years and like many other issues disposed of in the past, its consideration is not pertinent to the issues at hand. The next dead issue he debates is the opinion in original contracts whereby SPA could purchase G. and T. transmission lines. This has long since been relegated to the scrap heap, as is made clear in the testimony in the foregoing hearings. There will of course be no purchase of G. and T. lines by SPA.

Mr. JENSEN admits that the G. and T.'s were asking for reactivation of their contracts without the lease-option in them. He says this would make the contracts "nebulous." These contracts are written, and executed, and have been made a matter of public record. Would any fair-minded man say they are "nebulous"? Mr. JENSEN advocates contracts between the private power companies and the G. and T.'s. Is there a copy of one of these proposed contracts in the record? Does Mr. JENSEN have one? I challenge him to present one for the record. Who is advocating something "nebulous"?

I am surprised to find Mr. JENSEN pitched in the role of advocating higher power rates for our farmers. He says so long as these higher rates come out of the pockets of the farmers it's all right. He says, and I quote, "* * * adding as much as 4 or 5 mills to the wholesale cost of power would add but 16 to 20 cents to the monthly bill of a minimum user (small farmer) and $1 to $1.25 to the monthly bill of the farmer with a 250 kilowatt-hour use." He professes to be a friend of the REA, while at the same time he is advocating higher rates for farmers and strangulation contracts for the G. and T.'s with private power companies.

Mr. JENSEN has hand-picked a few situations to show it doesn't matter what the wholesale cost is, it won't affect the retail rates to farmers. Cooperative managers, in their testimony, showed that 30 to 45 percent of their total costs was for purchased power. They testified that in many instances a slight increase in wholesale power costs would throw them in the red and render them unable to pay debt service to REA.

I have always believed that Mr. JENSEN has a high regard for our American courts. Surely Members of Congress, above all, should respect the opinions of our courts, but again he says, "Mr. Wright, would have you believe that because the available power and energy is not of the type to supply the normal requirements of the potential preference customers, he has an obligation to obtain other power to supplement the surplus hydro power and energy. He will have you believe that definitive court action has proclaimed that right."

Now let's see what the district court of the District of Columbia had to say when these contracts were challenged in that court by the Power Trust.

"In like manner it is clear to the court, in view of the rule laid down in *Ashwander* v. *T. V. A.*,[1] that the purchase of thermal energy generated at the steam plants of the cooperatives, which purchase is reasonably incidental to the integration of hydroelectric power generated at the reservoir projects, is not prohibited by the provisions of the Flood Control Act but rather is within the scope of its provisions and in accord with its purpose. Consequently, the court finds that authority to purchase power and to pay rentals for the use of transmission facilities by SPA is contained in the terms of the Flood Control Act. The court holds, therefore, that the lease and power contracts do

[1] *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, *supra* (n. 24). (See infra 7, pp. 26-29.)

not violate the provisions of the Flood Control Act."

Mr. JENSEN says that SPA has no right or need to lease the G. and T. lines. Here's what Judge Charles F. McLaughlin of the Federal district court said:

"The court is of the opinion that the language of the statute justifies a holding that the Secretary of the Interior, through his marketing agent, may acquire by a lease agreement such transmission lines as may be necessary in order to accomplish the objectives of the act. Within the authority of the Secretary 'to contract or acquire by purchase or other agreement' is embraced, in the court's opinion, not only the power of acquisition by purchase, but also the power of acquisition by lease agreement. Not only is this conclusion justified by the wording of the act, but, in view of the context, any other conclusion would thwart the proper exercise of authority reposed in the Secretary of the Interior.

"In connection with the foregoing, the court has also taken into consideration the question raised by plaintiffs as to whether the leasing of these facilities is 'necessary' within the meaning of the act. It would appear that the answer to this question, initially, must be determined administratively since the Congress has imposed upon the administrative agency involved the duty to 'transmit and dispose of* * * power and energy in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers thereof consistent with sound business principles.' The court finds that there is warrant in the record and reasonable basis in law for the Administrator's determination of the means to be adopted, that is to say, the leasing of transmission lines and accompanying facilities, for the carrying out of the congressional mandate contained in the act. Consequently, the court holds that the leasing of these facilities is 'necessary' within the terms of the act."[2]

When this case was appealed to the circuit court the judges there threw the power trust out of the court saying they had no grounds for a suit against the G. and T.'s.

Mr. JENSEN claims the G. and T.'s were forced into these contracts against their wishes. Again he says they were not too "unhappy" in their present sad plight. Look at the record. The officials of the G. and T.'s who worked hard to get these contracts set up were present at the recent hearing and to a man testified that they not only entered into the contracts without coercion but worked hard to get them and now wanted them reactivated.

It is claimed that the farmers will be subsidized $2 to $15 a year on their power bill if the original contracts are reactivated. He says they were baited into the contracts with low rates which will be increased to 10–13 mills. There is no evidence in the record to support these figures.

Let's see who is being subsidized. Mr. Wright says SPA hydropower is worth $17.85 per kilowatt-year and 1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. Allowing 2,100 hours use the total value per year would be $21. To bait the G. and T.'s to illegally use their preference rights to buy this power for the power trust, Mr. Aandahl is offering this same power for $10.58 or $10.42 less than it is worth. On 130,000 kilowatts programed for the K. C. P. & L. under the new proposed contract between N. W. Co-op and SPA this would amount to a subsidy of $1,354,600. It could also be demonstrated that through similar contracts the Federal Government is subsidizing private companies in the Texas, Oklahoma, Aluminum and Narrows contracts.

A moratorium on the G. and T. payments of debt service to REA is proposed. This would pile up the debt resulting in heavier payments in later years. He says "This would give them time to * * * make arrangements for greater utilization of the facilities through interchange contracts between themselves and the other utilities of the region." The testimony before the committee is to the effect that further negotiations would be fruitless. In addition, the testimony of the Administrator of the REA in the hearings on the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1955, makes it clear that this would be extremely poor management of the affairs entrusted to him.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] waved this Power Trust-printed pamphlet around and asked anyone to deny a single thing in it. In conformity with his request, I will take it statement by statement and point out the errors he requests.

First several pages of the Power Trust-printed statement recite history back to 1946 when SPA proposed construction of steam plants for its own system and draw a picture of Mr. Wright as an empire builder.

The statements are mere personal opinions and include no evidence whatever to support ascribed motive. It is long well recognized that steam power is needed to firm up hydropower to provide firm power—in order to meet the intent of the Flood Control Act in serving preference customers. This is a dead issue and has no application to the question before us.

The trust-distributed statement accuses Wright of coercing G. and T.'s into building and leasing steam plants.

This is completely refuted by testimony on the part of the G. and T. managers in hearings on page 858, part 3, of the central section on public works.

The Power Trust-approved statement charges that the G. and T. systems would serve towns of over 1,500 in violation of REA Act.

This is a ridiculous deduction to the effect that G. and T. steam power would flow into the SPA system which is by law allowed to serve municipalities as preference customers. It is the same as saying that SPA system may not serve certain preference customers with firm power unless it buys the firming power from private utilities.

The courts have dismissed this contention. It is a matter of record.

The power-trust-cooperated statement infers that rates will go as high as 12 to 13 mills if the G. and T.'s are integrated under the original contracts.

The Administrator of SPA says 8.05 mills at most on page 64 of part 2 of hearings. And that is a maximum rate. It could be much lower.

The power-trust-sponsored statement claims the G. and T.'s signed away their property under a lease-option provision.

This is no longer an issue. The option provision is out. The statment is begging the question and seeking to divert attention from the real issues.

The Jensen statement attacks the representatives of the G. and T.'s for evading the moral, if not the legal restriction on activities of persons previously on the Federal payroll.

This is wholly unwarranted. The reference is to the Administrative Procedure Act. But it has been long since interpreted by courts as applicable only when such ex-employee is engaged in prosecuting a claim for money.

Mr. JENSEN (and presumably the power trust which cooperated in distributing the statement) insist that they are friends of REA's.

But Mr. JENSEN has voted against every motion to increase the REA appropriations. And he reported out the bill which revoked the SPA continuing fund and repudiated the Government's contract with the farm cooperatives.

The Power Trust-endorsed statement uses 1953 figures to show that Union Electric sold power to 4 co-ops in Missouri for 8.2 to 9.7 mills.

These figures are out of date and, of course, mean nothing. Union Electric was asking 10.2 in recent negotiations with Central. It is because of such figures as those quoted that G. and T.'s want to build their own steam plants or integrate with SPA.

The trust-printed and approved statement says there is no justification for talk about G. and T.'s being on the verge of bankruptcy.

Testimony—page 362 of hearings on second supplemental, 1955—of REA is that all of them operated at a deficit last year. Financial statements on pages 374 through 378 also show this.

The trust-printed statement claims that power generated at SPA dams can best be used by the large private or public systems.

This is exactly right. It is the reason Mr. Jensen and the Power Trust try, in court and otherwise, to show that the Federal Government has no legal authority to buy steam power. If such purchase could be prevented, most of the hydropower in the SPA system would have no market except to private utilities. Preference customers could not be served as intended by the flood control act. This is the crux of the campaign against the farm cooperatives.

Mr. JENSEN and his friends try to interpret the flood control act to mean that the sale of power by the Federal Government must be limited to hydropower produced at the dam, and the question of the right to buy steam power is not clear until tested in the Supreme Court.

No credence is given at all to the court decision already handed down to the effect that steam power may be purchased. It must be, of course, if the provisions of the flood control act are to be effective. But what is a court decision among friends?

He next goes through a lot of gymnastics with figures on power production and power rates.

This is extremely technical and must have been prepared. It is doubtful if any unbriefed layman understands them.

The combined statement seeks to attack the allocation of costs to the power features of dams.

All this is purely academic since FPC is responsible for and is thoroughly competent to evaluate figures given them

---

[2] See *American Power & Light Co.* v. *Securities & Exchange Commission, supra. Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288 (1936)).

and approve rates accordingly. Possibly he can scare some people into thinking Federal rates would be higher if FPC understood the facts as well as he does, but it is doubtful.

Summing up the whole purport of this statement, reprinted by the utility companies, Mr. JENSEN points out that the hydroelectric power generated at Federal dams in the SPA system can best be used "by utility systems, public or private, that are large enough to use all capacity and energy to serve the peak portion loads." This is correct, of course, but as he also points out there are few if any preference customers, that is public bodies or cooperatives, which have the facilities or are large enough to use this peaking power.

Mr. Wright, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration said the same thing on page 79, part 2, of the Central Section Hearings on Public Works, as follows:

The Government had built projects, multipurpose projects, in the Southwest which produced a commodity which we refer to as peaking power. That is what it produces. It doesn't have any other commodity.

At the same time the Flood Control Act of 1944 provided that in the sale of that power you must give preference to cooperatives, public bodies, and Government agencies and private companies, in that order. You had a commodity that they couldn't use. They couldn't use that commodity. You had exchanges, integrations, or you had to do something with it before they could use it in the judgment of people who were trying to do something with it.

With all this in mind it becomes quite clear why Mr. JENSEN and the private utilities continue to attack, in and out of the courts, on the authority of the Federal Government to purchase steam firming power. If this point could be established, and the courts have said it cannot be established, it would then be possible for the large private utilities to take almost all of the power from Federal dams and practically none would be left for preference customers as intended by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with one of the vital issues of the day. Too much cannot be said in emphasizing the service rendered rural America through the establishment and operation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

It has completely reversed living conditions on the farm; it has changed the drift of population from the country to the city. It has especially brought health, happiness, and prosperity to the farm wife and mother.

REA has been practically effective in Missouri and the Southwest. Farm cooperatives were organized there and a contract was negotiated with the Southwestern Power Administration under which SPA contracted to buy the thermal power generated by the co-ops, rent their facilities, operate those facilities, firm up SPA waterpower with co-op steam power, and sell the firmed power to the distributing farm cooperatives at a price the farmer could afford to pay. With this contract as security the co-ops borrowed $70 million from the Government—good loans at a fair rate of interest and payable in installments in 40 years. This system was remarkably successful and under this contract every cooperative was meeting its annual amortization installments and service was extended to practically every farm and farm home in the territory.

But in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] reported a bill under which money was denied Southwestern for the purpose of complying with the Government's contract and buying thermal power to firm up hydropower, and leasing the facilities, transmission lines, and plants in order to provide funds for the amortization payments.

As a result all these cooperatives are now operating at a deficit and it is merely a question of time before they will be unable to make their payments and in default will be thrown into bankruptcy. When they are put up and sold they will be taken over by the private utilities which have been bringing suits against them and paying for the printing and distribution of statements submitted by the gentleman from Iowa. It is these statements which I am now answering after the gentleman from Iowa declined to yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says I declined to yield to him. I certainly did not decline to yield to the gentleman. I asked him to point out any place in the statement that he thought were not the facts, and the gentleman did not do it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will read the exact quotations here:

I would like to have someone stand in his place and deny a single thing in this statement.

As I said, the statement was full of erroneous references to me. At least that was the inference thrown out by the gentleman from Iowa. I said:

Will the gentleman also include the reply in which I did the very thing he asked someone to deny?

Mr. JENSEN said:

That is your business. Your reply said nothing. It did not answer a single statement in my statement.

Mr. CANNON. All I ask is that the gentleman put in immediately following his statement the reply to that statement.

The reply contradicted most of his statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is possibly the best parliamentarian in the House, with the exception of our House Parliamentarian. The gentleman knew that he could insert his statement any time he wanted to in the RECORD any place he wanted to. The gentleman should not stand on the floor of this House and say that I denied him the opportunity of putting his statement in the RECORD. The gentleman did not make the request to have his statement put in the RECORD. The gentleman certainly knows that I would not have objected to having his statement put in the RECORD. Let us be fair about this thing.

Mr. CANNON. That is right, let us be fair about it.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CANNON. He was inserting a statement attacking me. I asked him to put in the RECORD the reply in the committee hearings. He declined. Then I made this request:

I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD his statement and my statement appearing in the hearings on pages 866 through 877 of the volume entitled "Central Section, No. 3."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not object if the gentleman from Missouri wanted my statement and his answer to my statement in the RECORD. I hope he puts them in right now.

Mr. CANNON. At the time when the statement was made, he declined.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is making a mountain out of a mole hill. The gentleman knows that he could have asked unanimous consent to put both my statement and his answer in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON. That is exactly what I did. Here is my request:

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa his statement and my statement.

And I was denied that privilege.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not deny the gentleman that privilege. I did not object to having him put the statements in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] objected, and the gentleman did not intercede.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, the gentleman knows when Mr. HOFFMAN objected to that, that I had no recourse.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman was standing there like Saul at the stoning of Stephen, consenting.

Mr. JENSEN. What could I have done? Tell me, what could I have done?

Mr. CANNON. It was only fair to permit me to be heard.

Mr. JENSEN. Tell me what I could have done.

Mr. CANNON. Did the gentleman suggest to Mr. HOFFMAN that I be allowed to be heard?

Yesterday the gentleman again produces the trust-print statement before the Committee on Government Operations. And when asked who prepared it and who printed it, who paid for it, the gentleman from Iowa could not remember who had it printed or who supplied the copies he was handing out.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to all things.

Mr. CANNON. There certainly is.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, the testimony that I gave before the committee is all printed for everybody to read, and I deny what the gentleman has said. If the gentleman will not twist my words around, I will get the statement and put it in the RECORD and show the House exactly what I said. The gentleman from Missouri is a professional, as every-

one knows, in twisting words to suit himself.

Mr. CANNON. I will not ask that the gentleman's words be taken down because everybody knows the man who makes the charge. But, he was asked about it, and he said that it was reprinted by a utility company; that they paid for it; that they circulated it. But, he refused to say——

Mr. JENSEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I thought the gentleman just got through saying—and the whole House heard him—that I said before the committee that I did not know who had it printed. Now the gentleman says I told the committee who had it printed.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman said before this committee that he did not know who had it printed; he could not name all of the utilities that joined in. He said he did not know how much it cost. He said he did not know how many were circulated.

Mr. JENSEN. And that is the truth.

Mr. CANNON. It is remarkable that the gentleman did not know. He had this treasured report which he has carried around with him and showed on every possible occasion and which he held up here in the House and said: "Now, if that is not the truth, let someone rise and deny it," and then denied me the right to answer and explain it was not true.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman, Mr. CANNON, did not deny or take exception to a single statement in my statement of facts regarding APA, nor has anyone else, to my knowledge.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the statement which I printed following it in the committee took issue with statement after statement in it.

Mr. JENSEN. No; it did not.

Mr. CANNON. That is all right. We are going to print it in the RECORD, print your statement and my answer to it, and let the House judge for itself.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly. That is what I want.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman had a bad memory. He could not remember. He could not remember anybody that had it printed. He could not remember how much it cost. He could not remember how many copies were printed, and he could not remember who circulated it or to whom it was distributed or where he got his copies. Now, that is a remarkable lapse of memory on the part of my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman give me just a little time to answer him?

Mr. CANNON. Proceed, I will yield to the gentleman. I hope the gentleman has remembered in the meantime the answer to these questions which he could not remember when he was before the legislative committee.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Iowa always remembers facts. The gentleman from Iowa does not twist words to suit the occasion. The gentleman from Iowa inserted that statement in the hearings as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says. A few days after the hearings were printed, a gentleman, a member of the private utilities of the Southwest area, called me and asked if I cared if they reprinted the statement which I had made before the committee. I think it was May 5.

Mr. CANNON. Who was that who asked you that over the telephone?

Mr. JENSEN. I told the committee, I tell you today, and I swear to God that I do not remember who the man was, because if I did I would tell you.

Mr. CANNON. That is rather remarkable, that he asked if they could have it reprinted and the gentleman does not remember who it was.

Mr. JENSEN. It was a passing incident. He said to me, "Do you care if we have this statement reprinted?" I said, "It is a public document, and of course I have no objection to it at all." He said, "All right." That was the end of the conversation.

I have been a pretty busy man, as has the gentleman from Missouri. We have had a lot of things to do.

Mr. CANNON. That is all I want to know. The gentleman does not remember who asked him to have the speech reprinted or why they wanted to spend money on it.

Mr. JENSEN. I will tell the gentleman what I will do, since he has gone this far. I will run it down and find out just who that gentleman was; because the officials of the private utilities in that area in my estimation are honorable gentleman. They are hired men for a few million people, that is all. They do not own the private utility. They have nothing to cover up. They appeared before the Committees of the House and the Senate for years.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. I ask for the regular order. These gentlemen are certainly not on the subject before the House. Is this a private fight or can anybody else get in it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asked unanimous consent to speak out of order, and that consent was granted.

Mr. FULTON. He is certainly speaking out of order.

Mr. CANNON. But I am not making unfounded charges against a colleague and then refusing to give him an opportunity to reply. And none of the expenses are being paid by the Power Trust.

Mr. JENSEN. This is a private fight between us. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I have had a good many of them and we still respect each other. But as far as this question concerning private enterprises and Government ownership, we have some differences. But I wish the gentleman would stay with the facts.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, these private utilities brought suit against REA to declare the contract of the Government with REA invalid. The courts twice decided that the contract was valid. These private utilities that sought to destroy the contract are the people who reprinted the gentleman's statement. The statement undoubtedly was very favorable to the utilities and very unfavorable to REA or they would not have gone to the expense of paying for the printing and distribution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. In this contract the gentleman from Missouri speaks of between Southwestern Power Administration and the REA there was a provision which read like this.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. JENSEN. I know the gentleman does not want to hear this.

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad to hear anything the gentleman says, specially why the power trust is printing his speeches.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. The gentleman has criticized the committee because we did not go along with a provision in the contract that he speaks of which provided that any time the Southwestern Power Administration paid the unpaid loan of the REA they could take over thousands of miles of transmission lines which were built by the REA generating and transmission companies of that area. Then it further provided that after the 40-year pay-out period and the REA had paid off their REA loan in full, the Southwestern Power Administration could pay the REA $10, and all of those thousands of miles of REA transmission lines would belong to the Government. That was the provision we objected to, and every member of the committee will tell you that is the truth. Then Mr. CANNON called the committee gullible. I looked up Webster and "gullible" according to Webster means easily duped.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman would like to get away from the provisions of that contract. I will tell you what the contract provided. The contract provided in these words——

Mr. JENSEN. Well, listen, did not the contract have those provisions in it?

The SPEAKER. Both gentlemen in the well of the House have great respect for the House and are good parliamentarians. The Chair does trust that this matter may soon be finished.

Mr. JENSEN. I am very well satisfied, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON. I will tell you what the contract provided. The contract provided that Southwestern should lease the facilities and provide power at a rate the farmers could pay. It provided that REA have enough income to meet its amortization payments; but after we adopted the provision offered in the first session of the last Congress, the REA immediately began to lose money. Every one of them is running today at a deficit. Why? Because of a bill brought in by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield, Ancher Nelsen the Administrator of REA just recently testified before our committee that every REA in the Southwestern Power area was current in pay-

ments. Congress has appropriated money to help them out over the past several years.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. They appropriated the money under a Democratic Administration, and now they are paying out. But the testimony was that every REA was running at a deficit because of this change in the bill brought in by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, and by Senator HAYDEN's committee. Is Senator HAYDEN gullible? Is Congressman MIKE KIRWAN gullible? Is Congressman WM. NORRELL gullible? Is Congressman FENTON gullible?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up more time of the House. The gentleman is circulating statements printed by the utilities which brought suit in the courts against REA in order to destroy REA.

I will extend my remarks by inserting here material which shows conclusively that was the intent.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman include my statement and his answer?

Mr. CANNON. I asked to have it inserted in the RECORD, and the gentleman objected.

In addition to pointing out the errors in the statement, I will also call attention to the discrepancies in the testimony before the Committee on Government Operations.

This necessarily includes matters previously discussed in connection with the analysis of the statement above.

At page 216 of the transcript of his testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources, on July 26, 1955, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] said:

He (Mr. Wright) induced the five G. and T. cooperatives in the Southwest area to sign a contract, that contract for leasing of all of the transmission lines which the G. and T.'s owned, to the Southwestern Power Administration.

On page 858 of part 3 of central section hearings on public works, under questioning by Mr. PHILLIPS, presidents of the G. and T. boards specifically denied there was coercion of any kind and explained that the contracts offered their organizations the best alternative of those available for providing service to their farmer customers.

At pages 216 and 217 Mr. JENSEN is quoted as insisting that the option-to-purchase clause is given as the reason for setting the contracts aside when Mr. JENSEN was chairman of the subcommittee.

This provision could very easily have been changed by action of the Congress without destroying the entire contract. Further, this provision, while it has now been deleted, could be considered as only reasonable protection for the Government investment. It has been taken out of the contract and need be given no further attention.

On page 218 Mr. JENSEN says: "May I say that Ancher Nelsen, the Administrator of REA, testified before our Public Works Committee about 2 months ago that all the REAs in the Southwestern Power area were current in their payment."

This does not give the whole story. On pages 374 through 378 of the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1955, the financial status of the G. and T.'s is clearly shown. All were operating with an accrued deficit. And on page 362 of the same hearings, Mr. Cole, of the REA, testified as follows:

All of the G. and T. borrowers in the SPA area operated at a deficit last year.

At page 220 the statement is made that until the question of authority of Federal Government to purchase steam power and build steam plants is argued in the Supreme Court, Mr. JENSEN said, "It is poppycock for Mr. Wright or anyone else to say that this issue has been settled and the legal right to do these things is clear."

The district court has ruled that authority of SPA to purchase steam power is clear and unequivocal. The United States court of appeals said utilities had no right to raise the issue. REA Act in section 4 authorizes the Administrator "to make loans for the purpose of financing the construction of generating plants." The G. and T.'s built the plants—not the Federal Government.

No objection has been made to any existing contracts between SPA and the private utilities under which SPA purchases steam power from the private utility.

On pages 220–221 Mr. JENSEN's testimony implies that the only questions in suits brought by utility companies was on the matter of purchasing of steam power and building of steam plants.

The court decision in the 10-company suit is found on pages 729 through 740 of section 3 of the Central Section Hearings on Public Works. The court ruled on the following points:

First. That the contracts do not violate the Central Station Service provision of the REA Act.

Second. That the contracts do not violate the rural area provision of the REA Act.

Third. That the loan contracts were not executed for the sole benefit of SPA.

Fourth. That the loan contracts do not violate the self-liquidating provision of section 4 of the REA Act.

Fifth. That the loan contract between REA and M. & A. Electric Power Co-op is legal.

Sixth. That the lease and power contracts do not violate the provisions of the Flood Control Act.

Seventh. That the lease and power contracts are not illegal on any other grounds mentioned in the suit.

At page 221 Mr. JENSEN stated:

I don't want the Federal Government or anyone else to attempt to run their business or to acquire their property by subterfuge or any other manner, illegal manner.

However, on pages 763 and 764 of part 3, Central Section hearings on Public Works, Mr. Green, manager of Central Electric Co-op, says:

The power company (Union Electric) proposal provided that all control over the use of the capacity in the cooperatives' 161-kilowatt transmission lines and power plant be surrendered to the power company as if these facilities were leased. Earlier we had severe criticism for leasing our lines (to SPA), even from the power companies themselves. In fact, we were taken to the courts by these power companies, and one of the issues was that leasing of the lines was not a legal and proper method, but now we found in these negotiations that the power companies themselves wanted to take the place of SPA.

At pages 237 and 238 Mr. JENSEN explains that Minority Clerk George Green helped to prepare pamphlet of Mr. JENSEN's testimony in part 3 of Central Section Hearings on Public Works, and that it was printed by private utilities in Southwest area, but he cannot recall name of any of them.

Comment is unnecessary.

On page 246 Mr. JENSEN reiterates:

In that connection, since that statement was made by me and put into the hearing, not one person in this America of ours has taken exception to one statement of facts or figures in that statement, to my knowledge.

But my statement immediately following Mr. JENSEN's in the hearings at page 875, part 3. Central Section, Public Works, and which I repeatedy called to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa on the floor conclusively refutes the major points in the statement.

At pages 246 and 252 many figures are used to show there is wide difference in cost of power to ultimate consumers and the wholesale rate to the co-op. Implication is that a small difference in wholesale rate (i. e., 5.6 mils to 10.2 mils) would have no bearing on ultimate cost to consumers.

This is seriously misleading, since there will of necessity be variations in the spread between wholesale and retail prices because of customer density, terrain, average customer consumption, and other factors unique to the area served by any given co-op. And since they operate without profit, a small change in wholesale cost per kilowatt must be passed on in total to the consumer. The small charge per kilowatt becomes a substantial sum when multiplied by the number of kilowatt-hours the farmer uses.

It is precisely this small difference at the point of ultimate use that brought about the REA's in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, these proceedings have not gone unnoticed by the press. And under leave granted me to insert material in the RECORD in this connection, I include an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 29, 1955, as follows:

POWER PAMPHLET HELD VIOLATION

(By Warren Unna)

One House committee yesterday took the unusual step of subpenaing another committee's staff member in an attempt to find out if an anonymously printed pamphlet on Midwest power problems was in violation of the lobbying act.

But George S. Green, 10211 Lorain Avenue, Silver Spring, minority clerk to the House Appropriations Committee, proved to be of no help.

Green, subpenaed by the House Government Operations Public Works Subcommittee, said he had "assisted" Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, Iowa, in writing the "technical aspects" of the 17-page pamphlet. But he added that the first he knew that possibly hundreds of thousands of copies had been circulated in the Arkansas-Missouri-Oklahoma area was when JENSEN gave him one.

Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania, subcommittee chairman, said after the hearing: "There is no question about it; this is a violation of the lobbying act."

CHUDOFF explained that the law provides that anyone spending more than $10 "for the purpose of influencing legislation" must register with the Clerk of the House. He estimated "many thousands of dollars" had been spent on this pamphlet, Facts About the Southwestern Power Problem, and said its purpose was clearly to "influence Congress and its legislation."

The pamphlet reprints remarks JENSEN made before the House Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee May 19. In it he accuses Southwestern Power Administrator Douglas G. Wright of "a burning and insatiable obsession to obtain, without regard to method * * * a gigantic power empire."

The pamphlet, under JENSEN's name, characterizes as "canned dialog" question-and-answer testimony between Representative CLARENCE CANNON (Democrat, of Missouri), House Appropriations Committee chairman, and Wright.

JENSEN's pamphlet came to public light Tuesday when he submitted it in testifying before CHUDOFF's hearing on administration power policies. He was immediately asked about its origin.

He said Green had written most of the remarks for him and then a representative of 12 private utilities in SPA's Arkansas-Missouri-Oklahoma area had phoned him for permission to reprint his speech in pamphlet form.

"It was a public document. I cannot tell anyone not to reprint it," JENSEN testified at the time. "(But) so help me God, if I die on this spot, I do not know all the private utilities that contributed to it. Maybe all of them did, I do not know."

Green was asked yesterday if he was the only one who had helped JENSEN.

"I couldn't say," he replied.

Asked if he had obtained any of his data from the 12 private utilities in the SPA area, Green answered: "I don't believe so—in connection with this particular pamphlet."

Green, a former Federal Power Commission employee who has been working with Representative JOHN TABER (Republican, of New York), on the House Appropriations Committee staff since 1953, said JENSEN had requested his help—"I assume it was in my capacity as a minority clerk. I was instructed by Mr. TABER to assist any members of the minority of the committee."

I also include editorial comment from Labor's Daily of Saturday, July 30, 1955, as follows:

The private utilities of the Southwest have very definitely violated the Lobby Act by printing pamphlets which Representative BEN J. JENSEN (Republican, of Iowa) distributed to all Congressman, a House committee has decided. But the pamphlets contained a statement by JENSEN in opposition to certain funds for the Southwestern Power Administration.

Also reported in the New York Times of July 28, 1955:

HOUSE UNIT SEEKS PAMPHLET BACKER—PRO-PRIVATE POWER PAPER PROMPTS ONE GROUP TO CALL CLERK OF ANOTHER

(By C. T. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—A subpena was issued by one congressional committee today to require sworn testimony from a clerk of another.

This unusual action was taken in an effort to discover who prepared, financed, and attained Congresswide circulation of a pamphlet favorable to private utilities. It appeared just before a vote was taken on appropriations concerning both public and private power interests in the Southwest.

It appeared to be the opening of an investigation into the power of lobbies of the private power interests.

The pamphlet now at issue indicated that its author was Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, of Iowa. Mr. JENSEN formerly was chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling public utilities funds. It was identified, however, as having been almost wholly a reprint of a statement he had filed with a House Government Operations Subcommittee earlier this year.

Mr. JENSEN asked to be heard by the Government Operations Subcommittee now examining public-power policy. He said he had agreed to the distribution of his statement among colleagues at the request of someone he could not identify.

The subcommittee, headed by Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, wanted to know more about this. Examination of the 17-page pamphlet gave no hint as to who financed it or who printed it. Mr. JENSEN said he did not finance it and did not know who published it.

It came out, though, under the title, "Facts About the Southwestern Power Problem * * * by BEN F. JENSEN." It dealt, to the advantage of private utilities, with the sales of power by public projects.

Suspicion seemed to center upon George Green, a minority clerk of the Appropriations Committee. Mr. Green was in the room. Representative JOHN E. MOSS, JR., Democrat, of California, asked that he be called to the stand. Representative JENSEN protested. Never, he held, had one congressional committee intruded upon the operations of the staff of another.

The chairman of the full Government Operations Committee, Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, nevertheless, issued a subpena for Mr. Green.

And the following article from the American Public Power Association Newsletter of July 29, 1955:

POWER MYSTERY: WHO PAID FOR JENSEN PAMPHLET BLASTING SPA?

The Chudoff subcommittee this week questioned Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, Iowa, and a member of the House Appropriations Committee staff regarding authorship and financial backing of an anti-public-power pamphlet which Representative EARL CHUDOFF said was distributed by the "hundreds of thousands."

The 17-page pamphlet Facts About the Southwestern Power Problem, bears not indication of its source other than that it reprints testimony by Representative JENSEN before the Appropriations Committee with respect to SPA funds.

The Iowa Congressman told the committee that he received a telephone call asking permission to reprint the testimony and that he assumed "the private utilities in the Southwest area had that statement reprinted:" He provided a copy to every Member of the House and Senate, he added.

In answer to questions from Chairman CHUDOFF, whose subcommittee has jurisdiction over public works and resources within the House Committee on Government Operations, Representative JENSEN declared, "So help me God, if I die on this spot, I don't know all the private utilities that contributed to it."

Following the Jensen testimony, Representative CHUDOFF told reporters that "there is no question about it; this is a violation of the lobbying act." He admitted the possibility that the utilities which footed the bill for the pamphlet may be registered as lobbyists and thus have complied with the law.

In an effort to track down authorship of the pamphlet, Representative CHUDOFF drew from Representative JENSEN the fact that George S. Green, minority clerk of the House Appropriations Committee, aided in its preparation. "BEN JENSEN, the old lumberman, would not be capable of going into all those details so far as rates are concerned," he explained.

The pamphlet attacks Southwestern Power Administration, whose policies are under investigation by the Chudoff group, and charges SPA Administrator Douglas Wright with "a burning and insatiable obsession to obtain, without regard to method, the 'comprehensive plan of power distribution' whereby he would build a gigantic power empire."

Letters From the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Relating to Provisions of the Social-Security Laws Dealing With Sharecroppers and Migrant Agricultural Laborers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting two letters which I have received from the Commissioner of Social Security relating to crop-sharing arrangements and migrant agricultural labor:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND LABOR,
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1955.

Hon JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to confirm, as requested by you, the informal discussions that have been held with you and Congressman MILLS by representatives of the Department of the Treasury and representatives of this Department on the interpretation of normal crop-share arrangements for coverage purposes under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Social Security Act. You requested that prompt consideration be given to this matter so that information would be available in the near future to persons entering into crop-sharing arrangements.

In accordance with your request, we are glad to confirm your understanding of the provisions as they apply to crop-sharing arrangements. Under the interpretation agreed upon between the two agencies, an individual who undertakes to produce a crop or livestock on land belonging to another for a proportionate share of the crop produced or of the proceeds from the crop will be considered an independent contractor and not an employee. His net earnings from the crop-share arrangement will be creditable for social security purposes if they amount to $400 or more for the year. On the other hand, a landowner receiving a crop share, or the proceeds thereof, from such an arrangement will be considered as receiving rentals from real estate. Since such rentals are excluded from coverage under the Social Security Act, the landowner will not receive social security credits as a result of the crop-share arrangement. This interpretation accords with views as expressed by you and Congressman MILLS in our informal discussions.

It is proposed to underwrite this interpretation through the promulgation of regulations by both this Department and the Department of the Treasury. Fundamental agreement has been reached regarding all essential aspects of this matter. Phraseology designed to implement the agreed-upon interpretation will be incorporated in the body

of the regulations now being developed covering the amendments to the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code which were amended during the year 1954. In the meantime, both agencies propose to follow in current rulings the effect of the proposed regulations.

We must point out, however, that this interpretation is restricted to crop-sharing arrangements where the share-farmer agrees to do substantially all of the physical labor incident to the production of the crop or livestock during substantially all of its growing period for a proportionate share thereof. Where the agreement between the parties provides that the individual undertaking the physical labor incident to the production of the crop is to be compensated at a specified rate of pay or is to receive a fixed sum of money or a stipulated quantity of the commodities produced (as distinguished from a percentage share of the crop, or the proceeds therefrom), the regulations will not apply. The regulations also will not be applicable, of course, where the parties enter into a valid partnership agreement or joint venture in regard to the farming enterprise.

Whenever the circumstances of any case make the agreed-upon interpretation inapplicable, the case will be disposed of upon the basis of such principles and interpretations as will be pertinent to determination of the social security status of the parties.

If you wish additional information or if we can be of further service, please call upon us.

Sincerely your,

CHARLES I. SCHOTTLAND,
Commissioner.

JULY 5, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 28, 1955, when we talked with you and Congressman MILLS about certain farm coverage questions, you requested information dealing with the administration of the social-security amendments of 1954 and their application to farm laborers in general and particularly to migrant and short-term employees.

As you well know, the amended law liberalized the tests for determining whether or not remuneration for agricultural labor is wages after 1954. The test is now on a yearly basis and requires that an employee be paid $100 cash wages in a calendar year by one employer. Payments in kind, such as board and lodging, do not count for social-security purposes. Under the new law, only the cash wage is considered with respect to agricultural labor and such factors as the period or the regularity of the service, previously in the law, are of no concern or consequence. Thus, migrant workers, day haul workers, and other intermittent or short-term farm workers are not covered unless they are paid at least $100 in cash wages for agricultural labor in the year by one employer.

The $100 annual cash wage test for farm employees, as you will recall, was established by Congress to cover additional farm workers and, at the same time, keep the reporting and recordkeeping problems for farm employers to a minimum by excluding the most casual and incidental employment. This test, of course, differs from the coverage requirements in business and industry where all earnings up to $4,200, including certain payments in kind, are counted for social-security purposes.

The purpose of the $100 cash wage test in respect to minimizing record-keeping difficulties was kept fully in mind in designing the record-keeping and reporting requirements. These requirements have been worked out jointly by the Internal Revenue Service and this Bureau and are outlined in Internal Revenue Circulars A and Ag, which are tax guides for agricultural employers.

On page 7, of Circular Ag, item 8 states, in part:

"You should keep the following records on each employee to whom you pay, or expect to pay, $100 or more cash wages in the year for agricultural labor;

"(a) The name and social security account number of the employee;

"(b) The payments to the employee of cash wages for agricultural labor; and

"(c) The amount, if any, deducted as employee tax.

"If a record was not required to be kept because you did not expect to pay the employee as much as $100 in a year (for example, a migrant harvester or other short-term worker), but it develops that he will be paid that much, you should begin keeping records for that employee including, as a starting point, the best available information or estimate of the amount you previously paid him in the year."

The same instructions are included in Circular A.

Circular A, item 7 on pages 5 and 6, provides instructions for the filing of returns involving agricultural employees. This item states, in part:

"Every employer who pays taxable cash wages after 1954 for agricultural labor will make a return on form 943 for each calendar year, beginning with the first year in which he pays such wages. In January following each calendar year the employer must report on Form 943 the taxes, if any, payable with the return, and must list on such return the social security account number and name of each employee to whom he paid taxable wages in the year for agricultural labor, and the total amount of such wages paid to the employee * * *.

The return on form 943 is the only return the employer will file for a calendar year if he incurs less than $100 total liability in the first 9 months of the year for employer tax and employee tax on wages for agricultural labor. * * *

"An employer whose tax liability on wages for agricultural labor amounts to as much as $100 at the end of the first, second, or third quarter of the year must also file a return on form 943A after the close of the quarter in which the $100 liability is reached. Form 943A is a tax return only, and does not include any listing of employee's names, account numbers, and wages. Any taxes required to be reported in a return on form 943A are payable with such return and are not to be included in the return on form 943 due after the close of the year."

We are aware that some special problems arise in identifying and keeping earnings records for migrant, day haul, and other intermittent and short-term workers, especially where payment is made on an item or piecework basis. We have discussed these problems with a number of farm employers in different parts of the country and have made available to them simple techniques of identity and earnings accumulations.

One of the simpler systems used by employers in recording the taxable wages paid consists of cards which contain space for entering each employee's social-security account number and name, with a three-column arrangement for entering the cash payments. As the employee is paid, the amount is entered in the appropriate space. When the employee leaves, at the end of the day or at some other designated time, he presents the card to his employer who retains it for use in preparing his annual tax return.

Descriptions of this and of other systems have been made available to the district offices of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance for use in answering specific inquiries regarding record-keeping devices. Record-keeping forms have been made available to, and may be obtained from, State agricultural extension services, and business firms and agencies that publish farm record-keeping aids.

With regard to the employee tax deductions, the law gives the employer a choice of deducting the employee tax for all wages, or he can begin making the required deductions as employees reach the $100 cash wage amount. If the employer deducts the employee tax and the $100 wage test is not met, or deducts more than the correct amount, he should repay the employee. Where the employer is unable to locate the employee or for other reasons cannot repay the worker, circular Ag, page 7, item 7, paragraph 3, contains the following instructions:

"If you are unable for any reason to repay an overcollection to the employee by the end of the year, you must pay the amount of the overcollection to the district director in January following the year. You should furnish the district director a statement, explaining the overcollection, and showing the employee's account number (if known), name, and the amount you overcollected and did not repay to him. If you are required to file a return on form 943 for the year, your payment and statement should accompany the return. Please write the statement on a separate sheet of paper and not on the form 943."

Since the employer is not required to trace the worker for purposes of making a refund of tax contributions, the worker can secure his refund directly from the Internal Revenue Service if he cannot locate the employer.

Progress has been made in developing criteria for determining the identity of the employer for reporting and tax liability purposes, where the workers are recruited by third persons known, for example as labor contractors, crew leaders, row bosses, and the like.

The identification of the employer responsible for paying the tax is made by determining whether the farm operator or the labor contractor has final authority to control the workers as to when, where, and how the job is to be done. Thus the labor contractor would be the employer when he agrees to perform all or a designated part of the farming operations, free of direction and control by the farm operator, for a stipulated sum or portion of the crop. As an employer, any workers he might hire to carry out the terms of his contract would be his employees. In this instance, his tax-paying, reporting, and recordkeeping responsibilities would be the same as those of any other employer of farm employees.

Of course, where the labor contractor simply makes workers available to the farmer and receives a stipulated fee for that service, he would be acting, in effect, as an independent labor broker and the farm operator would be the employer of the labor. Where he recruits the labor force on behalf of the farm operator and assists him in the work on the farm, under the general supervision of the farm operator, he is an employee the same as the farm workers he recruits.

We have received excellent cooperation from farm organizations throughout the country in the dissemination of information about the program, and on the whole the administration of the new coverage provision is progressing well. While there are still problems to be met in recordkeeping for migrant and other short-term farm employees, we are confident that these problems can be solved satisfactorily. Our experience shows that the continued protection of these workers under social security is not only desirable but entirely practical.

If we can be of further service to you, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES I. SCHOTTLAND,
Commissioner.

Parliamentary Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on the date of July 12 you paid me the honor of appointing me one of the six Members of the House of Representatives to attend the First Parliamentary Conference of the NATO countries to be held in Paris, France, from July 18 to 22, inclusive.

The other members of the delegation appointed were Congressmen HAYS of Ohio; ANFUSO, of New York; UDALL, of Arizona; JOHNSON of California; and CRUMPACKER, of Indiana. In accordance with the resolutions adopted by the House, we left for France on Saturday July 16. Starting on Monday morning, July 18, we attended the first session held at the Palais Chaillot.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it very important that Members of the Congress know what took place and the results of this Conference, as well as the feelings and individual reactions of the six Members of the House of Representatives who attended.

The Conference was called to order and selected Senator Wishart Robertson, of Canada, as president.

After the meeting was organized in the conference room where the 15 NATO countries were represented, the conference got underway with a discussion of the amount of good arising from such meetings of the parliamentarians of the NATO countries.

It was agreed that no particular subject matter would be discussed other than this until such time as an approval could be had by the various Parliaments and Congress to set up a permanent Parliamentary Conference to meet once a year.

After listening to these discussions for several days and having the opportunity of off-the-record discussions after the formal sessions were over, I came to the absolute conclusion that a permanent organized conference of this kind would serve a great purpose, as all matters affecting NATO could be discussed by the members of Parliaments and Congress, and a report made to the Congress by the delegates rather than the second-hand reports that we are now receiving.

I also had the opportunity to meet in a friendly way with the members of the various Parliaments putting everything on a very friendly basis.

One whole morning was spent at the headquarters of SHAPE where a complete briefing was given us by the following:

The Supreme Military Commander of NATO: Gen. Alfred Gruenther.

The deputy commanders: Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery, Gen. Pierre Brissac, Adm. Georgio Gay.

I could not help being extremely satisfied that this is a competent military defense organization for the free countries of Europe and the United States and that great strides have been made to prevent any aggression. I believe the organization of NATO and its military organization SHAPE under NATO is doing a very competent job of preserving the peace as well as promoting the economic welfare of the countries involved.

The final windup of the Conference was to adopt a resolution making the parliamentary conference a permanent organization. This resolution is to be submitted by the various delegates to their parliaments and congress. Quite a discussion arose for the admittance of Spain into the NATO organization, and there was much favor in this regard.

The delegates of Portugal were going to press this point and there were several other matters the delegates believed were important to discuss, just as it was my firm intention to take up the matter of article VII of the Status of Forces Treaty whereby the agreement permits the prosecution of American GI's in foreign courts. However, due to the unanimous opinion of the parliamentarians that no discussion take place on matters affecting the treaty until a permanent organization was established, the other delegates and I agreed to set these matters aside.

In private discussions, however, I explored the matter and hope that sometime in the near future this matter will be discussed and some favorable action can be taken so that our GI's serving in foreign lands will have the full protection of the United States Constitution to which they are justly entitled.

I am sure this has the backing of the American people.

All 15 countries of NATO were represented by large delegations of their members of parliament, and there is no doubt in my mind whatever when I say to you in all sincerity that as members of legislative bodies everyone spoke very frankly. As the conference developed ,one could readily observe that any slight tensions that may have existed at the beginning of the Conference had completely disappeared. One could readily see that there was understanding and appreciation of the various parliaments of the member countries.

During the course of the week a special committee was appointed with one member from each delegation to draw up a resolution requesting their various parliaments to form a permanent NATO parliamentary organization, and several different resolutions were introduced. Out of these the committee reported unanimously a resolution which was adopted by the 15 delegations present. I am incorporating thas resolution at this point:

This meeting of members of parliament from NATO countries:

Recalling that the aim of the North Atlantic Treaty is both to ensure the defense of member states and to contribute to the economic, social, and cultural development of the peoples united within the framework of the Atlantic Community;

Considering that achievement of the aims would be facilitated by closer relations between the members of the representative assemblies of the different countries and considering that this is particularly desirable in the case of the legislative branches of the member states who have by solemn treaty pledged themselves to the mutual defense and welfare of their respective peoples through the far-reaching initiative in international relations that is NATO;

Believing that these discussions between members and the NATO authorities and between members themselves have already been of great value;

Invites the speakers of the various parliaments concerned, according to the procedure which they think appropriate, to send delegations to a similar meeting each year.

Expresses the wish that the governments of the countries here represented facilitate through the NATO council further meetings.

Considers further that before we separate a continuing committee should be selected composed of the present officers and other members of the steering committee, 15 in number, to include 1 from each NATO nation and with the right of substitution to make arrangements for the next meeting.

This meeting further considers that such a continuing committee would require some secretarial assistance of its own. This should be, for the time being, on a part-time basis. The necessary finance, which should be quite small should be provided by the participating governments or parliaments concerned on a basis to be mutually agreed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my very firm conviction and belief that we should participate in these parliamentary conferences where member delegates may hear the views and discuss the many problems that are in conflict today, even among the NATO countries. I feel positive that our delegates who attend these conferences would be in a very excellent position to explain to Congress, when legislation comes up whether it be in matters military or economic, the feeling of the parliaments of the other countries. A first-hand report on these matters at the proper time on the floor of the House, I am sure, will be helpful to all of the Members. I cannot help but feel that these discussions, ultimately, will bring about not only a fine relationship between the member countries but also gain the one and only desire, to halt Communist aggression.

I deeply appreciate the privilege that was given to me to represent this great House of Representatives at the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

A New Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, failure of Congress to enact highway legislation to provide the Nation with more, better, and safer highways is a disappointment and a disgrace.

This major mistake can be corrected only by Congress taking prompt action to enact a highway bill that will get the Nation's proposed expanded highway program on the road at the earliest possible date. Death on the highways does

not wait while Congress procrastinates. While Congressmen vacation, death goes ahead killing an average of 100 persons a day, 3,000 a month, or 36,000 a year in highway traffic accidents.

Congressmen may have a vacation but death on the highways takes no holiday.

Because of the seriousness and urgency of the Nation's highway needs, I have introduced today a new highway bill as the basis for a compromise to obtain highway legislation at an early date.

President Eisenhower and the Republicans proposed to finance the greatly expanded highway program by bonds to be paid off with the present and anticipated receipts from the present 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. That plan involves no new or additional taxes. Federal Treasury fiscal experts and most of the Nation's governors pronounced this plan to be fiscally sound and feasible.

The Democratic leadership, however, called this plan "fiscally irresponsible" and said the Democrats wanted nothing to do with any bonding plan to finance building highways.

The Democratic leadership, after weeks of working on a substitute for the Eisenhower-Republican bond financing plan, introduced a bill which proposed a finance highway building with new and additional taxes that would collect $13 billion in 15 years through new and additional taxes levied on motorists and truckers.

Two choices thus were before Congress: First, the President's bonding plan or, second, the Democratic high-tax plan.

When the two plans were put to a vote, both plans were rejected.

On the vote on the President's bonding plan, 216 Democrats voted against it and only 5 Democrats supported it.

Then when the high-tax plan of the Democrats came to a vote a majority of both the Democrats and the Republicans voted against it. These actions left Congress and the country without a highway bill. The Democrats voted against the President's bonding plan and then against the pay-as-you-go tax plan of the Democratic leadership. The Democrats seemingly wanted no highway bill.

It is imperative, it seems to me, that an expanded highway program be started just as soon as possible. Every day of delay means more persons killed or maimed needlessly.

There must be some ground on which the Republicans who want a bonding plan and the Democrats who want a tax plan can reconcile their differences. If Congress is to enact a highway bill, Republicans, who like myself have fought for the President's bonding plan, must agree to take some taxes as a means of raising some revenue for highways as wanted by the Democrats, and the Democrats who have opposed any bonding must agree to take some bonding, as desired by the Republicans. A blending of the two ideas of bonds and taxes, in my opinion, is the best compromise which can be had.

Because I am convinced there can be no highway legislation without compromise, I, today, introduce a new highway bill which proposes to finance the expanded highway program which all profess to desire by blending the two plans, the Republican bond financing plan and the Democratic tax plan. My bill would raise about half of the money to finance the highway program by taxes, as the Democrats prefer, and half by the bond issue method, favored by the Republicans.

The bond issue idea of the President is set up in my bill just as it was in the Dondero bill and would involve the sale of about $5 billion in bonds. Most of these bonds, however, would not have to be sold until the latter years of the highway construction program.

If Congress, later, extends the taxes levied by my highway bill for 4 to 5 years beyond completion of the highway building undertaking, the added revenues from the extra years would pay off this bond issue in 4 to 5 years after the highway program was completed. Thus, under my compromise bonding-tax bill proposal, the entire cost of the $48½ billion gigantic expanded highway program would be paid off in 20 to 21 years after enactment of the legislation.

The new taxes which I propose in my new highway bill are:

An additional one-half cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline which over a 16-year period would yield an estimated $4,324,000,000.

A 1 cent-a-gallon increase in the diesel fuel tax which over a 16-year period would yield $118,500,000.

A 4-cent-a-pound additional tax on large sized truck tires of the 8½ by 18 size which, it is estimated over 16 years, would yield $400 million.

A 2-cent-a-pound tax on tires of all sizes smaller than 8½ by 18, meaning those used on smaller trucks and pleasure automobiles, estimated to yield $1,447,000,000; and,

A 2-percent increase in the present excise tax on trucks at the wholesale level, estimated to yield in 16 years a total of $885 million.

The five taxes proposed in my bill would yield the Government an estimated additional $7,622,500,000 in revenue in 16 years or an average of about $475 million a year.

My bill exempts all off-highway users of tires and gasoline or diesel fuel from the taxes in the bill including farmers, on off-highway vehicles, and fishing boats and aircraft.

My bill does not make any provision for payments to utilities for removal of their facilities from highway rights-of-way but leaves the matter of whether such compensation should be made entirely to the States.

My bill does not exempt city transit companies from having to pay the taxes on tires, gas and diesel fuel that are in my bill.

My bill is different in another respect from all other bills thus far considered in the House in that it imposes no additional taxes on automobile and truck tubes or upon camelback used in tire retreading.

Tubes are rapidly becoming obsolete and the number manufactured is decreasing. A tax on tubes provides only an uncertain source of revenue. Furthermore, tubes already are taxed 9 cents a pound which is higher than the tax on any type of tires that is now in effect or than is proposed in my bill. Also, a few cents of additional tax on tubes would not produce any great amount of revenue.

I abandoned any idea of taxing camelback because the revenue from this source would not be large and also because camelback is essentially a repair material used almost exclusively by small businessmen, 10,000 of them, who operate small tire repair businesses and who would be injured, and in many cases forced out of business, by any substantial additional tax levied on them.

I have offered my new bill in the hope that it may become the basis for reopening consideration of highway legislation and of soon arriving at some reasonable, practical and acceptable compromise that will get a grand program of highway building started soon.

With 36,000 Americans being killed on our highways annually, with another million or more being injured each year in traffic accidents and with the economic benefits of an expanded highway program estimated at more than $4 million a year, Congress ought to act affirmatively to enact needed highway legislation. We ought not to procrastinate and shun our responsibilities as congressmen and thereby force the President to call us into special session to do that which we should have done before we adjourned.

World Domination Still No. 1 Soviet Aim With United States the Big Obstacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Philip Simms, a very distinguished journalist and one of our most experienced analysts of foreign affairs, has contributed a special article to the Scripps-Howard newspapers on the meaning of the Big Four Conference at the so-called summit.

Mr. Simms warns that we are now engaged in a new course which presents graver dangers than we, as a Nation, have ever had to face in our history.

I agree with Mr. Simms on his forecast on the dangers of the future and I recommend that every Member of the House give a very careful reading of this forthright analysis of the meetings at the so-called conference at the summit.

Under leave obtained, I insert the article in the RECORD:

WORLD DOMINATION STILL NO. 1 SOVIET AIM WITH UNITED STATES THE BIG OBSTACLE

(By William Philip Simms)

The United Sates and the West today face the most hazardous period since the end of World War II.

Russian never has been as dangerous as she is right now.

At this moment—with the exception of a scant half dozen men inside the Kremlin—even the best informed can do no more than guess at Russia's real intentions.

Everybody is saying: "Russia has changed." And so she has. Until a few weeks ago her face wore a perpetual scowl. Today it is all smiles.

But why?

Nobody outside the Kremlin can say for sure. But there is every reason to believe her real, ultimate objective remains the same as always—to set up a universal communist dictatorship run from Moscow.

RUSSIA REALIZES NOW SHE MUST CHANGE HER SGNALS

Also that the destruction of the United States, the big obstacle in her road to world domination, remains Russia's No. 1 aim.

That the Red conspiracy to destroy us by hot war, cold war, regional wars, fifth columns, lying propaganda and bankruptcy having failed, she now realizes she must change her signals.

That she thinks she can make better progress by concealing her bloodstained bludgeon under a pile of olive branches and trying the more subtle art of poison.

That she is convinced that henceforth neither side will dare resort to nuclear war because both sides know to do so probably would result in mutual annihilation.

That because of this atomic stalemate, conventional weapons will come back into their own and hers might be decisive—at least in Europe.

That by lulling the West to sleep she can revert to her early plot to gain control of the world by infiltration, through her fifth columns and similar subversive agents trained in Moscow. And that we can't prevent it.

That by adopting a New Look she can hasten the isolation of the United States and the more easily beguile our European allies into believing Soviet Russia is more sinned against that sinning.

That she thus can elbow the United States out of the Eastern Hemisphere, dismember NATO, neutralize and disarm Western Europe and put across her fake peace-and disarmament plan which, once completed, would leave her mistress of the world.

IKE SEES THROUGH THE PERIL FORTUNATELY AND QUITE CLEARLY

Such is the peril.

Fortunately, President Eisenhower sees it quite clearly.

He knows Russia's new face most likely is merely a mask and that her recently adopted white robes may have been donned the better to conceal her weapons.

But he already has accomplished two historically vital things:

First, taking Russia at her word, he has provided her, in all sincerity, with a chance to prove she means what she says about peace, and

Second, by a single dramatic stroke at Geneva he has recaptured for America the moral leadership without which western unity and the West itself hardly would stand a chance.

RUSSIA IS NOT OBLIGED TO FOLLOW IKE'S PROPOSALS

Yet, Russia is not obliged to conform, in toto, with the President's Geneva suggestions—like swapping blueprints, aerial reconnaissances, and so forth. She could show her sincerity, for example, by two very simple measures:

Opening up her frontiers to Russian and foreign travel—no more and no less than western countries have done since time immemorial—and,

Quit interfering with the right of other countries to live their own lives in their own way under governments of their own free choice.

As long as she refuses to do these things; as long as she persists in hiding what is going on behind an impenetrable wall and declines to disavow her fifth columns operating inside other countries, she cannot be trusted, no matter how sweet she makes her song.

REAL TEST HAS NOW BEGUN, THANKS TO THE PRESIDENT

The real test, thanks to President Eisenhower, now has begun. It began on July 21, at Geneva. From that moment on, until something gives inside the Kremlin, it is definitely up to Russia.

By the same token, July 21 ushered in a perilous period for the free world. Peoples everywhere—on this side of the Iron Curtain, at least—are so tired of tension, so eager to relax, and return to normal life, that the temptation is to jump at the first rosy mirage.

And therein lies the danger.

The Bogey of Yankee Imperialism Exposed by Panamanian Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, from time to time there appear in certain sectors of the Latin-American press statements and comments critical of the policies of the United States with respect to the Latin-American countries. Generally speaking, those making such criticisms are inspired by local political considerations, more or less demagogic in character. In all history no nation has been so uniformly generous in its dealing with other countries—big and small—as our own—all of which is well recognized by the well-informed and thoughtful men and women everywhere, especially in the countries of the western world to the southward. The attitude and influence of the United States during the period—more than 100 years ago—touching the struggles for independence of the lands of Latin-America, were of the most outstanding character; and today there are no names more greatly revered in the republics of Central and South America, than those of Henry Clay and James Monroe, whose official acts played so large a part in bringing about and maintaining that independence. The people of the United States and its Government yet hold in affectionate regard and esteem the peoples of these neighbor nations, and, in consistent manner, continue, to practice the deeds of goodwill in numberless ways.

Touching the subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of July 16, 1955, which quotes from the illuminating address of Dr. Jose Narciso de la Vega, of Panama, to what is described the largest radio audience in the history of Panama. The speaker is an outstanding lawyer and publicist of the Isthmian Republic, and he effectually disposes of the charges of North American imperialism directed against the most generous nation in history by designing or ill-advised writers and speakers of our sister nations of the Western Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICAN PRESS HOAX

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—Latin American attacks on North American imperialism often are attempts to cover up the inadequacies of South and Central American governments in dealing with problems in their own countries. This statement, made some time ago by Dr. Lasso de la Vega to the largest radio audience in the history of Panama, is a partial explanation of something that puzzles many visitors traveling south of the Rio Grande. The confusion comes from the frequent attacks on, or unfair criticisms of, the United States in the Latin American press.

This may be in editorials condemning (North) American imperialism. They may be in slanted news stories. Often the medium is a satirical cartoon.

"Why should this be?" ask American travelers. "Aren't the United States and Latin American countries good friends and neighbors?"

Yes; they are. The attacks are the exception rather than the rule in the area. The explanation of the seeming anti-American attitude is usually threefold.

First, to sell more papers to nationalists. Nearly every Latin American country has a strong nationalistic group. This may exist as a section of the over-all population or may be a well-established political party.

In some instances, these parties honestly believe that the United States, commonly referred to as the Colossus of the North, is a great threat to their welfare. They resent point 4, economic aid, etc., and spurn any offer extended by the United States. Since they are minority groups, the aid is accepted. In deference to them, however, the newspaper may include with the announcement of the aid some deterrent statement.

Second, many Latin American newspapers are openly critical of the considerable amount of financial and other aid given to European and Asian nations as contrasted with the miserly aid apportioned to South and Central America. Readers may see in the numerous references to this in the Latin American press a condemnation of the whole United States Government which does not, in fact, exist.

Last, by deliberately focusing attention on Uncle Sam and the alleged imperialism of the United States, local politicos use the press to divert attention from their own failures and improper acts.

Local ineptitude in dealing with situations, failure to comply with international obligations and misuse of funds; all are buried under accusations that the United States has mistreated the subject nation, has insulted her "dignidad" as an equal nation, etc.

In this connection it is enlightening to read a portion of the statement made by Dr. José Narciso Lasso de la Vega in this city this year. The occasion was the trial in March of ex-President Guizado. Dr. Lasso de la Vega was the prosecuting attorney. As in so many other instances, the United States had been mentioned publicly as having done injury and damage to the Republic of Panama. Over a nationwide radio hookup, Dr. Lasso de la Vega spoke substantially as follows:

"The Republic of Panama has never suffered damages of any kind from the Government of the United States. The maliciously introduced idea that Panama has been victimized by the United States Government, nevertheless, still persists in Panamanian public opinion.

"From 1903 (founding year of Panama) to date, we have never been the recipients of

any concrete act on the part of the Government of the United States which we can in all honesty say did damage or injury to us. It is erroneous and absurd to even think that the Panama Canal could have been detrimental to our nation. The Panama Canal has been greatly favorable to our country and thanks to its existence and its operation our country has been able to develop itself, little by little, into one of the most advanced countries in Latin America.

"The ugly truth is that in our relationships with the United States the Latin American oligarchies have traditionally attempted to cover up their real impotency to solve everyday problems by blaming North American 'imperialism' for the sad state of affairs in their countries, and therefore, deliberately misleading public opinion.

"We are no exception; this happens here in Panama as well as in the other Latin American countries. Because of this typical oligarchical outlook, we are still subjugated to a hoax which dupes us into viewing the North American Government as an enemy, an adversary, as a group hostile to our development, and which pictures the individual North American as if he were incompatible with us.

"The masters of this venom describe him in such a way that it appears the most we could do with the North American would be to tolerate him, and this is simply not true."

Now Talks With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, extreme statements and suggestions are being made by individuals, including those in responsible positions, about the anticipated meeting in Geneva between representatives of our Government and of the Chinese Communist regime. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor provides some of the balance needed for a proper appraisal of this difficult situation. Therefore, I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

NOW TALKS WITH RED CHINA

If the summit conference has succeeded in relaxing East-West tensions across the Atlantic, there has been almost equal need and urgency to relax the tautness between Communist and non-Communist countries across the Pacific.

And the Geneva meeting between heads of governments is no more than completed before Washington and Peking announce that something is to be done about that, too—if possible.

The approach to a solution of grievances between the United States and Red China will be in some respects, however, quite opposite to the method invoked by the Big Four nations to get their diplomacy off dead center.

Where the summit spokesmen handed down an agenda and a directive to their foreign ministers to initiate new negotiations, the preparation of American-Chinese contacts has been more like a scouting at ground level by field parties to see if negotiations can be worked up to the foreign ministers' level.

Beginning with talks between consuls, the meetings, also at Geneva, have dealt with return of American civilian prisoners in Red China. Now those talks are to be continued between ambassadors, and with hope that they will extend to the return of 11 American airmen. United Nations, British, Indian, and other officials have aided the contacts.

Now, the question is whether the ambassadorial meeting beginning August 1 at Geneva will show sufficient resiliency and civility on the part of the Chinese Communists to warrant going further. If so, even Secretary Dulles has indicated that they may lead in time to a meeting between him and Premier Chou En-lai.

It is too early to assume that Peking is ready to return the imprisoned airmen and civilians merely on request. But if some progress on that issue can be anticipated, then it may be fruitful to take up the prospect of a cease-fire between Communist and Nationalist China in the Formosa Strait. The United States insists that the Chiang Kai-shek Government be represented at any negotiations affecting its future status. A mere renunciation by Peking of intent to use force would help matters.

Of course, what the followers of Mao Tse-tung most want is recognition in the United Nations as successor to the seat assigned to China. This the United States certainly will continue to resist. The scheduled negotiations constitute no diplomatic recognition of Communist China, nor would American sentiment remotely countenance establishment of diplomatic relations with Peking.

There is, among other counts, a matter of aggression against United Nations forces in Korea to be squared before even any compromise formula for participation in U. N. could be acceptable. But that is far away. The immediate question is return of military and civilian prisoners.

Communist Control in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following article which appeared in the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express on July 27, 1955. The article is by Victor Riesel, the well-known writer and exposer of Communists in labor unions.

The article substantiates many of the facts stated to the House during the debate of the Hawaiian-Alaska statehood bill:

PRO-RED BRIDGES HOLDS TIGHT GRIP ON ALL HAWAII

(By Victor Riesel)

HONOLULU.—I stood on Kau Kau corner, where Kapiolani Boulevard meets Kalakua Avenue, some 5,000 miles from New York and little more than 5 miles from Pearl Harbor—and suddenly realized that we'll all have to stop being playboys of the Western World if we want our kind of world to survive.

It is in these lush islands, where they use Cadillacs for taxis, and the trade winds, the sea, and the dramatic mountains conspire to make us forget that our national existence may depend on this defense outpost—that you see most graphically the pro-Communist apparatus at work.

What makes this apparatus so dangerous is that it is not a cloak and dagger outfit. It is legal. It is above ground. It has given Harry Bridges and his pro-Soviet high command real control of these islands. Only the Army, Navy, and Air Force can match the power wielded by the man who has worked with the world Soviet apparatus for over 20 years. Harry can shut this outpost down any time he wants—in an hour. How?

By controlling just 1,300 workers, the longshoremen, most of whom are Filipinos. On Harry's order, nothing could move in or out of these islands. He could literally make 490,000 people go hungry. He could put hundred-million-dollar corporations out of business. Only our Armed Forces could break him if those 1,300 members of his International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union struck—and the other 21,000 sugar, pineapple, and allied workers quit in sympathy.

What's his hold over these Filipinos, Japanese, and Polynesian workers?

They're loyal only to him and his regional chief, Jack Hall, because these pro-Commies have delivered to the Asiatic and low-income workers.

The Sovieteers deliver to this minority bloc of workers every day. Bridges' powerful propaganda machine never lets the native workers forget it.

Bridges completely services his polyglot people—virtually all of whom are honest workingmen, anxious to get their families out of the slums and to turn their children into white-collar workers.

Bridges and his pro-Commie clique supply everything from medical to marriage advice.

The pro-Commie union here, which now has about $1 million in assets, provides doctors, medicine, legal advice, and domestic counseling.

Go into the office of the pro-Communist attorneys here and you see native workers waiting for their turn to consult a lawyer—at $2.50 a week as a fee. One of these lawyers has boasted of handling 1,300 divorces for union people or their family members—at $25 to $50 a divorce.

The leftwing union helps its people to buy furniture and household appliances at cut-rate prices. The stuff is bought wholesale on the mainland and shipped here.

Soon these workers may even be able to buy automobiles wholesale through the Longshoremen's Union.

This union works night and day out of the most imposing labor headquarters on the islands. It has the hardest hitting union propaganda machine outside of the CIO Auto Workers Union.

There are several newspapers. There are two public relations offices, one for English language operations and another for the Filipinos.

There is an early morning radio broadcast to the Filipinos 5 days a week to catch the workers at breakfast before they hit the docks and fields.

There is a 5-day-a-week evening broadcast in English.

Every Sunday morning the Bridges' crowd puts a half-hour Japanese broadcast on the airways.

All this costs the leftwingers some $250,000 annually.

Cheap enough for control of this romantic military outpost. More than that is spent by tourists across the bars at Waikiki.

Isn't that always so? The opposition always works while we play. If we want the western world to survive, we'd better take some time out and do a little more for the peoples of the eastern world. Right now their aren't exactly fond of us.

And as they go so goes civilization.

The Harris Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, in all honesty and sincerity, I believe that the Members of Congress, who voted for the Harris natural gas bill (H. R. 6645) can take justifiable pride in having protected the best interest of the consumer by their action. In the limited time that was available to me during the debate, I pointed out a few of the many practical reasons why this is true, and anyone who has worked closely with the industry, either representing the industry or representing the public, realizes that it is true.

There is one additional matter that I think should be called to the attention of those who stood for private enterprise as opposed to Government controls, that pertains not only to the best interest of the consumer, but also to the matter of States rights. It is a real example of how a State regulatory body, close to the people whom it serves and unconfused by diversified pressure, can best serve them.

Under the Phillips decision was without the Harris bill, the State regulatory commission in my State, called the Wyoming Public Service Commission, was completely divested of the necessary authority to protect its people. Remember, we operated for 16 years from passage of the Natural Gas Act to June of 1954 under the theory that the Federal Power Commission had no authority whatsoever over the price of gas at the wellhead or at any other time until it entered the interstate transmission line. It was not until after the Phillips case that many of us received increases due to the increased cost of the gas as it entered the transmission line. Why was this true? Simply because of this. It is well settled public utility law that the regulatory body will not award the utility for the utility's own improvidence if the regulatory agency is doing its duty to the public. It is also well settled that confiscation does not begin as long as the utility is allowed some return, even though smaller than the court might think fair. This gave to the State or local regulatory bodies, a wide area in which to operate, generally considered at some place between 4 percent and 10 percent in determining the rate of return that they would allow the utility to make in profits. Now prior to the Phillips case when the Cheyenne Light Fuel & Power Co., the utility which imports its gas from Texas to sell to my constituents, asked for a rate increase because they had contracted to buy gas for 10 cents, the Public Service Commission of Wyoming could say to them, "New York City buys its gas for 7.8 cents per thousand cubic feet. Other sales are made for even below 7 cents. If you are such an imprudent operator as to be paying 10 cents, we will penalize you by only allowing you to earn at the rate of 4 percent on your overall investment." If, on the other hand, the utility was successful in purchasing gas for 5 cents per thousand cubic feet, the Commission could say to them, "Because of your good operation and prudence, we will let you earn at 10 percent."

Until the Phillips case, this permitted effective control by the people really interested in the consumer and closest to the consumer. After the Phillips case, what happened? The Federal Power Commission, in effect, said that 11 cents per thousand cubic feet was a fair and reasonable price to pay at the source for the natural gas. The public utility commission was powerless to look behind this decision. It had to allow this 11 cents as a part of the cost of operation to the utility. It had to allow a rate increase based to some extent upon this increased cost of operation. It just so happens in the case of the local utility, that they have the complete affiliate setup. Think what this would have made possible if carried to the ultimate. Had we not passed the Harris bill and thereby returned to the Public Service Commission in our own States and the regulatory bodies in some instances in our own cities, the right and authority to protect our best interest and the best interest of the consuming public, there might have been no end to cost of gas rate increases.

The Harris bill is a good bill for all of America. It is a triumph for free enterprise and the American system that has given us the best standard of living in the world. It is a triumph for States rights. It will redound to the benefit of the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly in no way intended to be critical of those fine Members who, in good faith, voted against passage of the Harris bill. Those whose purpose was to mislead by misinformation did a methodical and masterful job.

The only one who will be disappointed when all the facts are on the table is the person who stands for Government control, for big centralized Federal Government, and for ultimate ownership of our natural resources by the Federal Government. This I believe in all sincerity.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, which follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Few really large American cities could survive a month-long strike of public mass transportation as well as Washington has done it. It has been a remarkable demonstration of a city going about its business almost as usual—but, of course, with a lot of personal inconvenience for many people.

From the very start of the transit stoppage on July 1, business and Government proceeded without any real hitch. Many were late at first getting to work or home, but they did get to work and they did get home. Traffic at peak hours was frightful, but thinned out fast, even though just about everything on wheels that was in shape to drive seemed to be on the downtown streets.

Washington was able to coexist so well with a transit strike only because of a number of distinctive features about the city and those who live and work in the Nation's Capital. (Just imagine New York without subways, buses, or street cars.)

For instance, for years Washington had more taxicabs than any city in the country, including New York City. It still has an unusually large number compared to other cities, and rates are comparatively low—particularly for group riding.

Group riding—not only in cabs but in private passenger car pools—has been an accepted and very popular thing in Washington since early in World War II. Every large Government agency has its car pools of workers living in the same part of town and taking turns driving a full car to work each day. When the strike began, car pool notices—rides needed or rides available—began going up on corner drug store bulletin boards (another Washington neighborhood phenomenon).

Many Washington workers commute by train to within walking distance of both home and work and never use the transit system.

Washington's main traffic arteries are unusually wide, accommodating greater traffic flow and providing lots more room for parking than most cities. With the start of the strike, cars were permitted to park on the trolley tracks in the middle of such wide thoroughfares as Pennsylvania and Connecticut Avenues, and parking meter restrictions were lifted to permit all-day parking in 1-hour zones. This was a bonanza for motorists who usually parked in lots or garages; if they got into town early enough, they could park free all day. So garage and lot space they used to fill then became available for shoppers and others.

Although hours in Government agencies are staggered to some extent, the city is used to a concentrated, heavy influx of private cars each morning and an equally heavy outflow each evening—usually on turn-about 1-way streets with fast-paced traffic lights and few bottlenecks. The strike merely intensified the flow.

With most traffic headed in one direction, it was customary to be offered a ride if you were waiting at the curb for a taxi. Motorists went blocks and even miles out of their way to be helpful.

But for those who traveled at other than rush hours, or were headed away from the direction of traffic, the only answer for those who did not have their own cars was the ubiquitous taxi—and that can be expensive even in a city where taxi rates are low.

One group above all others made it possible for Washington to get along so well during the strike—the city's magnificent police force. The men worked 12-hour shifts each day—in 95 and 100-degree temperatures—keeping traffic moving and streets fairly clear. The police became the city's heroes overnight.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Russia's Achilles' Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first installment of an article entitled "Russia's Achilles' Heel," appearing in the Marine Corps Gazette for February 1953. The article was written by our good friend, Col. J. D. Hittle, legislative assistant to the Commandant. I commend it to the attention of the Senate for its very pertinent background information on Russia's strengths and weaknesses.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S ACHILLES' HEEL

(By Col. J. D. Hittle)

PART I

Soviet Russia of today is a vast and complex nation—the product of important historical and geographical influences. In size she is a veritable titan of contemporary states, and in her vastness she is both powerful and weak.

Her power and weaknesses can be evaluated by a study of basic geographic facts which should be considered in any strategic appraisal of the Soviet Union—geographic facts that make her a powerful nation while she flaunts a vulnerable Achilles' heel.

In addition to Russia's size, apparent to anyone glancing at the map, there are some other important general considerations. First, there is the matter of isolation. Surrounded by the Arctic in the north, the Pacific and mountains to the east, and by more mountains and deserts in the south, the Soviet Union is open only to the west. These physical barriers in the north, east, and south, compared with the relatively open approaches to the west, would at first glance seem to suggest that, for geographic reasons, Russia would be oriented westward rather than to the east. However, this is a clear example of the paradoxical character of Russia, for Russia is by history oriented to the east rather than to the west.

* * * * *

Perhaps nothing better illustrates the topsy-turvy nature of Russian geography than the rivers, for from the standpoint of usage, they either run in the wrong direction or, for the most part, are landlocked. Rivers flowing into the Arctic are icebound from 8 to 12 months per year, which means, obviously, that some years there is no period of open water at the mouths. Thus the lower rivers and their mouths, still icebound while the upper drainage system carries off melted snows and ice, form natural dams, forcing the waters from the south to flood vast Arctic plain areas. On such occasions, it is reported that the lower Yenisei is over 40 miles wide.

Ice is not only a problem of the rivers flowing toward the north. The southern Ukrainian rivers, such as the Dnieper and the Don, are icebound on the average of 2 months per year; rivers in the Moscow area are icebound about 6 months a year; even the rivers flowing into the Aral Sea, in the southern part of the country, are icebound about 2 months each year. Needless to say, such ice conditions would have an important influence on military operations in the U. S. S. R., both operationally and logistically, particularly in view of the fact that waterways are a major means of transportation.

Continual effort has gone into the development of the rivers as important means of freight transport. Not only have the channels been deepened, but an extensive system of canals connects the various major rivers. At the present time, the Baltic-White Sea Canal, the Marlinsk Canals, and the Moscow-Volga and the Don-Volga Canals connect major river transport systems, permitting continuous water travel from the White Sea on the Arctic Circle to the Caspian. With good reason, Russian writers often refer to Moscow as the "Port of Five Seas." Completion of the great Volga scheme will make it possible for large seagoing vessels to carry cargo from Astrakhan to Archangel and from Rostov to Murmansk.

As stated above, Russia's climatic character is a direct expression of her continental nature and her latitudinal position. Five conditions exert basic influences on the climate throughout Russia: (1) it is open to the Arctic; (2) the world's cold pole is located in Siberia; (3) Atlantic air masses; (4) extreme distances from warm water; and (5) the deserts in the south.

The cold pole of the world is located in the vicinity of Verkhoyansk, Siberia. What is probably the world's lowest temperature reading of minus 90 degrees has been recorded there. This cold pole, located as it is in northeastern Siberia, exerts a broad and severe influence on practically all Soviet weather for a good portion of the year. During the winters a stable and widespread high-pressure area, centering on the cold pole, becomes the dominant factor in Russian weather. Because the winter cold emanates from the region of Verkhoyansk in Siberia, we find that temperatures generally decrease, not from south to north, as is the case in the United States and most other major regions, but rather from west to east.

* * * * *

From the military standpoint, this west to east decrease in temperatures would have great strategic and logistic significance. For one thing, it means that troops in the field would be exposed to the same cold intensity in many parts of southern Russia as they would above the Arctic Circle. A campaign, such as Napoleon's invasion or that of the Germans, would be faced with constantly decreasing temperatures the deeper the forces pushed eastward into Russia, even though, from the standpoint of geography, the forces move on a direct west to east axis, and consequently never head north. Conversely, in a winter campaign against Western Europe, Russian forces moving eastward would move continually toward warmer temperature zones as they moved on.

Adding to its peculiar characteristics, the cold pole disappears in the summer, as a cast low-pressure area supplants the winter high-pressure area. At the same time as the cold pole, dominant influence in winter weather, fades, a new factor takes over as the major influence on summer weather in most of the Soviet Union. This influence is the Atlantic Ocean, and it causes summer temperatures to vary in a normal manner, decreasing generally from south to north.

Rainfall, like some other features of Russian climate, possesses characteristics peculiar to Russia. Rainfall in most of the Soviet Union varies from 12 (approximate minimum adequate for Soviet nonirrigated agriculture) to 30 inches per year. At the same time, there are extreme differences encountered throughout the country. Most of Siberia has less than 12 inches a year, while in the Trans-Caucasus region the total rises to 60 inches, and in the area of Batumi, due to the mountains, there is an annual rainfall of 90 inches.

Atlantic air masses are the source of most of the precipitation. Consequently, the rainfall diminishes progressively, as the winds move toward the interior. Also, it explains why the bulk of precipitation occurs during the summer months of July and August. A study of Russian rainfall statistics dispels the all too prevalent myth of the military importance of "General Mud" during the fall season in Russia. Fall is a period of relatively less rain, and this is one of the principal reasons why, for instance, Hitler launched his attack on Poland—having a precipitation pattern similar to Russia—in September. Of the two short seasons, more mud would be encountered in the spring due to the melting of winter snows. German experience underlines the importance of this consideration in Russian military operations. The matter of rainfall is relatively more important to logistic planning in Russia due to the shortage of all-weather roads, a condition to be noted later. Only in the southern Crimea and the Black Sea shore areas is the winter precipitation heavier than in the summer.

Snow has an understandably important influence on military operations. The length of time snow is on the ground varies according to locality, but generally bears a close relation to the January isotherms. Some appreciation of snow duration can be gained from the following: along the Arctic coast snow is on the ground about 260 days per year. This decreases to about 140 days in the Leningrad-Moscow area, about 60 in the southern Ukraine and northern Caspian shore regions, but increases to about 80 days per year in the Trans-Caucasian Mountains between the Black and Caspian Seas, extending as far south as the Iranian border. On the Pacific, snow duration ranges from 220 days in the northeast coastal area to about 100 days in the Vladivostok region.

As the German Luftwaffe found out, winter in western Russia is characterized by cloudy skies. Leningrad, for instance, has on the average only 39 days of clear skies per year. With as much of a clear season as there is coming in the summer months, it means practically continuous cloud cover during the winter. This obviously would have real significance in the execution of air operations against European Russia in the bleak winter months.

The first fundamental that must be appreciated by anyone trying to understand

the true nature of the Russian nation is that the Soviet Union is today a nation of many nationalities. There are about 150 identifiable national groups in Russia, ranging in size from the greater Russians, numbering about 100 million, down to the native tribes in bleak northeastern Siberia, whose ranks are counted in the hundreds.

How this cast conglomeration of peoples has been brought within the national borders of the Soviet Union is explained largely by one word—conquest. While it may be realistic to suspect that many of the raciol minorities were brought under Russian rule by methods other than entirely voluntary, the western students of political science must, of necessity, recognize the cleverness with which the Reds used the racial minorities to gain acceptance of communism and enhance Red control. Initially, the Communists wooed the minority groups by appealing to their national pride and promising independence if they would join in the revolution against the tsarist government, a promise yet unkept.

In setting up their geographic political structure, the Soviet officials have sought to gain added support of the various major racial groups. Generally, each major group has its own political unit, called a union republic. There are 16 of these union republics in Russia. As usual, the Communist leaders can point with pride to the fact that, under the Soviet governmental system, the major nationalistic groups have been, in fact, given their independence, and that they remain within the Soviet Union by free choice. To substantiate such an assertion, they have but to invite attention to the 1936 constitution (often referred to as the Stalin constitution) which gives these republics the right of secession.

So far there is no record of any union republic successfully exercising its right of secession. One can readily imagine the reaction of the Kremlin if, for instance, the Azerbaijan Republic, in which are located the geat Baku oilfields, should announce that it had decided to secede and become a part of neighboring Iran.

In keeping with the pure democracy (Communist interpretation) of the Soviet system, there is equality of all races and nationalities. But here again the facts and the theory do not always coincide. The distinction between the true Russians, largely located within the R. S. F. S. R. (Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, the largest political unit) and the many national minority groups is not openly defined. Yet the result is apparent. The true Russians are frequently referred to as the "Greater Russians," and the rest of the vast population, comprised of many national groups, are called the "Little Russians." The relationship is more apparent when viewed in light of the fact that, while all Russians are brothers, the Greater (true) Russian is the big brother and the others are all the little ones. Although the Greater Russians may consider themselves the brothers of the other nationalities under Soviet rule, the fact remains that the brothers do not associate and mingle very freely.

* * * * *

The bulk of the Russians in these various Republics are encountered in the capitals and major cities. There they function largely as the trusted Soviet political and industrial leaders.

Since the Russians are clustered in the cities, enjoying a standard of living far above that of the local national group in the rural areas, a situation is created that encourages the local groups to feel they are being exploited by their big brothers. This situation, quite naturally, could not help but create a feeling of insecurity on the part of the Soviet rulers.

One needs but recall the reaction in the Ukraine in World War II. When the German forces advanced into that area, they were frequently welcomed by cheering crowds throwing flowers and bread to the advancing Nazis. So strong was this anti-Russian feeling that it is reported that the Germans were able to employ captured Ukrainian divisions in the war against the Soviet Government. According to some reports, all that was necessary to formalize the transfer of allegiance was a change of insignia. As it is widely known, what the German military accomplished in gaining the support of the Ukrainians was destroyed by Hitler's military government personnel whose cruelty and oppression alienated the Ukrainians, driving them back to the support of the Soviet Government.

Obviously, a desire for independence that could manifest itself so forcefully in World War II must still exist in the Ukraine, and even though such wish for political freedom may now be latent, it must be reckoned with as a potent element in evaluating Soviet strength and weakness.

Unassimilated national minorities must of necessity assume great importance in evaluating the true military strength of the Soviet Union. Whether they join the Soviet Union's enemies or are forced into an alliance with the Soviet, as were the Ukrainians as the result of Nazi stupidity in the last war, would be determined largely by the extent to which an antagonist of Russia understood the nature and significance of the national groups comprising, in fact, the majority of the Soviet Union's population. Should those minorities join the enemies of the Soviet Union, it could well prove disastrous for the Red leaders. Yet, should an enemy, for instance, conduct a kind of war that would alienate the minority groups, forcing them into alliance with the Soviet in defense against a common enemy, it would be a major victory for the Russian rulers and a distinct reversal to the enemy. That is precisely why talk of an all-out war calling for the mass destruction of cities is so questionable. Mass destruction directed against the populace would be against the national groups and would undoubtedly force them into an unwilling alliance with their Soviet rulers, thus presenting the Communists with a major strategic victory. The strength of Soviet Russia may well be determined in terms of the degree of cohesiveness demonstrated by the various nationalties.

In addition to the national groups composing the Soviet Union, another important population factor that must be considered in evaluating Soviet strength is found in the distribution of the peoples within the borders of modern Communist Russia. In Russia, as in most other nations, the regional density of population is a fairly sure indicator of the importance of that area from the industrial, agricultural, and military standpoint. Analysis of the relative population densities of the various areas of the Soviet Union illustrates how fallacious it is to evaluate Russian strength solely on the basis of geographic size.

In way of comparison it should be realized that Russia is not as densely populated as the United States. Average density of population for all of the Soviet Union is about 22 persons per square mile. In the United States the figure is about 42 persons per square mile. In one sense, in particular, the population distribution of the Soviet Union is similar to that of the United States; it is extremely uneven, having areas of very high density, and other areas of sparse population spotted throughout.

The fundamental feature of Russian population is the concentration of Soviet peoples in European Russia, the area west of the Urals. In this area, due to its tolerable temperature, landform, and adequate rainfall, is 80 percent of all the Soviet population. This concentration, obviously, points up the sparseness of some other vast areas eastward beyond the Urals. It also points up the fact that European Russia is today, as in the days of Peter the Great, the heart of Russian power.

In addition to this inhabited area, as the geographers often refer to European Russia, there are only two other areas of relatively high population density. These areas are a narrow ribbon along the trans-Siberian railroad with an extension southward to the Kusbas Basin, and in the irrigated river valleys of central Asia. The significance of the relatively few areas of high concentration comes into clearer focus with the realization that 95 percent of the total population is in only one-fifth of the total area.

The extremes are found in southwest Russia where population density runs 200–400 per square mile, and in Siberia, which has an extremely low population-area ratio. The Ukraine, with 40 million people, or about 25 percent of the population, has but one-fortieth of the total territory. Siberia, in contrast to southwest Russia, has only about 10 percent of the total Soviet population, and 90 percent of this 10 percent is located along the trans-Siberian railroad and in the Kusbas. That means that in all the remainder of Siberia, one of the largest land areas of the world, there are only about 1 million people. From the military standpoint, Siberia, while important to the security of the Soviet Union, is by no stretch of the imagination the critical area.

Significantly, Russia is exceeded only by the United States in the number of great cities. There are 98 great cities in Russia and 106 in the United States. If the present trend toward further concentration in urban areas continues, there is no question but the size of Russian cities will continue to grow. From 1926 to 1939 the urban population of Russia increased from 26 to 56 million. Such a phenomenal growth of cities was not an entirely voluntary process as far as the individual inhabitants were concerned, as it reflected a determined Soviet policy of expanding industrial development at the expense of agricultural production. The effect of such a policy upon agriculture will be noted later.

In addition to the national composition and distribution of the Soviet population, the continuing growth of the population is of real significance in any long-range strategic evaluation of Russian power. Not only is such growth important from solely the Soviet viewpoint, but it acquires even deeper significance when examined in relation to anticipated European population trends.

The last official Russian censuses were taken in 1926 and in 1939. Since that time there have been no official Soviet announcements of population figures for the nation as a whole. However, the present population of the country is authoritatively estimated at 230 million. By 1970 it is expected to top 270 million. If we consider the population of the Soviet Union and that of all of Europe as a whole, the comparable trends are shown as follows:

Of the total population of Russia plus Europe—1940 Europe was 70 percent, Russia was 30 percent; 1970 Europe will have 62 percent, Russia will have 38 percent.

As impressive as this trend is with respect to the population as a whole, it assumes even more strategic meaning when the figures are analyzed from the standpoint of the male population of military age. Again, taking the combined European and Russian male population of military age (15 to 34 years) as the total unit, we find that:

Of the total 15–34 age group of males in Europe plus Russia—1940 Europe's was 68 percent, Russia's was 32 percent; 1970 Europe will have 58 percent, Russia will have 42 percent.

Not only do these comparative trends in total population show a fundamentally significant shift in favor of the Soviet Union, but the strategic consequences are even

more discernible in the case of males of military age. It simply shows that the pattern of manpower is and will continue to develop in favor of the Soviet nation at the expense of the manpower reserve of the European nations.

Most certainly this is a critical feature of the changing pattern of world power, for in spite of the fact that we may be living in the so-called atomic age, the population of a nation, and the future trends in comparison with other powers, still remains and will continue to be a major essential in assessing national military capabilities. As long as manpower is an important factor in military power, the non-Communist world can take little comfort in the population trends of the Soviet Union.

But population in itself is not a final criterion of strength. Granted that Russia can produce a large population, the next question is whether Russia can produce enough food to maintain such a population. This leads directly to the next aspect of Russian geography—Agriculture.

Russia's Achilles' Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the second installment of the article on "Russia's Achilles' Heel," written by Col. J. D. Hittle and appearing in the March 1953 issue of the Marine Corps Gazette. The first part of that article told of the Soviet Union's wealth in raw materials and population reserves. The second article is a most revealing description of Russia's weaknesses, and is particularly pertinent today in the light of what we now know about the failure of the Soviet's agricultural program.

The articles are a tribute to Colonel Hittle's scholarship and analysis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S ACHILLES' HEEL
(By Col. J. B. Hittle)
PART II

It's the Soviet agriculture that will, in large measure, decide how well or how poorly the nation is fed in the future. From the strategic standpoint this is important, for a nation's staying power in war is in large measure determined by the degree to which that country's agriculture can support a war effort.

Just to add to the examples of how fundamentally the Soviet Union differs from the United States, it should be pointed out that, while North American soil zones run generally north and south, Russia's soil zones, due to climatic conditions, run generally east and west. By far the best soils are in southwest Russia. There in the Ukraine are found the rich black chernozems, most productive soil type in the world. It is these highly productive soils, developed under the grasses of the Russian steppes, which are the foundation of Soviet agricultural production. The critically important chernozem soil zone is formed much like a giant wedge, with its broadest area in the southwestern Ukraine and tapering toward a poorly defined point to the eastward, where the zone disappears in the more arid wastelands of central Soviet Asia. In the Soviet Union, the rich chernozem soil area totals about 1 million square miles, or about four times the total for the similar soil area in the United States.

Strategically, the chernozem zone of the Ukraine is of major importance to Russia in peace or in war, for it provides 25 percent of the cultivated area of the Soviet Union. Its importance is even greater, for in this soil zone is produced, for example, 90 percent of Russia's sugar beets and 75 percent of her wheat. From the standpoint of food alone, loss of effective Soviet control over the Ukraine, with its rich soils, would be catastrophic to prolonged all-out war effort by Russia.

* * * * *

Here are some basic facts on the scope of agricultural activities in the Soviet Union: Due to climatic and landform limitations, the arable land amounts to about 432 million acres, which is close to 8 percent of the total Soviet area. Meadow and grassland totals 268 million acres, or about 5 percent of the total area. By combining these figures, we have a grand total of close to 700 million acres, or about 13 percent of the Soviet area devoted to agriculture in some form.

In agriculture, as in population, the important area is that west of the Urals. Not only is the bulk of the Soviet population in this area, but it also possesses 80 percent of the agricultural land of the Soviet Union. Of this region west of the Urals (excluding northern wasteland), 65 percent is devoted to agriculture. By contrast, only 2 percent of Soviet Asia is agricultural area.

On the eve of World War II, the land area actually sown for crop production totaled 373 million acres. This takes on more meaning when it is broken down into sown acres per person, compared with similar per capita figures for other nations. The per capita figure runs about 2.2 acres for Russia, 2.8 for the United States, and 0.45 for China. However, the available agricultural produce is not in direct proportion to the amount of sown area per person, as agricultural efficiency is an important contributing factor. Comparison of farm efficiency of the Soviet Union and the United States discloses that it takes about 2 Soviet farm families to produce the food for themselves and 1 nonfarm family. In the United States, 1 farm family feeds itself and 5 to 6 nonfarm families. This explains why the population of Russia is 65 percent rural (agricultural) and 35 percent urban (industrial). Reasonably acceptable figures show that there has actually been a considerable overall increase in the production of grain in the Soviet Union under the Communist regime. However, the real criterion of agricultural progress is production measured on a per capita basis. Consequently, the following table is significant:

Total Russian production in grain crops (per 100 persons)

	Tons
1913	63
1938	55
1949	39

The conclusion is evident: Soviet grain production is, in terms of the number of persons to be fed, far below that of the Czars. It would be less than realistic to contend that such a per-capita decrease has not had its effect on standards of diet. In addition to the decrease in grain production, there has also been a decrease in the production of potatoes and vegetables when measured on a per capita basis.

* * * * *

There is, on a population basis, less livestock under the Soviets that under the Czars. What is more important is that the decrease is large enough to be of major significance in evaluating the food reserve the Soviet Union would have to depend upon in event of war. In short, there is considerably less meat per person today in the Soviet Union than there was when Imperial Russia moved into World War I.

One of the principal reasons given by students of Soviet economy for the comparatively low grain and livestock production in the Soviet Union is the emphasis of the Communist rulers on industrialization. This constant striving for greater industrialization has been characterized by a planned shift of population from rural to urban areas, which in turn means more hands for industry but less on the farm. There can be little question but what Soviet agricultural efficiency is superior to that of the time of the Czars, but such technological improvement has not been able to compensate for the stepped-up movement of peoples from farm to city. Unquestionably, the agricultural economy of the country is being knowingly stretched thin. It apparently is a calculated risk by the Soviet Government. It is also a risk that could prove a serious miscalculation in event of war, because it does not provide the kind of agricultural foundation required to support a nation's wartime economy. While more a matter of speculation than geography, the question might be asked as to whether the Soviet rulers would deliberately so weaken their national agricultural base if they considered a major war imminent.

* * * * *

As is so often the case in industrial development of any nation, Russian industry is concentrated largely on the basis of proximity to coal and iron reserves. Yet it would be wrong to visualize the coal and iron centers as immediately adjacent installations, because considerable hauling is required to get coal and iron together even in the same industrial areas. For instance, in the heavily concentrated Ukraine, Donbas coal and Krivoi Rog iron are 200 miles apart; iron in the Urals is 600 miles from the Karaganda coal mines and 1,200 from the great coal fields of the Kuzbas Basin. With such extensive hauling, practically all by rail, the Russian transportation system is undoubtedly a weak feature of Soviet industry, for precision bombing of the coal and iron transportation net would immobilize Soviet steel production, the foundation of any great peace or war economy. As far as coal reserves are concerned, the Soviet Union appears to have little cause for worry, as she ranks second only to the United States in estimated reserves.

Current Soviet steel production is estimated to run about 30 million tons per year. Compared to the United States total of well over 100 million, it may seem Russia is too far behind to be a serious threat in production of steel-fabricated war materiel. However, it must be remembered that, with a much lower standard of living in the Soviet Union, far less steel is required for civilian consumer goods than in the United States. The result is that Russia obtains far more in the way of war material from each ton of steel than does this country. Any appraisal of Soviet steel adequacy should consider the fact that estimated current production is about one-third greater than Germany's World War II peak.

Neither does Russia appear to have reason to fret over the sources of metal alloys. Among the important nonferrous metals, only tin presents a major problem. Strenuous efforts are being made to eliminate this shortage by development of reserves in the Verkhoyansk region of northeastern Siberia. Russia has 20 percent of the world's chrome ores, the bulk of the world's manganese, and is the world's third largest producer of aluminum.

In the matter of nonferrous metals, as in the case of coal and iron, the key wartime

problem would not be one of resources nor even of production, but rather transportation and delivery from the points of extraction and smelting to the manufacturing areas. The great dependence of Soviet industry on maintenance of transportation can be realized from the fact that the largest production of lead in the Soviet Union is located in Kazakhstan, in south Soviet Asia, and the center of zinc production is in the Caucasus, both producing centers well removed from the heavy industrial areas of European Russia.

Oil resources and production are a crucial factor in determining the strategical capabilities of the Soviet Union. Some geographers have estimated Russia to have up to 59 percent of the world's oil reserves, a figure viewed by other as far too high. The bulk of the known oil reserves is in a relatively narrow belt along the western Urals and extending down into the Caucasus. It is this Caucasus region that is the heart of the Soviet oil production, accounting for about 75 percent of the total national output. Grozny-Maikop and Volga-Ural production amounts to 15 percent and 4 percent respectively. The military problem presented by the relatively distant and highly concentrated character of the Baku fields is readily apparent. Both the fields and the transportation of the oil from them would offer a tempting target to land- and sea-based aviation. However, in view of the relative ineffectiveness of Allied raids against the Ploesti fields in Rumania during World War II, it would seem that precision air attacks against the oil transportation system would be the most effective device for depriving Soviet industry and arms of oil. The result, from the Red standpoint, could well be catastrophic.

Production, more than reserves, is the problem of Russian oil in the foreseeable future. On the basis of comparison with other major types of production in Russia, oil is lagging far behind. In 1901, for instance, Russia, turning out 11 million tons, accounted for 50 percent of the world production of oil. In 1951, with 32 million tons, it is but 10 percent of the world total. The United States, incidentally, has from 60 to 70 percent of the total.

By United States standards, oil-transportation methods in the Soviet Union are behind the times. In this country, 79 percent of the oil is transported by pipelines, 2 percent by rail, and 19 percent by water. In Russia it is only 11 percent by pipelines, 43 percent by rail, and 46 percent by water. Such dependence on water and rail transportation again points up the vulnerability of the oil-distribution system to the proper type of precision air attack.

* * * * *

Any assessment of Russian oil adequacy as well as vulnerability should take careful account of the newly developed fields in the Volga Basin west of the Urals. This new area, result of exploration in the late thirties, has been hailed as a second Baku. Whether it rates such comparison is questionable, but there is no doubt but what it will become a major source of Soviet petroleum production. * * *

Russia, while not brimming over with oil production, can hardly be considered a have-not nation, either from the standpoint of current production or reserves. The quantitative inferiority of the Soviet Union in comparison with the United States is in the matter of oil, as in steel production, not a true criterion of Russian adequacy or inadequacy. Under a rigidly planned economy the military has prior call on available petroleum products and does not compete with heavy private civilian demands. Oil requirements for a nation whose populace rides bicycles or walks is significantly less than for one in which two cars in a family garage is commonplace. So, despite the frequent assertions to the contrary, it is doubtful if Russian petroleum production is inadequate to fill the essential needs of a strict war economy.

Not even a cursory examination of Russian resources would be complete without reference to the vast manpower pool of that nation. With a shortage of technological machinery to support the ever-increasing demands for greater industrialization, the Soviet rulers have utilized the manpower resources as a substitute for machinery. Of course, it is recognized that such use of manpower is not as efficient as well-designed mechanical equipment, but at the same time it is, in the cold calculation of Soviet leaders who are willing to sacrifice individual lives in furthering attainment of the goal of a greater Soviet Union, a workable, relatively cheap, and well-nigh inexhaustible means of developing Russian industry in spite of mechanical deficiencies. The forced-labor or concentration-camp system is the result.

By using forced labor the Soviet is able to push development of areas into which free labor would slowly, if ever, migrate. Consequently, forced labor is a major instrument for exploiting the natural resources of Siberia. * * *

In 1928 there were about 28,000 in Soviet concentration camps, and by 1931 the total zoomed to 2,200,000. By 1943 the estimated total was about 12 million. It has been further estimated that about 12 to 16 percent of all adult Soviet males are in concentration camps.

In the Soviet Union, as in any large-area nation, transportation is of primary importance to the maintenance and growth of the economy in peace as well as being an indispensable factor in determining the success or failure of a major war effort. There is no question but what the rail system of Russia is of crucial importance in estimating the strategic capabilities of that nation, for only by the rail net can the many widely dispersed resources and industrial capacity be brought together. In a large sense the rail capability of Russia is a criterion of her strategic capabilities.

By any standards Russia compares unfavorably with the United States in terms of rail transportation. In 1940, for instance, the Soviets had a total of about 60,000 miles of railroad in the entire country. This would equal about 25 percent of the United States total. Such a comparison is all the more indicative when it is realized that the Soviet Union has 2.3 times the land area of the United States.

Generally, as would be expected, rail net density corresponds with the population density (map 1). This means that the heaviest rail concentration is in the Ukraine, where the rail density runs about 52 miles of track per thousand square miles. Gradually, the rail density thins out to the eastward. In the Volga region it is down to about half of the Ukrainian density, or about 25 miles per thousand square miles. In the Far East rail density figures drop precipitously from the Ukraine and Volga totals down to about 2 miles of track per thousand square miles of area.

Again such figures have somewhat more meaning when compared with United States totals. The average rail net density of the entire Soviet Union will run about 0.6 mile per thousand square miles of area; in the United States we have 7.7 miles of railroad per thousand square miles of area.

Rail density in terms of population is another useful basis of comparison. The Soviet Union has about 2.7 miles per 10,000 persons. The United States has 18.2 for the same number of inhabitants.

* * * * *

The doubletracking of the Trans-Siberian, plus the recent route around Balkhash to Tashkent, constitute necessary and valuable additions to the strategic rail net of the Soviet Union. But while these additions to the rail system enhance Soviet war capabilities and strengthen the economy, they must be evaluated for what they are—significant improvements over previously existing facilities, but still not enough to give the Soviet Union the necessary rail net to support safely a strained wartime economy. It is at best a tenuous link militarily, and economically in peacetime; in war a link that would offer a tempting target for precision air attack.

The Trans-Siberian Railroad, indispensable as it is to maintenance of Soviet influence and power in the Far East, is but a thin ribbon of steel stretching across the greatest land expanse in the world, over steppes and deserts, through narrow mountain gates, and over rivers. Severance of the Trans-Siberian road would isolate, except for air and infrequent water shipping around the north coast of Russia, the Far East from Soviet bases of power in the west.

In a far eastern war with any great western sea power, Russia would be at a distinct strategic disadvantage. The sea power nation, by using the oceans, would have a broad highway by which to deliver men and materiel to an Asiatic fighting front. True, Russian submarines could interfere with the flow of such tools of war, but powerful balanced naval forces would inevitably protect the sea lanes from disruption by Soviet subsurface units. On the other hand, Russia's Trans-Siberian Railroad, only connecting land route with the Far East, would be highly vulnerable to air attack by carrier- and land-based air. Severance of the Trans-Siberian road, or even frequent and prolonged disruption of traffic, would isolate Russian and satellite forces in the Far East. This simply underlines again what thoughtful geopoliticians have long recognized—that the Far East is a sea power theater. Russia, greatest land power in the world, could not persevere against a great and determined sea power in Pacific Asia.

Because of the inadequacy of the Russian rail net, aviation is being rapidly expanded to provide travel and communications with the widely separated cities of the Soviet Union. At the present time it is estimated that scheduled air routes total 26,000 miles.

Highways do not hold much promise of relieving the transportation problem resulting from the sparse rail system. Of a total of about 840,000 miles of roads in Russia, only about 60,000 are hard-surfaced by either gravel or cobblestone. Less than 3,000 miles are asphalt. (These totals are based on figures at the beginning of World War II.)

Thus most of the roads are dirt—mud in summer rains, and frozen ruts in winter. It can be readily appreciated why the Soviet road system—or lack of it—would be an important factor in any Russian military operation. It would certainly influence the type and amount of motor transport and armored forces and would, as well, posses important logistical implications. It also helps explain why the Soviet Union still maintains such large horse cavalry forces.

Here is the salient fact that emerges from evaluation of the Soviet industrial and transportation system: At maximum efficiency it is probably equal to the demands of a war economy. Attainment of such maximum potential would depend on every major element of Russian economy making its timely contribution to the overall effort. The objective, therefore, of any Soviet enemy would be to prevent the smoothly coordinated meshing of the Soviet Union's industrial gears. Thus, disruption of the transportation system would be the most effective means of undermining Soviet wartime economy.

In summation, the following salient conclusions regarding Soviet strength and weakness can be deduced:

(a) Today, as in the time of Peter the Great, the vital area of Russia is the region

west of the Urals. There is located the bulk of population, industry, and usable resources.

(b) In terms of population trends, Russia is getting relatively stronger and Europe weaker.

(c) The Ukraine is the industrial and agricultural heart of European Russia.

(d) The minority national groups of the Soviet Union are a potential source of domestic trouble to the Kremlin in event of war.

(e) Russia, with a rigidly controlled economy, has adequate metal resoures and steel production to support a war effort.

(f) It would be dangerous to assume that oil output in the Soviet Union is inadequate for the armed forces. However, the oil fields and petroleum transportation lines from the Baku region are vulnerable to carrier and land-based air attack.

(g) It is highly questionable if Soviet agriculture is adequate to support a growing population and a major war.

(h) Sea power could triumph over Soviet land power in Pacific Asia.

(i) Transportation is the "Achilles' heel" of Soviet power.

In short Russia's strength lies in her tremendous raw material and population reserves coupled with a rigidly ontrolled economy which could release sufficient oil and steel for a war effort.

Her weakness lies in an inadequately developed agriculture program, and a vulnerable transportation system linking widely separated raw material sources and production centers.

Comparing the Soviet's transportation system to the nerves in a body, Russia is a giant—subject to a nervous breakdown in an all-out war.

Recognition Well Deserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly pleased and proud when it came to my attention that the Virgil Wilson and Auxiliary, No. 4961, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Seaford, Del., had received numerous awards and citations both locally and nationally for their wonderful community work. I would like to enumerate a few of their achievements to give proper recognition to this very fine organization.

For the second consecutive year the auxiliary received the trophy for the outstanding Americanism program in the State and a citation for the best legislation program. Mrs. Aline Hill was awarded a citation for the best legislative study program and facts book on legislation. Last year the Post's Press Book won the top award both in the State and nationally, and this year's edition was adjudged number one in the State and is being forwarded to the national competition where it is felt that it will again be in strong contention for the national award. In a statewide competition the post and auxiliary received the third place plaque for community service. The auxiliary placed second in rehabilitation, third for the cancer program, fourth in youth activities, above general average in hospital work, cerebral palsy, and aid to Korean children, and maintained a 100 percent contribution list for the VFW veterans orphan fund.

A very lively interest and concern for veterans and veterans' problems was justly rewarded when Mr. Wright Robinson, editor of the Seaford Leader, the local newspaper, received the Ernie Pyle award at the VFW National Encampment in Philadelphia, which was awarded to the editor who devoted the most in space and content to veterans' affairs, editorials, and advertising.

On the 13th of August of this year the post will hold a citations and awards night at which time they will present to Vernon Layton, Henry Hutchinson, John McKay, and past Post Commander William Lee Cordrey, all of Seaford, citations for their quick thinking, improvising, and effective action in saving two fishermen from drowning in the icy waters of the Nanticoke River last winter.

Additional citations will be given to the Lions Club of Blades, Del., for service rendered their community; to the members of the Teen-Age Canteen of Seaford who have done a wonderful job in making useful citizens of tomorrow as well as today by conducting their canteen in an atmosphere of wholesome entertainment and to John Temple for his outstanding work for the Blades-Seaford associated charities.

These tributes to the members of the Wilson Post and Auxiliary should also be taken as a tribute to the many other VFW posts throughout the land whose civic and patriotic responsibility is so graphically shown by their many good works. Men and women who take such a serious attitude toward their endeavor to make America a better place in which to live are deserving of the prayers and thanks of us all.

Jewish War Veterans Express Views to General Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter written by the national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, Joseph F. Barr, to Gen. Omar M. Bradley, Chairman of the Veterans Commission on Veterans Pensions, outlines in detail JWV's views on the laws and policy regarding pensions, compensations and related nonveteran benefits for veterans and their dependents. Representing a joint endeavor, the views are based upon research and material prepared by JWV service officers under the supervision of Charles Drescher and comments submitted by PNC Maxwell Cohen, national rehabilitation officer, and Dr. Paul Guten, national hospitalization chairman:

EXPRESS VIEWS TO GENERAL BRADLEY
(By Joseph F. Barr, national commander)

Gen. OMAR M. BRADLEY,
Chairman, President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: In the first place may I thank you, even at this late date, for your kindness in discussing at the home of our mutual friend, Myer Dorfman, past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, the matter of the President's letter concerning a comprehensive study of the laws and policies pertaining to pensions, compensation, and related nonmedical benefits for our veterans and their dependents.

I drew from our conversation certain views as to your impressions on the matter which have encouraged me in making the following analysis.

As I said to you, there seems to be a rather general view in the minds of veterans and nonveterans alike, an unfortunate one, that both your committee and the Hoover Committee on Medical Services were created with the specific view that a reduction in veterans' benefits would follow. I know that nothing is further from the truth, but, frankly, your committee will have to deal with the fact that a public impression of this kind has been created.

The President directed that your committee should appraise the structure, the scope, and the administration of veterans' legislation with particular attention to:

(a) Changes in basic military, social, fiscal, and economic factors in our society affecting the role of these benefits;

(b) The conditions under which benefits should be provided for different categories of veterans; and

(c) The relationship of various veterans' benefits to each other; that is, to benefits for persons still in the military service and to the broader social security and other benefits which are provided to persons without regard to their status as veterans.

In the study there is, of course, involved a résumé of veterans' legislation.

The first veterans' act providing an allowance from Federal sources for service-connected disability was the act of 1792. Various pension measures were enacted by the Congress thereafter from time to time until in 1862 the General Pension Law was enacted. This General Pension Law which provided monetary benefits for disabilities and deaths incurred in military or naval service was the governing law until the War Risk Insurance Act of October 6, 1917.

In the interim the Congress of the United States, from time to time, enacted laws described as service pension acts which, without regard to the question of service-incurred disabilities, authorized both disability pensions to those who had a minimum period of service and death pensions to their surviving widows and children. A fixed date was set for a widow to have been married to the veteran—to be classified as "widow," children were included only if under 16 years of age, or, if incapable of self-support after that age, where the incapacity was based on conditions arising before the 16th birthday.

The act of October 6, 1917, known as the War Risk Insurance Act, departed from the system heretofore in effect. It provided for three separate benefits; a fourth was added by subequent degislation, but was incorporated into the basic system of laws governing the Veterans Bureau by the act of June 7, 1924, which codified the then existing laws for the Bureau into one basic act. These acts with their amendments provided for the following:

Allotments and allowances to dependents while the breadwinner was in service. (For World War II and the Korean period these

benefits were administered by the Service Departments.)

A monetary benefit "compensation," based on the concept of workmen's compensation for disabilities incurred in the service, as well as medical and hospital treatment therefor. Also provided was a payment described as death compensation for widows, children, and dependent parents.

War risk insurance, under which persons in service, on application, were insured for a maximum amount of $10,000, based upon a principle under which the Government assumed the cost of administration and the cost of permanent total disability. This permitted the insured to buy from $1,000 to $10,000 of insurance in multiples of $500. The premiums were, of course, adjusted to reflect the share of the Government in bearing the cost.

Vocational training: This provided for the retraining into various civilian occupations of those who by virtue of service-incurred disabilities, had become unable to carry on in their prewar occupations.

These laws were amended from time to time by the Congress of the United States (each amendment providing either for an increased benefit or enlarging the base) until in 1933 the Congress enacted what is now known as the Economy Act of 1933. This act repealed all laws providing for either compensation or pension, as they applied to military or naval service subsequent to 1898, and the President was authorized to provide by regulation (Executive order), which could be revised by him before March 20, 1935, and thereafter only by statute, the conditions for payment of compensation to veterans and their dependents.

These regulations, as amended, are in the main, today, the system of laws under which veterans and their dependents are receiving monetary benefits.

It is, in my judgment, exceedingly important to note that the fourfold concept of the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, which has been in effect for a matter of some 38 years up to the present date, is with two important exceptions still the governing law. These exceptions are (1) that in 1951 the Congress substituted a so-called indemnity provision for the system of war risk insurance, and (2) broadening the concept of allowing education and training after discharge to other than those who had incurred a disability which interfered with pursuing their prewar occupation.

Under this Indemnity Act the survivors of a veteran, specifically named in the statute by describing kinship, unless otherwise named by the veteran, receive the sum of $10,000 in the event of his death in service, or within 120 days thereafter, in installments for a stipulated period of time thereafter. No premiums are charged for this protection. If relatives as described do not survive, no benefits are payable. This program, while designed to replace insurance is not a suitable substitute therefor and has created a great deal of discontent among veterans, and the dependents of veterans.

The result is an almost universal recommendation on the part of veterans and their representatives that the Congress of the United States should be urged to enact a law whereby veterans in the active military service of the United States today and those who had or should have had the opportunity to apply for insurance under laws which were in existence until 1951 should be given the opportunity to apply for insurance in multiples of $500 between the $1,000 minimum and the $10,000 maximum, the premium therefor to be based on the American experience of mortality tables.

One of the major difficulties arises from inadequacy of the rating schedule to reflect the facts of life.

An indication of this inadequacy is an instance which one of the JWV service officers called to my attention. An individual who served in General Patton's Tank Corps had a tank blown out from under him which resulted in complete loss of both air and bone conduction. He is rated as 10 percent disabled under the schedule. Does it not stand to reason that such a loss under any concept of disability should be considered as more than 10 percent disability?

The last complete survey of veterans' benefits conducted was in the depth of the depression, early in the year 1933. At that time the average man was lucky to be earning $20 per week. The rules and regulations set up in those times are, in the main, the rules under which disability is being evaluated today. The experience of the last 22 years is, in the main, not taken into consideration. These rules were established on a hypothesis that the generous administration of existing laws would bankrupt the country.

As a result the veteran today with an arthritis of the spine due to service may draw a minimum of 10 percent or even a zero percent on his back condition, even though he is totally disabled for his usual occupation.

It is the opinion of qualified members of this organization, who have dealt with this problem, that as it is being administered, and as the law presently provides, there seems to be a constant irritant between the idea of a consideration of disability or death, alleged to be service-incurred, other than a battle casualty, and the thinking resulting from fears arising from the depression period of 1923 to 1938.

The economic prosperity of the recent past few years has had little, if any, effect other than from sporadic and somewhat inconsistent allowances resulting from congressional action to grant monetary allowances based on specific disabilities. While this is not, and this is not intended to be a statement of disagreement with such specific allowances, one who thinks of veterans' benefits as a concept to cover the many cannot help but express a desire for a more uniform consideration, resulting in the allowances of adequate benefits to the disabled on a basis of a realization that the present allowances are in too many cases unfair and unjust.

One constantly faces the question, which is implied in the President's letter, i. e., are veterans to be considered as a class, apart from other citizens?

The answer, in our judgment, is "yes," unless and until we have universal military service. If all persons are subject to the draft, and those who are unfit to participate in the fighting effort are required to make their contributions as soldiers behind the front upon exactly the same basis, financially speaking, as the men who are asked to serve in the military service, then a different situation would exist, and a contrary answer would be in order. Under these conditions the servicemen on the war front and the civilian on the home front alike would be in more closely related positions. As a matter of fact, in this atomic age it might be advisable to provide by law that the entire country be fully mobilized for war and every person be required to render some kind of military service, thereby eliminating distinction between veteran and civilian.

This concept has been advanced heretofore by those who seek a really adequate defense for the Nation, but has not been accepted. Actually, on a proposed program of military training to provide a more adequate Reserve, the objections that have arisen are such that the House of Representatives in its very recent consideration of the Reserve bill found it necessary to withdraw the bill from consideration.

This makes all the more important the distinction between those who serve in the military forces and those who not being in military service are benefited to a large measure by the scarcity of labor because of manpower shortage and wartime inflation of wages. Some measures to adjust or to compensate for the economic disparity due to participation in military service would be appropriate therefor. If this is considered by some to be an unfair adjustment, then that must be considered as their opinion and not as a necessarily correct conclusion either morally or legally.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States suggests the idea of adjustment in the 1945 schedule of disability ratings to be more in line with industrial evaluations of what is a disabling condition and the extent thereof. Take, for instance, a service-connected loss of a procreative organ without loss of procreative power. Such a loss is compensated by a $47 monthly statutory award.

Compare this with a coal loader who has a traumatic arthritis which is not completely disabling. The 1945 rating schedule provides a rating of 10 percent disability or 0 percent. Yet a coal loader who has even a slight traumatic arthritis is generally totally disabled from following his usual occupation.

Another suggestion to amend the 1945 schedule is that pensions for total disability be payable to hospitalized veterans suffering from tuberculosis from the date of hospitalization and not from 6 months thereafter, as is now the case. Our national hospitalization officer has advised that he has ascertained that some far advanced cases reach an arrested stage even sooner than minimal cases.

The general view which appears to be well supported is that the schedule (1945) should be completely overhauled.

There is unanimous opposition to the proposal of combining VA benefits and social security benefits. The social security system is a contributory one, in which citizens pay a share and the Government makes up any difference. On the other hand, while benefits under VA laws are a gratuity, given by the Government without a monetary premium as compensation for injuries incurred during military service, the scheme of VA legislation, since 1917, has provided such benefits on the basis of workmen's compensation laws.

Now some are raising the question of need before an award may be made, even for service-incurred disability or death. This is an alien philosophy, and it would mean a completely new approach, one which would be utterly in opposition to all of the concepts which have, at least since 1917, correctly in our judgment, served as the guide to benefits for veterans and their dependents for service-incurred disabilities. It would also raise the question as to whether those who are entitled to employees' compensation because of industrial injuries are to be similarly treated. We are completely opposed to this idea.

We now approach the question of "pension," i. e., a payment to a veteran, or his widow and/or children, based on the fact of his service, and not on disability or death incurred in or as a result of service.

In the statement by the President on August 28, 1954, accompanying his signature of H. R. 9962, he said that he had approved this bill, a measure providing an increase in benefits for non-service-connected disabilities, because "I recognize that many of the individuals who will benefit from this increase are now living under circumstances of extreme hardship."

The President further said that statistics show that many who would receive this increase need no additional assistance and that "in this respect H. R. 9962 is inconsistent with our pension system and tends to perpetuate inequities and anomalies which have arisen not only within the pension system itself but also in its relation to closely related Government programs."

A question which arises on this message is occasioned by the fifth paragraph of the statement of the President of August 28, 1954. This reads "Although additional benefits have been granted from time to time, our basic veteran laws have not changed materially in the last 30 years.

"We must also recognize the fact that, because of the inauguration and growth of closely related—and uncorrelated—Federal programs designed to provide assurances against want to all of our citizens, there are today many instances of uneven and inequitable benefits. Under the present system, for example, there are no means of taking into account the degree of a veteran's need—no relation between payments received under the veteran pension laws and payments received, for example, under our old-age and survivors insurance system."

Is not this statement inconsistent with the provisions in Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 1028 which defines payments under the old-age and survivors insurance act as income? If, therefore, the income of the applicant, with these old-age and survivors insurance payments included, exceeds the $1,400 or $2,700 limitation, which is provided before pension may be paid, the claim must be denied, even if there exists a need because of unusual conditions.

The Economy Act, Public Law 2, 73d Congress (March 20, 1933) as amended, is the basis of all allowances of pension and compensation.

The act, as amended, now provides for a presumption that tuberculosis, and certain other diseases, are presumed to be due to service if manifested within a stipulated period after discharge from active service. There is considerable dissatisfaction with these provisions. What about a disease such as muscular dystrophy?

What about tuberculosis, otherwise unexplained as to origin, becoming manifest a short time after the 3-year presumptive period?

What about the mysterious tropical diseases, hiterto unknown to American practitioners, incapable of exact diagnosis, which become identifiable after the presently provided presumptive period expires? These provisions relative to presumptions of service incurrence, require careful reanalysis by a competent group of physicians, and it is suggested that your committee either recommend such a procedure, or itself call for the study by such a group—selected from the leading medical schools and research groups, to be included with your report.

In this connection, I invite your attention to the fact that the present provisions of law and regulation concerning presumptive periods for service connection have not kept pace with medical knowledge, and do not take into account the exceptional conditions which may have existed during a particular period of service.

Another matter which has raised controversy deals with the attitude of the Veterans' Administration in determining what is sound medical judgment on the question of rebutting a presumption of service connection for such chronic constitutional diseases. This is directed to what may be described as opinion although called sound medical judgment.

It now becomes necessary to discuss other benefits, monetary in nature, provided under present law. After World War I there was a provision for vocational training for those suffering from service-connected disabilities who required training or education to fit into another occupation. For World War II, Public Law 16 provided education or training for those whose disabilities originated in the service, who needed such training to overcome a handicap due to such disabilities. During the Korean period the substance of this law was reenacted for these veterans.

During World War II the GI bill of rights was enacted. This act, among other things, provided for an opportunity to those who had served, to acquire either education or training without regard to whether disability had been incurred.

It recognized that service in the Armed Forces had interrupted such education or training and that it was the obligation of the Nation to assist the discharged veteran to equip himself with the necessary skills to make his living.

A similar benefit was provided for Korean veterans, and although hostilities in Korea terminated on July 25, 1953, those who entered service after that date and before January 31, 1955, are entitled to have their service computed in their entitlement to this benefit.

The draft laws are still in effect. There is, however, since January 31, 1955, a statutory bar since the period of emergency has expired, and those who enter service after that date are not entitled to their benefit.

It is urged that so long as only a small percentage of those actually available are being drafted for service, some measure should be provided to make up to these boys, and to those who voluntarily enter military service, for the opportunities they may be losing through the fact of this service. No one can argue, with justification, that the boy who, during peace, served before January 31, 1955, is losing any more than the one who was drafted subsequent to February 1, 1955.

Moreover, admitting the foregoing statement to be a specious argument, the fact remains that it is to the advantage of the Nation, as a whole, to offer opportunities for education in the arts, skills, etc., particularly to those whose education in this respect has been delayed beyond others of their generation who have not been faced with the requirement of such service.

I do not predicate this thought on a waving of the flag, but on the sound principle of recognition of a mutual obligation. Hence, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States urges that your Commission give careful consideraton to this matter.

While this draft would be extended unduly to discuss, in similar detail, the entire question of survivor's benefits, a few references thereto are in order.

The provision of law, whereby a 6-month gratuity is paid because of death in service, should receive careful study. If this is paid, as has been indicated, as compensation, then the matter of the recipient requires some closer analogy than that presently existing in between this benefit and benefits similar in nature paid by the Veterans' Administration. If it is an insurance benefit, then some closer relation should appear between the present provisions and those governing the Indemnity Act.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to justify those statutory provisions granting an election of rights, either to veterans or their survivors, between the Federal Employees Compensation Act and the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. The fact that the veteran was a career military person does not signify that his dependents are any less deserving than those of a reservist. This does not mean that we oppose the greater benefit, but rather that we favor the grant of such a larger allowance to all entitled, as being in keeping with the need, and so recognized by the Employees Compensation Act.

Further, this analysis has not gone into any discussion of the provisions of the GI bill concerning guaranteed loans. So far as these measures are concerned, they have more than justified themselves in the economic benefits to the country at large.

There can be no question but that as concerns the housing situation, the veteran group which attained maturity during the period of the conflict came home to an economy not prepared to offer them adequate housing for their families.

The boost to the national economy, which flowed from these provisions of law, more than paid for the little which veterans received over and above nonveteran citizens and whatever the cost to the Government, this was, the improved economy as a whole, resulting therefrom, more than repaid in the way of a higher national income the cost thereof to the taxpayer.

In my discussion of these matters with you, General Bradley, you assured me that, as you saw it, the primary objective of the commission was to consider what measures should be provided for the veterans of the future rather than for the veterans of today. May I suggest that the commission would do very well to study the question as to whether the benefits available to veterans of today are adequate in the light of the economy of the country as a whole. Today our economy is based on a $380 billion national income. Today the general wage level is far beyond what it was in 1917, in 1933, or in 1945. Shall the veteran continue to be judged by the economy which was in existence from 20 to 40 ago?

May I in the name of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States offer to you our sincere thanks for the opportunity to make our views known. Should there be any occasion in the future wherein our further views may be desired or should it be desired that we supplement the views herein stated by oral testimony, you can rest assured that I and my staff will be available to you.

Present Situation of Home Building and Mortgages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement on the present situation of home building and mortgages, by Mr. James R. Price, president of the National Homes Corp., whose general offices and main plant are located at Lafayette, Ind., in my district. The statement follows:

The current high level of home building in the United States is not a boom phenomenon based upon excessive credit or unrealistic economics. It is an entirely normal and orderly response to a basic need for new housing.

Furthermore, the prevailing type of long-term mortgage financing with a steady amortization is very well suited to the economy of the American household today.

The present and prospective market for houses rests upon a genuine demand arising out of at least four factors: (1) Increasing population, (2) a larger percentage of the population in the middle income group, (3) the relative stability of personal incomes when compared with 2 or 3 decades ago, (4) social changes which encourage many more people to maintain homes of their own.

As to the financing, the long-term, fully amortized mortgage, with little or no downpayment, is in some respects more conservative and safer than that which prevailed prior to enactment of the National Housing Act of 1934 and creation of the FHA. In those days downpayments of 50 percent were

commonplace, and mortgages were written for no longer than 5 to 10 years. But amortization was rarely required and the high interest rates that then prevailed often invited default and foreclosure at the least economic downturn. The mortgage risk lies in the ability to maintain payments. The current type of long-term mortgage is better tailored to the pocketbook and in addition provides for growth of the owner's equity month by month.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has put the present prospects clearly: "The widespread use of the long-term, fully amortizable mortgage is one of the great reforms of our time. As a result, mortgage foreclosures on a mass basis are much less likely than they used to be."

The appeal of the post-World War II long-term mortgage financing to former rent payers is demonstrated by the fact that owner-occupied homes outnumbered renter-occupied units for the first time in 1948.

It is frequently and rather sweepingly stated that everybody is buying too much on credit these days. Yet all interest costs today—corporate and individual, for all purposts—are less than half as big, in relation to national income, as they were in 1929. In the housing field, people are paying about 20 percent less of their disposable income for home buying, including debt charges, than in the late 1920's. And the current mortgage debt, about $75 billion, is estimated by the National Association of Home Builders to represent no more than 45 percent of the value of all mortgaged homes. Only 4 percent of these houses, according to this analysis, are mortgaged for over 80 percent of their value. Moreover, a Federal Reserve Board study last year determined that, despite the long terms of currently written mortgages, the average maturity of nonfarm mortgages in the portfolios of insurance companies was only 11 years.

The best test of this credit's soundness is, of course, the default record of home buyers, especially during dips in the national economic barometer. Dr. Burns has said there were no defaults or foreclosures "on any appreciable scale" during the contractions of 1948–49 and 1953–54. This reflects the experience of our National Homes Acceptance Corp. which was established in 1947 and today is servicing $155 million of mortgages on National homes for over 175 insurance companies, savings banks, and other lending institutions, including some of the country's largest. Going back to 1952 when NHAC took a backward look over its first 5 years' experience, it had then made more than $70 million of mortgages, representing 8,000 loans, only 6 of which were 30-day delinquents. This was a delinquency ratio of 0.075 percent.

The delinquency rate on all home mortgages seems to confirm our own experience. It reached a record low in the first quarter of this year, according to a survey of 2 million mortgages by the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. Even in the contraction of last year when foreclosures rose to 26,000 from 21,473 in the previous year, they were only about 10 percent of the number in 1933–34.

I think that on the whole the current home mortgage situation is sound, especially since the Federal mortgage insurance agencies wisely got rid of the so-called no-no down payment financing. Sometimes this even included automobiles in addition to closing costs in the principal of mortgages. Conditions will continue to be sound if available financing is used in such a manner as to protect those few home buyers who tend to prodigality in their financial commitments. In arranging mortgages on National Homes we make our own, independent investigations of loan applicants to satisfy ourselves as to their credit standing and employment prospects. No one is permitted to commit more than 20 percent of his real income, other indebtedness considered, to the cost of carrying these homes. Loans are rejected if applicants are found to have had unsatisfactory payments records on any installment credit. Moreover, our builder-dealers are told that "issuance of an FHA commitment does not bind NHAC to acceptance of the loan if applicant does not meet its requirements." Perhaps this helps to explain why buyers of National Homes have proved extraordinarily faithful in meeting their financial obligations.

As to the genuineness of the market for new homes, it is first essential that we revise the habit of measuring basic home demand by the rate of so-called household formation. The official figures are a highly questionable byproduct of annual population estimates that the Census Bureau, which issued them, is only too glad to admit have little validity. Since the rate of household formation for the current year (not yet announced) is believed to be from 600,000 to 700,000, there has been some apprehension that building over a million homes a year since 1949 (this year around 1.3 million) would saturate the market. This theory assumes erroneously that prospective home buyers are largely those establishing new households. This further distorts the picture by its assumption—again erroneous—that newlyweds, of whom there is a net annual increase currently of around 400,000, are for the most part buyers of homes.

Our experience at National Homes is that newlyweds constitute only about 5 percent of our home buyers. We recently made a survey of 1,250 of our dealer's customers in 7 cities scattered across the country to check our impression. It turned out that in only 2 of these cities did newlyweds comprise more than 5 percent of the buyers. These were Buffalo (25 percent) and Springfield, Ill. (30 percent). This is supported by a 1952 Cornell University study which found that 63.9 percent of purchasers of prefabricated homes are "founding families"; that is, young couples with children under 8 years of age. And only recently the Federal Housing Administration announced that of 6,500 home buyers sampled in the first 10 days of March, the typical buyer of a new home was 34.6 years old. Since the median age for marriage is now around 22 years, this means that the average home buyer in the FHA sample had been married over 10 years.

All of this evidence supports our belief that homes are most frequently bought when families expand to the point of having 2, 3, or more children. It would explain why the typical current home buyer in the FHA survey had been married 10 years or more.

What all this means, so far as the marriage rate goes, is that the rate of 10 years ago, not the present rate, is the one affecting the present home market. And 10 years ago the marriage rate was breaking all records. The all-time high was the 2.3 million marriages in 1946. Home builders are now undoubtedly reaping a sales harvest from the founding families resulting from those marriages. Moreover, the evidence indicates that this pressure for home buying will continue, with another upsurge after 1960 when the army of war babies, which set records during World War II, commence themselves to marry and have children of their own.

There are several other pressures for home buying: the great mobility of American families with one-fifth of the population relocating every year; the separating of doubled-up families, competent authorities claiming that 2 million homes will be needed for these situations alone; and the age and consequent deterioration of existing homes, over 24 million of which are more than 30 years old. The Twentieth Century Fund's massive survey, America's Needs and Resources, concludes in the recently revised edition that there will be a demand for 1.2 million homes a year until at least 1960, even though many more are really needed.

The third and overwhelming important consideration is the drastically altered income situation of American families. The Department of Commerce recently reported that the average annual income of nonfarm families was $6,393. Even since 1947 the families with incomes over $4,000 have increased by 70 percent. Only 14.6 percent of them earn less than $3,000 a year. This astounding revolution in income distribution led the magazine House & Home to the conclusion that it was the biggest element in the demand situation. It went on to say that each year the number of families who can afford a house costing $12,500 or more is increasing by over a million, while the number who cannot afford such a house diminishes by half a million. Whether such estimates are precisely correct is not so important as the indisputable fact that in recent years we have been having a dramatic converging of the well-known American desire for better homes and the means to buy them. This is one of the factors in the national economy which makes the home market of today an actual market of serious buyers rather than the symptom of an unhealthy boom.

Finally, there is the underlying confidence of people in the future growth of the economy. Without this the housing market could not be sustained. Fearful people don't make long-term financial commitments of the kind mortgages involve. At the same time they are buying realistically, according to their means. In a sense, they are casting a vote of confidence in themselves and their country.

Smuggling of Heroin Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, some weeks ago, I received a letter from Mr. Andre Fontaine, the editor of the Bluebook magazine, sending me a copy of an article published in his magazine, in which it was asserted that the Italian Government was facilitating the smuggling of a great flood of heroin into the United States.

In order to obtain some informed comment on the observations contained in this article, I wrote to the State Department. I have received from the Department a very interesting reply containing reference to some official reports on the measures the Italian Government has undertaken to inhibit and restrain the narcotics traffic and the export of illicit drugs to the United States.

I am sure we will all be pleased to know that the Italian Government is taking active and forceful steps to stamp out this evil trade, which is a source of such concern to the entire country.

I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the State Department, which I have just referred to, together with my letter to Mr. Fontaine, editor of

Bluebook magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 6, 1955.

Mr. ANDRE FONTAINE,
Editor, Bluebook Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. FONTAINE: As you will recall from our previous correspondence, I sent your letter and the article entitled "How Italy's Government Lets Heroin Flood United States," contained in the June issue of Bluebook, to the Department of State for its consideration and comments.

I have just received a very interesting reply from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton, and I am enclosing Secretary Morton's letter for your information. I am pleased at the concern which is evident in Secretary Morton's reply with regard to this very important narcotics problem. Obviously the Bluebook article has been studied with great care by the State Department, and I am sure it will have a salutary effect in maintaining proper concern for meeting this vital problem.

Thank you again for sending me this very informative and provocative article. You may be sure I will continue to watch developments in this matter with great interest.

Yours very sincerely,

———— ————.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 30, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have received your communication of June 3, 1955, enclosing a letter, dated May 19, 1955, from Mr. André Fontaine, together with a copy of the June issue of the Bluebook.

As indicated in the testimony of Mr. Harry Anslinger, the United States Narcotics Commissioner, before the Senate Subcommittee on Narcotics on June 3, the Bluebook article in many respects presents a picture of the Italian narcotics situation as it existed a few years ago, but it does not reflect the present state of things. In the past 2 or 3 years very great progress has been made by the Italian Government. This is confirmed by the report of the Committee on Seizures of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs which was adopted by the Commission at its 10th session in New York on May 5, 1955. An extract from this report reads as follows:

"ITALY

"50. The observer from Italy reported to the Committee on the narcotics situation in his country. Of the 36 kilograms of narcotics seized in 1954, 35 were of foreign origin, indicating that Italy was rapidly becoming a country of transit rather than origin. He assured the Committee that the Italian Government had intensified its struggle against the illicit traffic. A central bureau of narcotics had been set up in accordance with a new law passed in November 1954, and this office would coordinate activities throughout the country.

"51. In addition, the observer reported that his Government had taken energetic measures to prevent diversion from licit drug factories. One of these measures was to institute in each drug factory a permanent control system to be enforced by the fiscal police.

"52. As regards the Migliardi case, the Committee was informed that the firm involved in the case (S. A. Schiaparelli) had lost its license to manufacture narcotic drugs and that the principal culprit, Migliardi, had recently surrendered to the authorities and had received a sentence of 11 years imprisonment.

"53. The Committee desires to record its warm appreciation of the measures introduced by the Italian Government for the suppression of the illicit traffic and recommends that these be recognized in the Commission's report."

It should be noted that the United Nations Commission on this occasion expressed deep concern over the illicit traffic centering on certain other countries. The above-expressed views of the United Nations Commission were supported by Mr. Anslinger, the United States representative on that Commission.

The Department of State, in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Narcotics, has investigated the charge made in the Bluebook article that the Italian Government condones or protects illicit heroin manufacture and trade, and finds the evidence to be to the contrary at the present time. In July 1951 the Italian Government issued an order suspending the production of heroin in Italy. This order has been in force ever since. The most flagrant violator of the order has been severely punished by the Italian courts (the Migliardi case referred to above). According to the United States Bureau of Narcotics, the Italian Government is satisfactorily cooperating with United States narcotic agents in their efforts to prevent the flow of heroin and other narcotics through illicit channels into the United States.

It is to be noted that international organizations of which most of the nations of the world are members have recommended the extension of additional safeguards against the manufacture, trade and use of heroin to countries, including Italy, which have not yet adopted these further measures. In the case of Italy the safeguard most urgently needed is the permanent prohibition of the manufacture of heroin, as recommended by the World Health Organization and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The United States Government has always supported these recommendations and it will continue to do so through the medium of the international organizations which have been established for this purpose.

Mr. Fontaine's letter and the Bluebook are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Louisiana State Vets Honor Al Labiche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, today I want to make the House acquainted with an old friend of mine and a combat veteran who has just been elected State commander of the American Legion in Louisiana, Albert Labiche, of New Orleans.

Here is the typical American story.

Al Labiche was the father of two children when he went off to the war. He was a happy-go-lucky sort of a guy when he went away. When he came back he was a seasoned soldier who had been through the roughest and the toughest of the campaigns around the Bulge.

In typical American fashion, however, he picked up his life in the busy industrial world which he had left and became a renewed force in his community. His endeavors and his talents were given to all civic movements and he served his city as foreman of the grand jury at a time when service was not what could be called very desirable because of local political conditions. But Al Labiche did his job and did it well.

Now he has been honored by being named the State commander of the American Legion for Louisiana, an honor and a tribute which justifies my grasping this oportunity to introduce him to the entire membership of this body.

I saw Albert Labiche in Paris less than a fortnight after Germany had surrendered. Specifically it was a Sunday May 20, 1945 morning at the Hotel Rafel. This is what I wrote in my account of Europe immediately following the end of the war under the title of "I Went, I Saw, I Heard":

Albert Labiche came by and we had breakfast. He is going to have plenty to relate when he goes back to New Orleans.

When the war can make a tough, hard-boiled soldier out of a guy like Albert Labiche it can accomplish anything and there is little wonder that victory has come to us.

Carefree, gay, laughing—almost irresponsible, I have never known anybody Albert Labiche didn't like. Today I saw a hardened tough soldier who had 7 weeks in the front-lines at Aachen.

An American father of 2 children, drafted into the army when past the age of 30 and now a veteran of frontline action. That's the kind of stuff Americans are made of and the kind of stuff which wins wars for America, make no mistake about it.

That was written 10 years ago almost to the day, give a few days. That was 1945.

Now this is what the New Orleans Item wrote about Albert Labiche in an editorial only a few short days ago after he had been elected State Commander of the American Legion. This is 1955:

STATE VETS HONOR AL LABICHE, A NATURAL AS LEGION CHIEF

Albert V. Labiche is a natural for State commander of the American Legion, and the veterans who chose him at the convention in Alexandria on Sunday are to be commended.

A father of two daughters, now 21 and 19, Al went into World War II service as a buck private. He came out in 1945 as a staff sergeant with three battle stars, the combat infantry badge, and a purple heart (for shrapnel that ripped through his hand).

He fought in France, Belgium, and Holland, where he was wounded, as a doughboy in an armored division. Al was there.

On being mustered out, he became active in the Legion, helping organize the Arthur Scott post and serving on various State and national committees.

But his service to his community has extended to many other fields. He was a first-rate foreman of the Orleans Parish grand jury 2 years ago, in the very midst of the police uproar.

(In addition to its investigative work, the jury made two noteworthy recommendations: that police pay be raised and that a system be set up to provide overlapping service on grand juries so as to avoid the traditional break in continuity.)

Vice president of the store which bears the family name, Al Labiche is prominent in the community's business life.

He is a past president of the Radio and Television Association, a director of an insurance company and of a bank.

The kids of New Orleans know Al, too, for his ardent support of sandlot sports. This interest goes back to the days when Al, himself, was a star prep school fullback; a plucky one, too, who could run 106 yards for a touchdown—with a broken collarbone.

A believer in teamwork, a fine citizen, and a leader, Al Labiche will give the State Legion high-caliber service as its new commander.

Why Chinese Kids Don't Go Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Post, one of America's most effective liberal and crusading newspapers, has been publishing a series of articles on juvenile delinquency; and, as part of that series, several articles have appeared on Chinatown of New York, where the children do not "go bad," where they stay out of trouble, where their record is exceptional, as instanced by the fact that out of 7,700 delinquents in the Children's Court in New York City last year, only 9 were of Chinese ancestry.

It is a great satisfaction for me to submit these articles for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There have been many myths about Chinatown. Sensation seekers and writers of trashy fiction have done their worst to give Chinatown a bad name. The facts are quite the reverse of their sordid pictures. New York's Chinatown, while picturesque and colorful and worthy of a visit from the out-of-towner, is a community of Americans of Chinese descent, most of them citizens, possessed of a great tradition and with admirable human and social qualities. Its members follow a way of life that deserves to be known, applauded, and emulated. The sober virtues of respect for parents and teachers, of a stable and loving home life, of the desire to learn, and of peaceful adjustment are predominant in New York's Chinatown.

I am proud to be the Representative in Congress of the district that includes these fine men, women, and children:

[From the New York Post of July 11, 1955]

WHY CHINESE KIDS DON'T GO BAD

(By Henry Beckett)

Late on sunny afternoons the shadow of the huge Criminal Courts Building at 100 Centre Street falls across Chinatown children playing in Columbus Park, the only playground for Public School 23, their school.

But few of them will ever enter the building charged with crime. Out of 7,700 delinquents in Children's Court last year, only 9 were of Chinese ancestry.

The judges, police, welfare workers, and community leaders attribute this striking record to many factors, including ancient tradition, close neighborhood feeling, parental responsibility, and most of all to love in the home.

But they sometimes sum it up in one question and answer:

"How could they get into mischief? They don't have time."

That is because they attend two schools daily, in season, and help out at home more than most of the city's children do. Their loitering hours are few.

At Public School 23, Bayard and Mulberry Streets, children of Chinese ancestry make up about 85 percent of the nearly 400 pupils. Classes run through the sixth grade, so that the oldest pupils are about 12.

Attendance is above the Manhattan average and for months it may be as high as 97 percent of enrollment. Parents are so eager to have children learn that teachers have difficulty in getting them kept at home when they are ill.

PARENTS SET THE EXAMPLE

Some parents are studying in the school at the same time as their children. From 9 a. m. to 3 p. m., 4 days a week, there are 2 adult classes in English. A few mothers have their youngest children at their side. One little girl of 4 years has learned to read, by herself, in this way.

"Teaching is easy here," the principal, Marie K. Lelash, said, "because at home parents set an example in discipline and responsibility, train the children well, and teach them to tell the truth in all circumstances.

"Naturally, preaching doesn't mean much if children hear their parents tell little lies at home, in stores, in the daily round. In a Chinese household, children are important. Parents share their lives with them, have them help in shopping, take the laundry, assist in the father's business.

"These children are not on the streets at night. Their parents don't give the impression that they are glad to get rid of them, that they are indifferent, and the less seen of them the better."

THE CHILDREN POLICE THEMSELVES

Touring the old school building, in hard use for more than 60 years, Dr. Lelash noted that everything was spic and span and no walls had been defaced.

"If any child scribbled or rubbed paint on the wall," she said, "50 children would report it right away and would form a squad to clean it up. Pupils police one another. Patrols report if a child fails to wait for a green light at a street crossing. Names are taken.

"Once a child handed me a note reading like this: 'Please excuse my father for damaging my geography book. He left it on the radiator. He is willing to buy a new book. It won't happen again.' The father insisted upon paying.

"Tears rolled down a child's cheeks when he had done something naughty and I told him that I must write to his father. Children are taught not to fight. They understand that they are a minority group and will be noticed if they do not behave well."

Chinese children love to read and paint, Dr. Lelash observed. They fancy hot dogs and pizza pie and don't care for ice cream or sweets. They go for Hopalong Cassidy and Davy Crockett.

The school library was arranged to suit them, with an "artificial fireplace," and curtains their mothers made and still wash and iron. On holidays, parents give them money and the pupils of Public School 23 have had as much as $40,000 on deposit in a bank.

A PRINCIPAL'S 7 POINTS

About 200 children, or 20 percent of the total, are in Public School 130, Hester and Baxter Streets. As soon as the question of low juvenile delinquency among Chinese children was put up to him, the principal, Dr. Henry Seideman, sat down and with evident enjoyment wrote out what he considers the reasons for it.

The range in his school is from kindergarten to high school, and here are Dr. Seideman's seven points:

Stable home. Mothers don't go out to work as much as others.

Fathers have authority. Are in charge of home.

Feel responsible for their community. Have a small-town, family-close relatedness, feeling that they must uphold their neighbors' estimation of them, feeling that their neghbors' eyes are on them like an uncle's or aunt's.

Ambassador-at-large role. Feel a representative of their community, a model or ambassador by whose conduct their community is judged by others.

Natural, mature values. Unacceptance of cheap, get-rich-quick values. (Let's steal for a good time. Money is happiness.) They are rich because they don't set themselves superficial, Hollywoodish goals.

Real, not verbal, morality. No double standards between lipservice moral talk and actual adult ways. Pride in their reputation for honesty. No confusion of standards—church talk versus real adult fraud, cheapness, or evasion. (Credit given by wholesalers. Atmosphere of honest business.)

Security. Emotional, social. Belongingness, so important. (To the home. Do chores.) They are accepted and loved in their community. They are not rejected. While other children, belonging to the whole Nation, in reality may belong to nobody in particular, Chinese children have one whole community that loves them.

THEY ATTEND A SECOND SCHOOL

After attending the American public school or parochial school, most Chinese children go to what is called Chinese school.

One such school is financed by the Chinese Community Center in a one-time public-school building at 60–64 Mott Street. A drive is on now for $1 million for a new building to house both center and school.

The head of the school, Dr. Kenneth C. Chan, came from China 7 years ago. He expected to return, but the Communists took over, so he remained. He has a Ph. D. from New York University, and is editor of the China Journal.

"We have 170 pupils out of perhaps 600 attending all 3 Chinese schools," he said. "We have one American woman as a pupil, too. When public school is out, the children play in our building from 4 to 5 p. m., then attend classes from 5 to 7:10 p. m. We have nine Chinese teachers. They instruct in the Cantonese dialect, and we have a course in Mandarin. We also teach Chinese history and geography.

"We never spank a child. In case of misconduct we inform the parents and have the child copy maxims or stand in the corner. But we would expel any child who struck a teacher, because first of all we teach good citizenship."

The Church of the Transfiguration supports both a regular parochial school and a Kung Wa, or Chinese school. About 20 percent of the 357 pupils in the parochial school are Chinese, Father McLaughlin estimates. They have their regular schooling, 9 a. m. to 3 p. m., and then attend Chinese classes, 4 to 6 p. m.

THE KIDS AND THE COPS

The schools are administered by the Maryknoll Fathers and the Sisters. Some were missionaries in China until the Communists expelled them. Their present pupils, from first to eighth grade, come from Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens.

"In China today," says Father McLaughlin, "the Communists are trying to turn children against parents and have them spy on their elders and report. So the children are extolled as individuals and trained in a youth corps to betray their parents. Some have done so.

"The Communists want the state to predominate. Therefore the family must be

broken up. This has to be a clean break from the past, because for centuries parents have been judge and jury and to bring dishonor on parents is a crime, according to their philosophy."

Father McLaughlin mentioned the expressions "Sin King Lo Sz Sin," meaning "First revere one's teacher," and "Hau King Foo Mo," meaning "Revere father and mother," as central Chinese precepts. He had heard of a Hong Kong lad who hanged himself because he failed to get passing grades.

The Chinese attitude toward the police pleases Father McLaughlin:

"The boys walk up to policemen on the beat and shake hands. You see a policeman walking down the street holding the hand of a small boy. Gradually the police have grown to understand Chinese ways and grant liberties regarding firecrackers at holiday time."

SCHOOL WITHOUT A JANITOR

The Reverend Paul Chang is principal of the Chinese school of the True Light Lutheran Church, 195 Worth Street, the largest Chinese church in the United States, with 1,500 on the rolls.

"To them obedience is the first virtue, obedience to parents," says Chang. "Their concept of religion is different. If they profess it, they live by it.

"Although ancestor worship is gone, children respect their elders. They do not call parents by first names as many American children do. They heed advice of uncles and cousins. If pupils err, parents are informed and they do the punishing.

"We have a gymnasium and 17 basketball teams. Over weekends, students clean this 5-story building. We don't need a janitor. It is true that gambling has been a Chinese vice, but the younger generation is disgusted by it, knowing how families have been impoverished. And the Bowery, with its drunks, is so close that the young people have an object lesson alcohol as well."

[From the New York Post of July 12, 1955]

WHY CHINESE KIDS DON'T GO BAD—HOW PARENTS HELP CHINESE KIDS STAY OUT OF TROUBLE

(By Henry Beckett)

Parental example and pride play a key part in the good behavior of youth of Chinese ancestry—a group that rarely appears in court for delinquency.

"Parents set the example," says Kock-Gee Lee, president of the Chinese Benevolent Association. "They must do so if children are to remain uncorrupted by bad influences around them."

When children do well, Chinese parents feel that their own lives are being fulfilled and are not ashamed to show pride over it. The association's secretary, Louis Hong, broker at 120 Broadway, has this to say:

"I am the proud father of four. All are Columbia University graduates, all in the professions. One son is an economist, another an electrical engineer, the third a civil engineer, and my daughter is a chemist.

"Our offices and meeting hall in Chinatown are headquarters for all people of Chinese ancestry in Greater New York. Some 60 associations are affiliated. Most of them are family groups.

"If there are disputes that cannot be settled within the family associations, they come to us and we decide. It is gratifying that the conduct of our children is appreciated by the city. There are reasons for it:

"First, the teachings of Confucius, thousands of years ago, have great effect even today.

"Second, parents are more mindful of the welfare of their children than American parents ordinarily are. Fatherhood is taken more seriously, the father's duty is emphasized more.

"Third our aim is to make children become ladies and gentlemen, have good character, be dutiful citizens, and the Chinese schools guide their ethics and train them to know their obligation to society and to their country. As a child grows up, he is told that it is his duty to maintain a good family, in his turn, and to serve the general good.

"This must include respect for authority and the police first of all. It is understood that the police department is here to maintain order. Since most Chinese-Americans are law-abiding, they look on policemen not as persons to be feared but as friends and protectors.

"But you have asked me what I consider the solution to the juvenile delinquency problem and I must reply that it is parental example and guidance."

Among members of the Consolidated Benevolent Association are the On Leong Merchants Association and Hip Sing Association, whose bitter rivalry some years ago led to the worst of the so-called tong wars.

Dr. Chih Meng, director of China Institute in America, at 125 East 65th Street, suggests that an ancient Chinese concept which he calls "familyism" accounts for the conduct of Chinese children, as well as adults.

He remembers an English missionary's remark that in 53 years of work in a Chinese town of 30,000, where Dr. Meng himself was born, he had never heard of a crime of violence.

The China Institute in America furthers cultural relations between the United States and China and aids students in both countries.

Dr. Meng was a leader in the first Chinese student patriotic movement, has lectured widely on traditional Chinese ways, and is himself a descendant of Meng, the Chinese scholar known in the West as Mencius.

Mencius (372–289 B. C.) is China's foremost advocate of a democratic government and his teachings have influenced Chinese thought for 20 centuries. His attitude was that people are inately compassionate, not self-seeking, but that to practice virtue they need peace of mind and to have that they must have material well-being.

"Even a fist fight was rare in the town where I grew up," Dr. Meng says. "Life centered in the family and if any member of it did wrong the entire family was disgraced.

"In orthodox Christianity, the emphasis seems to be on a future life, on that kind of immortality.

"We think of immortality as coming through our descendants, so all Chinese want children. But if one of the children should commit murder, that immortality would be ruined.

"I was trained in that way, with a liking for the traditional Chinese compliment, 'May your family name remain fragrant for generations.'

"And the family tradition is carried on in the United States. The family is a financial unit, so that one has the obligation to assist any member of it, even to a cousin in the fifth degree. We have a kind of life and family and accident insurance, with all chipping in when necessary. The family is a real insurance company.

"In my own family there are 144 members. All turn for guidance to the head of the clan and in a just manner he reserves certain funds to aid what you call a weak sister, if need be.

"But frankly I am worried. Rapid change and the world situation lead to the breaking of these family ties, this close relationship, in the second and third generations of Chinese in America.

"I am in my fifties and my generation is all right and our children will be all right for a little while, but the environment and the school associations in New York are such that there is a breakdown in the home relationship and the mutual love needed between children and teacher.

"So I am much worried about the next generation of people of Chinese ancestry in this country. All of the money spent to stop juvenile delinquency, all of the expedients, higher paid teachers, and better buildings and recreational facilities—all of this will be futile unless family life is rehabilitated here."

Discussing Chinese family life, the president of the Public School 23 Parent-Teachers' Association remarks with approval that in a Chinese household the authority is more on the father's side, going back to grandparents.

She is Mrs. Grace Mok. Her father, Lee P. Lock, an importer, put 6 daughters through college and was gratified because 4 of them had Barnard scholarships. Her husband, Lam Mok, is with the Bank of China.

"With us," Mrs. Mok says, "parents are responsible for the way their children behave. There is no excuse for parents not to know what goes on. If there is no father, it is up to the father's uncle or brother or cousin to keep a child in line and pay for his education, if necessary.

"The Chinese have respect for learning. If correction is needed that is done privately, to save face and not hurt feelings. In all Chinese homes children are told that they must be good or the family will suffer disgrace.

"On the other hand, parents are praised if children do well. If Dr. Salk were one of us, everybody would be speaking well of his parents for having such a son and we would be proud of them.

"It isn't their money, it is the achievements of children that give parents standing. And if I, even at my age, did something wrong and got into the courts, Chinese people would be asking, 'Who's daughter is she?'"

[From the New York Post of July 13, 1955]

WHY CHINESE KIDS DON'T GO BAD—SPARE THE ROD, LOVE THE CHILD

(By Henry Beckett)

The Chinese child is loved in his home. He is appreciated; he is treated with the dignity that makes him feel he belongs, and this is a positive factor in contributing to his happy disposition.

It is this family love that has combined with discipline, obedience, and a dash of Confucian presecpts to keep Chinese-American youngsters at the bottom of the juvenile delinquency rate, in the opinion of people who have worked with them.

Miss Marian Lang, since 1937 in charge of the branch public library on East Broadway, says it this way:

"Long ago the Chinese discovered what some of our psychologists are emphasizing now, that children need plenty of love and affection.

"Parents and all older people treat the very smallest almost as pets, so that they feel loved and protected. But as soon as they are old enough for it, children are given responsibility. And anyone who thinks they are plain, placid, old-poker faces is wrong. If the like you and if they are stirred emotionally, well, you should see their faces light up."

If other children make noise in the library, Chinese children walk out, Miss Lang says, and the older children see that the younger ones are quiet.

Mrs. Beatrice Dunham, public-health nurse with the Community Service Society, 24 Pell Street, notes that there's a special reason, not flattering to this Nation, which may account in part for the warmth of the family life that turns out such children.

"For so long only the Chinese men could enter the United States. Women were excluded. That was a horrible thing to do."

So men left their families, came to America to earn more, and regularly sent money home to their wives in China, hoping for reunion someday.

"This is the only place where fathers take as active an interest in the home as mothers do. They are not afraid to do women's work. I have never seen anything like the way they dig in.

"And with their wonderful sense of humor, Chinese children have become the most popular of all at summer camps. It is a new experience for them and how they take to it.

"The police have nothing to do here. The Chinese know the art of living. When we first came to this section they knew nothing about community resources, but now they are the most responsive to health education of any people. They are self-directing.

"Children have so much fun in a Chinese home. Parents are kind to the little ones and I have yet to see a parent spank a child.

"As they grow up, the girls have a natural dignity, a kind of shy reticence that is genuine and very appealing."

Until recently, boys and girls were kept separate, outside the household. A girl did not shake hands with a boy and when some object was to be given him she placed it on a table.

Mrs. Moole Eng, another CSS nurse, observed that baby sitters are not needed in Chinatown:

"Parents take children and babies along with them to parties. There are parties to introduce the new baby, haircut parties, wedding feasts and on holidays Chinese people come to Chinatown from all over the city. It is their home community, a unifying, wholesome influence."

At the Mariners Temple, 3 Henry Street, the Reverend Joseph B. Palmer has been struck by the way older children look after the younger ones.

"When Chinese girls of 13 and 14 brought 6-year-old brothers and sisters to our parties, they were told that such small children were not invited.

" 'Then we can't come,' they said. Their parents were busy in laundry and store and someone had to look after the tots. So we arranged to accommodate them, too."

The Mariners Temple is 110 years old. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick did community work there in his student days and gained his fondness for the Chinese. It is a Baptist Church and the famous Riverside Church helps to support the manifold activities among the 13 nationality groups.

THE CHANGE FOR THE GOOD

Recently many Chinese-Americans have moved across Chatham Square from Chinatown proper, into the Mariners Temple precinct. Apparently their influence has not been bad.

"Ten years ago," the minister remarked, "this precinct was one of the city's most lawless. Now it is about the best."

Mrs. Irwin J. Cohen described the Chinese children as being better behaved than others when parents bring them to the law office of her husband, who formerly had a Chinese partner and has specialized in immigration and refugee problems.

"They are quiet as mice in the office," Mrs. Cohen declared. "Their elders are gentle, soft-spoken, rarely on relief. They do not like to be seen in court. And they stick together. Over in Dover, N. J., there are three households, including in-laws, sharing one home, eating and working together.

"In the past, gambling has been the traditional Chinese vice, but the big gamblers were mainly seamen, without wives, on shore leave."

Dr. Tan Chi-ming, executive secretary of the Chinese Community Center, who came here from Canton in 1948, points out that although three Chinese boys were arrested for disorderly conduct in the Chinatown precinct last year, all were acquitted.

"It was only mischief," he said, "but that was enough to cause parents to lose face, a punishment they can't bear. When a child goes wrong there is a family conference. The family is the unit. If the wrong continues, he is expelled from the group and none will accept him."

"Too many American parents have failed to guide and discipline youth," says Raymond Wu, the first Chinese to sell $1 million insurance for the New York Life.

"And life seems to have no constructive meaning for too many young Americans. Chinese elders, in fact the entire community, hold parents to account if children go wrong."

P. H. Chang, Chinese consul general adds, "Before a Chinese child makes a move, he stops to think what the reaction on his parents will be. Will they be proud or ashamed?"

Wayne Wu, editor of a forth coming Freedom Daily, in both English and Chinese, attributes Chinese child behavior to heredity, culture, and environment:

"When young people see that their elders care only for a good time, and are not interested in the general welfare, they are not likely to respect them. Chinatown youth is fortunate in not being subjected to so much bad American influence."

"Chinatown is the only area in the city that has this strong home discipline," insists the Reverend Stephen Murany, Church of the Sea and Land. The building, at 61 Henry Street, is shared by the Chinese Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Sun Yat-sen, founder of modern China, wrote the new nation's constitution on Chinese Presbyterian premises here, when he was a young student.

A spokesman for the Chinese Christian Center, 21 Pell Street, said that the church is dedicated to "mutual understanding of parents and youth, both confused by the customs of a strange land."

This understanding exists in Chinatown, he adds, and it accounts for what the children do.

But Americans closest to the people of Chinese ancestry feel that understanding and appreciation of their virtues in this country has been too slow.

It was only 11 years ago that a Chinese physician became an American citizen, the first in this area to achieve naturalized citizenship through repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act.

It was only 4 years ago that Thomas H. Lee, brother of the late Shong Lee, mayor of Chinatown, became the first New Yorker of Chinese descent to receive an important political appointment. He was made an assistant United States attorney.

But in 1951, also, William S. Y. Wang, 18, who began his American life as a dishwasher, received a Columbia University scholarship established by Sou Chan, restaurateur, "because America has been good to me."

And in 1952, Mrs. Toy Len Goon, mother of eight, and herself a laundry owner, was honored as Maine's mother of the year.

I'M A SINISTER CHINESE—MY NAME'S FU MANCHU

One American who has tried to help his fellow countrymen understand the Chinese is Carl Glick, author of Shake Hands With the Dragon, and he says it's well to remember that the Chinese have a rougish, insatiable sense of humor.

For awhile, as Church of All Nations athletic director, Glick was in despair, feeling that the Chinese boys didn't like him. But they admired his patience and were trying him out.

"I'm a sinister Chinese," was the deadpan greeting of one of them one day. "My name's Fu Manchu. What's your name?"

"Jesse James," Glick retorted.

Although Chinese authorities believe that Sax Rohmer's imaginary Chinese villain, Fu Manchu, has made life much harder for the Chinese here, the young Chinese could be ironic about it.

Glick, now so close to many of the city's 40,000 residents of Chinese ancestry that children have been named for him, quotes a father's plea to a court:

"Kindly send me to prison for a long term in place of my unknowing son. I am at fault. I have lost much face. I thank you."

The boy of 10 had only stayed away from school a couple of days and there was no penalty.

OPIUM AND THE CHINESE

Perhaps the most common misconception that still afflicts the Chinese is the one that makes them out to be opium smokers.

"Social education and happier circumstances have almost stopped what opium smoking there was," says a prominent citizen of Chinese origin. "And the Chinese have always been the victims of outsiders in this regard.

"Remember that it was the British who introduced opium to China. They, and more recently, the Japanese, used it deliberately to demoralize the Chinese.

"In this country the lonely Chinese, separated from their families and persecuted by Americans who didn't try to understand them, took to opium to forget and to win temporary bliss. That developed after the 1882 exclusion laws stopped immigration."

Both Americans and Chinese who know most about it agree that residents of Chinese ancestry are a growing American asset precisely because they are able to be themselves.

The real Confucius has said:

"When the heart is set right then the personal life is cultivated, when personal life is cultivated, then the family life is regulated; when the family life is regulated, then the national life is orderly; when the national life is orderly, then there is peace in the world."

[From the New York Post of July 14, 1955]

WHY CHINESE KIDS DON'T GO BAD—THE CHINESE IN NEW YORK

(By Henry Beckett)

Sightseers on a guided tour of Chinatown walk warily through the crooked streets, wondering where the opium dens are and asking whether it is safe to go into the shops with their bright jumble of Oriental wares.

They want to believe that they are adventuring into a place of mystery and evil and the guide seldom disillusions them. Patrolmen, overhearing lurid spiels about tong wars, drugs, and white slavery, sometimes suggest that the guide mix some fact with his fiction.

"Chinatown is safer than Park Avenue," says Lt. William Nevins of the Fifth Detective Squad, Elizabeth Street station. "We never get a case of juvenile delinquency. It's because they have a happy home life. And there's no such thing as a youth gang here."

But romantic legend, dating from the time of the tong wars, dies hard. And not all who believe Chinatown is a dark place of depravity are out-of-town tourists, eager to believe the worst of New York.

Recently an acquaintance spoke with apologetic hesitancy of Mrs. Beatrice Dunham, public health nurse with the Community Service Society. Her office is at 24 Pell Street.

"I don't want to insult you even by asking," he said, "but somebody told me that you work with the Chinese in Chinatown. Is that so?"

He said that as if it must mean, if true, that Mrs. Dunham was connected with something illegal.

Quiet influences, along with the march of history, have made it possible for the Chinese in New York and other cities to be

themselves and to grow out of a bad situation not of their own making.

The tongs, for example, developed in the United States, not China, for the protection of Chinese men who could turn only to one another.

"The first Chinese coming to this country," explained Dr. Chih Meng, director of China Institute in America, 125 East 65th Street, "were brought over as laborers in the western mines and on the transcontinental railways.

"European immigrants did not like them because they were different and would work for almost nothing. They had to. So the Europeans mobbed the Chinese, burned their wretched huts, killed them. In nine Western States the Chinese were leading a very unhappy life.

"In the eighties they organized the tongs to fight back. Drifting east, not even knowing their ABC's, with no way to make a living except as laundrymen and in running restaurants, they had to live together.

"They competed with one another for the best locations. One would muscle in early, another would try to scare him off and occasionally a gun would be used. Then as the struggle became worse racketeers were hired and there was real warefare."

GROWTH OF THE TONGS

A detailed account of the tongs was given in 1930 in a speech by Eddie Gong, president of the Hip Sing Tong, then a bitter rival of the On Leong Tong.

It was the first time a member of the so-called Chinese secret societies had ever discussed them publicly and he likened them, in origin, to American vigilantes.

"The tongs," he said, "had their beginning in the same spirit of justice in freedom that moved the Americans of 1776 to throw off the oppression of an unjust ruler.

"In the early days of California the immigrants were grouped by families. The big oppressed the small, who could not appeal to the law of the land and were subject to race prejudice. They could present grievances only through interpreters who were invariably on the side of the rich oppressors.

"The tongs spread all over the United States to maintain justice. They became business associations, with counsel. But bad traditions developed and tong executives have not yet solved the mystery to bring an end to what your newspapers call tong wars.

"We have not yet been able to find out why, when a member of one tong is injured by a member of another tong, it is not a matter of individuals, but every member of the injured man's tong goes on the warpath looking for vengeance, seeking it from every member of the other tong.

"What you may never have heard is this: When an atrocious crime is committed within the circle of membership of one tong there is a trial within the tong, leading to a verdict and appropriate punishment.

"In time, perhaps, we will be able to persuade our members to take that verdict to the city and to the courts for ratification. I hope so.

"What are we doing to abolish tong wars?

"We have established the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, a court of arbitration. I believe that today, with this court, the Hip Sing Tong and the On Leong Tong—at present our friends—are great influences for good in this community."

But Eddie Gong was premature. Six months after he spoke, police seized pistols, an ax, knives and four men, leaders in a scheme to recruit gunmen from the unemployed approached in city parks. Recruits were offered $500 apiece for dead Chinese of a hostile tong. Seven were marked for death.

Three days later, when a fusillade of bullets wounded 4 of 30 tongmen playing pool, Eddie Gong himself told police it was a deliberate attempt to kill as many members of the rival tong as possible.

Fear of wholesale deportations prevented more extensive tong warfare in 1930. Influential leaders reminded tong members of what happened in 1925.

Then, after 60 killings in 5 States, 1,200 Chinese were rounded up, 264 deported, and there were threats to raze the Chinese settlements in several cities.

Even so, in those 5 years, there were intermittent flareups. The strife continued in 1928 although a Chinese Consul General wired 40 tong headquarters, ordering that it stop.

In 1 case, 4 men had been killed and nearly a dozen wounded, all because 2 members of a family, belonging to different tongs, disputed over a debt and 1 killed the other.

Those tong encounters were really written up, too. This is from one story about that slaying:

"Around the edge of the door appeared a face. It was pale with a cold, ruthless hatred. The lips, displaying one gold eyetooth, were set in a mocking grin. And the black, menacing eyes sought and held the eyes of Wong Chun. The song of the Seven Petals was abruptly stopped."

[From the New York Post of July 15, 1955]

WHY CHINESE KIDS DON'T GO BAD—HOW CHINATOWN HAS CHANGED

(By Henry Beckett)

Only 25 years ago Chinatown was the city's problem community, with its not infrequent tong conflicts, it gambling, its traffic in narcotics—all exaggerated by the press.

Now police call it the most law-abiding of all and Americans who know are saying that its children set a fine example for children throughout the metropolitan area.

The change has come gradually, as a result of better treatment by citizens in general, growth in understanding, economic depression, the war between Japan and China and World War II.

For too long it was the fashion to make fun of the Chinese or depict them as a cruel, sinister people. Coney Island wax exhibits showed Chinese figures smoking opium and indulging in torture and public executions.

As a new tong war threatened, in 1931, this is the way a newspaper described the situation:

"Dark figures are darting mysteriously from drab doorways, grim and sardonic faces peer from shuttered windows, mysterious signals flash from hithter to yon."

With rival tongs denouncing and perhaps slandering one another, some Americans were ready to believe the worst. Killers were reported as taking terrible oaths, putting this curse on themselves in case of failure:

"And if I go to the mountains I will be bitten by bears and torn by fiery horses, if I go to the sea I will be drowned."

In 1931 the two most powerful tongs had conventions, simultaneously, in Chinatown. At a Chinese Theater party police frisked 200 men hanging around. On three they found loaded pistols.

After 3 killings in 3 weeks in 1933, police called on Federal authorities for help. The United States attorney called in the tong secretaries, told them that he was investigating narcotics and immigration violations and they would have to bring in their tong books. That worried the Chinese more than the simple deportation proceedings in earlier years.

A peace treaty was signed pledging the tongs "to maintain peace and quiet and to engage in no acts of lawlessness from this day on" and to submit disputes to the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, as well as to public officials.

That was for United States authorities. Another peace treaty was signed at the behest of the Chinese consul general.

THE TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS

Nothing deserving the name of tong war has broken out since 1933, but the Government has had to cope with a Chinese narcotics traffic.

A Government agent, planting a story about a rich uncle wishing to make a lot more in narcotics, managed to get initiated into a tong. He got the facts, there was a quite drive, 23 were arrested and a former tong president and 16 members were indicted.

"It meant," the press reported, "collapse of an alliance between the underworld of the Orient and the West that had monopolized the annual $1 million trade."

A few days later, agents found opium smoker in back rooms of tenements on Ludlow, Elizabeth, Mulberry, Rivington, and Madison Streets. White string soaked in heroin was selling at $1 an inch. Chewing heroin, that was. Same for a heroin-soaked letter.

LIKE REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

Faith in the tong peace was shown by the absence of a heavy police detail when 1 of the 2 rival tongs held a convention. Nine years before, 200 police were on guard, but in 1941, 1 patrolman had little to do but look at a street banner bearing words in English and Chinese and urging Chinatown to buy war bonds.

"We meet just as the Elks do," a secretary insisted, "and talk over relief for China and aid to the Red Cross. We used to have parades and things like that, but we cut it out because of the war. Now, since the Japanese attack, we help one another. It is just like Republicans and Democrats."

In another instance that year, at a minute before midnight, on the final day for income-tax payments, a Chinese girl took a position at the cash-payment window and went on talking, keeping the window open, while a huddle of Chinese men grew in the corridor.

Scarcely any of them needed to pay a tax, but they filed returns, paying a total of $1,600. It was explained that no Chinese could enter his club until he could show that he had paid a tax.

Such incidents, indicating a growing awareness of American citizenship and a desire to aid a government—their own—which also was coming to the rescue of the land of their forefathers, occurred more and more often.

By 1946 the Chinese who had been a police problem were complaining that the police were a problem to them. One of their leaders charged a reign of police terror through arrests without warrant.

Magistrate Kross backed him up, saying that hundreds of Chinese were brought into night court every Monday after unwarranted raids. Mah Jong was the offense, disorderly conduct the charge.

POLICE RAIDS CRITICIZED

"I send them home," she remarked.

"For years," a Chinese benevolent society spokesman said, "police have had the habit of walking into private Chinese homes without warrants. If the Chinese refuse to open, the door is broken. Most of the fear is because the Chinese do not understand English."

One Chinese editor added that "police invade homes at all hours," and another said that in their ignorance the Chinese did not know the police were breaking the law when they did that.

At the same time, young non-Chinese hoodlums were attacking Chinese in and near Chinatown and with the victims not even reporting it, because they did not epxect protection. It was estimated that in 6 months there had been at least 400 incidents of the kind.

The latest threat of tong war was 5 years ago. One Chinese man in Brooklyn killed another and then took his own life, following a fight over transfer of a Raleigh, N. C., restaurant. Police conferred with the Chinese consulate and tong executives. This was the edict of the late Shavey Lee, "mayor of Chinatown":

"Any tong conflict will be obstructed and opposed by the Chinese here, who want wartime unity continued. We live in the American way and will settle our differences in the American way. There won't ever be another tong war here."

And still Chinatown is not perfect. As recently as last August, police broke up a $1 million lottery ring and confiscated hundreds of thousands of pay slips and much equipment.

Eight-Hour Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, recently the public has been fed a steady diet of statements and news items, originating with the majority party, which purport to show that the majority party will have passed into legislation most of the administration's program before this session of Congress adjourns.

Pardon me if I have a few reservations. For example, on April 20 I introduced a bill, H. R. 5758, which would revise and replace the present group of complicated, overlapping and ambiguous statutes known as the 8-hour laws, with a single general hours law. No action whatsoever has been taken on this bill.

Under the provisions of the present set of 8-hour laws, some of which have not been changed since the last century, contractors on Government jobs have been free to work their employees seven 8-hour days—56 hours—in a week without paying them overtime compensation. Other contractors have adopted the standard 40-hour week, established by Congress for Federal employment, and for work covered by the Federal wage-hour law and the Public Contracts Act, in their collective bargaining agreements with the unions representing their employees. They pay overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 40 in the week. Thus, some contractors suffer an unfair competitive disadvantage when bidding for Federal contracts.

One of the 8-hour statutes permits employers to work their employees more than 8 hours a day if they pay time and one-half for the extra hours. The courts and the Comptroller General, however, have taken different views as to whether the present language of the law also gives the employees who work overtime the right to collect the overtime pay if the employer fails to pay it.

Even a casual glance at the laws as they exist today will convince anyone of their utter inadequacy. The Federal Government should set an example in good employment practices on projects proposed under Federal programs. As long as these archaic laws are on the books, we may set an example, but it won't always be a good one.

H. R. 5758 would eliminate the confusion and correct the abuses stemming from the present set of laws by doing the following things: First, it would replace the text of the present 8-hour laws with improved provisions; second, it would cover not only direct Government contracts, but also contracts for work financed in whole or in part with Federal assistance; and third, it would provide in addition to the present standard work day of 8 hours, a standard work week of 40 hours with not less than time and one-half pay for overtime work.

The bill is part of the President's program—the same program for which the majority party is claiming so much credit. How many here are against a 40-hour week for employees on Government contracts? How many here are for a set of outmoded laws which permit some operators to work their employees overtime without paying the standard compensation? How many here are willing to say that they are against a law which would help do away with unfair competition in the bidding of Government contracts? Does anybody on the majority side of the House disagree with the contention that the Federal Government should have a law which states clearly that workers on Government contracts must be paid overtime compensation for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek?

At the present time, the bill lies uselessly in the files of this body's Education and Labor Committee. Apparently, the majority party considers the bill unimportant. It is a small thing, this business of giving workers a 40-hour week. It would hardly cause a ripple of publicity. Social security and personal income tax reduction are far greater attention-getters.

During next year's campaign, I hope that a few of the majority party's candidates drop by the sites of Government projects which may be located in their home districts. Drop by when Saturday or Sunday work is being performed, and ask the workers if they consider the bill important. Perhaps, then, we will get some action.

Secretary Shapiro Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared on July 26 in the Temple Daily Telegram, of Temple, Tex., lauding the program and policies of the Honorable Harry Shapiro, secretary of welfare for the State of Pennsylvania.

For many years it has been my privilege to know Harry Shapiro. He is a man of integrity, ability and large experience. As the Temple Daily Telegram editorial points out, Mr. Shapiro worked hard in his youth, building these values which come from industrious application and earnest effort. Later he obtained a fine education and became a practicing member of the bar. As a lawyer, a Philadelphia lawyer, if you please, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shapiro was an outstanding success. His interest in the public welfare prompted him to engage in politics and for 12 years he served with distinction in the Pennsylvania Senate.

Along the line, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shapiro became interested in the problems and welfare of the mentally ill. With characteristic thoroughness he plunged into this subject and his own kinship with humanity served him admirably as he delved into this subject. It was typical of Harry Shapiro that he was not just a theorist in the matter, but he went out and got first-hand information and then was resolved to do something about it. Last January when Governor-Elect George Leader took over the office of Governor of Pennsylvania he surrounded himself with an excellent cabinet, men of character, all of whom were highly qualified for their respective posts. It was the Governor's good fortune to enlist the services of Harry Shapiro as secretary of welfare.

That Secretary Shapiro is justifying the Governor's confidence in him is amply borne out, Mr. Speaker, in the wide, favorable attention the Shapiro program for Pennsylvania's mentally ill is attracting. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the question of mental illness is one of the most challenging questions of our times and that any contribution to its solution is indeed a national blessing. Harry Shapiro's fellow Pennsylvanians, without regard to partisan affiliation, are delighted therefore that he is getting on with his program for the mentally ill in such a way that all of America is aware of what is being done in this field in the Keystone State. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to ask unanimous consent to have this editorial from the great State of Texas inserted in the RECORD acclaiming, as it does, one of Pennsylvania's first citizens and one of humanity's benefactors.

The editorial follows:

ONE STATE, AT LEAST, DOING MUCH TO IMPROVE MENTAL INSTITUTIONS

Human progress, since the beginning of man, has been an unending relay race. In each succeeding generation, the best minds have passed on to the most promising of the upcoming youngsters the torch of understanding and the injunction to carry it further.

Many years ago as an impressionable youth, Harry Shapiro, a Philadelphia Jewish boy read a Catholic priest's story of the life of Dorothea Dix, a Protestant nurse who devoted her life to improving the miserable lot of the mentally ill. When she started her great work, she found the mentally deranged chained like animals in foul dungeons. By the time her work and her life ended, almost simultaneously, the world was beginning to understand that insanity is sickness, and not the wrath of God visited on the unworthy.

Young Shapiro, who had left school at the age of 10 to earn his way in the world, and who was then working in a paperbox factory, made up his mind he would somehow carry on Miss Dix's gallant crusade. Years later, after he had made his fortune, gone back to school to study law and was well on his way to a brilliant professional career, he accepted membership on various hospital boards and the presidency of a hospital with this early ambition in mind. Still later, for 12 years in the Pennsylvania Senate, he

fought tirelessly for improved care for the mentally ill.

Last year, Pennsylvania's Democratic Governor George M. Leader gave Harry Shapiro his big chance, appointed him secretary for welfare. Immediately Shapiro began putting his long-nurtured plans to work. Unheralded inspections of State hospitals uncovered some deplorable conditions, resulted in instant dismissals. Partisan politics was banned in the department. Efficient, dedicated, hospital superintendents, whom Shapiro found to be in the majority, were retained regardless of their politics, and given added authority to meet their responsibilities. While he made it plain there were no roosts in his department for party hacks and the faithful, he has asked for higher salaries all along the line to attract the qualified, experienced people he wants. He has gathered together the best medical brains of the State into an advisory committee and needled medical colleges and hospitals into research and training programs on mental illness. He is establishing outpatient departments and following through on discharged patients in line with his theory that sick minds, too, can largely be cured.

Harry Shapiro's program is costing Pennsylvania taxpayers some money, but he's getting results, and they seem to like it. His projection of the Dix crusade in his own State has only begun, but it seems safe to say that when Harry Shapiro is ready to pass on the lamp of inspired leadership that lights his way, worthy hands will be ready to receive it. Maybe we should invite him to Texas to inspire our efforts.

Beet Sugar Industry Very Important to California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, I made a short speech entitled "Excellent Food With Low Caloric Content Now Available to Everyone." This statement illustrated the ingenuity of American industry. It was not intended, directly or indirectly, to cast any reflection on the beneficial uses of sugar and especially its importance as an energy-producing food necessary to the health and vigor of all normal persons.

Sugar is a tremendously important part of the normal diet. Its production is an important American industry. As the Representative of the people of one of California's foremost beet sugar-producing districts, I am, and long have been, well aware of these facts.

During my seven terms in the House of Representatives, I have been fully aware of the importance of the beet sugar industry. For 10 years, I had 4 sugar refineries in my congressional district—third. Following the redistricting after the census of 1950, my district has been the 11th and it contains two sugar refineries; the Spreckels Sugar Co. at Manteca, and the Holly Sugar Corp. at Tracy, both successful and prosperous plants.

When consideration is given to the fact that 85 to 90 percent of all food taken into the body is used for energy expenditure, the importance of carbohydrates—particularly sugar—is evident. These are the quick energy foods which play an important role as intermediates in protein manufacture as well as in the growth process.

The production of sugar in the United States is a major industry. In California, the income to sugar beet farmers from their 1954 crop alone amounted to more than $65 million. Payrolls in our 11 California beet sugar processing factories amounted to an additional $13 million. Our beet sugar industry, one of the most important consumers of natural gas in California, paid gas companies in excess of $3 million last year, and more than $8½ million was received by the railroads from our California beet sugar industry. Exclusive of Federal taxes, expenditures of the industry reached the very significant total of $100 million in California in 1954.

This year, more than 170,000 acres of sugar beets are being grown in 34 counties of California.

This year we are writing a sugar bill. I believe I can modestly say that I had a part in getting the Rules Committee to reverse its stand, and consent to put out a rule to make the sugar bill in order.

I have a vivid recollection of how in 1920 when I was married, my bride paid 32 cents a pound for sugar. Later, a Sugar Act was enacted and at no time since we have had a Sugar Act, has the price risen above 8.5 cents a pound.

All during my congressional career I have given complete support to the beet sugar industry and to the legislation pertaining to the industry, and expect to continue to do so.

United States Drops Cotton Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, disturbing indeed is the announcement by the United States Department of Agriculture canceling plans to place 8 million bales of Government owned surplus cotton on the world market at competitive prices.

We find ourselves in a situation where we have virtually forced our farmers out of the world market by a parity price program which bottles up our agricultural produce in our own country. It is the only farm program we have and I have supported it. But it is based on a mistaken philosophy which can only take our farmers out of the world market and eventually out of the American market also. There is little future for the American farmer today under the present price support program whether fixed or flexible. He produces much more than we can consume at home and he has little access to world markets. The United States Department of Agriculture had aroused hopes that at long last it was awakening to the gravity of this situation and that it would take steps to meet it. Now those hopes are dashed as the department resumes its long slumber. I include herein an article by Mr. Aubrey Graves on the Government's announcement:

UNITED STATES DROPS COTTON PLAN
(By Aubrey Graves)

Opposition by other Administration agencies has forced the Department of Agriculture to cancel its plans to place eight million bales of Government-owned surplus cotton on the world market at "competitive prices."

The President's Council of Foreign Economic Policy and the State Department threw the successful block. Other cotton-growing countries have been vigorously protesting this Government's impending move to "dump" its surplus stocks.

CFEP and State are understood to have convinced the President that to proceed in the face of their attitude would damage international relations when crucial diplomatic negotiations are underway.

Foreign producers have been steadily taking over former United States cotton markets through the simple device of pegging their prices just under the Government-supported United States price.

Withdrawal of the USDA plan means that this country will enter the 1955–56 cotton marketing year, beginning August 1, with the old one-price system for foreign and domestic sales still in effect. As a result, foreign growers will retain their hold on former United States markets, while our surplus fiber continues to pile up.

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson announced last May his intention to make an export policy statement "well in advance" of August 1. Such a statement was actually drawn up 10 days ago, but never released. It was to have announced an export subsidy for United States growers, which would have enabled them to sell their staple abroad at a lower price.

Explanation of H. R. 3600 and H. R. 3601, Relating to Budgetary and Fiscal Matters of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there has long been a critical need for the Congress to know to what extend the taxpayer has been committed to expenditures annually, over long periods of time. Prudent management of governmental affairs would appear to require at the time of consideration of each legislative proposal, the availability of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed over the period of its operation or if such legislation will be effective for move than 5 years, over the first 5-year period of its operation.

On February 3, 1955, I introduced two bills, H. R. 3600 and H. R. 3601 relating to the budgetary and fiscal matters of our Government.

The committees to which these bills were referred have not held hearings on the bills, and I believe that it was most

unfortunate that they were not considered during the first session of the 84th Congress. I respectfully urge that they be given consideration as soon as possible after the reconvening of the Congress in its second session next year.

H. R. 3600 requires that estimates of cost be included in committee reports on proposed legislation which authorizes an appropriation. The estimate of costs shall cover the life of the operation, or a five-year period if that is shorter. Estimates will be made by the department or other agency concerned, and reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget at request of the congressional committee which reports the bill. The problem of keeping the information sufficiently current to guide Congress in extension of programs and enactment of new programs is the subject of H. R. 3601. That bill proposes to require incorporation in the Budget of "a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress." This special analysis would show estimated total cost, and information about cost in both priod and subsequent years.

The bills would provide an increased amount of information of a sort that now is available in departmental proposals of legislation and in the budget. In the present budget estimates of the cost of proposed legislation are included in chapter summaries. Estimates for civil functions, Army, appear at page 613; and for Health, Education, and Welfare, at page 669. In a few earlier budgets, e. g., 1950 and 1951, the estimated costs of all proposed legislation were tabulated at the end of the President's Budget Message. The programs for which estimates appeared were described in more detail than in budgets subsequent to that for 1951. The estimates are deficient, from the standpoint of H. R. 3600, in referring only to 1 year. This deficiency is crucial if a program is expanding.

The public works programs are summarized in a special analysis in current budgets. Information shows estimated total cost, costs to date, and projected costs to complete the works. That analysis shows the name of the program or agency—Corps of Engineers, Reclamation, TVA, Veterans' Hospitals, Air Navigation facilities, grants in aid and kind of work—continuing, new projects, new features. Information is shown for the 1956 program, both authorized and proposed. The special analysis required by H. R. 3601 would include estimates of amounts for each of 5 years, in addition to data now provided, and presumably would require data to be shown for each project—which is now shown in the current special analysis.

The requirement in H. R. 3600 that cost estimates be made for all authorizations of appropriations would end indefinite authorizations. Of the 78 acts of the 2d session of the 83d Congress in which appropriations were authorized, 36 were indefinite in amount. Among them was Public Law 768, establishing insurance and other benefits for Federal employees. Definite amounts were authorized in 42 of the acts. Appropriations were made for 17 of the acts, including 4 for which authorizations were indefinite. Appropriations were made in 4 instances for only a portion of programs which are likely to continue 5 years or more.

The provisions of H. R. 3600 would not prevent year to year authorization of continuing programs such as ECA and MSA. The bill requires only that estimates be made for the period authorized unless it exceeds 5 years. The bill does not alter the content of authorizing legislation, but only requires definite financial statements in relevant reports. The adaptability of authorizations to current needs, and the bargaining strength gained by limiting commitments to 1 year, would not be impaired by this bill.

The additional information contained in reports is expected to make some substantial changes in what is authorized. Positive benefits would be obtained. The availability of cost estimates covering a period of years for each program authorized would enable the Congress to exercise better control over appropriations and expenditures, and better control over the civil benefits programs and the impact on industry of defense—protection—expenditures. The biggest and most difficult problem of controlling expenditures could be kept in sight of all the Congress by the reports prepared under these bills. The biggest problem is to control the number of programs and magnitude of responsibilities under those programs, for which money will be spent. The economies available through deciding not to enact a program, or through enacting a program of modest size, dwarf the economies that can be attained through such actions as replacing two GS–5 clerks with one GS–7, or other trimming of administrative costs. Statements of the cost of a program over its life or over a 5 year period would help the legislative branch to make a continually up-to-date approximation of the total of expenditures in future years, of the needs for revenue in those years, and of the portion of the Budget on which expenditures can be reduced without breaking commitments established by law.

The schedules of expenditures for construction and for armaments programs would enable the Congress to formulate a better estimate of when the industries included will be drawn on. A better picture of the effect of programs on the entire economy would be presented, and the economic feasibility of civil-benefits programs—grants-in-aid, air, farm, and other subsidy programs—could be better estimated if the demands of the programs were better known.

The substance of H. R. 3600 has passed the Senate in earlier Congresses. During the 82d Congress, S. 913 was passed. It was supported also by Frederick J. Lawton when he was Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In his remarks on a proposed Joint Committee on the Budget, he stated that—

> Still more important is the review of the fiscal effects—the effects upon following budgets—of authorizing legislation which is introduced and considered at any given session of Congress. Such a review is at present beyond the purview of the Appropriations Committees or any other single committee in either House. It would seem fundamental that in appraising the soundness of pending legislation from the standpoint of public policy, the Congress should do so with a knowledge of its effect upon future fiscal policies. * * *
>
> Large segments of the Federal budget are required by authorizing legislation. * * * To illustrate the effect which such authorizing legislation produces upon the budget, * * * the 1952 budget, excluding the military programs which represent more than half of the budget, include more than $7.5 billion in expenditures to meet the requirements of legislation enacted by the 80th and 81st Congresses alone. * * *
>
> Some authorizing legislation makes certain expenditures mandatory, as in the cases of the Federal-aid highway program. Still other authorizing legislation makes available permanent appropriations sometimes without regard to the need for these moneys in any single budget year, as in the case of the permanent appropriation of an amount equal to 30 percent of the customs' receipts for expenditure on certain agricultural programs.

The bill H. R. 3600 provides that reviewing of the departmental cost estimates by the Bureau of the Budget may be requested by the committee reporting a bill. The Bureau presumably will have passed on the estimates before the agency has transmitted them to Congress. Its review will extend to a legislative committee aid of the sort which it has given over the year to committees on appropriations.

I would respectfully urge prompt and careful consideration of these bills upon the convening of the second session of this Congress.

History of State Fair of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the July 29 issue of the White Sulphur Sentinel, a very fine weekly newspaper published in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., included a most interesting article entitled "History of State Fair of West Virginia."

Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD and at the same time extend an invitation to any Member of the House or Senate who may have an opportunity to stop by Greenbrier County between August 22 and 27 to enjoy this most delightful affair in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress:

HISTORY OF STATE FAIR OF WEST VIRGINIA

For a century and a half fairs have been the annual relaxation for America's farmers, a natural time for exhilaration, friendly competition, and reward for the best of the crops—and another growing season ended. Today it is a different story. Both farmer and city dweller meet at booming harvest festivals that entertain and educate an estimated 85 million visitors a year.

The giant State fair is at Dallas, Tex., which 2 years ago had an attendance rec-

ord of 2,382,712 during its exposition period.

Each year more than 2,000 county, State, and regional fairs occur across the United States. California, with 58 counties, stages more than 70 fairs; the Los Angeles County Fair at Pomona is the second largest fair in the country in attendance. In the east, industrial Ohio and and Pennsylvania both hold about 100 rural fairs.

The amazing statistic is: That half the population of the United States attend fairs. All this began with harvest celebrations and market fairs in both the new and old worlds. Their ancestry traces back to Old Testament times and the writings of the prophet Ezekiel.

West Virginia's first State fair was established at Wheeeling in Ohio County, in 1881, and after a number of years—to about 1930—the Northern Panhandle exposition ground was taken over for use as a professional race track, and since operated as Wheeling Downs.

The great Greenbrier Valley Fair, organized in the early 1920's in Greenbrier County, a phenomenal success from the beginning, grew rapidly and was an exposition of State fair stature long before it was designated by an act of the legislature in 1941 as the State Fair of West Virginia.

This year, from Monday noon, August 22 through Saturday night August 27, the once famous regional fair will run its 31st year of operation—the young, growing, reestablished State fair of West Virginia—an exposition equalled by few and surpassed by no other State fair in the east for its quality and excellence of exhibits.

The State fair is representative of the 55 counties of West Virginia. It is also the competitive ground for surrounding States—a place to assemble the best in livestock and agriculture, and permit the best to win. More than $40,000 will be distributed in prize awards and purses at West Virginia's 1955 State fair, located in Greenbrief County, midway between Lewisburg and Ronceverte.

The entertainment program of this year's fair is the biggest and finest ever assembled. A top feature is again the appearance of State high school bands, majorettes, and performers—a different community music organization each day of fair week.

Official Actions of Howard I. Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1955 there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 8752 to 8761, what purports to be a summary of a Government Accounting Office report of the official actions of Howard I. Young while serving as Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency from September 1951 to May 1953.

This summary and statements of certain members of the other body cast a reflection upon the character and integrity of Mr. Young and have been given wide publicity in the newspapers and other public relations media. As is frequently the case, the wide publicity is being used to produce certain political ends, in this instance to effect legislation which will limit the use of businessmen in Government during periods of emergencies or otherwise. At least the political aspects of the matter have been limited to specific legislation rather than partisan politics, inasmuch as a democratic administration was involved with a Republican acting as Deputy Administrator.

This limitation, however, is hardly a comforting thought to the individual whose reputation has been affected.

Contrary to all concepts of American justice or good congressional investigatory procedure to get at the bottom of facts, the gentleman whose official actions were the subject of the alleged investigation and inquiry was never consulted or asked to throw light on the matters sought to be clarified before the publicity ensued.

I know the gentleman involved personally over a period of years. I know the excellent reputation he bears in his community for honesty and integrity. He is a person whom the term "public spirited" aptly fits, and the community and I know him as such.

The matter of Howard Young's official actions, of course, are matters for public scrutiny. He knows that and is among the first to insist that they do be scrutinized and that this principle be always followed in regard to actions of all public officials.

Because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been used to present one aspect of the matters at hand, I am inserting into the RECORD a statement of John F. Lane on behalf of Howard I. Young before the Joint Committee on Defense Production July 27, 1955. I only wish the reporting fraternity would be as zealous in reporting rebuttals as they are in reporting charges. So often charges appear on page one under banner headlines and rebuttals and retractions appear in the back pages.

I don't know how much Mr. Campbell, the Comptroller General, is responsible for this deplorable matter. Certainly he is responsible for the basic errors already admitted by him to exist in his office's report, not mere "technical differences," as he is reported to have referred to them. Although from the knowledge I have of Mr. Young's integrity and ability and the brief review I have made of the charges and rebuttal, I am satisfied that Mr. Young will establish beyond a question of doubt his integrity and good judgment, I am not going to say that the investigation made by the GAO was uncalled for or was not properly conducted. I think it might have been, although it is difficult to see why at some stage it was not deemed important to question Mr. Young about the matters. I make this statement on the assumption that the publicity given to this matter was not done with either the consent or the connivance of the GAO. Possibly the actions of the congressional committee going into these matters were within the realm of proper procedures, provided again that the publicity given to the matter was not done either with the consent or connivance of the committee.

However, one thing is quite clear. Someone on the committee or on the committee staff was guilty of a gross error in "leaking" unsubstantiated charges to the press. If the committee wishes to protect its fair name, I suggest it be zealous in getting to the bottom of this matter and do something about it and properly publicize it.

When all is said and done and the facts have been sifted from rumors and hearsay I am hopeful that those who have made unfounded charges will realize the importance of admitting with the widest publicity possible that the charges were unfounded. I am referring to charges made against Mr. Campbell and the GAO just as much as I am referring to charges made against Mr. Young. Let's have an end to this hit and run smearing that has been going on for so many years.

Since writing the above, certain matters have already become apparent. In two specific and basic instances the GAO has admitted its facts were in error, and yet these specific instances bore directly upon the character and integrity of Mr. Young, if indeed they did not suggest criminality. There are only two other specific and basic matters in the summarized report of the GAO inserted in the record by a Member of the other body which specifically reflect upon the integrity of Mr. Young. Both of these specific matters have been clearly contradicted by Mr. Young in his statement which was placed in the RECORD by a Member of the other body. They are matters which are subject to outside proof and can be readily determined. One, I have checked for myself and I find Mr. Young's version accurate, the GAO version inaccurate. The other should likewise be easy to verify and undoubtedly has been verified, I suspect, in Mr. Young's favor inasmuch as I have not seen it reiterated by the GAO representatives.

Of course, once the specific charges have been disproven, all the general charges fall of their own weight. It is the general charges, however, which are the most serious and most damning. Left with unproven generalities, if he is, the Comptroller General should waste no time in clearing the air and admitting his errors.

The matter has now gone beyond the case of Mr. Young, however. The charges against the GAO set out in Mr. Lane's statement must be carefully examined into. If, indeed, the GAO selected Mr. Young to illustrate a point in order to get through specific legislation, it has gone considerably beyond its authority and the purposes for which it was created. Indeed, it loses its usefulness to the Congress if it has been guilty of selecting an individual "as a case example to provide the Congress with material upon which to decide legislative policy," as alleged by Mr. Lane in his statement and has indulged in the techniques and tactics alleged in Mr. Lane's statement.

I am sending a copy of these remarks to the Comptroller General of the United States with an accompanying letter asking him to comment upon the charges made against his organization and perforce against himself in his official capacity. I am certain that he recognizes

these charges are so serious that if proven, and done with his knowledge or knowledge attributed to him, his resignation is indicated.

STATEMENT OF JOHN F. LANE ON BEHALF OF HOWARD I. YOUNG BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION, JULY 27, 1955

At the adjournment of this committee's hearings on July 14, the committee requested that we meet with the representatives of the General Accounting Office for the purpose of reconciling the discrepancies between statements made in their report of investigations as to Mr. Howard I. Young and to Mr. Young's testimony before this committee.

We wish to inform the committee that we have sought in the utmost good faith to comply with the request. Our discussions began in the committee room immediately after adjournment of the last hearing and have continued up to this time. We have met with GAO on 4 occasions in the intervening period and on 2 of these occasions Mr. Young was present. I was present on all occasions. Our discussions involved approximately 18.5 hours of time and 60.5 man-hours. During this period, any and all readily available information and materials that GAO has requested of us has been made available to them and we have made it plain that any facts or information within our knowledge was at their disposal. We have also sought to demonstrate to them a number of the errors of omission and commission in their report as it relates to Mr. Young personally.

Nevertheless, in spite of these earnest efports on our part we regret to have to report to the committee that the purpose of these talks has not been accomplished. We must further report to the committee that in our considered judgment, this reconciliation effort between Mr. Young and the General Accounting Office cannot be expected to prove helpful to this committee and in our opinion is grievously unfair to Mr. Young. Our reasons for this conclusion include the following:

1. Our talks with GAO representatives have provided us with no evidence that they are interested in an impartial and unbiased determination of facts. On the contrary, since Mr. Young challenged the GAO report before this committee, it has seemed clear to us that the principal, if not the sole, effort of the GAO has been to justify its report rather than to find out all of the true facts bearing upon its erroneous and misleading allegations respecting Mr. Young's activities, which, of course, should have been fully determined by them in the first place. This, we believe, has been demonstrated in part by:

(a) Their sharp challenge and extensive investigation throughout the country of all information and data favorable to Mr. Young which tended to refute passages of their report submitted to this committee or directly to them.

(b) Their decision to neither accept nor reject for inclusion in their report new subject matter which favored Mr. Young (for example, the Hoffman letter and the facts respecting the capacity of operation of American Zinc smelters, both of which are of record before this committee).

2. We were astounded to be told that Mr. Young, because of his outstanding prominence in the mining industry, because of his presidency of the Mining Congress of 23 years, and because of his retention of presidency of the American Zinc Co. while he occupied a Government position, was selected as a case example to provide the Congress with material upon which to decide legislative policy as to businessmen in Government. We were not informed that Mr. Young was so picked as a "guinea pig" after all the facts were in, nor after their impartial ascertainment and after unbiased conclusions from all available facts were submitted to the Congress. Moreover, we derive the strong impression that the GAO people concerned with this report feel that it is wrong per se for businessmen to take Government positions on the ground that a "conflict of interests" is inevitable. Hence, these people who are fully conscious of their position as an arm of the Congress—and not of the executive department—in effect conduct their own crusade and their own powerful lobby to have businessmen legislated out of Government.

3. The clear and convincing evidence these talks provided that the report of investigation was not only ill-conceived and biased but incomplete. Thus,

(a) It was readily admitted that responsible present and former DMPA and GSA officials with accurate knowledge of the facts had not been contacted (though listed in the report). But this was thought to be justified on the basis of GAO's usual practice of having the report reviewed by the agency concerned before release. In this case we were told, as indeed was testified to before this committee, that the General Counsel, the Comptroller of GSA, and his assistant reviewed and approved this report. Thus, despite the fact that these gentlemen, however knowledgeable about the fiscal and legal procedures of the agency, would necessarily have little if any direct knowledge concerning Mr. Young's activities, the activities of the American Zinc Co., the activities of the contractors involved, and numerous other factual matters, their review and alleged approval appears to be relied upon by GAO to justify not only as to its assertion of facts but also its conclusions.

(b) When we informed the GAO that it was to the advantage of the Government and its contractors to have the concentrates involved in these contracts smeltered at East St. Louis, they immediately dispatched numerous investigators from their many regional offices to ascertain whether our allegations could be undermined. For example, they contacted smelters in Blackwell and Bartlesville, Okla., and reported to us information acquired there which initially, at least, seemed to modify our assertion. But they failed to inform us concerning similar contacts made by their investigators at other smelters which seem to corroborate our assertion.

(c) Rather than accept the corroborating statements of the alleged buyer and seller of $60,000 of equipment from American Zinc (an allegation of their report which was false) the GAO has resisted retracting their false statement which has seriously defamed Mr. Young from the 15th day of July to date. In the meantime, numerous investigators have been checking upon the sale of equipment issue. For example, the Western Machinery Co. (the secretary of which, I believe, is in the room today as he happens to be in Washington) has since July 15 been visited by no less than 3 teams of 2 investigators each. This in itself is significant but that is not all. These investigators have been interested not only in inquiring as to the facts of the alleged sale but apparently in order to retrieve something of GAO's position have been seeking to establish either a direct financial interest by American Zinc in Western Machinery or such a substantial business relationship between the two companies as no doubt to warrant an inference as to American Zinc influence. We have had similar reports of additional recent intensive investigations seemingly intended to discover information detrimental to Howard I. Young. As a further example, the American Cyanamid Co. in New York was so plagued by antagonistic investigators completely lacking in technical knowledge asking questions obviously designed to prejudice Mr. Young that the company had to object.

4. The patent unfairness to Mr. Young not only through taking extended periods out of his busy workdays but also through an effort to shift the burden of proof as to GAO's erroneous, unsupported or misleading statements to Mr. Young. This was made clear when we were informed that Mr. Young's testimony before this committee and the information that he had provided GAO after some 14 hours of discussion was not adequate to treat of various additional allegations made as to him in the GAO reports. We were informed that a list of these allegations, approximately 50 to 60 in number, would be submitted to us for comment.

5. The collective bargaining nature of GAO's ultimate proposal on Friday of last week after we had been requesting almost daily from July 15 that the GAO retract its defamatory statements respecting the alleged sale of equipment by American Zinc. At that time GAO formally proposed that as a result of a conference that morning with the Comptroller General, the Comptroller General would consider a statement to this and other committees correcting the report as to the sale of equipment and freight rates issues but on the condition that Mr. Young would retract two statements that he had made to this committee. This was explained to us to be a "2 for 2" basis, that is, 2 for you and 2 for us. One of the statements of Mr. Young to this committee requires no retraction and as to the other, the transcript was clarified by Mr. Young's letter to the chairman of July 20.

Mr. Young accordingly yesterday formally advised Mr. Ellis that the proposal was unsatisfactory and requested that the Comptroller General provide him with a prompt decision as to his willingness to fully and unmistakenly retract the admittedly erroneous GAO statements in its report respecting the alleged sale of equipment and to correct the inaccurate and misleading information provided by GAO as to the alleged disadvantageous freight rates to the Government and its contractors attributable to utilization of American Zinc smelter at East St. Louis. A copy of this statement is presented for the record of the committee.

6. Our own analysis of the GAO report, delivered to us at the request of this committee on July 14, indicates that the erroneous, misleading, and unsupported statements of the report are so numerous as to defy reconciliation with any agency operating in a climate as above prescribed. There is submitted for the record of the committee a numerical summary of these statements. We believe, that as to Mr. Young there are 21 erroneous statements, 12 misleading statements, and 34 unsupported statements in the GAO report.

7. We have also been shocked at the surprisingly militant—if not vicious—attack on Mr. Young personally by Mr. Ellis in the executive sessions of the Banking and Currency Committee and of this committee. We do not believe that the role thus assumed by Mr. Ellis is an appropriate one for an objective investigator for the Congress. And we cannot refrain from pointing out the marked differences in his attitude as revealed by the transcripts as between those committee sessions when Messrs. Young and Larson were not present and the session at which they confronted him.

It seems to us that this matter raises extremely important policy considerations for this committee, for the Congress and for GAO. These would include:

1. Does the Congress intend its own agency, the GAO, to provide it with reliable, accurate and supportable reports as a basis for its determination of important legislative policy?

2. Does the Congress intend that the appropriations it provides for the General Accounting Office shall be utilized to the extent here evidenced to hound and harass a

citizen, to defame his character, to have his name dragged in the mud by sensational newspaper publicity, to attack his character, to affect his relations with his industry and with his Government, when his only offense is that he is an honest businessman doing a nortoriously successful job for his Government?

3. To what extent does the Congress of the United States wants its administrative arm, the General Acounting Office, to be unbiased, to be impartial in its reports of findings of fact? And to what extent does it wish its instrument to be crusaders seeking to impress upon the Congress ideologies and philosophies which in the last analysis it is for the Congress to determine as a matter of legislative policy under our Constitution? And finally, does the Congress wish it to be known throughout the land that no honest businessman can come into Government to do a job for his country without running the risk of personal persecution and assassination from the General Accounting Office?

We believe these to be among all the important and vital questions raised before this committee. We conclude by making three requests of this committee:

1. That we be relieved of any further obligation to this committee to discuss the GAO report with the GAO.

2. That the committee direct the Comptroller General to withdraw all copies of his report on the grounds that its erroneous, misleading inferences, inaccuracies and lack of completeness fully warrant the conclusion that it should not have been issued in the first place.

3. That this committee suggest to the Comptroller General that an apology to Mr. Young now appears to be entirely in order.

Raw Cotton Export Program and Cotton Textiles and Apparel Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to include the following letter and memorandum I have received from Mr. William F. Sullivan, president, Northern Textile Association, Boston, Mass., on the matter of cotton export and textile import policy:

NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., July 29, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: We understand that Senator GEORGE has invited you and other Congressmen from textile States to a conference at the White House on next Monday on the matter of cotton export and textile import policy.

This matter is of importance to our New England cotton textile mills which already face severe competition from Japan and other countries. A policy which would grant cheaper cotton to our foreign competitors would greatly aggravate this problem unless coupled with a quota restriction on imports.

Enclosed is a brief memorandum of the issue involved. Your interest and assistance in connection with this problem will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

BILL SULLIVAN.

RAW COTTON EXPORT PROGRAM AND COTTON TEXTILES AND APPAREL IMPORTS

As a result of the United States cotton price support program, domestic cotton is priced above the world market and is rapidly losing its world competitive position. As stocks accumulate in this country the problem of disposing of 5 to 6 million bales to other than the domestic consumers becomes acute.

The Department of Agriculture has been attempting to work out a disposal program, and it has been consistently rumored that serious consideration was being given to selling American cotton in the world market at prices below those paid by domestic mills. If such a two price system were adopted, it would result in a further increase in imports of cotton textiles, displacing American workers and displacing cotton which American farmers would otherwise sell to domestic mills.

The present low tariffs and the new concessions granted to Japan at Geneva, effective September 10, 1955, will undoubtedly cause serious injury to the domestic cotton textile mills. Domestic mills which cannot presently compete because of the wage differentials with Japanese mills could not conceivably compete against a raw material differential as well.

United States mills are the principle market for United States cotton. Japan, on the other hand, buys two-thirds of its cotton from sources other than the United States. The substitution of Japanese textiles for American textiles in the American market hurts both worker and farmer alike.

If farmers are to have the opportunity to maintain their fair share of the world market without destroying their home market and American workers are to keep their jobs, it is essential that there be established an integrated program. Under such a program cotton could be sold in the world market at competitive prices and an import quota be established on cotton textiles and apparel under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This would give foreign exporters a share of the United States market on a historical basis and at the same time provide a measure of protection for United States workers and mills against unemployment caused by textile imports.

With the low duties which have already been established for Japanese cotton textiles, we believe that quotas on imports from Japan should be established regardless of cotton export policy. But if United States cotton should be sold to our foreign competitors at prices lower than we are required to pay, adequate quota proection against imports must be provided simultaneously to avoid serious unemployment and distress in the United States.

What's Behind That Smile?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, Thursday, July 28, 1955. The writer discusses the current attitude of cordiality on the part of the Russians and its possible effects upon the free world.

The article follows:

REDS' "CORDIALITY BLITZ" WORKS—FALSE SOVIET SMILES ARE WEAKENING WESTERN FIRMNESS ON ASIAN ISSUES

(By Constantine Brown)

The "cordiality blitz" of the Kremlin apparently is paying even richer dividends than the Russians hoped for. Without yielding 1 inch from their past position, without giving a single tangible proof of their alleged sincerity—as President Eisenhower had demanded earlier—the Russians have launched the free world, particularly the United States, on a good-will binge.

The fact, for instance, that Mr. Eisenhower's Monday night broadcast to the Nation was published in full in the Moscow newspapers is taken as an indication that the Kremlin wolves mean to live in friendliness with the Western sheep. The fact that a number of Soviet farmers headed by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture are behaving like human beings in their visit to Iowa farms, is taken as another sign that the Reds are ready to bury their hatchet (and not in our skulls). Some newspapers in this country have actually waxed lyric over the fact that the Soviet Embassy at Washington has dispatched one of its attachés, accompanied by a number of pounds of that costly delicacy caviar (better known in American rural areas as fish eggs) to be consumed in the homes of American hosts. The old bromide circulated during the wartime honeymoon with the Kremlin that Russians are just like Americans, only they speak a different language, has been revived. The tyrannical domination of the masses by the Kremlin elite is being as much overlooked now as it was then, when Stalin ran roughshod over allies and enemies alike.

Yet nothing has happened at Geneva, in the U. S. S. R. and in the captive Eastern European states, to justify the present orgy of optimism, which begins to worry our own leaders.

At no time, either at the conference table in Geneva or in the pleasant gatherings of the delegates before a well-laden buffet, have the men in the Kremlin given the slightest indication that they want to deal the cards above the table. President Eisenhower's dramatic inspection proposals have never been answered by the Reds, either officially or in private. According to those present in Geneva, Mr. Eisenhower was convinced that he had put the Russians in a box whence they could get out only by giving at least lip service to his sincere proposals. This they did not do.

The covering of the Kremlin men's faces with a friendly mask is now affecting our far-eastern policies. Heretofore we have maintained a policy in the Pacific which, while occasionally wavering, was by and large adequate and in keeping with our major security interests. The fundamental principle of that policy was that so long as the Peiping regime continued to flout all accepted tenets of international law and continued its gangster behavior, we would have no truck with it.

Nothing was done by the men in Peiping to offset our previous views of them. Yet, probably as a result of some private conversations at Geneva, we decided to meet the Chinese Communists first at an "ambassadorial level" and later, possibly, at a higher level to discuss not only the releasing of American captives in Communist China but also a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait, where there has been no real fighting since 1949. Chiang Kai-shek was "leashed" by President Truman in 1950, "unleashed" by President Eisenhower in 1953, "released" in 1954 and ordered to watch with his arms crossed the tremendous buildup of our enemies in Fukien Province. Whatever shooting there was in that area was done as a retaliation to the Reds. According to the best information, the price the men in Peiping will ask for the

illusory cease-fire will be the surrender of the offshore islands. We are in the mood to accept the price for the sake of relaxation of world tension.

Top officials in the administration have indicated very recently that since the Red "blitz of cordiality," the American people in their opinion will strongly oppose our supporting with air and naval power a Nationalist resistance in those islands. Hence, they say, if the surrender of Quemoy and Matsu can appease the Chinese Communists and cause them to behave in the future, why not let them have these two gateways to Formosa?

The same logic was followed 17 years ago by France and Great Britain when they forced their loyal ally, Czechoslovakia, to turn over to Hitler the Sudetenland. Prime Minister Chamberlain and Premier Daladier also were peace-minded and hopeful that by satisfying Hitler's "last" demands for a union between the Sudeten Germans with the Reich, they would achieve their "peace in our time" objectives.

Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD an address which was delivered by me over 33 Ohio radio stations on July 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This has been one of the biggest months in recent history for news, and I am glad to discuss it with the folks back home. Whether we look at the recent Geneva Conference optimistically or pessimistically, it has given the world a clear picture of its leaders. We have watched them under fire and we have seen how they act. By any standard, our President emerged from Geneva as the No. 1 figure on the international scene. What is more important, he demonstrated the basic strength of our free Republic. The Soviet delegation did not report to the people whom they represented. They did not consult with congressional leaders. They were not concerned with the opinions of the men and women back home. President Eisenhower was. He consulted Congress before Geneva. He reported to us during the Conference, and we know what was done. Whatever he did, whatever he said at Geneva was done and said with deep concern for its effect upon the people of our country.

Our President made a tremendous impression upon world opinion through his conduct. They saw a constitutional leader at work. I regard this as a great gain. There is a serious and strange defect in our country's public relations. People in other countries do not believe that life can be as good as it is here. The nations of Asia and central Europe are so accustomed to a meager existence that they cannot grasp the richness of American living standards. They have equal difficulty in realizing that the leaders of our Republic represent our people instead of controlling them. President Eisenhower has gone a long way toward convincing them that our system really works.

I do not believe that we made any historic strides toward ending the conflict between East and West over the conference table at Geneva.

Our differences are too fundamental to be resolved by the exchange of ideas. The Communist ideology is based upon a set of economic theories and political conclusions which the Western World will always reject. I oppose the Communist viewpoint from its dialectric materialism to its Cominform strategy. But we should understand one truth in this second half of the 20th century. There have always been conflicting viewpoints on Government and economics in our world. It does not necessarily follow that we must go to war because we differ. Our country did not fight the Russian Czars although we disagreed violently with their tyranny. We did not go to war with any European nation until we were attacked.

What we must do in this generation is to prevent the Communists from imposing their way of life upon those who do not want it. As of this moment, no country has ever adopted communism by a vote of its people. They never will.

Our policy is simple. This is our approach. When the Russians understand that we are determined to prevent aggression and subversion wherever we find them, they will stop the cold war.

As of this moment, I believe that this policy has proven its validity. There is one great achievement which did come out of the Geneva Conference. We ended the name-calling game started by the Soviet Union and resumed the use of civil terms in public affairs.

This in itself was a victory, because the use of every conference for propaganda purposes is the complete denial of diplomacy. Propaganda is part of the cold war. Diplomacy is at least an approach to peace. It offers no guaranties, but opens the door. We do not have any illusions on the subject of world peace.

We have established a strong line with our Western allies. There is every reason to believe that for years to come, Western Europe will work at our side. We are doing our utmost to win new friends all over the world. The Conference of Asiatic and African Nations at Bandung this spring proved that we are doing better than the Russians. President Eisenhower's work at Geneva added new stature to our efforts. We are refilling that great reservoir of good will toward Americans which was once a tremendous asset of our Republic.

What this means in terms of foreign affairs is easy to understand. At the end of World War II, the Soviet Union was riding high in the saddle. Its influence was sweeping over Asia. So-called intellectuals were spreading the rotten apple theory all over Washington. They said that Russia had everything to gain and nothing to lose in Europe—it was all going to fall into the hands of the Communists like a rotten apple dropping off a tree. We have been growing better apples. Thanks to President Eisenhower we went to Geneva in a powerful position.

For once we went to an international conference leading from strength. After the Second World War, we allowed our military forces to disintegrate. We scrapped our guns and rushed back to normal living, while the Soviet Union kept its army intact and its powder dry. As a result, we found ourselves on the defensive in Korea. The Russians took advantage of our public statements to try for a knockout in Asia. We could not save free China, but we have served notice that we are going to save everything else that is threatened from Moscow.

At Geneva, President Eisenhower was in command of the situation. Bulganin and company knew that, for once, the men across the table were just as strong—and probably lots stronger—than themselves. If we have ever learned a lesson the hard way, this should be it. From now on, we must never permit ourselves the luxury of unpreparedness. We must be ready, willing, and able to meet the challenges of history, whenever, wherever, and however they may arise.

These are important developments in our world problems. We shall be facing some others of equal importance in the weeks to come. When Congress closes its books and goes home after more than 7 months of continuous sessions, there will still be plenty of unfinished business before the Nation. Legislation often works in stages. Congress will pass a law, but no one will know exactly how it may affect our country for some time to come. We must often wait and see.

One of the bills that has disturbed many people is the military Reserve program. Some folks insist that it is an entering wedge for universal military training. I am certain that the overwhelming majority of Congress is opposed to universal military training in any shape, form, or manner. We have made it clear on a dozen occasions that such legislation could not pass. What Congress is trying to do is to establish a system which will assure our country of a trained body of young men who can be called upon in an emergency. No one wants our sons and daughters to be exposed to the risks of war. We certainly do not want them exposed to war twice in their lifetime. That is exactly what happened to thousands of young men during the Korean war. Young fathers, young businessmen, families just getting started in normal living were recalled for military duty in Korea. We do not want that to happen again. I hope that our program will make it possible to train a strong nucleus of volunteers for Regular Army service. They must be backed by others who are part of our Reserve forces. Certainly, every American must realize the need for a powerful Military Establishment in these troubled times. We must never deplete our strength again to a point where our weakness invites attack. We must never permit our people to believe that we can buy preparedness without pain, or prevent war without preparation.

This session of the 84th Congress has a mixed record of accomplishments and failures. The Democratic majority found itself in the position of adopting a Republican program for the most part. It has not balanced the Federal budget. It has not cut taxes. It has not thought through the important job of cutting down waste and extravagance in the structure of our Federal Government.

These are items on the agenda for the future. We must do our best to bring them to pass when the next session takes place. I cannot exaggerate the feeling of frustration that grips so many Americans when we seek action in Washington. Businessmen find it impossible to obtain fast, reliable information. Departments shift responsibility for the handling of contracts. Things often get done despite red tape, not because of it. Yet, at the same time, we understand the need to protect Uncle Sam from unwise spending or hasty action. There are ways and means of ending much of this confusion. The Commissions that have studied these problems have made some down-to-earth recommendations. If we act upon them, we shall go a long way toward solving some of the big money problems that face our people.

I look forward to the next few weeks. They will provide me with an opportunity to talk face to face with thousands of people who do not come to Washington, who do not write letters, but who are deeply concerned with our country. I hope to see them at county fairs, in their home communities, and to learn their views. Nothing offers a better assurance for the future well-being of

our Nation than the free expression of public opinion.

In the meantime, my standing rule is still in effect. If there is any way in which I can be of help, a letter to Senator GEORGE H. BENDER, Washington, D. C., always opens the door to my office for every public service.

Simon E. Sobeloff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to Hon. Simon E. Sobeloff, who has just been nominated for membership on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

Maryland is proud of Simon E. Sobeloff. The Free State has sent many talented members of the bar to Federal service, among them William Pinkney, Roger Brooke Taney, and Reverdy Johnson.

The contribution these men made to the Government of the United States is well known and their influence on the law of this land was great. They brought distinction to themselves and to their State. Simon E. Sobeloff, who has been nominated by the President as a member of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, lives in that great tradition.

His philosophy as the attorney for the Government is that the best interests of the United States is served when justice is done. Such a concept is in keeping with that of the Honorable Morris Soper, the distinguished jurist whom Mr. Sobeloff is nominated to replace.

The career of Simon Sobeloff is exceptionally well known to all Marylanders. He was born in Baltimore, educated in our public schools, and graduated from the University of Maryland Law School in 1915.

As a member of the bar he earned the respect and admiration of the best lawyers and judges in our State.

As a Baltimorean and a Marylander he earned the gratitude of our people by his devoted public service.

Long before he held any public position he was known as a civic leader whose advice and counsel was readily available for any worthy cause.

Such an enviable reputation made him a man much sought after by other men in public office. His services were called upon by mayors of Baltimore city and governors of our State.

The present Governor of Maryland has paid Simon Sobeloff a great tribute by remarking that he is "a man who goes forth to meet the situations that are fraught with danger and calmly sets them aright before they acquire the statures of crises."

Simon Sobeloff has never failed the people of Maryland. As a public official and as a private citizen he has shown himself to be a man devoted to the common good.

He has served as solicitor of Baltimore city, chairman of the Commission on Administrative Organization of Maryland's Government, as Chief Judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals.

Our State was honored and proud of his appointment as Solicitor General of the United States.

In that office he has served his Government and the people of the United States well, and brought additional distinction to his name and to his native State.

I am not a lawyer, but I have heard his work as Solicitor General praised by outstanding members of the legal profession, and I know him as a man with a great understanding of people's problems, and as a man who possesses a rare and gifted sense of judgment.

Now, as Solicitor General it was Mr. Sobeloff's duty to present the Government's argument before the Supreme Court as to how that Court's historic decision on segregation in public schools should be implemented.

There are those with strong personal feelings on this subject who appear to hold Solicitor General Sobeloff responsible for the Court's original decision. The fact is that Mr. Sobeloff was not in office when the original case was argued, and his presentation to the Court was the position of the Executive Department as to how the desegregation decree could best be implemented in the interests of all the people of the United States.

It was his duty to place before the Supreme Court the view of the Government, as it was the duty of other attorneys to advocate the recommendations of other interested friends of the Court.

Mr. Sobeloff, knowing the situation in the South and believing in the essential justice of the Supreme Court's decision, argued for a decree which would carry out the intent of the Court and yet not radically disrupt the public school system in those areas where segregation had long existed.

The brief Mr. Sobeloff presented demonstrates his wisdom, and is ample proof of his qualifications for membership on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. Those who are "investigating" his qualifications would do well to read that brief and then join in confirming his nomination before this session of Congress adjourns.

I personally regret the delay on this nomination and I urge the committee to hold a prompt hearing and report the nomination to the Senate so that we may confirm Mr. Sobeloff.

Revision of Alien Property Disposal Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in regard to the proposed revision of existing law having to do with the disposal of alien property.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1955.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States supports the proposed revision of existing law with regard to disposal of alien property contained in S. 1405 and in section 4 of your bill, S. 2227, both of which are now before the Committee on the Judiciary.

We believe that the proposed amendment will materially aid in accomplishing what we hold to be a desirable aim, namely, the sale to American citizens at competitive bidding of alien property still held by the Office of Alien Property, with the proceeds to be paid into the United States Treasury.

We would appreciate being notified in advance of any hearings scheduled on the above bills as we would like to have the opportunity to present our views.

Cordially,

CLARENCE R. MILES.

The Lawyer's Part in Plans for Peace and Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Lawyer's Part in Plans for Peace and Disarmament," delivered by Charles S. Rhyne, a member of the District of Columbia Bar and president of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAWYER'S PART IN PLANS FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

(Address by Charles S. Rhyne before the annual convention of the Minnesota State Bar Association, St. Paul, Minn.)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate the invitation to speak to your great Bar Association. For years I have heard of your outstanding work. It is good to see you in action.

My subject today is the lawyer's part in the search for peace. But before discussing that subject, I would like to say that I feel that I am among "home folks" today. For the past few weeks I have been working with very wonderful people from your twin cities on one of the great current controversies in Washington, the controversy over exemption from Federal regulatory control of sales for resale in interstate commerce by natural gas producers and whether or not consumers are entitled to protection from price gouging. Mayor Joseph E. Dillon, of St. Paul; Mayor Eric G. Hoyer, of Minneapolis; Attorney General Miles Lord, City Attorney Charles E. Sawyer, of Minneapolis; Corporation Counsel Marshall F. Hurley, of St. Paul, and Patrick L. Farnand, counsel for your local gas distribution company have all made great contributions on the side of consumers. They opposed legislation to scuttle the so-called Phillips Petroleum Co. decision of the Supreme Court last year—a case in which I participated in the argument. Lawyerlike, I mention it because I was on the winning side.

For many years Bill Gibson, Morris Mitchell, Sidney Gislason, Ivan Bowen, John Burke, Bert McKasy, Cliff Gardner, John Palmer, Mike Galvin, Ruben Thoreen, and many of your other great leaders in American Bar Association activities and I have worked together. Morris Mitchell and I also worked

together on the program for an increase in salaries of the Federal judiciary and Members of the Congress, Morris as chairman of the committee of the ABA, and I as general counsel of the commission on judicial and congressional salaries. As a member of the ABA's regional meetings committee, I put Bill Gibson and his coworkers on notice that we expect the greatest regional meeting in all American Bar Association history here next October when the northwest regional meeting takes place.

You Minnesota lawyers have made great contributions in the public relations field. I had the pleasure of personally going with some of your high-school essay contest winners to visit the Chief Justice of the United States in 1949. And how appropriate your topic for those young people of "Why Freedom Depends Upon Government Under Law" is to my thesis of today. Your distribution of 420,000 pamphlets on law and lawyers during the past year is an amazing performance. I salute you for your good work and consider this most promising ground in which to sow the seed, or sell the idea, which I am here today to present.

My subject can be considered as an idea for an affirmative public relations program for the organized bar in the world of today, when related to the responsibility of lawyers to provide leadership in formulating public opinion on the great issues which are before our people. This is a responsibility of lawyers to the public that is unique and different from that of the members of any other profession. By training and tradition, lawyers have from the creation of our Nation performed this essential duty. In recent years we have been failing somewhat in our duty and the people are looking for leadership to business and labor leaders, organized pressure groups, and elsewhere.

We are now experiencing one of the strongest urges in all world history toward peace and disarmament and away from war. The headlines out of Washington—San Francisco this week—and from all over the world, herald the dramatic recent developments in the search for an ending of current world tensions. We are told that from this day forward a peaceful world is the only hope for the survival of mankind. With the prospect of atomic war destroying all civilization, machinery to create and maintain a peaceful world by preventing war is our last surviving hope. From the early pages of history we learn that many disarmament-peace proposals to achieve such a goal have been placed before the people of the world. But never has the carrying out of such a plan been more essential to the survival of the human race. Nor have the people of the world ever been more alert to such a need. This situation offers a great challenge, a great opportunity, and many dangers.

That is why I ask you today to consider with me the lawyer's part in this search for peace.

As lawyers we should go out on the very fringes, the frontiers, of the formation of public opinion and help educate our people in what to seek, and what to expect, in current discussions and conferences on peace and disarmament. The uncertainty of the present situation can only disappear when the possible results are analyzed and realized. Hysteria and fear based upon misconceptions must not be the lot of our people. By performing the task of discussion, analysis and clarification, lawyers can do a great service. By allowing our people to think the problem is easy, by allowing them to expect too much too soon, we may place our leaders in untenable positions, and our people may easily fall into the propaganda traps which the Communists are undoubtedly preparing for us.

The emphasis in the great current international debate is upon statement and counterstatement, diplomatic maneuvers for positions of advantage propagandawise, all preparatory to the Big Four and other impending conferences. So far little has been said about the fact that if an enduring peace plus disarmament is ever to be achieved, there must be a foundation of some legal framework wherein international disputes are settled under legal principles rather than by war. The current discussions relative to inspection and alarm systems, as a prelude to gradual reduction in armament, have not made this point clear. I propose that you, as lawyers, should remind our people that disarmament discussions may be mere words, fluctuating with national leadership changes, unless such a legal foundation is created for permanent peace.

I do not for one moment pose as an expert on world peace or disarmament. My basic thesis to you today is that all of us are involved in this constantly shifting and very confusing overall picture of international relations. International developments now dwarf and control most of our domestic problems. All of us must concern ourselves with these developments, especially we lawyers who, by training and experience, have the capacity to collect and analyze facts and come to some understanding of the issues involved. We lawyers have a real duty and responsibility to aid in the solution of this great problem. It is here that lawyers have the capacity and opportunity to make a real contribution to the future of all mankind.

When you collect the facts, all of you will not come to the same conclusions. And it is good that you will not. Many of you may decide that we can keep ahead in the great arms race, that you like the old balance of power idea, and that you do not feel that disarmament under a system of international law is desirable or feasible. My point is that this a great issue in which we all have a tremendous stake. Free debate on other great public issues has made America great. What we need on this issue is debate and discusion to educate and clarify. Tomorrow's World is being shaped by today's people. Now is the time for lawyers to aid in shaping it toward an enduring peace and away from war.

No group in the United States has been less conscious than lawyers of their power and their influence in the communities in which they live. But by training and tradition they are among the leaders in creating and moulding public opinion. Lawyers come from all religious faiths, creeds, races, and poltical parties. There are always lawyers to present both sides of all issues. Their skill in mastering intricate problems and in the art of persuasion is acknowledged by all. Their knowledge of history and the evolution of government best fits them to be a deciding factor in history's making.

We as lawyers have a duty to lift up our heads from the personal, individual controversies, from which we make our bread and butter, to the great international arena and do our bit toward a solution of this problem of peace—the geratest problem mankind has ever known, a problem which has plagued mankind since the beginning of time but which has never been solved.

And it is a problem which with nuclear warfare upon us, man must solve. Is a solution impossible of achievement? I do not know, but an atomic explosion was formerly believed by some to be impossible. So here, some day, some way, some plan may be developed whereby proud nations may maintain their sovereignty, yet submit their differences to settlement under a rule of law. I personally cannot agree with some of the one worlders that a surrender of sovereignty offers a forward step here.

A solution to this problem of peace and disarmament must be found in adequate legal machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes, or resort to war will continue as the only machinery for solving such problems. Talks among leaders of nations are essential preludes to such machinery. Yet until concrete legal machinery is created to put the agreements at such talks into permanent effect, those talks may not lead to peace plus disarmament. Leaders of nations change frequently. And we need more than their personal word as to the intentions of their nations. We can have no security or disarmament plan which depends upon the whim of the transitory dictators in the Kremlin.

Let us look at some of the physical facts of the international situation today. The airplane and communications have shrunk the world from nations to neighborhoods. We no longer think in terms of distance but in terms of time. Every spot on earth is within 24 hours of St. Paul—Moscow is only 8 hours or less. We now live in a physically indivisible world. Our interests are worldwide. All developments anywhere affect everyone everywhere. Not a single one of us can escape the consequences of certain actions the world around. This shrunken world can be a better place in which it is easier for all men to live in peace and prosperity, or a place where life is more difficult to preserve than ever before.

We are in the midst of the greatest arms race in the history of the world. More billions are now being spent for arms than for all peaceful activities of Government. We now have our largest peacetime armed force in all history. So does Russia. We hear and read conflicting reports as to who has the larger and better air force. We hear that our side leads in atomic and other nuclear weapons. We hear frightening things about intercontinental guided missiles, nerve gas, and bacteriological warfare. Nearly every week some new weapon, new airplane, or new airplane speed record is announced. Civilization has in fact produced tools whereby man can enter a fratricidal hell or the brotherhood of man. Our people are told that Russia has atomic bombs and the ability to deliver them. This means that with a word the Kremlin can set the world ablaze.

The prospect of the world divided into two mighty armed camps, ready to kill each other off at the drop of a hat, is no pleasant future to envision.

The international political facts are uncertain. Some may be clarified this week at the 10th commemorative session of the United Nations in San Francisco. There, many spokesmen for nations are giving their views on the current world situation. The Big Four meeting now scheduled for July will be the main forum for the expression of views and positions. The atoms-for-peace conference in Geneva in August may bring great developments. Some of our allies seem to want peace at any price. The neutral nations are sometimes playing up to both sides in the cold war. The creation of an office of "Secretary for Peace" of Cabinet rank headed by your own great former governor, Harold E. Stassen, was the greatest recent effective propaganda achievement of the Eisenhower administration. And one cannot help but note the fast-moving developments since that time.

Russia has almost in one breath proposed a disarmament plan; agreed to a peace treaty for Austria; agreed to the Atoms for Peace Conference; on bended knee begged Tito to return to the fold; and agreed to the Four-Power Conference of Chiefs of State. What does all this mean? Are we and our allies being led into a trap?

We know of the recent performance in Yugoslavia where buffoonery replaced diplomacy in large part. Is this a fair example of Russia's leadership as it now exists? I doubt it. The Russians knew what Krushchev was like before he went to Yugoslavia. They must have sent him to play his part for a purpose. We lawyers know how dangerous it is to underestimate an adversary. Is it

not safer to assume that this and other Communist peace moves are tricks designed to weaken us overseas in bases, allies, and other ways?

Such are some of the physical, economic, political and other facts against which the recently stepped-up peace moves must be measured. We know that every one of us has a direct personal stake in the issues to be considered at the upcoming conferences. In the world of today, such events are no longer of concern only to the diplomats. For the first time since the Indian wars, we are all in effect in the frontline trenches. Whether your son or mine leads a peaceful life or dies on some farflung battlefield depends upon a plan to keep the peace. And never forget that if war comes, the United States will be the No. 1 target. The enemy will know that his only hope for victory lies in a quick death blow for us.

We, in our Nation, never believe our leaders are all wise. We have a tradition of helping our leaders by constructive criticism and new ideas. And here with so much at stake we must all do our bit to help answer the unanswered questions. Public opinion governs many major decisions in a democracy. No issue has ever loomed as large or as important, as the issue of peace. And the time for decision on this issue—it can be phrased as the issue of civilization's survival—is drawing uncomfortably close.

The United States is the leader of the free world. We as the legal profession of that leader must do our part, make our contribution to a plan for international disarmament by providing ideas for some plan, some legal framework, which is a must if law is to replace war as the accepted procedure for settling international disputes. Until we have this legal machinery, universal peace is still a rainbow or a mirage which may disappear shortly after the diplomats or heads of state go home. Until they agree upon and leave behind them some permanent legal machinery to keep the peace, a real peace plan is still to be achieved.

Where are we now in our search for the necessary legal machinery? We start with the United Nations. It is woefully inadequate. Even its greatest friends so concede. But despite its obvious imperfections, it offers a start toward the legal machinery which is so desperately needed. We can profit from the U. N.'s errors and build upon its strong points.

Of special significance to lawyers is the fact that the International Court of Justice is the most ignored agency for peace in the world. Its record of 15 rather unimportant cases in 10 years is an amazing vote of lack of confidence in its effectiveness as an agency to settle international disputes. An increased acceptance by nations of its jurisdiction may offer a hopeful avenue on the road to peace and disarmament.

The historical predecessors of the UN, like the League of Nations and the Kellogg Peace Pact and other such dreams of great men, have crashed. But then, there were no dread facts to focus the attention of all the peoples of the World upon the dire consequences of war such as the horrors of atomic warfare.

Legal machinery is the ultimate end result of public opinion. It is up to lawyers to create the essential public opinion on a worldwide basis in order that the peoples of the world will demand and get the legal machinery which they must have to live in peace. The lawyers of our country and of the world, have so far failed miserably in providing this need. We have so far been derelict in our duty. And we must meet the challenge of our times or accept part of the blame for world catastrophe which is bound to come from continuance of the current arms race.

Lawyers live in a world of controversy. They constantly work out conflicts into compromises so as to avoid catastrophe to individuals. Their experience can aid in the international arena, where the conflicts and compromises are between nations.

Never before in all world history has such an opportunity and challenge come to any profession. Are we as lawyers equal to this challenge? Can we who have devised legal machinery to meet thousands of situations locally, nationally, and on a small scale internationally, measure up to this greatest of all challenges? I believe we can. But we cannot and will not if we continue to ignore our duty and never face up to our responsibilities in the world of today.

International law is still a mysterious subject to nearly all members of our profession. We simply must take the mystery out of the subject. In the early days of our Nation, lawyers were concerned chiefly with local problems. Now lawyers are concerned to a larger extent with national problems. Soon they will be more and more concerned with international problems as trade and travel continue to grow between nations. Few State and local bar associations concern themselves with international law. In the American Bar Association, international law subjects make headlines at conventions because of the work of a few on controversial issues. But they receive inadequate attention by lawyers in general. In fact, ignorance of the subject is looked upon as a virtue by some lawyers. They are proud of their lack of acquaintance with it. They feel the subject is not worth their time and effort. If war comes now, all concede that death and destruction on an undreamed of scale is a certainty. And without an effective system of international law, war remains the ultimate resort for settlement of international disputes. Under these circumstances should lawyers continue to ignore this subject?

Above all, in connection with the forthcoming conferences and discussions, we must be critical and cautious in considering Communist peace proposals. Peace and disarmament moves should not be allowed to develop into a Trojan horse designed to lure the free world to its own destruction.

In the disarmament discussions another job which we lawyers can do is to warn our people that until that dreamed for day when a peace plan with proper legal machinery arrives, our Nation must not give up or lessen its armed might. The only way adequate machinery to settle international disputes can be secured is to move from a position of strength rather than a position of weakness. We must all realize that the bargaining at these international meetings will not all be one-sided. There can be either appeasement, continuance of the arms race and eventual war, or honest, informed and vigilant bargaining looking toward an easement of world tensions and a plan for peace. But until a peace plan is formulated and agreed to, our people should know that they must insist upon a defense establishment which will in and of itself make peace as secure as possible. The quick disarmament which encouraged widespread advances by the Communists must never occur again.

Law or force will rule the world. If our civilization is to survive, the rule of law must eventually prevail. We lawyers must convince all people of this fact. They must march forward demanding a formula for a lasting peace—a peace through law. Then and then only will we lawyers have made our contribution to a real solution of the greatest problem of mankind. Then and then only will the hopes of the peoples of the world be realized in the achievement of a lasting universal peace. Only then can peace endure forever.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the recent parade of sports champions to the White House to lend their energies in the crusade against juvenile delinquency resulted in some editorial comment, in addition to the stories which filled the sports pages and spilled over into the political columns. The news that a committee was then and there being formed to consider ways to make every youngster a competitive participant in some sport, and thereby thin out the ranks of juvenile delinquents, has made many physical-education authorities wonder if the President has had the privilege over the years to keep abreast of their thinking. In the next few weeks, it is to be expected, many devoted leaders in this field will take time to inform the White House more fully on these matters.

A letter which in a completely cooperative and friendly spirit does this was recently addressed to the President by H. Harrison Clarke, research professor in physical education at the University of Oregon, in Eugene. For the benefit of everyone concerned with the grave subject of how to reduce juvenile delinquency, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able letter of Professor Clarke.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND
PHYSICAL EDUCATION,
Eugene, Oreg., July 20, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a professional physical educator in schools and colleges for over a quarter century, I was greatly pleased to learn of the White House luncheon to consider the use of sports in combating juvenile delinquency and in raising the physical standards of United States youth. Certainly, the Nation will applaud both these efforts.

The roster of those at the luncheon well represents leading personalities of the sports world, both as performers and coaches. Their support of and active participation in an athletic program designed to reduce juvenile delinquency should be tremendously effective. The contributions these men have and will continue to make to American life are very great indeed.

May I have the temerity to say, however, that the major problem in raising the physical standards of United States youth is to improve the fitness of those boys and girls who are subpar in basic strength and stamina. Effective treatment of those below standard should be fundamentally quite different from those who are athletically inclined, as I am sure Dr. Hans Kraus, who reported at the luncheon on the relative fitness of American and European children, will agree. Furthermore, this sub-par group will not respond to a voluntary sports program as they lack the strength, endurance, and skill for successful and enjoyable participation in it.

The sports program proposed is similar to those conducted for years in most schools and colleges and was promoted vigorously for the civilian population during World War II. In every instance, this type of program failed utterly to solve the problem of the low-fitness individual. To continue again with this failure on a national scale seems to this observer to be the perpetuation of a great wrong. This action is especially serious when it is known that effective processes for improving subpar boys and girls have been developed and successfully tested through use.

May I urge you and your advisers, therefore, to investigate these proven practices before proceeding with plans for a nationwide program to improve the physical standards of United States youth.

I have the honor to remain,

Most respectfully yours,

H. HARRISON CLARKE,
Research Professor,
Physical Education.

The Catholic Gift to the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting editorial published in the Catholic Standard and Times, Philadelphia, Pa., July 29, 1955, by the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., archbishop of Philadelphia:

THE CATHOLIC GIFT TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The question of Federal aid for public schools has been discussed editorially in the Catholic Standard and Times on two previous occasions this year.

On February 11, we called attention to wide discrepancies in estimates of the need of Federal aid revealed in the testimony of State school officers who appeared at hearings on legislation proposed for passage by the 83d Congress.

On March 18, we discussed a proposal of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools that $19 billion be spent on public education in 1965, and we showed that the fantastic proposal was based on an error of possible 10 million children in the projection of the average daily attendance in the public schools in 1965.

Various proposals for Federal aid for school construction have been studied by the respective committees of the Senate and the House during the current session of the 84th Congress. The House Education and Labor Committee has now reported a bill for debate, provided it passes the Rules Committee. We believe that we can add interest to our study of its provisions by interweaving a few facts on the Catholic financial contribution to the construction and operating costs of the public schools.

The bill approved by the House committee would set up a 4-year program of Federal-State participation, with Federal grants of $400 million a year on a matching basis for the construction of new schools.

It would provide also for the Federal purchase of $750 million in school bonds in districts which cannot sell bonds at a reasonable rate of interest.

A third provision would pledge United States credit on a matching basis for bond issues for existing or newly created State school building authorities. The Federal Government, of course, expects repayment on the bonds and due release from credit obligations assumed under the third provision.

This is the substance of the bill. To add interest to the study of its provisions we submit the fact that the Catholics of this country, by the construction and operation of their own schools, are doing considerably more for the public schools than the Federal Government proposes to do.

Take the item of construction alone. The Government has reported that private school construction in the United States in 1954 totaled $550 million. What portion of this was Catholic we are not told, but we are assured that more than 90 percent of the private elementary and secondary schools in the country are Catholic.

It seems clear, then, that the Catholic contribution to school construction in the United States last year was $100,000,000 more than the Federal Government proposes to grant to the States for public school construction in each of the next 4 years.

That this Catholic contribution is not a 1-year phenomenon is clear from the comment by the Bureau of the Census (Current Population Reports, series P-20, No. 54):

"Growth in private elementary and high school enrollment has taken place twice as past, percentagewise, as it has in similar levels of public schools since 1948, the first year for which census data are available on school enrollment by type of control of the school. During these 6 years, the number of public school pupils has increased by 4.8 million, or 20 percent, whereas the number of private school pupils has increased by 1.2 millions, or 49 percent." (Should we correct the census comment to read, 2½ times as fast?)

Even more striking is the Catholic contribution to the current expenditures for the operation and maintenance of the public schools. There are various ways of looking at this, but we select one based on geographical considerations, for we believe that it points up the whole issue of Federal aid to schools.

The statistical abstract of the United States for 1954 provides a table (No. 141, p. 126) showing the 1951 enrollment in the public schools and the current expenditures, in the four great sections of the country: northeast (Maine to Pennsylvania), north central (Ohio to Kansas), south (Delaware to Oklahoma), and west (Rocky Mountains to the Pacific).

From this data we can derive the following table:

Section	Enrollment (thousands)		Cost per pupil in average daily attendance, public schools	Cost per pupil enrolled in public schools	Cost per pupil enrolled in public and Catholic schools
	Public school	Catholic school			
Northeast	5,560	1,494	$281	$247	$195
North Central	7,189	1,116	239	215	186
South	9,411	486	165	144	138
West	3,545	272	263	231	214

It is perfectly clear from this table that in the Northeast, where Catholics are very numerous, their gift to the public schools amounts to the difference between $247, the cost per pupil enrolled in the public schools, and $195, the expenditure per pupil which the same budget would allow if Catholics closed their schools and sent their children to the public schools. This amount is $52 per pupil. Extend it to the 5,560,000 pupils enrolled in the public schools, and the total contribution in that section of the country is $289,120,000. For the four sections of the country it is as follows:

	Catholic gift per pupil	Number of pupils	Total contribution
Northeast	$52	5,560,000	$289,120,000
North Central	29	7,189,000	214,841,000
South	6	9,411,000	56,466,000
West	17	3,545,000	60,265,000
Grand total			620,692,000

In legal terminology, this is a grant-in-aid. Nothing is expected back. There are no bonds, there is no interest to pay. This grant for operating expenses, frees other moneys for school construction. The total present grant to the public schools, then, is the annual expenditure of $500 million for Catholic school construction, plus the $620,692,000 for operating expenses, or a grand total of $1,120,692,000.

This is contribution No. 1 of the Catholics to the public schools of the United States.

Contribution No. 2 is the local tax paid by Catholics along with their fellow citizens. A conservative estimate of the proportion of Catholic children of the United States enrolled in the public schools is 38 percent for the elementary schools and 60 percent for the high schools.

Contribution No. 3 is the State tax, which, like the local tax, is paid alike by Catholics and non-Catholics. It is the unused portion of these two taxes, representing the education expense of 62 percent of our elementary school pupils and 40 percent of our high-school students, that makes up the gift of $1,120,692,000 to the public schools.

Contribution No. 4 exists in California, where in spite of a law to the contrary, real estate taxes are imposed on parochial schools.

Contribution No. 4 for the rest of the country (No. 5 for California) is proposed in the current bill for Federal aid to public schools.

Turning back to the table which shows the cost per pupil for current operations, we find that the South presents the acute problem. The small Catholic population in that section makes a magnificent gift—$56,466,000—to the public schools, and this is more than the total expenditure for operating public schools in 19 of the States of the Union. But it spreads thin over the almost 10 million pupils in that section.

If the Catholic school population of the South were sufficient to provide for that section the bonus the Northeast enjoys ($52 per pupil), the expenditure in the South, with no additional taxation, could be $190 per pupil, or only $5 less than the expenditure in the Northeast, and $4 more than the expenditure in the North Central States.

Is there some way to solve this problem fairly and decently, without taxing the whole country, and thus asking Catholics for a fourth (in California, a fifth) contribution?

Catholics would be delighted, of course, if the well-known religious zeal in the South would manifest itself in the establishment of an abundance of private schools in which religion could be taught without the violation of conscience.

Put the matter this way: In the Northeast, the States collect 100 percent of the taxes and spend them on 80 percent of the students. If through the zeal of existing religious groups in the South only 80 percent of the pupils would depend on tax money for their education, the situation would be relieved.

We believe that the good will and the zeal for this exist. Can it be channeled by enlightened leadership? If this estimate is correct, then the problem can be solved without the danger of Federal interference in the local schools of our Nation.

Federal interference? It is inevitable if the Federal Government finances the schools. A minority opinion published in October

1931, with the report of President Hoover's National Advisory Committee on Education, stated correctly: "It is not easy to conceive the practical possibility of any Federal grants ever being made for education in general without some specific legal supervision of the manner in which the moneys shall be used. The function of supervising the use of Federal grants for education would naturally devolve on the Department of Education, thus making it a potent instrument for Federal control.

Let us suppose the administration of such funds were in the hands of a citizen of Massachusetts, a State which spends $14.80 for elementary and secondary education for every dollar it spends on higher education. What would be his reaction toward a request for funds for elementary education from a State which spends only $3.20 for the grade schools for every dollar it spends on higher education.

There are six States among the "needy" which spend less than $4 for grammar and high school for every dollar spent on higher education. That is their privilege, and they should cherish and protect it. Their best protection is the rejection of Federal control, and their position is strong if they reject Federal aid.

Faith in the Atomic Future and Atoms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note, as the leading article in this month's Reader's Digest, a splendid article entitled "My Faith in the Atomic Future," by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

I believe that Admiral Strauss' message, as told to James Monahan, will be of deep interest to all thinking Americans.

Just a week and a half from now, the International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy will open in Geneva, ushering in, we trust, a new era in civilian application of this miraculous scientific development.

There is now on the press in the Government Printing Office a new Senate document, prepared at my request, and authorized by the Senate on June 21. It is entitled "Atoms for Peace Manual." The manual, Senate Document No. 55, will be ready in time for the conference and, to the extent of a somewhat limited supply, for general distribution to Americans who will be following the conference's work.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Admiral Strauss' article, preceded by a biographical note, as published in the Reader's Digest, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY FAITH IN THE ATOMIC FUTURE

(By Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission)

(As told to James Monahan)

(Rear Admiral Strauss brings to the position of Chairman of the AEC a deep personal interest in the promise of atomic energy. In 1935–37 his mother and father both died of incurable cancer. As a memorial, he started a project at the California Institute of Technology to pioneer in the production of cheap radioactive substitutes for radium in cancer treatment. Early in 1939 Dr. Nils Bohr, the Danish scientist, arrived in the United States with evidence that the Hahn-Strassmann-Meitner experiments in Germany had definitely fissioned the uranium nucleus, making a chain reaction theoretically possible. To Strauss this was portentous news: it could mean the mass production of radioisotopes, cheap enough to be available to every hospital. But it also meant much more. One physicist working on the Caltech project wired Strauss: "I see enormous possibilities * * * leading, unfortunately, perhaps to atomic bombs." Seven months later Dr. Albert Einstein wrote the historic letter to President Roosevelt stating that the atomic bomb could be made. During the war years Lewis Strauss was on active duty in the Navy, but the atomic future was much in his mind. In 1945 he became the Navy member of the Interdepartmental Committee on Atomic Energy. In 1946 he was appointed by President Truman to the newly authorized Atomic Energy Commission. He resigned from the AEC in 1950 to reenter private business but was recalled in 1953 by President Eihenhower and appointed Chairman. On August 8, when the United Nations' World Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy meets in Geneva, Switzerland, Admiral Strauss will lead the American delegation.)

Many people regard the atomic discoveries of recent years as part of a nightmare that disrupts the peaceful dreams of civilized man. I do not believe history will see them in that light. We have gained control over natural forces that can advance civilization, even within a single generation, to a point which man has never attained before. I believe firmly that our knowledge of the atom is intended by the Creator for the service and not the destruction of mankind.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was a far-sighted law. But I had certain specific reservations about it. Nuclear energy, which I believed could change the world, was straitjacketed in Government regulations. Research, development, patents, manufacturing, and possession of fissionable materials were denied to private enterprise. Atomic energy was an absolute Government monopoly.

Atomic weapons development is necessarily a Government responsibility. But I was convinced that developments in agriculture, industry, and power production would not be realized fully until the field was opened to the genius and enterprise of American industry.

Actually, the restrictions might have been relaxed sooner but for the attitude of Soviet Russia. Beginning in 1946, when the United States held a virtual world monopoly on nuclear weapons, we proposed international control, subject to rigid inspections and enforcement, which would have limited the use of atomic energy to peaceful purposes. At that time we even offered to share our knowledge and resources with all nations.

The Soviets did everything possible to delay, confuse, and destroy that plan. Actually, they were launching their own secret atomic program. We detected their clandestine weapon test in 1949, and were at once engaged in the costly and perilous contest for supremacy in nuclear weapons. Every thinking person knows now that our present great and versatile stockpile is the major safeguard of the free world.

Meanwhile, atomic energy became associated in popular thinking with death and destruction. Yet the custodians of atomic energy under President Truman and President Eisenhower never lost sight of its benign potentialities. Progress was phenomenal in the production of radioisotopes.[1] They were produced by AEC reactors as early as 1947. They were distributed freely to institutions here and abroad, and within a few years revolutionized some areas of medical research and the diagnosis and treatment of certain diseases. Scarce, high-priced radium for the treatment of cancer was rendered virtually obsolete by radioactive cobalt and other elements which are equally effective sources of gamma rays and yet are now available to institutions at a small fraction of radium's cost.

Several different types of nuclear reactors for the generation of electrical power were designed by the AEC. But most authorities put the date of their construction in the remote future.

When I returned to the AEC as Chairman in 1953 I was deeply impressed by the growing conviction in the White House and the Congress that the time had come for full-scale development of atomic energy outside the military area.

President Eisenhower, in his address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, stated: "The United States pledges before the world its determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma, to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

Two months later the President sent to Congress the message which resulted in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The new law had two great aims—to make international cooperation possible, and to enable private enterprise to develop the atom for peaceful purposes.

The progress of the past 18 months—only a moment in history—has been extraordinary. For example, the AEC announced its program to develop power-producing reactors, and invited private companies to participate. The quick response was totally unexpected. The Duquesne Light Co. is building our first full-scale nuclear-power plant at Shippingport, Pa. At least 4 or 5 others will be constructed in the near future in Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, Illinois, and New York.

These pioneer nuclear-power plants cannot be economically competitive with conventional plants at present. Yet the participating companies are paying about 90 percent of the total costs. This, I maintain, could only happen under free enterprise in an expanding economy.

Indeed, 2 or 3 proposed plants will be constructed entirely without financial help from the Government. Mr. Hudson R. Searing, president of one of these companies, Consolidated Edison of New York, recently told stockholders that nuclear power "is the only

[1] An isotope is the twin of an element. It is chemically identical, but differs slightly in atomic weight. Radioisotopes also differ from their stable twins by giving off radiation. Some radio isotopes (radium and uranium, for example) occur in nature. Today it is possible to produce radioactive twins of any stable element (carbon, sodium, phosphorus, etc.) in the atomic pile or reactor.

way we can see of bringing about lower electricity costs over the long pull."

It is pointless to speculate on how soon nuclear power will be cheaper than power produced by falling water or the burning of coal or oil. We do know that our resources of fossil fuels are limited, and that coal and oil will be needed for functions which atomic energy cannot perform. We know that there is a great disparity in electricity costs between those areas where waterpower, coal, and oil are plentiful and regions like New England where such resources are scarce or nonexistent. We also must remember that there are many countries which are not blessed with such abundant resources as our own. So to me the present question of "economic" nuclear power is academic. I believe that it will be available before long, and that it logically will be used first where it is needed most.

Nuclear power for the propulsion of ships and aircraft will also come sooner than is generally realized. Few people have grasped the significance of the *Nautilus* and her sister submarie, the *Seawolf*. With the feasibility and safety of the marine propulsion reactor established beyond doubt, the job now is up to the designers and builders of surface vessels. The time to begin is now. That was the thought behind the President's recent recommendation of a nuclear-powered merchant ship.

I am convinced that the radioactive isotopes will continue to be the wonders of the atomic age. Today, they are being used by many industries to control processes, detect flaws and test the durability or wearing quality of all sorts of materials. New uses for them are found every day.

Used as tracers or as radiation sources, these atomic particles can search out the innermost secrets of nature and give man greater control over his environment. For example, plant geneticists have already used radiation from isotopes to produce a new strain of rust-resistant oats, wilt-resistant tomato seedlings, and a peanut plant with 30 percent greater yield. These and similar developments will means millions—perhaps billions—of dollars to farmers.

By incorporating small amounts of radiophosphorus in fertilizers, and then using instruments to trace the uptake from the soil through roots, stem, leaves and blossom, agricultural experts can now determine the right amount of fertilizer to use in the most economical manner, and at the proper time in the growing cycle.

For nearly a century science has tried in vain to solve the fundamental secret of photo synthesis, the process whereby nature traps solor energy in the green leaf and converts water and carbon dioxide into the sugars and starches on which all higher life subsists. Using radioactive carbon as the tracer, researchers today seem to be on the point of solving (and perhaps duplicating) this mysterious process. If successful, that achievement might lead to the synthetic production of basic foodstuffs from simple and abundant chemicals—the solution to the world's pressing food problems.

Since 1946 the American people have spent more than $12 billion on atomic energy. We will probably continue spending about $2 billion a year. Most of this money is invested in our stockpile of nuclear weapons, which represents the security of the free world. We have no choice but to maintain that security—until the whole world joins us in arriving at a safe solution to the atomic dilemma. I firmly believe that can be accomplished.

But our nuclear stockpile also represents a national resource of incalculable value. With nuclear weapons you can "beat swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks" even more realistically than the Scriptures envisioned. The material is immediately convertible to peaceful uses. That is what President Eisenhower had in mind when he told the United Nations that the weapon "must be put in the hands of those who know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace."

Young people have asked me if I sincerely think that we shall enjoy the benefits of the atom before the world is overtaken by the destructive power that is within man's grasp. With all my heart I can answer: Yes!

We are living in an era that seems designed to test the courage and faith of freemen. Yet I do not believe that any great discovery of the atom's magnitude came from man's intelligence alone. A higher intelligence decided that man was ready to receive it. My faith tells me that the Creator did not intend man to evolve through the ages to this stage of civilization only now to devise something that would destroy life on this earth.

My old chief, former President Herbert Hoover, to whose Quaker convictions all warfare is revolting, listened to President Eisenhower's U. N. speech and said: "I pray it may be accepted by all the world." We pray that divine providence will guide men of all nations to grasp this opportunity to "shake off the inertia imposed by fear and make positive progress toward peace."

Will America Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following oration written and delivered by a student in my district, Mr. William Randolph Robbins III:

WILL AMERICA STAND?

The chief threat of America comes from within America.

It does not come from a greedy dictator with hungry eyes and grasping hands who waits to tear down our flag and trample on it.

Have you heard of the fifth columnists in France and other countries? They bore from within, like termites, weakening the fiber of a nation gradually and unsuspectedly.

But danger does not come from jealous nations growing fat on American foreign aid, biding their time until perhaps they are strong enough to invade American soil.

The chief threat to America comes from me, and it comes from you.

Our complacency, our apathy in local, State, and National affairs; our disregard for the privilege of voting, which can be forfeited unless we choose to exercise it—these are the ugly, rasping rattles that can sound America's death knell.

Not the sharp staccato of gunfire in the streets; not the explosions of bombs shattering the morning calm; not a single piercing yell when an empire folds its wings. The death rattle of freedom is more than that.

It is the citizens rejecting their government through neglect. A government under the lash of its people is far stronger than one ignored. When people laugh, freedom is gasping for breath.

When our flag ceases to be a cherished symbol of American integrity and consecrated with devotion to an inspiring heritage, where shall the cause be found? Must we ready ourselves for the acceptance of slavery under a despotic, ruthless master who despises freedom and hates justice?

What is it that you are doing, and that I am doing, that makes us the chief threat to America? How do we reveal our disloyalty?

A secretary in a city crying for secretaries spends the summer at home collecting unemployment compensation. Two unnaturalized aliens in Chicago accepted unemployment checks totaling $10,000 over a period of 8 years, while working all the time. Any unemployed person may arbitrarily reject a job, and still collect unemployment compensation.

These examples show how twisted our thinking has become. Today there are Americans willing to trade free enterprise for social-security benefits. Has liberty, so loved that thousands of Americans willingly die to preserve it, degenerated itself for a price tag called social adjustment? Is a social welfare state an American design?

This country wasn't carved out of the wilderness, as some say. It was plowed, tamed, clawed, and hammered out—by men who just wanted a chance.

When their oxen died on the prairie en route to a wild new territory, they pulled and pushed their wagons by manpower. If their wagon broke down they didn't wait for Government aid, they didn't demand Government subsidies—when their crops failed, maximum pay for minimum work, or pay for no work at all.

They didn't demand anything except freedom.

There was hope, there was future, there was a chance for security. Security achieved by their own will power and self-confidence. Future because they were free to climb as high as they could carry their own weight. Hope because progress depended upon the individual not the State.

Those pioneers—Carson, Boone, Crockett—wrestled the wilderness for the highest stake in history—freedom for you and me.

We can abuse this freedom—corrupt it—laugh at it—and it will die. We can guard it, tend it, cherish it, and it will become again the hope of tomorrow. It is as we will.

It is not easy for us to be good citizens in a free country. Of course not. Nothing worth while ever is easy. The easy way out is to surrender the pick and the shovel for the soup line and chains. But freedom is like bread, you go on earning it every day. Otherwise it molds, drys out, and soon crumbles into dust.

Because freedom is hard, and slavery is easy; because it is easier to be a slave than a hired man; because it's easier to be told what to do than to think independently.

You and I need not be the chief threat to America. Can we not be the bulwark of the future, the hope of millions yet unborn, leaders of a world crying for leadership? Yes, but we must do it ourselves. We must be pioneers.

Let us halt the march of government power. Let us defy those who would degrade our flag; let us strengthen ourselves morally, economically and socially, lest we become like an angry scorpion that turns upon itself and dies of its own bite.

In this hectic 20th century, let us be pioneers. Let us be Americans.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

The Illness of Senator Johnson of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the press throughout the United States has recognized the great service which has been rendered by our colleague, the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Because of the nationwide interest in his present illness, and the hopes of all that he will soon recover, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the following newspapers paying tribute to the service of our distinguished majority leader:

The Daily Oklahoman of July 12, 1955; the Portland, Maine, Express, of July 19, 1955; the Salem, Ohio, News; the Lockport, N. Y., Union-Sun & Journal of July 9, 1955; the Mobile, Ala., Press of July 6, 1955; the Stamford, Conn., Advocate of July 6, 1955; the Hickory, N. C., Record of July 7, 1955; the Arizona Republic of July 7, 1955; the Kalamazoo, Mich., Gazette of July 9, 1955; the Lewiston, Maine, Sun of July 6, 1955; the New Britain, Conn., Herald of July 6, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Oklahoman of July 12, 1955]

A REWARD OF MERIT

Following the recent hospitalization of LYNDON JOHNSON virtually all of his colleagues have spoken most kindly of him. Apparently he enjoys the complete respect of all his associates. Many of them seem to have a real affection for the Texas Senator. His place in their estimation was revealed clearly when all of them stood as a body and breathed a silent prayer for his early recovery.

It is not very pleasant but it might be a bit helpful to turn from Senator JOHNSON who is esteemed by all his associates and consider momentarily some Senator who is esteemed by nobody at all. There are a few Senators who are not at all popular among their colleagues. If one of them were stricken, few words of praise would be evoked by their misfortune. Their associates might stand in prayer for them, but it is doubtful if the prayers would be marked by any degree of fervency. And if the pallid messenger with the inverted torch should call one of these to the final reckoning, no one would think of saying that his passing constituted a national calamity.

LYNDON JOHNSON is respected because he serves his country sincerely and serves his party in a gentlemanly way. He is not crazy about headlines. He does not bid for publicity with vituperation. He does not consider an opponent a skunk just because opinions differ. He is universally esteemed because he deserves universal respect. Of course there are other Senators like him, but unfortunately there are a few who are completely unlike him.

[From the Portland (Maine) Express of July 19, 1955]

OBSERVATIONS FROM THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Republicans, now absolutely convinced that President Eisenhower will run in 1956, are far more hopeful than they once were over their chances of regaining control of Congress next year.

In their optimism, they shrug off two well-known facts: First, that the GOP has far more Senate seats in danger than do the Democrats; and, second, that the Democrats have been winning elections and picking up votes at the local and State levels since 1952.

The Republicans reply to this by pointing out that no winning presidential candidate in many years has failed to carry his own party to victory in the congressional elections. And, they say, Mr. Eisenhower will definitely be an all-conquering candidate in 1956.

Democrats, who were confident to the point of cockiness about their 1956 congressional chances until recently, are no longer quite so sure.

They concede the President's personal popularity, realize he will campaign hard for a Republican Congress if he runs next year, and they admit they still have not come up with any really good issues for the 1956 campaigns.

The situation has been complicated by the heart attack which removed Senate Democrat Leader LYNDON JOHNSON from the political scene—temporarily, both his friends and his political foes hope.

The Texan, since taking over as majority leader last January, had demonstrated unusual political skill. He rates ace high with liberals and conservatives alike in the Democratic fold.

Without JOHNSON'S shrewd touch and his constant practice of what amounted to a political healing act, old enmities are likely to recur.

However, if he can return to the Senate floor in January the Democrats will be in a much better position to go into the 1956 race with ranks closed.

United States officials were hopeful that some progress could be made at the Big Four conference on a world disarmament plan, but they were well aware that a long, long road lay ahead before any concrete program could be worked out.

President Eisenhower, before he went to Geneva, said he hoped some agreement could be reached between the major powers on setting up a special group to consider disarmament and make recommendations.

Regardless of the developments at Geneva, it is obvious that several years may be required before the differences between the big powers can be resolved and a definite, workable plan formulated.

The big problem, of course, is the search for a method of inspection of armaments that would be both workable and acceptable to the various nations.

In the long run, this must boil down, as Mr. Eisenhower has pointed out, to how much the nations trust each other—and right now, despite the parley at the summit, there's still plenty of mutual distrust.

If you like meat, there's good news ahead. Millions of hogs in pens, cattle in pastures, and chickens in barnyards promise lower prices.

Agriculture Department experts say:

Pork prices, which have climbed slightly in the past few months, are leveling off and will start dropping soon.

Though top-grade beef may go up slightly, less expensive meat products will go down, and sharp declines are expected in veal and lamb prices.

There are so many chickens in the United States at the moment that poultry prices are due for a really sharp fall.

In general, the Agriculture Department men expect livestock prices for the rest of this year to be lower than they were in the last half of 1954.

The 1955 production of red meat is expected to reach a record 26.3 billion pounds, exceeding the 1954 figure of 25.4 billion pounds.

During the next 12 months, the Interior Department is going to undertake its largest program in history—to investigate the availability of surface-water and ground-water supplies.

The Federal Government is prepared to spend $4,350,000 on the project while other funds will be made available by State and local governments. The study will be made by the Geological Survey.

The survey says there is a growing water problem in this country. To back up its statement, it offers these comparisons: In 1920, water used for irrigation in the United States amounted to 65 million acre-feet; in 1940, 72 million; in 1950, 88 million, and in 1953, 92 million.

[From the Salem (Ohio) News, the East Liverpool (Ohio) Review, and the Canton (Ohio) Repository]

LEADERS ARE BORN

The secret of representative government is the leadership of its representatives. Through the years, the United States usually has found enough born leaders among the hundreds sent to Congress to keep it from coming apart at the political seams. Only once—in the post-Civil War period—did it draw a blank.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, majority leader in the Senate, has proved to be one of the born leaders. His dangerous illness at the peak of his responsibility is a blow to the entire Federal Government.

The impact on Government is being compared to that when the late Senator Taft was forced to leave his post as majority leader in 1953. Taft had become a national leader by virtue of his ability to master the intricacies of Senate procedure and to command the respect of his fellow Senators of both parties.

Senator JOHNSON is still young—only 46. Yet no one since Taft's death has emerged as a stronger legislative personality. His recovery will be prayed for by Senators of both parties and by everybody who comprehends how heavily this Republic relies on the democratic process to give it the natural leaders it must have to avert chaos in popular Government.

[From the Lockport (N. Y.) Union-Sun and Journal of July 9, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON STRICKEN

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S tireless work as the Democrats' Senate leader made him

the most influential man in Congress, and many have considered him the ablest. His heart attack may have far-reaching effects on both national politics and the affairs of Government. He has been talked of as a Presidential possibility in 1956 or 1960, but this would seem to be out of the question, as a man who has had a heart attack is not likely to stand the strain of a campaign or the duties of the White House. Nor would the voters choose a man whose health might fail him in an emergency.

Senator JOHNSON has been an extremely shrewd, capable majority leader of the Senate. As one commentator remarked, he has been "almost matchless in terms of political skill and in giving the Democrats a new and almost monolithic unity on every high occasion."

The Democrats are especially worried lest Mr. JOHNSON may not be able to return for the second session of Congress, in the election year of 1956. As much the most influential southerner in Congress he might well be the deciding factor as to whether such States as Texas, Virginia, and South Carolina will support the Democratic nominee for President.

It respect to affairs of state Mr. JOHNSON was entitled to observe last week that President Eisenhower had been mistaken, during last year's campaign, in predicting a cold war between the White House and the Capitol, should the Democrats win control of Congress. Under JOHNSON'S leadership such controversial administration bills as minimum wage, reciprocal trade, and foreign aid have been passed with hardly a ripple.

As the President retorted, a great deal of necessary legislation remains to be passed. However, Mr. JOHNSON established a program; probably the Democratic whip or assistant leader, Senator CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, will be able to carry out the details.

Yet to a substantial extent for this session, and to a much greater degree for the next, the country has cause beyond the personal consideration to hope for a speedier recovery than now seems probable for an opposition leader who is as much a middle-of-the-roader as the President himself.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press of July 6, 1955]

JOHNSON'S ILLNESS BLOW TO GOVERNMENT

The United States Government suffered a severe blow when Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, was stricken with a heart attack.

Perhaps no one realizes this fact more than President Eisenhower, who, despite occasional flareups, has gotten along splendidly with the able Texan.

While it is not indicated that the Senator is clearly out of the national picture, it is certain that Congress will miss his guiding hand during the remainder of its present session.

The esteem in which Senator JOHNSON is held is illustrated by this appraisal by William S. White, in the New York Times:

"Almost no one here, in either party, questions that Mr. Johnson's skill as a leader is unmatched in recent memory, as is his influence on a heretofore temperamental group of Senators running all the way from the profoundly standpat HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, to the volatile New-Fair Deal HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

"There is no legitimate question that Senator JOHNSON has repeatedly performed seemingly impossible feats and that the Senate has been far more efficient and far quieter in his regime than it has been in many years."

The leadership which Senator JOHNSON and other Democrats have given Congress, together with that of President Eisenhower, have provided America sound, conservative government at a critical stage in its history.

Much of the credit for this situation should go to the "responsible opposition" fostered by Senator JOHNSON.

The opposition which he has spearheaded was quite cooperative with the Republican administration at a time when President Eisenhower was "growing up" as a politician. This situation is due in part to the fact that the current Democratic leadership in Congress, and Mr. Eisenhower, are for the most part "middle-of-the-roaders" in politics.

As a result of this teamwork, the President has obtained practically everything he wanted in the field of foreign affairs. There still, however, is a considerable list of domestic legislation he would like to see enacted.

The question arises today as to whether there is anyone in Democratic congressional ranks to fill Senator JOHNSON'S shoes during his illness.

It would be most unfortunate for the country as a whole if some New-Fair Dealer should step into the role and lead the Democratic majority on an all-out drive to handcuff President Eisenhower's legislative program.

[From the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of July 6, 1955]

SENATE LEADERSHIP

The serious illness of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON is cause for regret by all Americans. A leader of the Democratic Party in Congress. Senator JOHNSON pushed through needed legislation in the interest of the Nation rather than of any one party. If he could twist the issue to benefit his party so much the better, but like the other great Senate leader Robert A. Taft he was never an obstructionist merely for the sake of obstruction.

His greatest service to the Nation in this session has been to keep the left-wing branch of his own party from flying off in all directions and so making no advance in needed legislation. Despite little political maneuvers, Senator JOHNSON has been a supporter of much o fthe President's far sighted and truly liberal program. True, it would be political suicide to oppose this program, but there are some in the Senate who in a search for issues would throw caution to the winds.

Senator JOHNSON has not been tempted. He has worked for the good of the Nation with a maximum of good will. One finds it hard to believe that there is any real deep difference in policy between that sponsored by the Republican Party as expressed by the President and that of the Senator from Texas.

We hope that the Senator makes a quick recovery. This session of Congress will be able to carry along without him. The next session would miss his strong hand. His hand will be needed for guiding and restraining.

[From the Hickory (N. C.) Record of July 7, 1955]

VALUABLE LEADER

It is to be hoped that the complete recovery of Democratic Senate leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, is only a matter of time. He is recognized as one of the ablest leaders in the Congress.

As was pointed out following the recent humiliating defeat of Senator JOE MCCARTHY in his efforts to embarrass President Eisenhower in his foreign policy, the victory for the Democrats was far-reaching, due to the resourcefulness of their Senate leader.

JOHNSON maneuvered the situation so that leading Republicans in the Senate were forced to repudiate their own 1952 platform, and give up their campaign tactics of calling the Democrats Communists.

The columnist, Drew Pearson, noted at the time how adroitly JOHNSON worked it so that Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, had to testify against the McCarthy resolution which sought to require Eisenhower to demand the liberation of satellite countries. MCCARTHY had read into the record excerpts from the Republican platform which called for liberation of satellite peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The GOP pledge which the Wisconsin Senator quoted, was as follows:

"We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. It will mark the end of the negative, futile and immoral policy of confinement which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism."

In the ensuing discussions Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, was jockeyed into a corner, where he stated publicly: "I wish to say that I have the greatest confidence in and respect for my Democratic colleagues, and I would be the last to say that any is an appeaser as far as communism is concerned."

In the course of the debate, when Senator CAPEHART of Indiana pressed MCCARTHY to say, "Wherein have President Eisenhower, the Secretary of State, or the Republican Congress at any time failed to live up to their obligations—or done something that would give comfort to the Communists?" the Wisconsin Senator seems to have let the Hoosier solon have both barrels:

"The Korean armistice was appeasement," he asserted. "Giving up the Tachen Islands was appeasement. Giving up Northern Indochina was appeasement. But a further example of appeasement is what the Senate is encouraging today."

Senator JOHNSON evidently decided it was time to call a halt and get on with the voting, which he did—the result being a 77-to-4 chastisement for MCCARTHY.

[From the Arizona Republic of July 7, 1955]

A REAL LOSS

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, suffering from a heart attack brought on by his mankilling job as majority leader of the United States Senate, won't be able to return to Congress during this session. His loss will be felt by the Democratic Party and by the Senate as a whole.

Senator JOHNSON represents the conservative, or southern, wing of the Democratic Party. It was men of his stripe who kept the New Deal from going completely overboard and who are now cooperating with Republicans in pushing through much of President Eisenhower's program. We join the President and the Senate in wishing Senator JOHNSON a prompt and complete recovery.

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette of July 9, 1955]

TAKE IT EASY

Just before Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S heart attack, one of his colleagues printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that had appeared in a Washington newspaper. The editorial writer, with no inkling of the impending breakdown, sought, with good reason, to eulogize the much-admired Texas Democrat and able leader of the Senate majority. Here are some excerpts from the editorial:

"These days JOHNSON throws everything he has into the leadership job—the stamina of the 200-pound, 6-foot, 3-inch physique, his political experience, and his persuasive gifts. He ordinarily works through the evening with a staff. * * * He accepts no social engagements. * * * The Johnson formula for legislative success is rigorous. * * * Sleep is forgotten, meals are ignored. * * * The system has paid off in the Senate with a long list of triumphs. * * * "

Senator JOHNSON deserves praise; and the American people, regardless of place or party, hope for his quick recovery. But let's hope, too, that when he returns to the Senate he'll adopt a less rigorous formula.

His doctor will probably say to him, "Take it easy."

That is what doctors say to many of their patients.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Sun of July 6, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The critical illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, the Democratic majority leader, is a serious blow to the party in Congress.

Only 46, the youthful Texan was struck down a few days ago by a heart attack, and he will not be back in the Senate before adjournment. That is not so serious, however, as the prospect that he may be unable to exercise his duties during the 1956 pre-election session.

JOHNSON has performed prodigious feats as Senate leader this year. His role has been, in a way, paradoxical. The Senator has rallied strong party support for many Eisenhower measures—measures frequently opposed by a heavy percentage of the President's own party. And when the cause of partisan politics seemed to call for it, Senator JOHNSON has gathered powerful Democratic backing, at the strategic time, on other bills. Washington is still talking about the housing measure, which came into the Senate as an administration bill and with the support of the Democratic-controlled Senate Banking Committee. Here was one of those issues where the Democratic liberals could see more votes in a liberalization of the housing provisions. But they lacked votes for a substitute bill that would permit 200,000 housing "starts" over a 4-year period instead of the 70,000 called for biennially in the Eisenhower bill.

Senator JOHNSON, however, went to work lining up Democratic support and collecting on "debts" due him by a number of Republicans. The result was a victory for the Democrats against what first seemed to be insurmountable odds.

The Texan's role has been made all the more difficult by the fact that an especially popular Republican President sat in the White House, while the Democrats held only a two-seat margin in the Senate. But by hard work, adroitness and the exercise of an attractive personality he has won the admiration and respect of many Senate veterans. At this time there is no one of equal stature to replace him.

We join with his friends in wishing this capable leader a speedy and permanent recovery.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald of July 6, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The Democratic party in particular and the Nation as a whole will lose greatly by the absence from his post of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who suffered a heart attack last week.

As recently as 10 days ago, the active, aggressive, 47-year-old Texan was busy stirring Presidential wrath with his (JOHNSON's) statement that the Democratic Senators were not going to be a bunch of second lieutenants to Ike.

JOHNSON is more than a militant politician. He is prominently mentioned as being of presidential timbre, and his attitude toward the welfare of the Nation, especially in such a major area of legislation as foreign affairs, is of statesmanship caliber.

Death and illness often strike when least expected, and certainly that is the case in Senator JOHNSON's attack. It serves to emphasize the frailty of man in comparison with the events around him.

Problems of the GOP in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Electoral Vote Analysis Shows GOP Faces New Problems in 1956," published in the Democratic Digest for June 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTORAL VOTE ANALYSIS SHOWS GOP FACES NEW PROBLEMS IN 1956

Two and one-half years after the Eisenhower landslide in 1952, there are no outbursts of optimism coming from Republican Party spokesmen predicting a comparable performance in 1956. This recalls a somewhat similar situation when another Republican occupied the White House.

Herbert Hoover, like Eisenhower, won a landslide victory in his first bid for the Presidency, with 58 percent of the popular vote and 440 electoral votes. Eisenhower won 55 percent and 442 electoral votes. Hoover, like Eisenhower, needed some Democratic votes to win, and in Congress his party squeaked through with a bare majority.

Half-way through Hoover's term, Democrats took control of the House of Representatives, whereas Eisenhower lost both the House and Senate in 1954. By the end of Hoover's first term, his political fortunes were sharply reversed and he was soundly defeated in his second-term bid by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Perhaps the summer of 1955 may seem a little early to start counting electoral votes in 1956, but certainly there are enough political indicators to speculate on the outcome. The Democratic trend since 1952, as seen in the local, State and national elections, raises a question as to whether the Republican candidate for the Presidency can carry enough States to give him the 266 majority of the 531 electoral votes needed to return him to the White House.

National Chairman Paul M. Butler, in noting the trend, recently stated: "There is no question of a great Democratic resurgence."

Republican National Chairman Hall, viewing the same results, said that his party is "in trouble," a feeling shared by some of his colleagues.

In March of this year, Republican Senator Goldwater told a meeting of the National Federation of Republican Women that the party is "suffering a downward trend nationally." Two weeks later, Vice President NIXON warned party workers in Los Angeles that "the Republican Party is not strong enough to elect a President. We have to have a Presidential candidate strong enough to get the Republican Party elected."

What he was saying, of course, is that there are more Democrats than Republicans in the country, a fact revealed in the 20 years of Democratic administrations and upheld by recent polls. Democrats outnumber GOP voters by 20 million, according to a 1955 Gallup poll. If all civilians were to register anew, says Gallup, the party lineups would list 54,300,000 Democrats, 34,000,000 Republicans, and 9,400,000 undecided.

Some of these Democrats voted for Eisenhower in 1952, but that was before he was clearly tagged as a Republican. His victory in that election was a personal one, with his basic appeal essentially along nonpolitical lines.

By 1954 the President had made it clear that he is a Republican and that he believes in the Republican philosophy of government. By last November, when the Eisenhower administration faced its first large-scale test at the polls, it lost.

It was then that Chairman Hall expressed his concern in terms of 1956, when he singled out the GOP loss of governorships as one of the most serious aspects of that election.

Democrats now hold governorships in 27 States with 347 electoral votes. The Republicans hold 21, with 184 electoral votes. Those figures clearly reveal the Democratic majorities in the States, which enabled them to sweep new Democratic Governors into office last year and reelect all the incumbents running. In terms of the electoral votes in 1956, this is an advantage, but not necessarily a guaranty of the State's electoral votes.

Few political analysts would question Democratic claims to the 89 electoral votes in the 9 Southern States that voted for Adlai Stevenson in 1952. They are Alabama (11), Arkansas (8), Georgia (12), Kentucky (10), Louisiana (10), Mississippi (8), North Carolina (14), South Carolina (8), and West Virginia (8).

An additional 57 electoral votes are in traditionally Democratic States which Eisenhower won in 1952. They are: Texas (24), Tennessee (11), Florida (10), and Virginia (12).

Democrats are counting on a return of the solid South based on the unity that has developed between North and South since the Democratic defeat in 1952. While Republicans went out of their way to woo the normally Democratic South in the last presidential election, they have been almost equally as aggressive in alienating southern voters since that time. There is a striking example in the GOP farm policies, contrary to the best interests of a region so dependent upon agriculture.

Also, such phrases as "creeping socialism," used by President Eisenhower to describe TVA, and his open support of the Dixon-Yates contract, are not the same language southerners heard from Eisenhower as a candidate. It will win few votes from public-power-conscious areas of the South.

Added to this is the Republican attempt to pin the label "party of treason" on all Democrats, which was answered with a stinging rebuke from one of the South's most loved and respected statesmen, SAM RAYBURN. Another southern statesman, Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, has won wide respect for his party in closing the gap between North and South on party differences. Bearing these facts in mind, Democrats are looking to a solid South, with a total of 146 electoral votes.

Two border States—Oklahoma, with 8 electoral votes, and Missouri, with 13—may be safely added to this group. Both have Democratic Governors and in each State there is only one Republican in the entire congressional delegation. This would give the

Democratic candidate a running start of 167 electoral votes.

Republicans are saying their sure States will include Indiana, 13; Iowa, 10; Kansas, 8; Maine, 5; Nebraska, 6; New Hampshire, 4; North Dakota, 4; South Dakota, 4; Utah, 4; and Vermont, 3—which would give the GOP a start of 61 electoral votes. But few Democrats would concede the loss of all these States.

Where the GOP has new cause to worry over Democratic gains is in a group of States with 56 electoral votes and which Democrats expect to carry by 1956. They include Michigan, 20; New Jersey, 16; Maryland, 9; Delaware, 3; and Connecticut, 8. Republicans also are concerned over Ohio, 25.

Michigan Republicans have been losing ground steadily in recent years while Democrats have been making sharp gains. This was shown in the victory of dark-horse candidate Senator McNamara in 1954, and early this year Democrats captured a majority of the offices in the spring election for the first time in 20 years. Moreover, they have a powerful vote getter in Gov. G. Mennen Williams, elected to his fourth term last November.

New Jersey voters were exposed to large-scale Republican corruption and turned the State administration over to Democratic Gov. Robert Meyner early in 1953, to mark the beginning of the Democratic trend nationally. In Maryland and Delaware, Democrats swept everything in 1954, with the exception of the governorship in Maryland.

In Connecticut last year there were enough Democrats to unseat Republican Gov. John Lodge and elect Democratic Gov. Abraham Ribicoff in what was considered a stunning upset for the GOP. Add to this neighboring Rhode Island, traditionally Democratic, with 4 electoral votes, and the Democrats have a comfortable 227 votes.

Political analysts point to the Pacific Northwest as a new source of Democratic strength since the Eisenhower administration's policies on power, agriculture, and reclamation have alienated many of the people of these States. They are predicting Oregon, with 6 electoral votes, Washington with 9, and Idaho with 4, will be in the Democratic column in 1956.

Without going too far out on the limb, the Democratic picture at this point adds up to 246 electoral votes, only 20 shy of the required majority. Thus, victory in any 1 of the 4 biggest States—New York, with 45 electoral votes, Pennsylvania (32), California (32), and Illinois (27)—would put a Democrat in the White House.

In New York, Democrats scored a sharp upset last year with the election of Governor Harriman, and in 1953 with the election of Mayor Wagner. The Democratic trend has been given an additional boost by the Eisenhower administration's decision to fire Edward J. Corsi, a New York Republican. Political writers are predicting this will cost the GOP many votes in New York and several other States.

President Eisenhower's popularity carried Illinois in 1952, but last year his personal intervention on behalf of the Republican candidate for Senator did not save him from a crushing defeat.

In the once-Republican stronghold of Pennsylvania, Democrats elected a new and comparatively unknown Governor, George W. Leader, in 1954, and this year's sharp upswing in Democratic registrations encourages even brighter hopes for 1956.

Increased Democratic strength in California is not reflected in Democratic gains in the Congress due to successful gerrymandering by the GOP State legislature (see April Digest). But the Democratic popular vote of 51.5 percent for Congress last year, representing a gain of 11 percent since 1948, would have been enough to carry the State for the Democrats in a Presidential year.

Then there are a group of States, such as Montana and Wyoming, where falling cattle prices under the GOP have been seriously felt; Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and Minnesota, with new Democratic governors and a combined total of 32 electoral votes, all showing strong Democratic leanings. And there are Massachusetts with 16 electoral votes and Nevada with 3, both with a consistent Democratic tradition in Presidential elections. Even Wisconsin, with 12 votes, now reacting strongly against McCarthyism, is a Democratic hopeful for 1956. Democratic Representative Lester R. Johnson's upset victory 2 years ago in the Ninth Congressional District was an early portent of the changing trend.

Summing up, the anaylsis seems to shake down to the following 2 points: First, whether President Eisenhower runs or not in 1956, the required majority of 266 electoral votes is well within reach of the Democrats. And second, if the Democratic gains of the last two and one-half years indicate the real trend of public opinion, the Democrats will not only win, but score a substantial victory.

Ethical Conduct in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled " 'The Team' Needs Scrubbing," published in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of July 27, 1955. It deals with ethical conduct in Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 27, 1955]

THE TEAM NEEDS SCRUBBING

President Eisenhower has a scrupulous, frank openness that has captured the imagination of the world and contributed to his great success at the recent Geneva Conference. We wish this frank openness was personified in all the members of "Ike's team."

While perfection is too much to hope for, the administration that came in on the basis of restoring ethical conduct to Government could be expected to be careful in selecting members of "the team."

Perhaps there was nothing technically wrong with what Harold Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, did, but testimony before Senate investigators leaves the impression that his engineering firm benefited from his public office.

Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of the General Services Administration, is the object of an attack by the conservative Fortune magazine for his messy appointments and favoritism. The magazine calls GSA "the most durable mess in Washington."

Senate examination of the Dixon-Yates deal has dragged out of deep shadows Adolphe H. Wenzell. Mr. Wenzell was with his left hand an expert adviser in the Budget Bureau on what to do about the Tennessee Valley Authority needs for more electricity, while with his right hand he was a vice president of the First Boston Corp., which was arranging to borrow the money for the Dixon-Yates answer to the TVA need.

Stocks and bonds for the Dixon-Yates financing had to obtain approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission, of which the Chairman is J. Sinclair Armstrong. The public is just now learning that the Chicago law firm of Lincoln, Isham & Beale, from which Mr. Armstrong came to the SEC, is attorney for the Commonwealth Edison Corp., once the capstone of the discredited Insull structure.

After months of determined digging, the investigators have only recently revealed that the Atomic Energy Commission advice on how the Dixon-Yates contract could be accepted under the Public Utility Holding Company Act came from Ralph Demmler, a partner in a law firm which represents First Boston, and from Robert McDowell, who became a SEC official on recommendation of the senior member of First Boston's New York law firm.

And then we have the long awaited explanation of why SEC hearings on Dixon-Yates were suspended while Congress voted on a Dixon-Yates question. It turns out that Mr. Wenzell was about to be put under the spotlight and the "assistant President," Sherman Adams, asked the SEC to pause.

Each of these men fits into a distasteful picture of the private power lobby being allowed to get so close to the center of governmental strength as to bring discredit on the Eisenhower administration.

It is time for Ike to direct his attention to "the team" and to getting it scrubbed up.

The Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Trade Policy May Disrupt Cotton Marts," which appeared in the Greenville (S. C.) Observer on July 22, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRADE POLICY MAY DISRUPT COTTON MARTS

MEMPHIS, TENN.—A number of top people in the raw-cotton-producing business are beginning to express concern about what will happen to American farmers when two different Government policies collide.

For many years, as a result of established law, United States cotton farmers have been helped by Government price supports.

Along with the price supports, the law also bars foreign-grown cotton from being brought into the country, except for a very small amount of specialty growths. This means the farmers have a protected market and a protected price in the United States for their cotton.

Under this program, more than 98 percent of all cotton goods manufactured and used in the United States is made from American cotton.

What bothers the farm leaders is that another big Government program is moving in an opposite direction and threatens to wreck the price-support system.

They refer to the State Department's trade program, particularly the severe tariff cuts made recently at Geneva on cotton textile goods for the special benefit of Japan.

The slashes, due to go into effect in September, are so drastic that in cents per

yard of goods they run considerably more, on the average, than mill profits now being earned in the manufacture of the goods.

In effect, these tariff cuts amount to an import subsidy on foreign cotton. In the case of common, unbleached print cloth, for example, the tariff cut is said to be comparable to an import subsidy of 3.3 cents a pound of cotton.

Increasing fears are being expressed that when these 2 policies run head on after September 10, many textile mills and countless farmers will be hurt. Already there are ominous headlines in the press, such as:

"Field's (Marshall Field & Co.) sees Japan becoming major supplier in 3 years." "Jap fabrics may be sold by Bur-Mil (Burlington Industries, Inc.)." "Hear Macy's to use whole floor to promote Jap goods," and many others.

It is obvious to the farmers that just as foreign manufactured goods are the product of foreign labor, so likewise are foreign fabrics mostly the products of foreign cotton. Taking foreign textile manufacture as a whole, seventy-five percent of its raw fiber material is foreign cotton and only 25 percent is American-grown cotton.

Farmers therefore fear the eventual loss of their biggest market—the consumption of American cotton by American mills—either because it will be taken over by Japan or because United States mills may be forced to shift to rayon and other synthetics, which were not touched by the Geneva tariff cuts.

Right now, it has been learned, there is a lot of high-level discussion going on in cotton trade circles and State farm organizations of the Cotton Belt as to how to remedy the situation before the policy conflict causes heavy damage.

One idea which is gathering momentum, and is reported being favorably considered in Congress, is a plan for establishing a system of cotton goods import quotas. Such a system, as one official described it, would set sensible, reasonable, and specific limitations on the amounts of foreign made cotton textiles permitted to enter the United States.

World trade thinking in cotton farm regions up to now has centered mostly on the problem of exporting and selling more raw cotton overseas. But farmers see there's danger in pushing all their efforts in that direction if some State Department monkey wrench ruins the 9 million bales a year home market for American cotton.

Considerations of this sort are understood to have prompted Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, to urge President Eisenhower to impose textile import quotas immediately. In a wire to the White House, the Senator pointed out that under present law the Chief Executive already has power to do so.

Recognition of Service Performed by Senator Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time American People Recognize Service Performed by Senator BYRD," published in one of the great and enlightened newspapers of Florida, the Miami Daily News.

The editorial is written about the admired, respected, and very able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The headline is one with which I agree. However, I think the American people are beginning more and more to appreciate the valuable, selfless service rendered by Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME AMERICAN PEOPLE RECOGNIZE SERVICE PERFORMED BY SENATOR BYRD

The Federal Government reported last week that it had gone almost $4,200,000,000 into the red in the year ended June 30. This was a deficit of approximately $1,000,000,000 more than the year before.

This isolated news item is not exciting by itself. This Nation has piled up deficits in 21 of the last 24 years.

In retrospect, it is interesting to recall that there was a clear voice of warning about this fiscal year—now history but still more than a memory since it will burden us and our posterity.

That was the voice of Virginia's Senator BYRD who said of the 1954–55 fiscal year, "The longer the administration goes without making good on the President's cardinal campaign promise to balance the budget, the more difficult it will be." This was a statement on March 6, 1954.

Of course it is also history that nothing was done about Senator BYRD's warning. Perhaps it is time to pay a little more attention to his wisdom.

This senator is probably the best known advocate of economy in the history of this country. Yet today he is still pretty much stigmatized by the more ardent New Deal and Fair Deal, as well as Eisenhower administration advocates of spending programs who have come up against him in the Senate Finance Committee. Senator BYRD is now chairman of that committee, as well as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Here is what Senator BYRD would do to bring a ballooning national debt down to earth and our spending to something approaching sanity:

First, require a "single package" appropriation bill.

Second, improve staff facilities of Congress for reviewing budgetary proposals.

Third, use Hoover Commission data more effectively in deliberation on basic legislation and on appropriation bills.

Fourth, open more committees to the public and invite them to participate—an objective also of the American press.

Fifth, tie authorizations to spend and appropriations more closely to funds actually available.

Sixth, eliminate use of carryover funds.

Seventh, give the President the right to veto individual items in appropriation bills.

Eighth, improve the accounting and budgeting systems of the Federal Government.

Ninth, decide there will be a moratorium on all new spending programs until the Federal budget is showing an actual surplus.

This last proposal is probably the most important of them all. Senator BYRD last week indicated how important he thought the authorization of new Federal-aid highway spending was by claiming for his Senate Finance Committee the bill now pending in the House. The consensus is that if he gets it, the bill will not get out of Congress this session.

What progress is being made, if any?

The Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget said in their tentative fiscal year-end report last week that "greater prosperity reflected in rising income-tax payments, sent Federal revenues about $1.3 billion higher than President Eisenhower's January forecast."

This has heightened hopes for a sharp reduction—or even possibly elimination—of the estimated $2.4 billion deficit for the present fiscal year, which began 24 days ago.

However, it is feared that mounting farm surpluses may offset this increasing Federal revenue traceable to good times. The crop price supports revealed in the year-end statement exceeded by more than $1 billion the estimate which Eisenhower sent to Congress 6 months ago.

So Senator BYRD and his advice are still needed—perhaps more than ever.

Come war, come peace, we need to lay bare waste and extravagance in government.

Come Democrats, come Republicans, one man has done just that—outstandingly.

It's time for the American people to recognize Senator BYRD.

Imposition of Censorship on Washington News Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Censorship Curbs Washington News Corps," published in the Democratic Digest for July 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CENSORSHIP CURBS WASHINGTON NEWS CORPS

Defense Secretary Wilson seems to have changed his slogan to "What is good for the Republican Party is good for the country," said the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times.

This is not, of course, an attitude peculiar to Mr. Wilson in the Eisenhower administration, but it is generally conceded by the Nation's press that the former boss of General Motors has now applied the Republican partisan doctrine in singularly extreme form. He accomplished that with his new censorship system in the Department of Defense.

His rule for news control, the Capital Times observed, "is just about the same kind of yardstick employed by the Kremlin to determine what information should be made public."

With that estimate, there appears to be no quarrel among the publishers, editors, and writers of America.

"If any censorship order of this extreme had been promulgated by former President Truman, the press of this country would have exploded in revolt," the Capital Times added.

It is true that there has been no general explosion in the press, but it doesn't follow that the journalistic profession is not vastly disturbed over the rise of secrecy and censorship in the Eisenhower administration. In fact, the press has been showing mounting concern over this phenomenon for some time. Secretary Wilson's news clamp has drawn criticism from both the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors. There's a large and steadily growing file of newspaper and magazine articles and editorials, warning of the increasing trend toward locked door government and handout administration.

Publishers and editors can see no justification whatever for the new Wilson test, requiring that all Department releases must be found not only free of any classified material, but must "constitute a constructive contribution to the mission of the Department of Defense."

This sets up a rule which can easily be construed by overzealous officials to mean that anything which might put the administration in an unfavorable light should be suppressed. Such an outcome seems as inevitable as that an old General Motors partisan should think that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. The tendency is shown by Secretary Wilson himself with his quick defense of a political brochure issued by the GOP Senate Policy Committee, which made a dozen security violations in the use of classified material. Political discrimination in favor of Republican leaks of classified material is a serious matter indeed, but, as the editors observe, the greatest peril lies in the suppression of vital information which does not fall within the proper realm of secret or classified material.

It is true that President Eisenhower subsequently termed publication of the GOP political brochure a blunder, but more significant is the fact that the President allowed the Wilson gag to stand. This left censorship and propaganda as the rule for the largest and most sensitive Executive Department of the National Government—a Department that controls the activities of millions of our citizens, spends over 70 percent of the money provided by the taxpayers, and bears most directly on the security of the whole Nation.

The threat which this news control system raises to the Nation's security interests is underscored by the furor over the administration's politically timed release of military intelligence information on sensational advances in Soviet offensive-type aircraft. The intention of the release, "as far as could be judged from inquiries at the Pentagon, was to head off and forestall criticism of the administration's defense program by members of the United States Senate," writes Hanson W. Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times.

Mr. Baldwin adds that this release "is the best possible illustration of what is wrong with Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson's formula for the release of military news that is 'constructive.' The word 'constructive,' in this instance, was translated to mean the political advantage and service effect."

The release did not have its intended effect of showing that the administration was alert in letting the public know of Soviet steps which threaten our aerial superiority, if they don't actually tip the balance against us. Instead, the information belatedly released to the public has now brought new demands for a Senate inquiry into the strength of our Armed Forces. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, asserts that the release proves that Secretary Wilson was "dead wrong" a year ago when he reported the Russians were concentrating on the buildup of defensive rather than offensive airpower.

For a year and a half, the Defense Department discontinued publication of the semiannual list of the 100 largest companies getting defense contracts—after one report revealed that in 6 months the total of General Motors defense contracts had increased by over $1.7 billion, while contracts going to all other companies decreased by $395 million.

Smarting under public criticism on this coverup, the Department revived the report in May of this year but used a different basis for the compilation, so that the new contracts going to General Motors were not listed at all. The Department withheld this information on General Motors and 44 other companies, on the curious ground that contract cancellations and cutback "offset" or exceeded new procurement since July 1, 1953. Under this fantastic reporting system, it was announced that contract cancellations exceeded new procurement by nearly $60 million in the General Motors account, although it was admitted that the company "undoubtedly is still one of the largest suppliers of military equipment."

The TV show which was made of Secretary Dulles' May 17 report to Mr. Eisenhower on his latest European trip gave an incomplete picture of the situation developing for the coming Big Four meeting. "Fiction and theater," columnist Walter Lippmann described the production. What Mr. Dulles talked about "was at best only half the truth," Mr. Lippmann added.

"* * * if, in the coming encounter with Moscow and Peiping, our own public opinion is crystallized on the half-truth which was Mr. Dulles' theme," the columnist warned, "the administration will not have the kind of informed support in Congress and among the people which it will need to have."

The full magnitude of this challenge to American traditions of the free press and fair play may be seen only against the backdrop of the long series of protests which have been registered in the press against the administration's thickening Paper Curtain between itself and the public. Incidents multiply which show that the fear psychosis—which Republican orators themselves have done so much to generate—is constantly erecting new barriers to communication. At the same time, security reasons are used increasingly as a pretext to shield normal Government operations from the public gaze, serving merely partisan purposes.

Newsmen complained of the silken curtain with which Secretary Hobby enveloped her Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with the muddled management of the Salk antipolio vaccine program.

In the Atomic Energy Commission secrecy has been carried to the dangerous point where not only the general public but other agencies of the Government have been kept in the dark on vital information needed for early and expeditious civil-defense planning. After the radioactive fallout at Bikini last year AEC Chairman Strauss gave an inaccurate account of the blast's range and effects, and that false reassurance to the public was never corrected by the administration. The public had to depend on an independent nuclear scientist for our first accurate analysis of the radioactive peril.

The double standard used by Secretary Wilson for military information circulated to the public in a GOP propaganda piece has the same political motivation as the Dulles leak of the Yalta papers and Attorney General Brownell's leak on the appointment of Chief Justice Earl Warren. In each case there is Government control and manipulation of news sources for partisan advantage.

Another manifestation of the administration's "papa knows best" attitude has been given in the Dixon-Yates deal. "A feature of the Dixon-Yates matter which has made the administration vulnerable from the beginning has been secrecy," said the pro-administration Indianapolis Star.

The administration has drawn a heavy curtain of secrecy around its management of the Federal employees' security program, under which thousands of patriotic Americans in Government service have been misbranded "security risks." An important segment of the press has met that challenge head-on, and largely as a result of good journalistic enterprise, the political hoax in the administration's security risk numbers game was exposed. However, the numbers game still goes on and the President rejects all recommendations for a bipartisan review of a system that has worked badly indeed.

The light shed by the press forced the administration to make partial redress to falsely accused Wolf Ladejinsky, but the system which produced the miscarriage of justice still stands, and Mr. Eisenhower has washed his hands of responsibility in the matter.

Tampering with the fifth amendment, wiretapping, and press registration measures are other aspects of the tightening grip of Government which have brought expressions of dismay from responsible editors.

"One of the biggest threats of the Communist Party to our way of life in this country is that we will be frightened into curtailing our basic freedoms in the mistaken belief that we are curbing Communist activities," warned editor Robert U. Brown of Editor & Publisher in an issue of his magazine last winter.

"Registration of equipment with the Government is a philosophy foreign to our democratic principles," he added. "Registration of printing presses was one of the things the framers of the Constitution tried to guard against. It is too close to licensing of the press."

Expressing its concern over the darkening climate of secrecy and repression on many sides, the Philadelphia Inquirer said:

"It is ironic that at a time when Americans are increasingly shocked by suppression of truth behind the Iron Curtain, there should be a swelling tide of attempts to gag newspapers in the United States of America."

Columnist Marquis Childs recently reported that among working reporters in Washington "there is growing concern over what appears to be a concerted effort to suppress legitimate news, and with a system of rewards and punishments to see to it that only news which is favorable or reported in a favorable light is given to the public."

The Alsop brothers, in an article published only last February in the Saturday Evening Post, declared they have actually been investigated by Federal agents for seeking to alert the public about atomic weapons and guided missiles.

"Their object was not to tell Soviet officials anything they didn't already know, but to alert the American people," said William H. Stringer, chief of the Christian Science Monitor's Washington bureau.

"Some officials," Mr. Stringer added, "apparently felt that the facts would frighten the American people. To this, the reply might simply restate the words of a former President, 'What kind of people do they think we are?' Can wise policy be developed in this country when only a few 'Q-cleared' individuals know the true facts?"

But the air of hush-hush and suspicion steadily thickens.

"'Secrecy' has become the keynote of governmental operations in the national Capital," writes Walter Trohan in the Chicago Tribune under a May 1 dateline.

"In the executive branch of the Government the press conference has become a neglected institution," he adds. "White House and State Department conferences have fallen off to a fraction of what they were 20 years ago. Most officials use the press conference to promote some plan they want to publicize rather than as a means of letting the press question the operations and programs of various departments or agencies."

Mr. Trohan finds that hostility toward the press among Government officials in Washington is now greater than at any time in the last 70 years.

This retreat to closed door Government evidenced itself at the outset of the Eisenhower term, even while the administration was making glowing promises to keep the news channels open.

At his press conference April 2, 1953, President Eisenhower told the Nation's press "to report to him any official who strangled or closed off any legitimate news and he would act."

In subsequent weeks and months there were increasing complaints in the press over the administration's attitude toward news freedom. One of the incidents of that period was an exchange of differences which moved the Washington Post to say:

"The Eisenhower administration would do well to heed the criticism made by correspondents the other evening in their television interview with James C. Hagerty, the White House Press Secretary. Raymond P. Brandt, correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, said bluntly that the administration 'is afraid of newspapermen and doesn't understand the place of newspapers in American life.'

"More experienced political leaders than some of those now in office do understand the role of the press and are not afraid of it, however much they may quarrel with it * * *.

"There is no better way to illuminate the problems of Government in these troubled times than for the President and his Cabinet officers to open their doors to the press. A new administration has an even greater obligation than one which already is well-known to make itself understood to the people."

The record, regrettably, shows the Administration has continued in an exactly opposite course. The President and his Cabinet appeared on one TV show, which proved to be a propaganda fiasco, and since then the Eisenhower Government has withdrawn increasingly behind tightly, sealed doors.

Newsmen find nothing reassuring in the picture despite Mr. Eisenhower's "generalization" in his May 10 address, when he said:

"There is one generalization to make as we proceed in our thinking about the Republican Party as an agency for serving this great country, and that is that the public must be an informed public, if a republic or a democracy is to be a success."

With the administration itself presenting the worst example, the atmosphere of fear, suspicion, and rigid conformity has spread a pall over extensive areas of our national life. Nowhere is the harmful effect of that hysteria more pronounced than in the field of scientific research, for never before was the Nation's security more dependent on unfettered scientific inquiry.

The triple dilemma which American scientists face today, as described in a Washington Post report of a speech last April by M. Stanley Livingston, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, is this:

Government security regulations are plugging the ears of the scientific community.

Scientists don't dare speak out even when they do have the facts.

Yet, if science is to progress, speak they must, particularly in regard to the current problem of atomic radioactivity.

The incalculable cost to the community of that kind of security is suggested further by Roland Sawyer, who writes in the Christian Science Monitor:

"I talked with two scientists who made no breaches of security, but who asserted to me—and they are men who can be trusted—that because of security many millions are wasted because mistakes are made from insufficient public discussion. Worse, according to these men, the country doesn't get the weapons for defense it could have, because the public isn't informed. If it were, those men claim, public opinion would insist upon things being done that have not been done. And air defense would be 2 to 3 years further along."

Here, in the reports of responsible and thoughtful representatives of the press, the dilemma of the press and the public is vividly set forth as the country faces the future under a fearful, rattled and overly partisan administration.

The Bicycle Industry Is Important to Many People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Huffman Manufacturing Co., of Dayton, Ohio, has been an important manufacturer of bicycles in our section of Ohio. Some years ago I was made aware of the disturbing effect of the lower tariffs on bicycles, the loss of business, and the consequent resulting loss of employment. This affected the employees of this company in a very personal way and caused many of them to seek other employment. Thus the company not only lost business but it also was unable to retain the service of many of its valued, skilled, and experienced employees.

Not only has the Huffman Manufacturing Co., of Dayton, and its skilled employees been seriously affected, but the entire bicycle industry throughout the Nation has suffered by the importation into the United States of bicycles from other nations of the world.

The Tariff Commission has made exhaustive studies and has made its report to the President.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the President will give this matter his earnest consideration at the earliest possible date.

Many people, Mr. Speaker, are deeply interested. Bicycle manufacturers use a considerable amount of steel, rubber, bearings, other manufactured parts, paint, etc., in their products. There are a considerable number of people employed not only in the industry directly but also in the allied industries in producing the materials and parts used by this industry. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this industry is important to many parts of our Nation.

It is also understandable, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, should be concerned because of the employment of people. A copy of Mr. Meany's letter dated July 15, 1955, and addressed to the President, has been supplied to me. Under unanimous consent, I include it in these remarks as an expression of the point of view of Mr. Meany in this important matter:

JULY 15, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is in further reference to the application of the bicycle industry for relief from injurious import competition under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, about which I wrote to you on March 11, 1955.

It is understood that this case was returned to the Tariff Commission for more up-to-date information and further observation of the trend of imports. I have accordingly myself had further inquiry made into this matter and as a result am doubly convinced of the urgency of remedial action.

The bicycle industry has lost ground rapidly to imports and continues to do so solely because of the lower wages paid in foreign plants, the tariff reductions made in the past and the currency devaluation of 1939.

During the 4 years preceding 1950, domestic lightweight models outsold the imported ones by 10 percent to 15 percent. From 1950, after currency devaluation, on top of sharp duty reductions, the imported product ran away with the market.

Today there is a retail price differential of about $20 in favor of the imported bicycle. This represents a formidable handicap in view of the quality of the imported product.

The American Federation of Labor, as stated in my previous letter, has supported the trade agreements program, but has always made it clear that we cannot condone import competition that drives our own workers out of employment when such competition derives its advantages from lower prevailing wages abroad than those enjoyed by American workers. Should this be permitted the American wage standard would soon be dissipated.

The bicycle case impresses me as clearly indicative of excessive tariff reduction in view of the exchange devaluations that took place. This brought the rates definitely below the peril point and the rapidly rising imports are the result. The workers in the bicycle industry have my full support in seeking a restoration of the duty and I would therefore strongly urge that you promulgate the Tariff Commission's recommendation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The President at Geneva: Moral Leadership Regained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to pay tribute to the President of the United States for the magnificent leadership he provided at the Big Four meeting.

The meeting at the summit has come and gone. The issues that divide the East from the West have not been settled. No realistic person expected them to be settled in so short a time.

Yet we know that it was eminently worthwhile, for in a few short days the work of years of Soviet propaganda against the United States was undone. The picture the Soviet Union has been trying to sell to the world of a trigger-happy, materialistic America was largely dissipated. It was dissipated because President Eisenhower, with the sincerity and moral fervor which are so characteristic of him, reached out and touched the heart of the world.

It was not only the President's dramatic proposal for an exchange of military blueprints with the Soviet Union and mutual aerial reconnaissance that was responsible, it was his evident truthfulness as a soldier, his directness, his refusal to be drawn into long discussions

of controversial details, that evoked widespread admiration.

The President said he had searched his mind and heart for something that would convince everyone of the sincerity of America's desire for peace. He found it, and in so doing he dispelled any lingering doubt that America stands for good will to all men. At Geneva President Eisenhower was the champion of all that is best in our country, what has always been the true source of its strength in the world, namely, its adherence to principles of international morality, and its sympathy with the common desires of all humanity.

Statement in Regard to S. 2253 Which Amends the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, authorizes the President to sell our farm surpluses to friendly nations for foreign currency. This law implements what I believe to be a sound principle, namely changing our farm surpluses into working capital and using that capital to develop and expand permanent markets in foreign countries for our farm products.

On July 12, 1955, the President issued the second semiannual report of the activities carried on under Public Law 480. In my opinion, this report demonstrates that this is an effective farm program which can be of material assistance to the present dilemma of American agriculture.

However, it became apparent to me that Public Law 480 needed minor changes which should be designed to assist in the administration of the program. I, therefore, introduced H. R. 7149 to amend title I of Public Law 480. A companion measure, S. 2253 was also introduced in the Senate. The Senate passed their bill on July 20, 1955. It was this bill as amended by the Senate that the House Committee on Agriculture reported out and that the House has passed.

While it is a matter of regret to me that the Senate amendments were felt to be necessary at this time, I feel that the Public Law 480 program will benefit substantially from the changes now in this bill.

It is hoped that by these few changes, sales under title I of Public Law 480 can be most efficiently made and the currency most effectively utilized. By these amendments, we hope to emphasize that the purpose of title I is trade development. We must find foreign markets for our surplus agricultural production. We do not feel that this program is designed to be used primarily to facilitate our foreign relations. This is not to say that any sale or other action under title I would be or should be contrary to the foreign policy of the United States. This program will continue to be limited to friendly nations and operate under basic foreign policies as determined by the State Department.

S. 2253 increases the authorization for the farm product sales program from $700 million to $1.5 billion. This will permit about $1 billion of our farm surpluses to be converted into currency and to be put to work developing foreign markets for farm products. We have now approximately $8 billion worth of surplus farm products. It seems only realistic to me that at least 12 percent of those surpluses should be taken out of storage and put to work for agriculture.

Let us examine the program as it has progressed to date. Public Law 480 was enacted in July of 1954. The President delegated the authority to administer title I to the Secretary of Agriculture in September of that year. By November the first sales agreement was signed under this authority. Turkey was the purchaser under this agreement. By January of 1955, agreements had been signed with two countries. During the next 6 months, the program became established and began to gain some momentum. Nineteen additional agreements were signed. Seventeen foreign nations agreed to purchase our farm products. As of June 30, 1954, we had sold 53 million bushels of wheat, 647,000 bales of cotton, 141 million pounds of cottonseed oil, and 62 million pounds of tobacco. To date $468.8 million of the $700 million authorization has been obligated. It should be borne in mind that this amount is the total Commodity Credit Corporation cost including transportation, handling, and so forth. The value of the farm products sold is actually $328.5 million. This points up the reasons why the $700 million authorization is inadequate. First, if it is not increased it could force the termination of this program by the end of 1955 since there remains only $231.2 million unobligated. Public Law 480 was designed as a 3-year program and should not be cut in half. Second, because of the other expenses charged against the authorization, the $700 million authorization will actually permit the sale of approximately $500 million worth of farm products. An increase to $1.5 billion could move about $1 billion worth of farm products.

S. 2253 also provides another means to insure that title I of Public Law 480 is used as a real trade program. By Executive Order 10560, the President gave the Secretary of Agriculture responsibility for the operation of title I. I feel it is essential that the Secretary also be given the authority commensurate with this responsibility.

Since we are attempting to sell farm products, it is logical that the Secretary of Agriculture should determine what surplus products should be sold and what quantity they should be sold in. If the purpose of this program is to create and expand permanent foreign markets for farm products, it is requisite that the Secretary determine what countries are our best potential markets.

Of course, I realize fully that Public Law 480 involves foreign interests of other departments of the Government. All of these interests should be coordinated. It is also necessary that the Secretary of Agriculture operate under the general policies laid down by these other departments. This amendment would not remove these requirements in any manner. What we are trying to do here is give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to operate the actual mechanics of selling farm products.

I believe that it is especially unfortunate that the present bill does not relieve surplus sales of farm products from the cargo-preference provision which now requires that 50 percent of these cargoes be shipped in American vessels. Sales made under Public Law 480 must eventually be exempted from cargo preference if we are to obtain maximum results from the program. These farm product sales are not just a means of disposing of surpluses. Another purpose is to use the foreign currency to develop permanent foreign markets. It is essential, therefore, that sales be made to countries where a demand can be generated for our farm products.

The plain fact is that the best potential markets for our farm products are maritime nations.

For example, the United Kingdom, Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark bought $654 million worth of farm products in 1954. This constituted over 20 percent of our entire agricultural export sales. These markets could be substantially increased if our surplus products could be put to work there.

The Cargo Preference Act, Public Law 664, was enacted last August despite the present administration's opposition. The principle had grown out of our foreign-aid programs, namely, when we give products away, 50 percent of them have to be shipped in American vessels. We do not here argue with this principle. What we contend is simply this: When bona fide sales are made under title I of Public Law 480, our customers should be allowed to transport the goods however they see fit. If we want to sell farm products, we must offer quality products, competitively priced and we cannot tell our customers they cannot transport the products in their own ships if they want to.

I can offer you specific examples from the experienced gained with this program to date.

On April 4, 1955, Denmark refused to purchase $7 million worth of farm products because of our demand that 50 percent of them must be transported in American ships. In March of 1955, England refused $30 million worth of farm products because of cargo preference. Norway, as well as other Scandinavian countries, refused to purchase under Public Law 480 as long as cargo preference applies. These are countries where our sales program could reap the maximum benefits, yet the program often

cannot operate there because of cargo preference.

In reviewing the agreements signed to date with 17 foreign nations, it is discouraging to note that 13 of those countries could have provided their own transportation. Thirteen million dollars has been spent by Commodity Credit Corporation for transportation that the customer country would have preferred to furnish itself. An additional $13 million worth of farm products could have been sold, had it not been for cargo preference. This is another unfortunate result of trying to make this type of requirement apply to a sales program.

Title I of Public Law 480 is a positive approach to our agricultural surplus problem and our urgent need to expand permanently export sales of farm products. As long as it remains a sales program devoted to trade, it can make a substantial contribution to the national economy.

S. 2253, when signed by the President, will increase the effectiveness of Public Law 480, and will assure the continuance of this vital farm program for at least 2 more years.

Maybe the President Needs To "Unleash" Secretary Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the cotton producers of my area are quite properly becoming alarmed over the situation which exists with respect to the exporting of our cotton surpluses. It would appear that this situation results because of the indecision which exists in the Department of Agriculture which may or may not be influenced by pressure from the Department of State.

Many people believe that cotton is not moving to foreign markets because of a feeling that the Department is contemplating a program of entering the export market on a competitive basis, in which event cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation would be made available at a price lower than that at which the cotton can be purchased at the present time.

Many of my producers would support such a program even if it meant a break in the cotton market which many believe would happen. I am inclined to believe this would happen. However, unless and until the United States begins to move more of its cotton into the export market, we will continue to see a greater increase in the production of cotton in other lands, in some of the nations where our mutual aid funds have been used to place their producers in a position to compete with us. I realize that there has been much opposition from our domestic textile mills if such a program is put into effect without the assurance that they would not be protected from the importation of textiles made from the cotton which we had sold at a lower price than that which prevails in our domestic market.

As long as our foreign buyers wait for the "fire sale" they will not buy cotton and the situation becomes more alarming each day with the approach of the harvest season in the United States.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in the opinion of most people, including some of the officials in his own Department, has the authority to sell surplus cotton for export at reduced prices, and there seems to be a prevalent rumor, current both at home and abroad that such action is contemplated, and the movement of cotton has come to a standstill.

There is need now for a positive statement from the Secretary of Agriculture, with the full support of President Eisenhower, as to what action, if any, may be expected during the next few months during which the 1955 crop will be harvested. A statement to the effect that there will be no reduced prices during the current season would at least have the effect of letting other cotton move. It is the inaction, the indecision, and the apparent inability of the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture to integrate their programs that has brought about the confusion which has prevented the disposal of surpluses now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and has discouraged the sale of private cotton in foreign markets.

While I have been anxious to cooperate in the passage of any legislation which is needed or which would relieve the situation, I would respectfully call attention to the fact that Secretary Benson has every authority which he needs to act, and if he needs to be "unleashed," I hope the President will take the appropriate steps to see that this is done.

During the past few days I have received numerous communications in the form of telegrams, letters, telephone calls, and personal visits expressing the interest of the cotton producers of southeast Missouri in obtaining some action. In additional I have met with numerous groups and had conferences with officials in the Department of Agriculture, in which I urged that some action—almost any action—be taken. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am reproducing herewith the text of a number of those telegrams indicating the interest in southeast Missouri in this problem:

PORTAGEVILLE, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
PAUL C. JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence to save the cotton producers and industry. Administration do-nothing is ruinous. Get something done PAUL.

O. H. ACOM.

SENATH, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
PAUL C. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe it is urgent to obtain reasonable cotton-export program at once. Urge your every effort to obtain prompt positive action on a practical and continuous export program.

R. K. SWINDLE.

EAST PRAIRIE, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Hon. PAUL JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please be reminded that the future of the agriculture economy in southeast Missouri depends upon disposal of surplus cotton via immediate export program. Missouri farmers depend upon production schedules and not upon the futures market.

A. L. STORY.

KENNETT, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully solicit your immediate assistance in securing prompt positive action to export 5½ million bales of cotton during next fiscal year.

DON THOMASON.
CECIL CAMPBELL.
AMIEL CAMPBELL.

CARUTHERSVILLE, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Congressman PAUL C. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you can get something done on the cotton-export program as we are losing our foreign market.

S. CREWS REYNOLDS.

EAST PRAIRIE, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Hon. PAUL JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I sincerely hope that you will lend full cooperation to some means of expediting cotton exports before session ends. Missouri cotton farmers need this export program to sustain cotton production in our State.

W. C. BRYANT.

CHARLESTON, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Congressman PAUL JONES,
Tenth Missouri District,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton producers this area urge quick action on export program.

JIM WALLACE.

KENNETT, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to do something about export program on cotton. We grow cotton to sell. Not to store. Had rather have reduced price and more acreage. Do something; we are in trouble.

VICTOR E. DOWNING.
VERNE W. JOHNSON.
F. W. JOHNSON.
A. E. BOLTON.

BRAGG CITY, MO.

SIKESTON, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Hon. PAUL JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton growers need an increase in acreage. Certainly not a decrease which must follow if exports are not greatly stimulated. We urge that all things possible be done to keep us in the cotton business abroad. Don't let us be frozen out of our foreign markets.

WILLIAM L. OLIVER.

EAST PRAIRIE, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Hon. PAUL JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request that you give every effort to matter of cotton exportation before Congress adjourns. Some means foreign disposal of cotton surplus absolutely necessary to agriculture in our area.

GEORGE U. SHELBY.

MATTHEWS, MO., *July 27, 1955.*
Congressman PAUL C. JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Would like something done on cotton-export situation.

ALLEN DAVIS.

Public Rebuffed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the majority on my left inherited responsibility as well as the spoils when they assumed control of the House of Representatives last January.

I should therefore like to call their attention to an editorial which recently appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 29, 1955.

The editorial follows:

PUBLIC REBUFFED

Few Congresses in our history had such momentous opportunity to boost public welfare as did this 84th in connection with highway construction. Still the job was muffed.

The program fell, according to Speaker SAM RAYBURN, to pressure of the truck lobby. By that token, those who need good roads most balked at helping pay the tab. But as much to blame was politics. The majority of Congressmen put fear of their jobs ahead of serving the people.

Largely because a timid Congress failed, we can look forward to more instead of fewer traffic fatalities and traffic jams on the highways. It is hard to reconcile them against political bargaining, pressure groups and selfish interests.

Yet outrage and disappointment must be overlooked in the face of practicalities. President Eisenhower has begged Congress to reconsider and come up with a compromise road-financing program. It would contain some tax increases and some bond issues, the President's original scheme.

The fact is, time has run out. Another highway bill would have to start from scratch, and hearings on the defeated measures ran 18 weeks. We do not anticipate a legislative miracle, for that is what it would require.

Moreover, recriminations really are useless. Ohioans lost over a billion dollars toward new roads in the coming decade because Congress bumbled. So? So we must find a way of helping ourselves to do the job.

The obvious kickoff line is the second turnpike, from Conneaut to Cincinnati. New York State is expediting the leg of its throughway from Buffalo southwest. Pennsylvania has announced the precise route of its connecting Erie bypass.

Thus Governor Lausche must come to grips with setting the route of Turnpike 2. Work on many other vital road projects is stalled until the decision is made.

Cleveland, too, must face the issue as far as its freeway plans are concerned. While the State's $500 million bond program is of considerable help to us—or will be—it's not enough.

Therefore will we, like New York City, finance our own freeways by special license or toll gates?

Or will we, like Congress, fold our tents and steal away?

For one thing, we can't. This thing hits us smack in the pocketbooks. Cleveland bobs up or down on the fortunes of the automobile industry. Soon, and much sooner than we think, this lack of adequate highways is actually going to curtail car production. To borrow from Willie Keeler, you can't put 'em where they ain't. That would be a unique recession, wouldn't it, based on our own cupidity?

Yes, we Americans are funny people. Here is our Congress in the process of approving several billions in foreign aid, with no substantial opposition. Yet we boggle over a sure way of saving our own lives, money, and happiness. Somehow the humor of it eludes us.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Kent County Tuberculosis Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan which is composed of Kent and Ottawa Counties. This year, 1955, marks the 50th anniversary of the Kent County Tuberculosis Society which was organized 3, 1905, as the Grand Rapids Anti-Tuberculosis Society.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state publicly and proudly a few of the outstanding accomplishments of the the Kent County Tuberculosis Society. This, I earnestly hope, will serve partly as a tribute to this organization's fine work and partly as an inspiration to other communities which are carrying on their own work in this crucial area of medical education and detection of disease.

During the 45-month period from January 1925 to September 1928 there were 377 deaths in Kent County attributable to tuberculosis. Now compare this to the 45-month period from January 1951 through September 1954 when, notwithstanding an approximate 20-percent population increase, only 91 tubercular deaths were recorded in Kent County.

The Kent County Tuberculosis Society has played an important role in achieving this record. It has through the years adopted the latest techniques as they have become available. The leaders in this society are convinced that any such program is best if handled on a local level wherever possible. Supported by the Christmas Seal series, their program is based largely on the Mantoux tuberculin test, the chest X-ray, and the fine opportunity for education it provides.

They fully realize that modern drugs and surgery are saving lives but cases must be found before they can be treated. A total of 37,512 persons were given Mantoux tuberculin skin tests between April 1, 1954, and March 31, 1955. Over 24,000 were X-rayed. Out of this number 21 active tuberculosis cases were discovered which may have gone for weeks without discovery had not these tests been promoted.

The society carries on a cooperative program with the public health department and the local sanatorium. It does the educational and stimulating job. Most of its work is carried on among apparently well people as it continues to educate for healthful living.

The citizens of Kent County,, Mich., owe a large debt to these people who are active crusaders against tuberculosis.

Multiple Use of the Surface Resources of Our Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, legislation has been enacted by the Congress which provides for the multiple use of the surface resources of our public lands, to provide for their more efficient administration, and to amend the mining laws to curtail abuses of those laws by a few individuals who usually are not miners.

In our efforts to arrive at a fair and reasonable answer to the problem of multiple use of the surface of our public lands and at the same time to protect the prospector and small-mine operator, I, and other members of the House Interior Committee, have had the finest cooperation and able assistance of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the American Mining Congress, the Nevada Mining Association, and other State mining associations, the American Forestry Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Lumbermen's Manufacturers Association, and many other conservationist groups.

Because of the interest that the miners and prospectors of Nevada and other Western States have in this legislation and because they wish to learn how they may be affected by the new law, I have prepared an explanation of H. R. 5891—Public Law 167, 84th Congress—which should answer many questions raised by those concerned.

Over the past 20 years there have been increasing demands from some conservation organizations, Federal agencies, recreational organizations, and sports writers that the mining laws be revised. It had been charged that the mining law of 1872 interfered with other uses of Government lands, and had resulted in unauthorized use of such lands in the guise of mining locations. The mining industry had in no way condoned the abuses by the few whose action has produced many of these demands.

There must be continued opportunity to go on the public domain to search for minerals, to locate mining claims as provided under existing law, to mine any minerals found, and to make a profit if fortunate enough to discover and develop commercial deposits. This is the

way in which our mining industry has grown from the early days. Our Government must encourage development of minerals on the public lands—particularly so when our national security is so vitally dependent upon these basic raw materials. The miner must have security in his investment, which requires that full title be given to him when he shall have fulfilled all the requirements for a mineral patent.

The new law closes the door to abuses of the mining laws, and provides for multiple use of the surface of mining claims prior to patent. At the same time, this new law guarantees the miner his full rights for prospecting and development, and the same rights upon patenting the claim as if the new law had not been enacted. The passage of H. R. 5891 has solved a problem that had been before Congress over the past two decades.

WHAT DOES THE NEW LAW DO?

It precludes from location under the mining laws of common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and provides for the disposition of these minerals under the Materials Disposal Act of 1947. It does not affect the validity of any mining location based upon the discovery of some other mineral occurring in or in association with such a deposit—for example, gold occurring in gravel. A deposit of such materials which is valuable because it has some property giving it distinct and special value continues to be locatable under the mining laws as does also block pumice which occurs in nature in pieces having 1 dimension of 2 inches or more.

As to mining claims hereafter located, the law, prior to patent: First, bars the use of a mining claim for any purpose other than prospecting, mining or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto; second, permits the United States to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage other surface resources—except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws—and to use so much of the surface of the mining claim as may be necessary for such purposes or for access to adjacent land, so long as these activities do not endanger or materially interfere with mining operations or related activities; third, precludes a mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources subject to management or disposition by the United States, except to the extent required in his mining operations or related activities—permitted timber cutting, other than to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management; and, fourth, provides that if at any time the locator requires more timber for his mining operations than is available to him from the claim after disposition of timber therefrom by the United States subsequent to the making of his location, he shall be entitled, free of charge, to be supplied with timber for such requirements from the nearest timber administered by the disposing agency which is substantially equivalent in kind and quantity to the timber estimated by the disposing agency to have been disposed of from the claim.

None of these limitations apply after patent, and the patentee will acquire the same title to the mining claim as if this law had not been enacted.

The new law provides an in rem procedure similar to that contained in Public Law 585, 83d Congress, which resolved the conflict between the mining laws and the Mineral Leasing Act. This procedure enables the Government to resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment, in the national forests or on other public lands, and thus to eliminate problems incident to timber sales, and so forth. It is in the nature of a quiet-title action, and follows generally the procedure applicable to securing mineral patents, whereby those who claim rights adverse to those of the applicant for patent are required to come forward and assert them.

This procedure may be initiated by the head of the Federal agency responsible for administration of the surface resources of the lands involved, but will be conducted through and in the Department of the Interior.

Careful provision is made for notice to mining claimants of the pendency of such a procedure. A notice must be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the county in which the lands involved are situated. If published in a daily newspaper, the law requires publication in the Wednesday issue for 9 consecutive weeks; if in a weekly paper, in 9 consecutive issues; if in a semiweekly or triweekly paper, in the issue of the same day of each week for 9 consecutive weeks.

A copy of the notice must be personally delivered to or be mailed by registered mail within 15 days after the date of first publication (a) to each person found from a required examination of the lands to be in possession or engaged in working the lands involved in the procedure, (b) to each person who has filed in the county office of record a proper request for such notice, and (c) a copy of the notice must be mailed by registered mail to any person who is shown by a title search to have an interest in the lands. Following such notice, if a mining claimant files a statement asserting rights to the surface resources of a mining claim located on the lands involved in the procedure, a local hearing will be held to determine the validity of such asserted rights. If the decision upholds his asserted rights, no subsequent similar proceeding will in any way affect those rights. If a claimant fails within 150 days from the first publication to assert his rights in the prescribed manner, the claim thereafter has the same status as claims hereafter located, with the Government having the right, prior to patent, to manage and dispose of surface resources as set forth above.

Any mining claimant can assure himself of notice of an in rem proceeding affecting his claim by recording an acknowledged request in the county office of record for a copy of such notice, giving his name, address, and the specified descriptive data as to each unpatented mining claim under which he asserts rights.

To limit, as to any in rem proceeding, the length of the hearing and the cost of transcripts, the law restricts any single hearing to a maximum of 20 mining claims, unless the parties otherwise stipulate.

The new law permits the owner of any unpatented claim heretofore located, if he so desires, to waive and relinquish rights to the surface resources of his claim not required in his mining operations or related activities; and thereafter his claim will have the same surface rights status as claims hereafter located, with no disturbance of his priority rights in other respects. No such waiver would constitute any concession as to invalidity of the mining claim.

The new law prohibits inclusion in any mineral patent for any mining claim of any limitation or restriction not otherwise authorized by law. However, it does not limit or repeal any existing authority to include any reservation, limitation, or restriction in any such patent, and does not limit or restrict any use of the lands covered by any patented or unpatented mining claim by the United States, its lessees, permittees, and licensees which is otherwise now authorized by law.

The law also specifies that surface rights to waters reserved to the United States, as well as those assured to mining claimants, will be continued to be regulated and controlled by the provisions of State law to the same extent and degree as they were prior to enactment.

WILL THE NEW LAW AFFECT THE OWNER OF AN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIM HERETOFORE LOCATED?

Mining claim holders could be affected by the new law in that all unpatented claims heretofore located will be subject to a section 5 in rem proceeding if one is filed which includes the lands covered by the mining claim. In this event, the mining claimants would be required to come forward and establish the validity of his mining claim if he desires to assert full possessory rights to the surface of the land. Determination of the validity of so asserted surface rights would be made by the Secretary of the Interior or his designated agent.

The new law should contribute to greater utilization of the surface resources of our public lands without restricting the opportunities for prospecting and mineral development or reducing the rewards of success.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS THAT MAY BE RAISED BY MINERS

Question: Does the new law affect the rights of an individual to go on the national forests and other public domain to prospect for minerals and to locate mining claims?

Answer: No.

Question: May a mining claim be hereafter located on a deposit of a common variety of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders?

Answer: No. However the term "common varieties" does not include deposits of such materials which are valuable because of some distinct or special value and does not include "block pumice"

which occurs in nature in pieces having one dimension of 2 inches or more. The report of the Senate Interior Committee pointed out that materials such as limestone suitable for use in production of cement, metallurgical or chemical grade limestone, gypsum, and the like, will still be locatable under the mining laws. The law is also specific in providing that a mining location may be based upon the discovery of a locatable mineral occurring in or in association with the common variety materials.

Question: What rights to the surface of a mining claim hereafter located will be controlled by the Federal Government?

Answer: The United States is authorized to manage and dispose of surface resources on claims hereafter located and to use the surface for access to adjacent lands, so long as and to the extent that these activities do not endanger or materially interfere with mining, or related operations or activities on the mining claim. In other words, the new law will in no way deprive a miner of any surface right which is reasonably related to prospecting, mining, processing operations. The House Interior Committee report on the bill was very specific in pointing out that this legislation would not have the effect of modifying long standing essential rights springing from location of a mining claim by stating that the dominant and primary use of lands hereafter located, would, as in the past, be vested in the mining locator of such claim.

Question: Do these reservations of surface rights to the United States continue after mineral patent has been granted?

Answer: No. The new law provides that no reservation, limitation, or restriction will be included in any mineral patent hereafter issued unless such reservation was otherwise authorized by law. In other words, the new law in no way affects the character and scope of title to a mining claim, including its surface resources, after patent is issued.

Question: Does the law impose any new restriction upon surface use of a mining claim validity located before the passage of the new law?

Answer: No.

Question: It has been charged that the new law gives a Government official the power to determine the validity of a mining claim. Is that true?

Answer: This has always been true under the general mining laws and this authority is not affected by the new law. The Secretary of Interior has always had authority to determine the validity of a mining claim. Under the in rem proceeding provided by the new law, the mining claimant without the filing of a specific contest against his location may be called upon to come forward and assert his claim and its validity. If he fails to do so, it does not invalidate his location, but simply gives it a surface-rights status like that of claims located after passage of the new law. He does not in such an in rem proceeding have to put the validity of his claim on the line. Of course, if he appears and asserts a validity of his claim predating passage of the new law, that question would be in issue. Determination might or might not completely condemn the location. For example, if it were found that the supporting discovery was not made until after passage of the new law, the effect of the decision would be to make the claim subject to the new law. But if it were found that the claim had no discovery, the effect would be a holding of complete invalidity.

Question: It has been charged that the new law discriminates against the small miner. Is this true?

Answer: The rights of every miner, small or large, are equally and fully protected under the new law. He is free to go on the public domain, including the national forests, and to prospect for minerals, to locate mining claims and to patent mining claims, just as he has been able to do so since 1872.

Question: Why did the mining industry support this new law?

Answer: The mining industry recognized that there were occasional instances in which attempts were made to misuse the mining laws to obtain valuable timber, a desirable homesite, or property for commercial purposes. It recognized that although such attempted mining locations usually lacked good faith or other elements requisite to validity, they nonetheless presented problems to those administering public lands and cast an unfavorable aura of suspicion upon the mining law system. The mining industry in no way condoned such abuses. Bills have been introduced for the purpose of preventing abuses which would have changed the basic concept of the location—patent system, or which would have imposed burdensome requirements on the locator. The industry felt that it was of vital importance to maintain the location and patent concept of established mining law, that the real purpose of the mining laws was to permit mineral exploration and mining use and that a prepatent preclusion of use of surface resources for other than legitimate mining purposes would not injure the good faith miner or retard mining activity.

Question: Does the new law require recordation of mining claim location notices of heretofore or hereafter located mining claims with any Federal agency?

Answer: No.

Question: How will common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders now be obtained from public lands?

Answer: Such materials may be obtained under the Materials Disposal Act from the Federal agency administering the lands involved—that is from the Department of Agriculture or Department of the Interior. The charge for such materials will be determined by the administering agency. In the case of a Federal, State, or municipal agency, or nonprofit association or corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture or Secretary of Interior as to lands administered under their respective Departments may permit the removal of such materials without charge. In the case of an individual or private company, such materials may be obtained from the Federal agency administering the lands involved—from the United States Forest Service or from the Bureau of Land Management. Payment for such materials will be determined by the administering agency. In the case of a Federal, State, or municipal agency or nonprofit association or corporation, the United States Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management may permit the removal of such materials without charge.

Question: Does the new law affect the validity of a previously-located mining claim, based upon a discovery of common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders?

Answer: No.

EXAMPLE

Jones is the owner of a mining claim located prior to enactment of the new law. He is satisfied that he has a valid mining claim, properly posted and recorded, and has a valid discovery of tungsten on the property. He has performed the annual assessment work requirements.

Question: What courses of action are available to Jones in the event the Secretary of Interior initiates action to determine the surface rights on lands embracing his claim?

Answer: First, if Jones desires to retain the full rights to the surface use of his mining claim which he presently enjoys, he must file—in the office specified by the Secretary of Interior in the published notice of the proceding—within 150 days from the date of the first publication of such notice, a verified statement setting forth as to his unpatented mining claim (a) the date of location; (b) the book and page of recordation of the notice or the certificate of location; (c) the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace such mining claim; or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument; (d) whether such claimant is a locator or purchaser under such location; and (e) the name and address of such claimant and names and addresses so far as known to the claimant of any other person or persons claiming any interest or interests in or under such unpatented mining claim. The Secretary of Interior will then fix a time and place for a hearing to determine the validity and effectiveness of any right or title to, or interest in or under such mining claim. The hearing must be in the county where the lands in question are located, unless the mining claimant agrees otherwise. Conduct of the hearing will follow the then established general procedures and rules of practice of the Department of Interior in respect to contest or protests affecting public lands in the United States. If the final decisions rendered affirms the validity and effectiveness of the rights asserted by Jones under his mining claim, then no subsequent similar proceedings can affect his right or interest under such mining claim.

Second, if Jones does not desire to assert full rights to the surface use of his

mining claim, proir to issuance of patent therefore, and is satisfied to have his rights of surface use limited to the surface use required in his mining operations or related activities, he could either (a) refrain from filing any statement, in which event his failure to file would be deemed to constitue a waiver and relinquishment of full surface rights and would thereafter subject the claim to the limitations and restrictions which permit the Government to manage and dispose of surface resources; or (b) file a waiver and relinquishment of such exclusive surface rights in the office where the notice or the certificate of location of such mining claim is of record which would thereafter subject the claim to the rights of the United States to manage and dispose of surface resources.

Discredited Public Housing, Killed Last Year, Must Not Be Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming vote by which the Wolcott substitute to S. 2126 was approved on yesterday, marked another milestone in the long struggle this House has made against the abuses and evils of public housing. Public housing was killed last year. As of today there is no such thing—except for the remnants of contracting remaining in the authorization for 35,000 units in the bill last year. And that authorization expires at the end of August.

On yesterday I addressed the House in support of the Wolcott substitute. Because of time limitation I did not cover many phases of the public-housing program which I believe should be reviewed. Therefore, I shall pursue the subject a little further at this time.

COMMITTEE BILL AGAINST ADMINISTRATION VIEWS ON PUBLIC HOUSING

In the debate on the Wolcott substitute, many proponents of the committee bill, which carried an overall total authorization for 124,000 housing units, contended the measure was in accord with the administration's request. That claim was challenged, and properly so. In a press release on July 13, Housing Administrator Albert M. Cole stated that the administration wanted the housing to require that—

First. Cities develop approved programs of urban renewal prior to participation in Federal public housing aid.

Second. Public housing be made available only to families displaced by slum-clearance projects.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the latest authoritative statement of the administration's position on the subject, coming from an official spokesman.

Both of those requirements are in the law now. But the committee bill instead of retaining them and complying with the administration's request, repeals both of them from the law, along with the repeal of several other very desirable restrictions to protect the public interest against evils and abuses that have cropped up in the administration of the program.

Moreover, while the President requested 35,000 units for each of the next 2 years, the committee bill went further and reauthorized the 35,000 included last year and went even further to initiate a brand new program calling for 20,000 units for old folks. This provision, not included in the President's request, is known as the Townsend plan.

So it is obvious that while the spokesmen for the committee which reported S. 2126 contended on yesterday that they were merely complying with the administration's request, the bill as reported was in many respects completely contrary to the administration's program.

SLIGHT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SLUM CLEARANCE AND PUBLIC HOUSING

For years, Mr. Speaker, the public housers have based their principal justification for socialized housing upon the claim that housing must be available for people who are made homeless by slum clearance.

But surveys have revealed that only a minor portion of public housing projects have been built upon land from which slums had been cleared, and that a very limited number of public housing tenants ever lived in knocked down slums. Some say the percentage is as high as 30 percent; others insist the figure is from 10 to 20 percent. Actually, therefore, there is but little relationship between public housing and slum clearance.

This well-known fact is proven not only by surveys but also by tacit admission of the Public Housing Administration. A few days ago Mr. Charles E. Slusser, PHA Commissioner, reported that a total of 29,509 units have been contracted out of the 35,000 authorized under what he called the crippling amendments which tied the program to cumbersome procedures. He added:

> The restrictive provisions in the Housing Act of 1954, tying the low-rent housing to slum clearance and urban renewal, stopped many housing authorities from further participation in the low-rent housing program.

He went on to say that out of more than 700 local housing authorities with active low-rent housing programs, a bare 34 have been able to enter contracts during the year.

In other words, here we have the Public Housing Commissioner himself virtually admitting that there is very limited relationship between slum clearance and the need for public housing. Yet public housers have demanded for years that we spend billions for socialized housing just so the people forced out in the street by slum clearance will have a place to live.

PUBLIC HOUSING BREEDS JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. Speaker, during the debate on yesterday it was said that public housing is a weapon against crime. I wonder about that. Actually, many people are asking: Why is there so much juvenile delinquency in public-housing projects? That is difficult to answer unless we assume that among tenants attracted to such projects there are a considerable number of juvenile delinquents, and by concentrating them the problem is aggravated. That fact is illustrated by a story which appeared not long ago in the New York Times, to this effect:

> Dozens of families are being evicted from city housing projects because their delinquent children are regarded as a menace to the safety and comfort of other tenants.
>
> City housing authority officials said yesterday that chronic or dangerous juvenile delinquency was among the reasons for which about 250 families are evicted each year as undesirable tenants.

A couple of years ago District Judge Campbell in Houston refused the custody of a child to a litigant who proposed to keep it in the San Felipe courts, a public housing project, because he said it was not a proper place to rear a child. And he cataloged from police records a long and unsavory record of crime, immorality, and delinquency in public housing projects in the city of Houston. While I am sure such conditions do not obtain in many well-administered projects, yet scores of instances have occurred in other cities that could be cited.

S. 2126 WOULD COST TAXPAYERS $2½ BILLION

Let us look for a moment at the fantastic cost of this program. If the committee bill had prevailed, and if the public housing units covered in it were constructed, the cost would exceed $2½ billion.

It would be cheaper, much cheaper, for the Government to build the projects and then deed them to occupants, rather than carry the load of subsidy, upkeep, financing, interest, overhead, and so forth, that are involved. But the tenant would be foolish to accept title, if offered, because it is much cheaper for him to become a ward of the state, enjoy rent at low or nominal levels, no taxes on the property and no assessments for streets, schools, sewer lines, garbage disposal, or even lawn mowing.

Here are the facts about the cost. Each apartment with a development cost of $10,000 (which is below the present average cost) eventually costs the taxpayers $18,600. The law (sec. 10 (b) and (c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) provides that the fixed annual contribution shall in no case exceed a sum equal to the applicable Federal interest rate plus 2 percent, times the development or acquisition cost.

Public Housing Administration has announced that the going rate for the period ending June 30, 1955 is 2⅝ percent. Therefore we can make this computation:

	Percent
Federal going rate of 2⅝ percent equals	2.65
Plus 2 percent	2.00
Total	4.65

Four and sixty-five hundredths percent times 40 years equals 186 percent.

One hundred and eighty-six percent times development cost of $10,000 equals $18,600.

Then by multiplying the 124,000 units authorized in S. 2126 times the $18,600,

the total possible subsidy cost is $2,306,400,000.

The cost which I have just described does not include the $4.90 per month per unit, which represents the Federal tax loss on tax-exempt public housing bonds. The confirmation of that loss is found at page 314 of the President's Housing Advisory Committee Report.

The total additional cost per unit is thus increased by $2,352.00, when computed over the 40-year period.

Nor does this computation include the tax loss to local communities which are required to exempt a public housing project from any form of local tax for a period of up to 40 years. This alone amounted to $25 million in 1953, according to the President's Housing Advisory Committee Report. In fact, the Federal Housing Agency's handbook of 1949 states:

> It is expected that the value of the contribution which localities make by foregoing full ad valorem taxes on projects occupied by low-income families, less in lieu payments which are received, will approximate 50 percent of the Federal contributions over the life of the projects.

Nor do the cost figures I have given include the administrative costs that will go on indefinitely. That alone runs into millions.

In other words, when we add the net loss suffered in taxes by local communities to the mounting administrative costs of public housing, and add the loss in revenue from tax-free public housing bonds, to the costs I have previously computed, the total outlay, direct and indirect, to support this venture in state socialism is truly fantastic.

PUBLIC HOUSING BONDS A BONANZA FOR INVESTMENT BANKERS

Mr. Speaker, much has been said here about Government bonds providing a big advantage for investment bankers. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has had a lot to say about that. He has expressed fear that such investors will garner an unfair advantage. That point is particularly applicable to the investors who reap such a windfall from the purchase of public housing bonds.

It must be remembered that the only Federal bonds being issued that are exempt from income taxes are public housing bonds. The Public Housing Administration has been selling around a billion dollars' worth of those bonds annually. They are much sought after by the investment bankers, and for good reason. You cannot blame them. It is legal, thanks to the 1949 Housing Act which exempts those bonds from income taxes. Now what does that mean to the investors?

It means this: Even at 2 percent yield, the tax-exempt bond is the equivalent of a yield of 13.33 percent on a taxable bond held by an individual in the $80,000 to $90,000 individual income tax bracket.

And the President's Advisory Committee on Housing states:

> It is estimated that for units completed under the Housing Act of 1949 the average tax loss (on tax-exempt bonds) will be about $4.90 per unit per month.

So the investment banker gets the big windfall at the expense of other taxpayers. As I see it, such an advantage is both unsound and indefensible. It should be repealed.

PUBLIC HOUSERS OPPOSE RESTRICTING OCCUPANCY TO LOW-INCOME TENANTS

Mr. Speaker, another deception that has been practiced by public housers has been the phony claim that it is to help only low-income people. Just you try to limit occupancy of public housing apartments to tenants who make $2,000 a year, or $3,000 a year, and witness the public housers blow their tops.

Let us take a few readings on this and see what the facts are. Take the city of Detroit where the local housing commission director reports that tenants are admitted to public housing apartments who earn $3,800 annually, and are permitted to remain indefinitely even if their income goes up to as much as $4,500.

In Wilmington, Del., it is reported to be $4,800.

In Dayton, Ohio the annual income limit for public housing occupancy is reported to $5,800.

Other comparable examples over the country could be listed here. But these serve to completely refute the phony contention that public housing is intended only for low-income people who have been displaced by slum clearance.

LATE SENATOR TAFT FAVORED PUBLIC HOUSING FOR WELFARE PURPOSES ONLY

Mr. Speaker, a number of speakers on yesterday cited the support of the late and lamented Senator Taft as justification for their present support of public housing as a policy. But they should go back and read the late Senator's speeches on the subject. They will find that his support of the program was confined to considerations of public welfare. He was too much of an advocate of free enterprise to favor public housing for tenants making incomes of, say, $4,000 a year.

Let me cite an illustration which delineates the difference between public housing as welfare and as socialism.

Two years ago, according to the Wilmington Morning News, Rev. F. Raymond Baker, a member of the Wilmington Housing Authority, appeared before the city council there and protested an increase of up to $4,800 which a public-housing tenant could make and remain in the project. He is quoted as saying: "Through the years, I have been a member of the Wilmington Housing Authority and during that time I have been interested in, first, housing for low-income families, and, second, keeping the professionals from going too far with public housing. I think I have been fighting against what happened in the Wilmington Housing Authority," where, he said, the action in increasing the income levels marked the end of public housing as welfare and the beginning of housing as socialism.

Those of you who get comfort from following the example of the late Senator Taft can be assured that he never advocated public housing as socialism. The record should be kept straight in that respect.

SHOULD TAXPAYERS HELP PAY GROCERY BILLS?

Mr. Speaker, the public housers demand that "every American have decent housing at prices he can afford." That is fine and good in theory. But it means having Uncle Sam help pay the rent bills each month. Under that theory, would it not be equally as logical to demand "a well-balanced diet of decent foods for every American at prices they can afford?" Or "decent medical and hospital care for every American at prices he can afford?" Or "decent transportation at prices he can afford?" Just where would those who adhere to that philosophy draw the line?

SHALL WE MARCH BACK DOWN THE HILL?

You and I know that socialized housing, as a philosophy, is simply contrary to our concept in this country of private ownership, of free enterprise. It is easy to say a little is all right. But that is just as logical as it is to say that a little pregnancy is all right. We have passed the so-called tapering-off stage. Public housing has passed beyond the welfare stage and is now in the socialistic stage. If that were not true there would be no such clamor by professional public-housing advocates for the repeal of the so-called restrictive provisions now in the law—provisions designed to confine public housing to welfare purposes.

We have been tapering off since 1951, when by a vote of 181 to 113 the House adopted the Gossett amendment to limit new public-housing starts the following year to 5,000. And we have insisted on ending the program each year, only to be overridden by the Senate. Then, last year, both the House and the Senate spelled out the total, final, complete end of public housing. Let us not march back down the hill and wipe out the progress that has been made. Let us think of America and its future, of the preservation of free enterprise against the inroads of this form of creeping socialism. After all, we have done right well under the free-enterprise system. Why pursue this foreign system of public housing, copied lock, stock, and barrel from England, where it was initiated by the Labor-Socialist Party?

Mr. Speaker, an English poet once wrote that—

> Vice is a monster of such frightful mien
> As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
> But seen too oft, familiar with its face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

A Tribute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to make an observation which has come to me as a freshman Congressman.

As we come to the end of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, I cannot help but express myself as being grateful for the privilege of representing a segment of the people of this mighty land of ours in the halls of Congress. I know now why it is often referred to as the greatest legislative body in the world. I have seen it operate. I know firsthand of its deliberation, of its innate sense of fairness, and of its constant striving to implement the voice of the people. I want to echo all of the fine things that have been said in tribute to Congress. I take exception to those who would deride and belittle it. It is not perfect in every sense of the word, but it is a true reflection of the hopes, ideals, and aspirations of free men as they strive for perfection. I am proud of Congress, and prouder still that I am a Member.

In this tribute, it behooves me to pay due respect to all Members of Congress for their help and guidance. I had lots to learn as a new Member. I still have a long way to go before I can feel that I am a good Representative. I am certain, however, that I will attain that status sooner through the helpful cooperation of my colleagues who have been kind and tolerant of another freshman.

I have a special tribute to pay to my fellow Members of the Iowa delegation. They have not had a freshman to break in for a long time. But they took me under their wing, and through the generous help they have given my office staff and me, I have done a better job representing my district than had I been left to "learn the ropes" by trial and error. I will always be grateful that they helped me get off on the right foot and that they lived with me, and worked with me, through this first session.

Already the pundits are starting to appraise the record of the 84th Congress. It will probably be some time before our efforts are fully evaluated and assigned a place in history. I am optimistic about that evaluation, and with a deep sense of humility, truly proud to have played a part in the record.

Banquo's Ghost—The Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the recent Geneva Conference is now over and, although the meeting at the summit will be placed in its proper perspective by the cold and scrutinizing light of history, some of the newspaper columnists have already been able to whisk us out of the atomic and cobalt age into the glorious age of rose-colored glasses. All is suddenly sweetness and light, there has been a recognition of the status quo, the bear is not really a bad bear after all, everybody is buddy buddy, and "there ain't gonna be no war."

A magic has been exuded from the conference which far excells anything that can be found in the Arabian Nights and, borne upon the wings of soft breezes drifting down the slopes from the sun-swept summit, occult powers have completely overcome some of the crystal gazers, to say nothing of certain administration spokesmen of the Democratic Party who have been felled at a single stroke of the wand.

However, Mr. Speaker, like a breath of fresh air, it is satisfying to find that many writers are refusing to follow the white rabbit into the land of imagery and that, on the other hand, they are showing a determination to study the facts realistically and relate the real results of the conference to the American people. In so doing they are contributing a service to the cause of justice and freedom.

To those who do suffer the illusion that the real nature of international communism has been changed by the new show of amiability and affability put on by the Russian delegation at Geneva, one might point to the announcement, on the heels of the Geneva adjournment, that the Soviets are increasing their military forces in East Germany.

Then, too, the Israeli plane disaster, in which more than fifty persons were shot down by Bulgarian Communists, only conforms to the Russian pattern of committing overt, violent acts in order to demean the United States before the eyes of the world. "So sorry," says the Bulgarian Communists, and they feel that they have atoned for their trigger-happy brutality.

After all, it was virtually on the eve of the Geneva conference that the Russians shot down one of our American planes over international waters, inflicting severe burns upon a number of American boys, scars which some of the victims will carry to their graves.

In that instance, the Soviets quickly assumed partial responsibility, a development, based upon past experience, that warranted the sound conclusion that they knew it was their full responsibility. Presented with this flagrant case which ought to have been pressed vigorously and for the assessment of full blame and total damages, our State Department made a hasty agreement, accepting the Soviet offer to pay for half the damages.

I repeat this case at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, to point up the sorry standards of measurement we are using in our official dealings with the Russians and to stress the fact that our sincere desire for peaceful relations with the Communists will carry us into serious danger unless we base our reckonings and policies on realism.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, without regard to party, would literally throw their hats in the air with joy, if Geneva had produced any real, sound basis for peace in our day. But all of the smiling and hale-fellow-well-met show at the summit failed miserably to alter the totalitarian Soviet structure. The satellite peoples are just as captive after Geneva as they were before. We have not read of a single prisoner having been freed. The world still looks in vain for the Soviet lifting of the ban against freedom of worship. The loved ones of the thousands upon thousands of politically imprisoned foreign nationals have less hope now for the release of their relatives than they had before the meetings began. No edict has been issued by the Kremlin for its subversive agents throughout the world to cease and desist in their foul efforts to undermine national governments throughout the free world.

What has come from the Geneva meetings, Mr. Speaker, is a vast flood of propaganda all aimed at showing that the prospects of peace are soaring because Bulganin exhibited party manners, that good fellowship was generated with the aid of cocktails and caviar, that a "new climate" has been produced, and that from here on everything is going to be just ducky.

If we ever get out from under this terrific barrage of propaganda bilge, we shall discover that the all vital, all important problem of German unification remains unsolved, and, as a matter of fact, the Western position vis-a-vis Germany has been damaged and the Adenauer government has been weakened. Why do I say this, Mr. Speaker? For the simple reason that the Western position on the German unification problem has been predicated upon a united-front posture by Britain, France, and the United States to the effect that German unification must be disposed of constructively before any discussion would be engaged in relative to the Soviet proposal of a general European security pact. As a matter of fact, published reports from recognized and established correspondents have related that, in a moment of exuberancy, during face to face conversations with the Russians, President Eisenhower said that the German unification matter was not necessarily a condition precedent for the discussion of European security. This statement, which the press reported, caused the British representatives to have a slight case of tremors, caused the French to go pale, and required a late hour press conference by Secretary of State Dulles to shore up the Western Alliance and give reassurance to the Bonn government.

As we get more of the picture of what really went on at Geneva, there are other disturbing angles coming to the fore. Let us consider for a moment the disclosure by French Premier Edgar Faure that it was a last minute proposal by President Eisenhower which broke the deadlock at the conference and made it the success it is being heralded.

The United Press is authority for the story on Premier Faure, and it carries the very significant editor's note to this effect:

> The secrecy of the final conference prevented Mr. Faure from explaining just what the items were that deadlocked the conference or what Mr. Eisenhower proposed to break the deadlock.

There is every indication that the concession Mr. Eisenhower made was in reference to the vital question of German unification coming before consideration, by the October Foreign Minister's meeting, of the Russian overall European se-

curity pact. If this is the price we paid for harmony, if this is the concession our President made in order that the summit meetings could be proclaimed a success, then, in reality, we have experienced a major defeat. It is hardly to be wondered at that the British would be greatly disturbed and that the French would be gravely upset, or that the Germans would have the feeling that its allies were cutting the ground from beneath the Bonn government.

And so, it is most disturbing to look back upon the fruitless Geneva Conference, and to wade one's way through the sea of phony claims being made for the summit meetings and then look out across the months to the forthcoming Foreign Ministers meeting in October. You, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of this House know my feelings on the subject of trade with Russia, of my insistence that all goods are strategic and that when we supply and alleviate the deficiencies in the Russian economy we are in fact strengthening and perpetuating the Communist regime. Well, there are significant indications that at the October meeting steps will be proposed to drop the trade barriers and open the floodgates. Of what other import are the following words by President Eisenhower, contained in his last speech at the Geneva Conference:

The work of our foreign ministers as they strive to implement our directives will be of great importance, perhaps of even more than what we have done here. Theirs is the task, reflecting the substantive polices of their governments, to reach agreement on courses of action which we here could discuss only in broad terms. I know we all wish them well.

I trust we will all support the necessary adjustments which they may find our governments must make if we are to resolve our differences in these matters.

These words, too, could apply to the German unification question and to many others, and if they do they are cause for serious concern, not for cheers.

The Army's Top Cops: A Well-Deserved Salute to Maj. Gen. William Maglin and His Corps of Military Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the August 1955 issue of Coronet magazine, a most unusual and outstanding bit of reporting is done in an article entitled "The Army's Top Cops." It should lighten the hearts of the families whose kin serve in the Army.

Would that the Department of Defense had a unified corps of cops for all branches of the service skippered by a general like Maglin who says, "Our work is really protection; we protect soldiers from rackets, from people who prey on them. It's our job to look out for trouble, not look for trouble."

The article follows:

THE ARMY'S TOP COPS
(By Tom Davis)

About an hour before reveille at a large eastern Army post, a military police car drew up before the post exchange and a young MP climbed out to make a routine security check of the darkened premises.

Leaving his partner behind the wheel, he disappeared around a corner of the building. A few moments later, he came rushing back to report: "One of the back windows is smashed. The screen's been cut. Radio the desk right away."

His partner grabbed the radio telephone on the car's dashboard, called the military police sergeant's desk, and within seconds the office of Maj. Max C. Vogt, Jr., veteran provost mashal, had put into action one of the Army's crack military police criminal investigation units. These men—soldiers first, military policemen second, and investigators by specialization—are among the finest detectives in the world.

The post exchange officer, among the first to be called, promptly arrived and it was discovered his office safe had been cracked and looted of $50,000 in cash receipts covering a 3-day holiday period. With this, the MPCI men went to work.

Checking revealed that entry had been made by cutting the heavy wire screen, then jimmying and pushing up the window. Two clues were uncovered a this stage: marks which the tool used to cut the screening had left on the prongs of wire, and cloth fibers which clung to the screening where the burglar's clothing had snagged on the sharp edges.

Screening and cloth fibers immediately were sent to the FBI laboratory for analysis. In this instance, an FBI laboratory was used because it was the closest to the post; normally, it would have been an MPCI lab.

Here it was determined that the fibers had come from a type of clothing issued to soldiers. A photographic blowup showed in clear details the markings left on the screen by the cutting tool. With continued use, tools such as wire snippers leave their own distinctive markings, much like a pistol barrel rifling leaves on a bullet.

Despite around-the-clock work, the investigation dragged on until a soldier found some costume jewelry secreted in a ventilator in a supply depot. The stuff, dust-covered but still bearing the stock tags, was brought to the provost marshal's office where it was examined.

The PX had been broken into several times in the past and in one of the burglaries a quantity of rings and necklaces had been taken. A check of inventory records disclosed that this was some of the loot. Now the MPCI people thought there might be a tie-in between the old and the new cases, and the search shifted to the new area.

It was discovered that workers in this building used tools of a type that could also be employed to cut heavy screening. Shortly such a tool was found hidden in a desk drawer and subsequent lab tests showed it was the one which had cut the screening on the PX.

Now 15 men who might have had occasion to use this particular tool came under interrogation. One of them—a married man long in the service—became a strong suspect. He denied any connection with the case, however, nor could investigators find evidence linking him with the burglary and safe-cracking.

A check of the suspect's service record showed that he had been in trouble in the past. It was learned also that he had purchased a new car, made a down payment on a home, and had been spending money freely since the burglary. The MPCI men knew that these things could not have come out of the suspect's military pay.

Brought to the Provost Marshal's office, he willingly answered questions and agreed to take a lie-detector test. But when the time came he refused flatly to cooperate and clammed up tight on all further attempts to question him.

The MPCI men knew that while there was overwhelming evidence that they had the right man—all of it was circumstantial. The suspect still continued to deny he knew anything about the case. At this point, they got their big break.

The Military Police, it should be explained, work closely with local police authorities in every area in which they operate. In this case, local police had been brought up to date on the latest development in the PX burglary. As the MPCI men were about to take the suspect and their evidence to the United States Federal Commissioner's office, a local policeman telephoned that a container holding three pistols and a large sum of money had been recovered from a city dump.

On a hunch, the Provost Marshal told the prisoner that they would make a brief stop on the way to the Commissioner's office. Shrewdly, he did not say where.

When they arrived at police headquarters, the prisoner took one look at the container and, believing he'd finally been trapped, made a complete confession.

He had surmised, he said, that the PX safe would contain a large amount of money taken in over the 3-day post holiday and had broken in during the night. The three pistols all belonged to him, although they had no connection with any case. He later was convicted and is now serving a 20-year term in a Federal prison.

Contrary to the general belief, the Army has no Criminal Investigation Division, and never has had one. The AEF, in World War I, had a Division of Criminal Investigation in Europe. In World War II, the Office of the Provost Marshal General had a Staff Division for Criminal Investigation. This Division did not exercise command over the investigators in the field. Investigators were assigned to major commands. Because of the wording on their badges and credentials, they became known as "CID agents," and frequently were organized for operations independent of the Army command structure.

The old setup now has been replaced by the hard-hitting, streamlined MPCI groups.

In the words of Maj. Gen. William H. Maglin, Provost Marshal General of the Army, Chief of the Military Police Corps, "the investigator has moved into his rightful place in the Army Establishment. He works for his local provost marshal in the same manner as the detective works for the chief of police in his home town, and the provost marshal of any command is the chief of police."

A soldier expressing a desire to become an MP may be assigned to the Provost Marshal General Center at Camp Gordon, near Augusta, Ga., where he may stay from 16 weeks to 8 months, depending on the extensiveness of his training. MPCI detachments are assigned to areas with potentially high crime rates, or where the need for strict crime prevention is necessary.

Today's MPCI man is a highly trained specialist in criminal investigation who may or may not wear a uniform. If the investigator is working in a military area where the uniform is commonplace, he will wear it. If he is assigned to a case involving civilians or foreign nationals, he wears civilian clothes. He averages 33 years of age and is married.

He is not charged with matters concerning spies or enemy agents. He's a career or professional soldier dedicated to fighting crime where it concerns the Army, and his identity is carefully concealed so as to preserve his usefulness to the service.

He works with this admonition constantly before him: "We want no 'Sam Spades' in the organization." This simply bears out

the military police slogan: "Of the troops and for the troops." Though it also serves to discourage any ideas a man might get about using the organization as a stepping stone to personal publicity.

Men taken into custody are, for the most part, enlisted men; and it is usually the soldier who is a. w. o. l. or who is a deserter who commits the major crimes—murder, rape, criminal or aggravated assault, or some other felony.

Larceny is the big crime, at the moment, in the life of an MPCI man. That is the felony that keeps him busiest. Commanders at large posts where there are supply depots will begin receiving reports of missing items. These are forwarded through channels to the provost marshal and MPCI men will be ordered to make an investigation.

One of the most bizarre cases in MPCI annals came up near the close of the Korean fighting. This was the Queen of Pusan case, so called from a 23-year-old former Korean nurse, Lee Yung Ja, known in the Korean underworld as the queen of Pusan. Lee was a striking brunette who attracted considerable male attention whenever she appeared in the better cafes.

With most of the off-duty soldiers frequenting these places, it was no job for her to meet a young corporal who worked in one of the big American depots storing clothing highly salable in clothing-shy Korea. It didn't take the beautiful, brainy, and completely unscrupulous Lee long to see possibilities in the friendship of this corporal.

The friendship grew in no time at all and soon she had managed to get him on dope. She herself, MPCI men say, never had the habit.

Floating between Seoul and Pusan, with a gang she had rounded up in the two war-torn cities, Lee began to move into the big-time of Korean vice. With the corporal nicely on the hook, she organized a systematic looting of the clothing depot where the corporal was working as a night checker.

He was in a position to pass loaded trucks through the security guards at the gates without arousing their suspicions, and he saw to it that these trucks contained clothing originally destined for U. N. troops. On one occasion, a Korean ambulance went through the gates carrying a load of the contraband apparel, and, like the trucks, headed straight for one of the "Queen's" hideouts.

This went on for 3 months, when military authorities suddenly launched a drive against the "Queen's" flourishing dope racket in Pusan. In one of the MP raids, the corporal was picked up for questioning in an off-limits cafe where he'd been spending money in reckless fashion.

With more than $86,000 in American money stashed away—a tremendous fortune when converted into Korean cash—the "Queen" decided this would be a good time to clear out of Pusan. None of the money so far had been split up among the gang and when a Korean member got wind of her intentions, he tipped off Korean Army officials. They, in turn, notified the American authorities. The corporal soon got the word and, realizing he'd been duped along with the others, exposed the ring's operations.

MPCI men rounded up the remaining American members of the gang who were later tried, convicted, and sentenced to long terms on charges of larceny and conspiracy to defraud the Government.

Lee Yung Ja—described as one of the most beautiful women in Korea—escaped. MPCI men who worked on the case think she bribed a seaman to smuggle her aboard a ship and get her out of the country. She is believed to be somewhere in Japan—studying to be a doctor.

The military police corps of today was established in September 1941. Its insignia is a pair of crossed flintlock pistols.

The actual strength of the corps is classified information, but it generally runs about 2 percent of the total population of the Army. Out of this relatively small number comes the even smaller elite group known as the criminal investigators.

The Military Police Laboratory, staffed with technicians—most of whom are warrant officers with scientific educational backgrounds—backs up the criminal investigators in the field with test tubes, cameras, microscopes, X-rays, and the latest of scientific equipment.

These crack Army detectives—many of whom were commissioned officers during World War II and, after being separated, returned to the service and went into MPCI work—have solved crimes dealing with larceny, assault, murder, rape, counterfeiting, car thefts, black-market operations, and even obscene letters. "Our work is really protection," General Maglin says. "We protect soldiers from rackets, from people who prey on them. It's our job to look out for trouble, not look for trouble."

Funds for Recreational Facilities in National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill (H. R. 7537) which I believe will be of interest to many Members of Congress and to which I earnestly invite their attention. It is a bill which makes a further effort to solve the knotty problem of providing adequate funds for recreation facilities in our national forests.

As the Members know, Mr. Speaker, this is a problem which has been before the Congress for many years and for which, as yet, no satisfactory solution has been found. The phenomenon of mass use of our national forests by the people of this country for recreational purposes is one which has developed largely since the end of World War II. It is to my way of thinking one of the healthier and finer aspects of our American way of life. It is good for a man's body, mind, and spirit to get into the forests away from the necessary but unnatural jangle, stress, and routine of every day life.

There have always been a few hearty souls who have felt it necessary, from time to time, to shake the impediments of civilization from their shoulders and get off into the woods. Prior to World War II, however, their numbers were relatively few. Following the end of the war we found ourselves at a new high level of personal prosperity, with good roads, improved automobiles, a short workweek and paid vacations for many wage earners, plus what was apparently a new and wider desire among the American people to find relaxation and refreshment out of doors.

This was, as I have remarked, a most healthful development in our national way of living. But this development has brought with it serious problems. In 1954 an estimated 40 million people used the national forest areas for recreational purposes. They found there, in the main, facilities which had been constructed during the late 1930's—largely by CCC workers—designed to care for only a fraction of the number of people who are now using the national forests.

The problem involved is not merely that of the convenience or health of the persons using the national forests for recreation. The larger aspect of the problem is the protection of the forests, the wildlife, and essential water supplies from damage, dissipation, or pollution by those who are rightfully and lawfully using the forests for recreational purposes. One of the greatest problems—let us be frank about it—is sanitation. The national forests are one of our greatest and most important sources of water. With millions of vacationists going into these national forests the problem of sanitation becomes very great and, if not provided for, threatens the pollution of streams and water sources endangering not only those who are visiting the national forests and must use streams and springs for their water supply but also the residents of other areas who depend upon the national forests for their water.

Another danger is that of fire. There is relatively little fire danger from widespread use of a national forest for recreational purposes if those who are in the forest find prepared camp grounds at which they may camp with convenience and safety. If they do not find such camp grounds, they will camp where they can, and, scattered about the forests they present a very real fire hazard and are virtually out of the reach of any kind of supervision or of immediate assistance, in case a fire should start.

Another problem is the maintenance of wildlife population. Those who go into the forests for recreation hope to find there an adequate population of fish and game. Our wildlife resources have been maintained at their present level only by the intelligent and conscientious effort of State, Federal, and private conservation agencies. Wildlife will not maintain itself in the abundance desired against the inroads of mounting millions of forest users without additional intensive effort on the part of those engaged in the restocking, development, and conservation programs.

To sum it up, the problem involved is not so much that of providing conveniences and facilities for those who want to use the national forests—it is that of protecting the water sources, the wildlife, and the forests themselves from the adverse effects of use by millions of Americans who are going into the forests whether facilities are provided for them or not.

Many Members of Congress have clearly recognized this problem and over the past 7 or 8 years there has been a constant effort to work out a solution as to how funds might be adequately provided to meet the needs. Let me state at the very first that the appropriations committees and the Congress have not been ungenerous in this respect. But

with so many demands upon the financial resources of the Nation, with so many items vital to the security and welfare of the Nation requiring tremendous appropriations, it is only natural that the appropriations for the purpose of providing adequate facilities for recreational users of the national forests have never been sufficient to do the job.

Beginning several Congresses ago, bills designed to provide these funds and solve this perplexing problem were introduced in Congress. At first, these bills took the simple form of providing that a certain percentage of all the receipts of the national forests should be set aside into a special fund to be used for the development, maintenance, and operation of recreational facilities within the national forests. This was a simple and effective plan, and there was precedent for it in laws providing for the setting aside of part of the Forest Service receipts for other special purposes. Many persons objected to this approach in principle, however, believing that the policy of establishing special funds which can be spent without further approval of Congress and of establishing permanent appropriations is not the best governmental procedure. Most of the major conservation groups and organizations in the country alined themselves solidly behind this approach and for several years there was a virtual stalemate as efforts were made time and again to secure favorable action on this type of legislation and Congress as frequently declined to approve it.

As an alternative, there were introduced in the 82d Congress bills which would have established some kind of fee system whereby the users of the national forests for recreational purposes would have paid a small fee and by their aggregate contributions have provided the funds for maintaining additional facilities.

These bills, too, encountered the valid objection that they gave the Forest Service what amounted to a taxing power and turned over to it funds for expenditure without the necessity of presenting a budget to the Congress and receiving approval of their plans. These bills were also objected to by certain groups, mostly sportsmen groups, who said that they were opposed to having to pay anything, no matter how small, for the use of facilities in the national forest.

Since then, intermittent conferences have gone on almost constantly between the staff of the Committee on Agriculture and the various groups and agencies and individuals interested in this problem. A number of compromise bills were developed, seeking to resolve the differences in viewpoint which heretofore have prevented effective legislative action. Limitations have been put on the amount of money which could be accumulated in this special fund; requirements have been included that the Forest Service should have to seek an appropriation each year, even though the money were coming from a special fund; and other licensing provisions and campfire permit provisions have been advanced. I myself introduced one of these bills at this session of Congress (H. R. 4994) and there are pending at the present time before the Committee on Agriculture no less than 10 bills dealing with this subject.

The bill which I have now introduced today (H. R. 7537) is not by any means an entirely new approach to the subject but is, rather, a refinement and development of the many proposals which have heretofore been made. The bill will authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a fee for the use of recreational facilities in the national forests.

It requires the Secretary to set the fee annually at a level which he estimates will reimburse the Treasury for appropriations made for the development, maintenance, and operation of these recreational facilities. The money will not go into a special fund—it will be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts along with other Government income. The Forest Service will not have any fund available for expenditure without accounting to Congress. On the contrary, the Forest Service will seek and obtain its appropriations for recreational facilities in the usual budgetary manner but the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress will have the assurance when the appropriation is made that there will be no actual cost to the taxpayer—that every dollar appropriated for this purpose will be reimbursed to the Treasury by the special license fee established and collected by the Forest Service.

I know that there will be those who will protest against the imposition of any fee or license for the use of what is regarded as general public property. I will not be impressed by these objections, however. It is not intended that there should be a fee imposed for access to the national forest but only for the use of facilities which are provided therein for campers and others using the forests for recreational purposes. To my way of thinking, there is no more democratic way of doing business than to provide that those who use and enjoy special benefits and facilities should pay the major part of the cost of those facilities. I can see no reason why the taxpayer in Maine or New York City or Miami who may never have any desire of going into a national forest should bear any part of the cost of providing facilities for me and others like me who do want to go into the forest and engage in fishing, hunting, or other recreational activities. On the contrary, it seems quite plain to me that those of us who want to use these facilities should be willing to bear the cost of their development and maintenance. I think that every American who enjoys and loves the forest enough to want to get out into them will be proud and happy to have an opportunity to pay the small fee which will be assessed and know that he is doing his part to provide the facilities he uses and to protect the forests and the watersheds against unnecessary damage.

Nor am I impressed by the protest that I assume will come from some sportsmen that here is another fee being added to the backs of the fisherman or hunter. I have bought enough trout flies and bass plugs and shotgun shells in life to know that the 50-cent or $1 fee per year that a sportsmen may be asked to pay to maintain national forest recreational facilities is going to comprise such a small portion of his recreational budget that he will have forgotten about it by the time he makes the next trip to the sporting-goods store.

I have not discussed my bill in detail with the Forest Service so I certainly do not pretend to commit that fine organization as to how it will administer the bill, in case it should become law. As I see it, however, the licenses required by the bill would, in most cases, be a windshield sticker that could be affxed to the automobiles of those using the forest facilities. The price of the license would depend, of course, upon the amount of the appropriation and the estimated number of persons using the facilities. My best rough estimate at the present time is that when the program got into full operation the fee would be somewhere between 50 cents and $1 per auto.

It is not intended that any fee should be charged those people who, en route from one place to another, merely pass through the national forest, even though they should stop along the road for a picnic or for other casual use of the forest. It is intended that the license and the fee should apply to those who camp overnight in the forest, who fish there, or go there for skiing or hunting or other similar recreational activities. I think it quite likely that the criterion as to when a license is required might be determined on the basis of whether or not the person was staying overnight within the forest.

As I visualize it, the license stickers would be on sale very generally in sporting-goods stores, general stores, courthouses, and other public agencies, and similar convenient locations within reach of all the national forest areas. Special provision should be made in the Secretary's rules and regulations for parties which travel by bus or in some manner other than by private automobile.

There is no intention in this bill to turn forest rangers into policemen and in my opinion the policing job would be very slight. I cannot conceive of any red-blooded American who likes to use and enjoy our national forests objecting to paying an almost nominal fee each year for the purpose of developing and maintaining the facilities he enjoys. Personally, I would be glad to have the privilege of buying such a license each year even if I were not fortunate enough to get to make use of it.

I invite the cooperation of my colleagues who are interested in better recreational facilities in our national forests to joint with me during the second session of the 84th Congress in my efforts to obtain passage of H. R. 7537.

Good Roads Lobbied Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Times of July 29, 1955, entitled "Good Roads Lobbied Away" and from the Detroit Free Press of July 28, 1955, entitled "Road Needs Disregarded" which I think merit the attention and thoughtful consideration of every Member of the Congress:

[From the New York Times of July 29, 1955]

GOOD ROADS LOBBIED AWAY

The House, in a depressingly irresponsible action, has defeated all legislation to accelerate highway construction. It repudiated the good sense and sound financing of its Public Works Committee by rejecting the Democratic highway bill by a vote of 292 to 123. The committee, with great political courage, had agreed by an impressive majority to match spending with taxation in a single package. The House spurned such fiscal responsibility. It also defeated the Republican bill for long-term bond issues for roadbuilding by 221 to 193. So the public gets nothing except a stunning disappointment.

How did this come about? Speaker RAYBURN said: "The people who were going to have to pay for these roads put on a propaganda campaign that killed the bill." The Democratic floor leader, Representative MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said: "Everybody wants a road bill but nobody wants to pay for it." He had a "sneaky idea that the truckers of the country played an important part" in defeating the bill. Yet only the other day the American Trucking Association denied that it was trying to kill the pay-as-you-build program, its president saying that truckers had been the first to state their "willingness to pay tax increases to support the program."

Nevertheless, from the time House Members began to talk about specific user taxes, such as on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires, instead of just the abstract virtue of spending $50 billion of Federal and State money in about a decade to build and improve highways, it has been obvious that the lobbyists were hard at work.

The recognition of need for greatly increased Federal investment in highways has been general and bipartisan. The Presidential Clay Committee charted a $101 billion Federal-State program for the decade ahead, on which Mr. Eisenhower relied in urging congressional action. The Senate, while rejecting the President's financial plan on May 24 by 60 to 31, was insistent on some highway action at once and of substantial outlay. It rejected recommittal of the Eisenhower bill, and passed the Gore bill by a voice vote.

The House Public Works Committee, with several Ways and Means members sitting in, spent many weeks developing a revenue base that would avoid adding to the public debt, or the evasion of this by setting up an independent highway corporation to issue bonds, and also escape the costliness of high interest charges.

It is interesting to note that this committee, which spent so much time on the problem, stood 22 to 6 for imposing taxes to pay the bill. But when the House showdown came, 128 Democrats opposed the Democratic bill and only 94 Democrats supported it. The Democrats were overwhelmingly against what they viewed as fiscal unsoundness in the Republican bill; only 7 voted for it, while 214 of them voted against it, in a fine show of righteous indignation against heavy borrowing. But when it came to the final test of responsibility—the voting of taxes to accompany spending—128 Democrats couldn't rise to the occasion, and neither could 164 Republicans.

President Eisenhower, expressing his deep disappointment and rightly arguing that contention over methods of financing should not be permitted to deny our people these critically needed roads, has called for reconsideration before Congress adjourns. The House Republican leader, Representative MARTIN, believes a compromise could be worked out at the session if we really want to do it. But the Democratic leader, MCCORMACK, says the House Members are anxious to adjourn, and in his opinion there's no chance of getting the bill up again. We wouldn't want to interfere with an early homecoming for these House Members, but they shouldn't count on too cordial a welcome if they give up this easily on a highway bill. There are a great many people, including voters, who are willing to pay for good highways—even if the lobbyists aren't.

[From the Detroit Free Press of July 28, 1955]

ROAD NEEDS DISREGARDED

Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives joined forces Wednesday to doom the American people to driving on an interstate highway network which is obsolete, inadequate and, in many cases, unsafe.

Under pressure of lobbying groups, the House killed two proposed measures, either of which would have provided the largest Federal highway aid program ever undertaken in this country.

By its failure to act, Congress ignored a moral obligation. That obligation is not only to help provide a highway network that will meet the requirements of the modern motor age, but also to establish a road system that is vital to our national defense.

The request for road aid legislation came originally from the White House. It was put high on the list of measures included in the administration's program. The bill, advocated by President Eisenhower, would have authorized issuance of bonds pledged by anticipated highway revenues. This was the first measure rejected by the House.

The second was a Democratic bill—a pay-as-you-go measure, with revenues derived from increased taxes on motor fuels, tires, etc. Trucker lobbyists are credited with swaying Congressmen to kill this legislation.

Where do we stand now in relation to modernizing our road system?

President Eisenhower has already appealed to Congress to make another try at passing highway legislation. But the measure is buried under an avalanche of other bills.

It is agreed that no Federal-aid measure is possible during the current session which is drawing to a close. Speaker RAYBURN and other Congressional leaders predict that no agreement is likely during 1956.

Michigan, relying in part on anticipated augmented road funds from Washington, approved higher State taxes to raise a very substantial amount of highway money, part of which was to be used for matching Federal funds.

Congress has left Michigan, along with other States, holding the bag. We must go ahead on our own, meanwhile paying hundreds of millions of dollars in gasoline and other motor excise taxes to the Federal Government, almost none of which will be returned for highway purposes.

This means that Michigan's program may have to be materially curtailed. Even with the generous appropriations that have been made, there will not be enough money to do all that is required in the way of constructing and improving our State's roads.

The situation calls for highway authorities in Michigan to adopt a different point of view toward building toll roads. That program, all but dead, should be revived.

Construction of self-financing toll roads would materially supplement the work that can be done by available State highway revenue funds.

If Congress has sidestepped its responsibility, it is more than ever incumbent upon Michigan to accept hers. That can be done by less cross pulling between the State highway department and the Michigan Turnpike Authority.

UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, the attention of the Congress has been increasingly focused on international affairs. The measures involving American relations with the rest of the world that have come before us will have a profound influence on the future of this Nation—indeed on the future of the free world.

We have voted huge sums to build America's defenses and to strengthen the defenses of our allies. We have given willing conent to American patricipation in a sequence of regional organizations—the Organization of American States, the orth Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. These are major components of the framework of collective security that we are endeavoring to construct.

We have approved the expenditure of huge sums for economic reconstruction and rehabilitation of the free nations with whom we are associated. We have, further, taken steps to remove barriers to international commerce by reciprocal reductions of tariffs and to simplify customs procedures. We have supported a program of technical cooperation to improve conditions of life in underdeveloped lands.

In taking these steps I am convinced that we have acted wisely and with forcsight. They are important components of the world peace we are striving to establish. But both the Government and the people of this country long ago recognized that guns and planes—that economic aid and greater trade, of themselves will not make us secure nor insure peace. This realization was expressed in the initiative taken by this country in the formation of the United Nations and its collateral organizations. We have since reaffirmed it by our continuing support of the U. N.

The popular backing given the U. N. is by no means uncritical. The United Nations has been subjected to its share of criticism—much of it intelligent and constructive.

We are all aware that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has been singled out

for particularly bitter attacks from some quarters.

I will not burden the Members of the House with a detailed discussion of these attacks. But I would like to call to the attention of the membership the procedure followed by a well-known national organization in regard to criticism of UNESCO in the past.

A few years ago, because UNESCO had become a subject of controversy, the executive committee of the American Legion appointed a special committee of distinguished legionnaires to study UNESCO and the criticisms made of it and report their findings. Ray Murphy, of Iowa, a past national commander, was made chairman. After an exhaustive inquiry which consumed 18 months, the special committee submitted its report which will be presented to the national convention in October.

It is a lengthy document but I can commend it to the attention of the Members of the House as a painstaking, thorough, and objective study. I believe that the American people are indebted to Past Commander Murphy and his committee members for their unselfish efforts to execute what must have been a difficult and probably thankless assignment. I feel, also, that the Legion national executive committee is to be complimented on the judicious manner in which they are handling a controversial matter.

Good as it is, I feel that the full report is too long to place in the RECORD. Therefore, I am asking that the conclusions reached by the special committee be made a part of the RECORD.

THE CONCLUSIONS OF A REPORT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COVENANT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND UNITED NATIONS (UNESCO) TO THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 5, 1955

Your special committee finds:

1. That UNESCO is not favorable toward world government; that the programs and functions of UNESCO are not such as to tend toward world government; that the United States National Commission individually and as a group are strongly opposed to world government;

2. That UNESCO is not atheistic; and

3. That UNESCO is in no sense or no degree communistic.

The special committee recognizes UNESCO and the United Nations as facts of life. They could not at the fateful hour in history that gave them birth have come into being without the aid, the cooperation and the membership of the United States of America. For 10 years they have been important elements in the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States. For two presidents they have been an essential arm of government. Like every American, we share the deep sense of disappointment, at times tending to despair, that has resulted from the inability of the United Nations to achieve a sound and, as we had dared to hope, an enduring peace. Long, long ago Christ said "Peace on earth to men of good will." It is because men not of good will have reigned in the Kremlin that the United Nations has in grave crises appeared impotent. Given good will among all men and all rules, its full potential for peace can be realized. On April 21, 1955, President Eisenhower said:

"Our programs of national action are not in any manner a substitute for United Nations action in similar fields. Every instance of effective measures taken through the United Nations on a human problem improved the ultimate prospect of peace in the world. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the United Nations technical assistance program, in which 60 governments participate and which is carried out by the United Nations and its specialized agencies be supported in continuing and adequate manner."

And the President said:

"Neither can we be secure in our freedom unless everywhere in the world, we help to build the conditions under which freedom can flourish by destroying the conditions under which totalitarianism grows—poverty, illiteracy, hunger and disease. Nor can we hope for enduring peace until the spiritual aspects of mankind for liberty and opportunity and growth are recognized as prior to and paramount to the material appetites which communism exploits."

Gentlemen of the national executive committee, we leave our report with you, happy at least that a time-consuming onerous and at times unpleasant task has been done. We could do no other than to report without fear or favor the facts as we have found them, and to state conclusions which an overwhelming weight of the evidence justifies.

We have been deeply disturbed by an intolerance and implacability of attitude that we have found all too prevalent and which can serve no one well.

We counsel, if we may, against name-calling, against disparagement of men whose only crime is that they differ with us, against organizations whose names are fair and whose fame is great, whose achievements are magnificent.

We are now engaged in global war, wherein, as the President has said:

"The forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny are met in a struggle in which the battlefields are indeed the minds and the souls of men."

It has been said that:

"The most deadly weapons in this age of the undropped bomb and the unfired gun are the spoken word and the expressed idea" (Roger D. Green, Associated Press).

Grievous a blow as the collapse of Russian imperialism would be to the Communist revolution, communism would not die, for it is an idea, and for future generations of freemen that idea will remain a deadly danger. The idea, the dialectical materialism of communism, must be met with an idea of greater validity, the idea of the freeman deriving his individual rights from God. There can be no certainty now that the idea of the freeman will prevail, though it can never die as long as somewhere, even in some far place, one man still free in spirit and allegiance to God yet lives.

We of America and the American Legion have work to do. Let us be about our Master's business.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM G. MCKINLEY,
PAUL M. HERBERT,
Rev. GORDON L. KIDD,
JACOB ARK,
MRS. HAROLD S. BURDETT,
Vice Chairman.
RAY MURPHY, *Chairman.*

MAY 5, 1955.

Old Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Whereas the Federal social security law permits recipients of old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments to supplement these benefits by earnings up to a specified amount in covered employment without a loss of such benefits; and

Whereas such provision encourages those who can do so to engage in productive employment; and

Whereas the Federal law governing grants to States for old-age assistance does not allow such supplementary earnings without a loss of benefits; and

Whereas the basic purpose of the two programs—old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance—is the same, namely to safeguard against old age dependency: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to make provisions which would permit recipients of old-age assistance to supplement their old-age assistance benefits by earning an amount equal to that permitted recipients of old-age and survivors insurance benefits without a loss of such benefit, by and with the consent of the legislatures of the respective States which have State old-age assistance plans; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, and to each Member of the House of Representatives in the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the senate June 27, 1955.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives June 30, 1955.

WARREN T. WARD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Rose as the National Flower of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to submit the names of the following prominent citizens in my Second Congressional District of West Virginia, who, together with myself, wish to add our voices to the current proposal to petition the United States Congress to designate the rose as the national flower of the United States.

The rose indeed personifies beauty and grace, majesty and leadership, sweetness and purity, love and tenderness to the great multitudes of Americans in this 48 States. God made all flowers to grace our lives, but none fulfills the overall role of messenger of inspiration, of victory, of consolation, of devotion, and of love—as does the rose.

It is my honor to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the name of the following citizens from Keyser, W. Va., who have made known their wishes that the rose be designated as the national flower of the United States:

Mrs. J. Clark Bright, Mrs. W. H. Kolkhorst, Mrs. Eleanor Dove, Mrs. R. A. Stoutamyer, Mrs. Herman Davis, Mrs. George Sheetz, Mrs. Ernest A. See, Mrs. George R. Spotts, Mrs. Roy A. Leatherman, Mrs. Ralph E. Casteel, Mrs. S. B. Jeffries, Mrs. Evelyn Bright, Mrs. Helen Bownall, Mrs. Charles A. Steiding, Mrs. Ernest E. Church, Mrs. J. P. Davis, Mrs. G. H. Klinestiver, Mrs. James W. Goldsworthy, Mrs. William H. Chappell, Mrs. William C. Clements, Mrs. Robert D. Chapman Mrs. R. L. Bridgers, Mrs. Roy H. Davidson, Mrs. Thomas Bess, Clyde W. Gardner, Lester H. Oates, John M. Hamilton, and Donald Heare.

A United States Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the August edition of the Catholic Digest, a well written and edited magazine of national circulation, features an excellent article on our distinguished colleague, TORBERT MACDONALD, of Massachusetts. I am proud to serve with him in the House of Representatives. I congratulate the gentleman and I commend the Catholic Digest for the presentation of a most enjoyable and interesting story. The photographs that accompany the article are quite unusual and they make a vivid contribution to the story.

In the short time that he has been a Member of the House, Mr. MACDONALD has proven his ability and his determination to follow in the footsteps of those great statesmen from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who have left their mark of influence on American education, industry, religion, literature, law, and culture.

I include the story from the Catholic Digest:

A UNITED STATES CONGRESSMAN—MEET REPRESENTATIVE MACDONALD—HE HAS A JOB LIKE YOUR MAN'S JOB IN CONGRESS

SAM RAYBURN leaned toward the microphone on the Speaker's rostrum, and said: "If the Members will rise, I will now administer the oath of office."

In every part of the Hall, Representatives rose in waves from their seats. The steady buzz of conversation faded into silence. All but 7 of the 435 Representatives were on hand to take the oath of office. It was the opening day of the 84th Congress of the United States.

RAYBURN knew personally most of the men and women standing before him. There was the usual crop of new faces, too—56 of them, to be exact. In the fifth row on the Democrats' side of the aisle was one of the freshmen, TORBERT MACDONALD, of Massachusetts.

At noon that Wednesday, January 5, the clerk had called the roll; first, to see if a quorum was present; then a second time, to elect a Speaker of the House of Representatives.

You can find MACDONALD'S first vote on page 7 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. RAYBURN received 226 to JOE MARTIN'S 198. In the list of those voting for Democrat RAYBURN, under M, you'll find "MCCARTHY, MCCORMACK, MCDOWELL, MCMILLAN, MACDONALD."

Just 8 days later, TORBERT MACDONALD was elected to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Looking on from the gallery that afternoon were his pretty wife, former movie star Phyllis Brooks, his two eldest children, and his proud parents.

He was the first Democrat elected from Massachusetts' traditionally Republican Eighth Congressional District. The eighth takes in some wealthy Boston suburbs; but Democrat MACDONALD won last November's election. His margin: 9,000 votes.

Some 2 weeks after the session opened, his Democratic colleagues elected MACDONALD majority whip for the New England congressional delegation.

Many parents dissuade sons or daughters from entering politics. A Congressman is not always regarded with respect. Yet, the successful politician who is elected to the House of Representatives has enormous power and responsibility.

The average Congressman represents 373,400 citizens. During the last 5 years he has had a vote in the spending of an average of $53,600,000,000 a year. And he has a hand in making decisions which ultimately touch the lives of most of the earth's inhabitants.

If there is such a person as an average Congressman, he is somewhat past middle age, more often than not has already served a few years in Congress, and usually has had some political experience prior to his election. It is safe to generalize, then, that the average Congressman is no babe in the political forest.

Three-fourths of the legislators in the average session of Congress are college graduates; many are lawyers; more than half are veterans.

It isn't easy to obtain information about the national and racial backgrounds of Congressmen. Their religious backgrounds are better known. A survey of the 77th Congress revealed that some 71 percent of the Members were Protestants, 18 percent Catholics, and just over 1 percent Jews. MACDONALD is a Catholic.

Although the House of Representatives does not begin its sessions until noon, the average Representative is at his desk early in the morning. If he wants to keep his hand on the pulse of public opinion in his home State, he must examine his mail carefully. Most Congressmen answer every letter.

During the morning, visitors from back home drop in at the Representative's office; and other Congressmen may visit him to discuss legislation. As the session moves forward, each Member of Congress must participate in committee meetings. Many such meetings begin during the morning, and continue most of the day. This accounts for some absences from the floor of the House.

To assist him with his work, the Congressman has an office staff which usually includes one administrative assistant and several secretaries.

Like a majority of his congressional colleagues, TORBETT MACDONALD, of Massachusetts, is a lawyer. After graduating from Harvard law school in 1946, he served as legal assistant to Eric Johnston, then czar of the movie industry.

Then he became, successively, a New England trial attorney for the National Labor Relations Board; a legal adviser to the congressional labor committee for its European survey; and legal adviser to his old friend, Senator JOHN KENNEDY, in connection with a 1953 labor-and-manpower survey of defense in Western Europe.

When the Democrats were looking around for a candidate to oppose the Republican incumbent in the Eighth Congressional District, they asked MACDONALD if he would take the nomination. He accepted—and won, much to the surprise of even his own State Democratic committee.

As a teen-ager, MACDONALD learned leadership in athletics. His first try was a flop. He went out for high-school football in his hometown, Malden, Mass., but failed even to make the squad.

However, the next year he transferred to the nearby Medford High School and made the State's all-scholastic eleven. A natural athlete, he also became captain of the Medford track team and a star basketball player.

After his high-school graduation in 1934, MACDONALD attended Phillips Andover Academy, where he was put on the scholastic honor roll, and became captain of the baseball team as well.

For 4 straight years, he starred in baseball, football, and track at Harvard. In 1939 he ran on the Harvard-Yale track team that toured Europe. The following year he was captain of the Harvard football squad.

When he was graduated in 1940, he turned down a Rhodes scholarship; instead, he signed, for a handsome bonus, as an outfielder with the New York Yankees.

"I traveled with the Yankees for that summer," he recalls. "But their regular outfielders then were Keller, DiMaggio, and Heinrich. You can see what chance I had of breaking into the line-up."

He entered Harvard Law school in the fall of 1940; and paid for his tuition with his summer baseball bonus and salary.

When the Yanks gave MACDONALD another bid in 1942 for spring training, he gave them a final no; he hasn't donned a glove since, except to toss a few balls around with his son, Torbert, Jr.

In January 1942, MACDONALD quit law school to enlist in the Navy. He served with Torpedo Squadron 12 in the South Pacific; received a leg wound, and won the Silver Star for gallantry in action.

Shortly after his discharge as a Navy lieutenant in 1945, he married Phyllis Brooks, whom he had met before the war while she appeared in a play in Boston. Although she was one of the better-known Hollywood stars at the time, she quit her career when she married.

"She's a really marvelous girl," says her admiring husband. "I had to go back to law school to get my degree. We had to live on practically nothing. But she never complained. A happy family life is more important to her than anything else."

The Macdonalds have purchased a home in Washington, D. C., where they live with their 3 children, Torbert, Jr., 9; Laurie, 7; and Brian, 2 years old.

Congressman MACDONALD'S background is fairly typical of that of his colleagues in the House.

Congressman Young Invites Nevadans to Discuss Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it is the responsiblitity of a Congressman to keep in close touch with the people he represents.

Upon my return to Nevada during the adjournment of Congress, I will make an official business tour of the 17 counties in my State.

The prime purpose of these visits will be to meet with Nevada voters to discuss problems where my office may be of assistance and to receive views and suggestions regarding national policy.

A temporary office will be established in various communities, and local citizens will have an opportunity to confer informally with their Representative in Congress. A member of my Washington staff will accompany me and assist me.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences.

Following these congressional clinics and throughout adjournment, I will maintain a full-time office in Reno, Nev., and I can be reached by writing post office box 206 in that city.

Dates and locations of the congressional clinics are listed.

Operations of the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a signed editorial from the August 1955, issue of the Farm and Ranch magazine. The editorial is written and signed by Mr. Tom Anderson, the publisher of the magazine, which is published in Nashville, Tenn. The editorial contains several interesting sidelights of the operations of the TVA, as observed by one of the citizens of that area.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHT TALK

(By Tom Anderson)

Here in the Tennessee Valley TVA is almost holy. I guess 90 percent of the people are for TVA—and against socialism. Almost all politicians, housewives, businessmen, sportsmen, and newspapers of all political parties are for TVA.

TVA for 22 years has been the main plank in the platform of virtually every valley politician. When TVA budgets are cut the valley politicians bawl like newly weaned calves. And the votes pile in. For a valley candidate for office to criticize TVA would be like attacking the church, or motherhood. Automatic political suicide. Even the press goes along practically 100 percent with TVA. (For a long time my friends and associates have been expressing the hope that I'd have the good sense to lay off TVA.)

THANK YOU, AMERICA

We residents of the valley, according to TVA, saved $70 million in the year ending June 30 through low-electric rates. Thank you, America. We heat our homes with electricity here, it's so cheap. You might say we're putting the heat on you. As someone well said, "The Tennessee River flows through 3 States and drains the other 45."

A 500-kilowatt-hour monthly power bill in a Nashville home is $6.90. In Asheville, N. C., just a few miles outside TVA territory, it is $9. A medium-size merchant in Nashville (6,000 kilowatt-hours) would pay $78. The same power in Atlanta would cost him $163.

If the Government can provide power that much cheaper than private industry, then why shouldn't the Government provide everybody's power? And why just power? Why not groceries? And automobiles? If the Government is more efficient than competitive business, then it could make a reasonable profit on the power it sold to all of us, and on the groceries, cars, homes; a guaranteed annual profit for the Government and everybody—on everything.

TVA now has 16 steam plants built or building, which will produce about two-thirds of its electricity and have no relation to the development of the Tennessee River, making TVA the world's largest buyer of coal.

If TVA figured its operations like the Government forces private utilities to do, and paid only 3 percent for its money, it would already have lost $169 million. TVA does not now include in its rates the cost of its money or its share of the taxes. And those two things are almost half the total cost of electricity. Thus, the famous TVA yardstick is really only 18 inches long.

Private power companies pay about $750 million in Federal taxes and nearly $470 million in State and local taxes each year. TVA pays no Federal taxes and only about $3,400,000 in local taxes.

The investor-owned utilities turn over to the tax gatherer 23 cents from every dollar they take in. For example, if TVA paid local, State, and Federal taxes on the same basis as Southern Bell Telephone Co., TVA would pay, not its present $3,400,000 tax, but more than $76 million. And instead of a profit it would have a huge loss.

Cheap power? Not at all. Almost half of each power bill we valley residents pay is charged to the taxpayers of the Nation. I want to pay all of my power bill, just as I want Farm and Ranch and all other publications to pay their fair share of the postage bill.

DIXON-YATES, THE DEMAGOG'S DELIGHT

Some time ago President Eisenhower said he could see no good reason why Memphis couldn't build its own powerplant instead of asking the TVA to build a new steam plant. Now that Memphis has decided to build its own plant, the politicians are joyfully digging the grave for Dixon-Yates.

The Socialists are already maneuvering to have Government own and operate all atom-power electric plants. It would be a tragedy if private enterprise were prevented from providing its tremendous human and material resources, and its competition which is so vital to progress and discovery.

The jobs are too big for private power? No. They were in the thirties; there was a depression on, remember? It was hard to raise money to buy a light bulb, much less a dam.

HOW TO PUT TVA ON A BUSINESS BASIS?

TVA should (1) sell its own bonds and stocks, just like any other business. Congress should make no more appropriations for steam plants or hydroelectric plants solely for power. If the plants are needed, private enterprise will build them and pay taxes on them. (2) Be made to continue to pay on its power investment until the debt is eliminated. (3) Pay the same State and local taxes it would pay if it were a private power company. (4) Pay the same interest on its outstanding debt which it would be charged as a private company. (5) Not be allowed to take in any new territory, nor build any more steam plants. (6) Pay Federal income taxes on same basis as private utilities. (7) Quit making fertilizer for commercial sale. (TVA makes about 200,000 tons of fertilizer a year, most of which is sold to the chosen few—mostly cooperatives.) (8) Give municipalities, cooperatives, and other public bodies no advantage in buying power. Treat everybody equally. (9) Keep books and report to Congress on same basis as the Federal and State regulatory authorities.

The above proposals would inevitably mean higher TVA power rates. But they would put TVA and other public power projects on a self-sustaining, self-liquidating, taxpaying, nonsocialistic basis—lock, stock, and dam.

Why not? If TVA is what its advocates claim, how would it be hurt? TVA is a big boy now. Twenty-two years old. Almost grown, we hope. A big bank account of his own. Good job. A booming business.

How much longer is he going to want an allowance? He's welcome to keep his feet under our table—being our flesh and blood—but ain't it high time he paid his room and board?

Amending Natural Gas Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6645) to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, as I stated a few minutes ago on the floor, I do not believe that we can exempt the production of natural gas from Federal control, and place controls on it at the same time. However, I have been willing to go along with section 3, in the interest of attempting to clarify the situation with regard to the status of natural-gas production. I have been willing to go along with most of these controlling amendments. However, when we reach the language in subsection (e) on page 5 of this bill, we find that we are going further than Congress actually has a right to go.

What we are doing in subsection (e) of this bill is placing a ceiling on existing contracts. Let us read the language for just a moment:

Whenever, in connection with an increase in the price of natural gas under the provisions of an escalation clause, the Commission, pursuant to subsection (d), has made a determination as to the reasonable market price of such natural gas, the natural-gas company shall be obligated to pay only such part of the increase in price as results in a price which does not exceed such reasonable market price.

As far as that goes, certainly I have no objection to the language in subsection (e). However, the language goes further:

And, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the contract containing such escalation clause shall continue in effect according to its terms as though this subsection had not been enacted.

That is, in effect, ex post facto. I think perhaps we would have a right to declare those contracts null and void, certainly voidable at the option of either party to the contract, in the event the price should rise above a reasonable market price.

However, I do not believe the Federal Government has the right under an

existing contract to change its terms so as to force one party to discharge his obligation unless he receives the contract price for his commodity.

This, in effect, puts the production of natural gas right back in a utility status. It is confiscatory in the sense that it refuses the producer a price that he has previously contracted for and forces him to sell at a price less than he had agreed upon previously. I think that this language should be taken out of the bill.

I think perhaps we should have written language into the bill, if we wanted to write this into the bill, which would have made these contracts terminate under these conditions and provide for their renegotiation. I do not believe that we can enforce the terms of a contract under any condition unless both parties to the contract agree to change that contract.

I hope the substitute amendment will be accepted in the interest of protecting contractual rights.

Higher Federal Taxes on Gasoline and Motor Fuel Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of testimony before the Public Works Committee about the need for this enlarged Federal highway program and how it should, or should not, be financed.

As a representative from Iowa—America's leading farm State—I am quite naturally concerned about how farmers feel about the proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax and how they feel about some of the other aspects of the program as well.

Iowa, like most of the other States, has its own problems of acute traffic congestion today, but there is some question in my mind as to whether the true solution is for the Federal Government to levy higher and higher gasoline and fuel oil taxes upon farmers and other highway users, while at the same time calling upon the State to apply to costly Federal-aid projects increased sums of State revenue derived from the same taxpayers.

As it is, our State tax on gasoline has twice been increased during the past few years, and is now double the rate of 10 years ago. The Iowa State Highway Commission now has $40 million a year to spend on primary roads, and that, coupled with $200 million that has been authorized for toll-road construction, will put our highways in pretty fair shape—unless we find that an unusual amount of this State money will now have to be devoted to costly projects for national defense.

The farmers of Iowa, as highway users, pay heavily under the State gasoline tax, although not to the same degree as they pay the Federal tax, which for years has been levied on the motor fuel they use on the farm as well as that used in their highway vehicles.

In Iowa, one out of every five gallons of motor fuel purchased is for nonhighway use—mostly agriculture. This is about twice the one gallon in ten ratio of nonhighway use that prevails throughout the Nation as a whole.

The natural distate which Iowa farmers have for the Federal gasoline tax is understandable when you realize that there are more than 275,000 farm tractors now being used on the 203,000 farms of Iowa, and that these tractors and other farm machines consume about 250 million gallons a year. That, in terms of a 2-cent Federal gasoline tax, adds up to $5 million a year—or $7.5 million under a 3-cent tax—in Federal taxes on gallonage not taxed by the State.

Even if the Congress now sees fit to grant tax refunds or exemptions for nonhighway fuel—and thus makes the Federal gasoline tax an out-and-out tax upon highway use—an increased Federal tax will still fall heavy upon Iowa farmers, who own and operate about 39 percent of the trucks and 27 percent of the passenger cars in the State.

Figures compiled by the United States Bureau of Public Roads show that the revenues of the State gasoline tax have increased by 192 percent since 1939—nearly tripled—although the total vehicle registration in the State has increased by only 48 percent during the 16-year period. Certainly this is some indication of the high tax load farmers, as highway users, now bear.

Farmers, of course, are and always have been vitally interested in roads, but the roads which interest them most are the ones which have been receiving attention under the regular highway programs carried on by the State. They are interested in the super-highway aspects of the Federal program, but do not want to see it accomplished through the proposed increase in gasoline taxes of the Fallon bill.

One other aspect of this highway program that we have heard a lot about is safety. Hardly anyone who has stood up to speak in favor of this highway program has failed to mention something about all the lives that will be saved by the building of these new and faster highways.

Being an insurance man myself, I am not unfamiliar with some of the studies that insurance companies have conducted along those lines, and am inclined to believe that safety is not a very good argument for the building of all these public speedways.

Accident records of some of the big, well-engineered turnpikes have almost invariably shown a higher death rate in terms of vehicle miles traveled than the other highways of the State.

Just last week at the committee hearing, one of the tire men testified—not in connection with safety but in relationship to wear and tear—that speed and long, uninterrupted stretches of road tend to generate tire heat, which he said is a major factor in shortening the life of the tire. Apply that tire strain factor again to the relatively high rate of speed the vehicle travels on such a road, and you have perhaps one of the causes of so many serious accidents on these superhighways.

One argument that does impress me is the military and defense need for a highway program of the scope indicated—but the question then arises that if these improvements are truly defense items, why should they not be paid for like jet bombers, battleships, and tanks—out of general taxes paid by all citizens—not by increased levies upon highway users as a class.

North American Airlines and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, surely there was no intent to raise an iron curtain right here in the United States raised by Americans against Americans. I should like to take these few minutes to tell you some facts.

A tremendous amount of national energy is spent on the fight against slavery and anarchy overseas. We must realize that at the same time the same battle must be waged at home to keep the freedom we cherish.

Could it be possible that one Government Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, has unintentionally become an iron curtain drawn between the aviation industry and men of initiative who want to enter the passenger field?

The CAB was the result of 1938 legislation: "An act to create a Civil Aeronautics Authority and to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics."

Has the Board promoted the development of air transportation in the American spirit of free enterprise? Quite the contrary. The Board, perhaps because it did not realize the effects, has chosen to promote the development of the grandfather lines—those carriers operating in 1938. There were only 17 then. There are only 13 now. And soon there may be only 11; then maybe 9, then 7, then 5, then 3, then maybe only 1. Not a single new trunkline carrier has been authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the 17 years of its existence.

Small feeder lines have been allowed into the passenger field, but only because they would not compete with the big boys. Four freight lines have been given the right to fly the skies, but only because their revenue is less than a drop in the billion and one-quarter dollar bucket—1.4 percent to be exact.

North American Airlines is the sole survivor of many companies who have been crushed trying to get through the defenses of CAB against competition and free enterprise. One of its principal officers, Stanley Weis is originally from my

district. The traditional rights of an American to run his own business in the public interest are being badly mangled in the struggle. Not one carrier has made it through the Iron Curtain of discrimination, the barbed wire of regulation and the barrage of adamant refusal to allow even a fair hearing.

Is this development as stated in the title of the act which I quoted above? Surely it was not meant to be an imperious, absolute dictatorship. Again and again North American has been pounded back by rejections of applications for certification. North American's perfect safety record has been slandered by a member of the Board who had full and official knowledge of their accident-free operation. Surely this was not intended on his part. He has an opportunity to rectify the same.

North American—a company with the courage to join battle—is critically wounded. If it dies free enterprise will be killed by its side. The grandfather carriers will continue to monopolize the once free American air. There will be no one to challenge.

I respect the major airlines; however, today the 4 big airlines collect more than 73 percent of all trunkline revenue. These are the same companies that were serving the infant air passenger business in 1938. Air transportation has increased 40 times since then, yet no new company has survived the bloody battle of certification.

Aircoach, the greatest innovation in passenger traffic, was the invention of North America. It was bitterly resisted by the mail-subsidized monopolies. They said: "We just cannot afford to take the chance." They were finally forced by North American's low fares to adopt it. Even today, however, passengers pay one-third more on certificated aircoach than on North American.

Are the big companies—with the help of CAB—desperately trying to hold the line of unnecessarily high fares?

Passenger air travel has mushroomed. In 1954 alone its growth was over three times as great as the total industry in 1938. Every flying plane in America is needed to carry this gigantic load. Yet the CAB is using every weapon it has to shoot down North American, and with it free competition—American style. It would deprive the people of the United States of desperately needed air transportation. It would force those who cannot afford the inordinately high fares of the certificated carriers to be earthbound in this air-minded age. It would cripple the aviation industry—just as it has been doing for almost 20 years.

Any company with know-how, resources, and the desire to serve the public should be allowed to compete. No Government agency should have the arbitrary power to put them out of business, as long as the interests of the American people are being served just because the incumbent companies do not want competition. Actually the competition indirectly aids the big companies.

Has the Civil Aeronautics Board failed the public by acting in the interest of a select group instead of the public it was established to serve by violating the very law which created it? Any such protection of big business against democratic competition is illegal.

If there is any Iron Curtain it must be lifted from the runways of all American airfields, by forcing the CAB to act in the interest of the people—not in favor of any bloc.

Yesterday the CAB took the first small, timid, trembling step in the right direction. It voted to await final execution of North American until the courts had a chance to review the legality of the regulations on which North American is being grounded. I think this shows, to same degree, that the new Chairman, Ross Rizley, has a spirit of fairness and grasps some of the practical consequences of killing off the air-coach pioneers.

The situation at the CAB was not Mr. Rizley's making. Last year it was brought out in floor debate that half of the CAB's enforcement budget was spent in a relentless vendetta against North American and other independent carriers. This was in direct conflict with the intention of Congress. This is the situation into which Mr. Rizley walked. The thinking of the majority of the Board has been inflexibly bent on warfare against new ideas, new enterprises, and new competition. There has long been a minority, Josh Lee and Joe Adams, who have fought valiantly in the public interest.

I should like to urge that the CAB go back to the act. I think that the Board now has a great opportunity to be of real service to the country, but it must hereafter move forward courageously, expeditiously, and administer all of the act, including the provision for entry and new competition. The CAB has been dangerously close to being an instrument of a few major carriers—the enforcer of the policies of certain companies rather than the administrator of the will and policies of Congress. Many Members of Congress are becoming greatly alarmed.

The Board can prove itself by handling the North American case in a constructive way. It cannot sit by and hope that the problem will disappear. Its job and function is to solve the problem—and not kill off the very assets which it is supposed to regulate. It should act without delay.

Confiscation or Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to support and include herewith the statements of Congressmen JAMES P. RICHARDS and BROOKS HAYS relative to the payment of equivalent value of confiscated German and Japanese assets and commend them for the action taken by the Foreign Affairs Committee on this problem. For the first time during recent years hearings were held by a committee in the House on this vitally important question.

On July 1 and 11 hearings were conducted before a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee relative to the payment of full compensation for those private properties owned by German and Japanese nationals which were vested by this Government. These assets were seized by the Office of Alien Property under the authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act which was essentially designed as a part of our economic warfare so that these properties could not be used in any manner detrimental to our war effort. However, it should be noted that the bulk of these assets were not in fact sequestered until after the war and such a program continued until 1953. Certainly, the permanent retention of these properties without the payment of just compensation stands out in marked contradistinction to what the United States has historically adhered to since the founding of our country.

One need not reiterate that the sanctity of private property has long been a recognized principle of this Government. It is inherent in the very concepts of our free enterprise system and has been stated over and over again from the days of Alexander Hamilton to the present time. Unquestionably the viciousness of such abuse to private property is best summed up in the words of our own beloved Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who denounced the policy of confiscation in stating that—

> Every writer upon international law in America from that time to now who has been recognized as an authority has taken the position that the most savage doctrine ever announced by any people anywhere was that private property should be taken for the satisfaction of a public obligation.

Truly, the theory upon which those German and Japanese properties were sequestered not only does not apply now but it is in diametric opposition to the postwar aims of this Government. Our policy is predicated on the basis that the Federal Republic of Germany is now to assume the status of an equal partner in the alliance against Communist aggression. Yet, how can an equal partnership be maintained or cooperation prevail when the policy of confiscation is directed against the individuals of that nation, a policy which still treats them as enemy aliens—as distrusted people. It can only be expected that Western Germany can become an effective partner in the Western coalition just so long as the people of that nation support the alliance.

In speaking out against the principle of confiscation, the Honorable Daniel Bell, one of the outstanding bankers of this Nation and former Under Secretary of the Treasury stated:

> I refer, of course, to the question as to whether our country, representing a bulwark of freedom and moral principle, has the ethical right to confiscate the property of private persons because of the fortuitous circumstance that they were within enemy territory during World War II. No charge is made or could be made that this property was confiscated because of the

war crimes or similar offenses of its owners. On the contrary, in many cases the property confiscated belonged to persons hostile to the Axis regimes who placed their assets under our protection, having confidence in our institutions and integrity.

In short, the confiscation of these so-called enemy assets is without regard to the guilt or innocence of their owners and reflects a disturbing philosophy utterly foreign to American concepts of morality and justice.

The recent summit conferences made it clear that Germany is of key importance in easing world tensions, and it is imperative that it continue a course of close alliance with the Western Powers on a basis of mutual respect and friendship. The aforementioned hearings clearly evidence the policy of confiscation without compensation presents a barrier to complete understanding and harmony between our two countries. Our leaders of the Foreign Affairs Committee, evidencing the true statesmanship that they continually display in guiding our country through these critically important times, well recognized the importance of resolving with the maximum of speed possible this grave moral issue which is a source of major irritation between our two countries. As also evidenced from the enclosed documents of Congressmen RICHARDS and HAYS, it can be readily be seen that final decision by the House in this matter is a necessary adjunct to the proper relationship between our countries. In order to realize the maximum benefits from the hearings and pressed with the urgency of presentation of this matter to the full House during the 84th Congress, they combined their broad policy consideration with Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's historical and technical background. It was well recognized by our Foreign Affairs Committee that the resolvement of this question of full return and the consequent benefits derived in our relation with Germany commands House attention at the earliest possible time. Moreover, the appended analysis of the hearings and transmittal statements bring into the House record the report of a Senate committee which likewise looked into the matter and established that the foreign-policy interests of our Government demand that full restitution be made for the property so seized. They further held that—

Since the conclusion of the Second World War, the Congress has authorized expenditures in excess of $3 billion for the economic rehabilitation of Germany. This financial support was furnished in an effort to sustain the democratic areas of Germany as a bulwark in the death struggle between representative democracy and Communist totalitarianism. By like token, similar expenditures have been made to support the rebuilding of Japan. These appropriations have undoubtedly resulted in recuperation of these nations from the devastation remaining after World War II. However, the good will which might otherwise have resulted from such generosity has been diminished by the action of this Nation in continuing to expropriate property of individual citizens of those countries. There can be little question but what these individuals have been alienated by the shortsighted policy of confiscation which has been pursued by the United States Government since World War II.

Certainly the program of payment of full compensation for the property can also be supported solely as a matter of national self-interest as well as on international, legal, and moral grounds and the creation of good international relations. Our Government has continually encouraged the program of investments abroad by American citizens and industry. Therefore, the continued policy of confiscation of private property by this Government does not only put this property in jeopardy but lessens the effectiveness of protest by this country against the action of other nations who would insist on violating the rights of American property owners. The United States cannot long continue to wield a double-edge sword of supporting confiscation at home and condemning it abroad.

To suggest that only small amounts of some dollar limitation be returned to individuals only lacks merit. Confiscation of large amounts if accepted in principle would be disastrous to our own expanded foreign economy. Further, confiscation of any amount would defeat the principle involved. As was so aptly stated by Mr. Hermann J. Abs, an outstanding leader in German banking, financial, and governmental circles:

It is of vital and urgent necessity for the policies of the Western World and its interests abroad that the United States, as the most important nation of our community, take the lead in the defense and restoration of private rights, thereby setting a decisive step in dissolving the moral disintegration and legal confusion into which we are more and more getting entangled.

During this present time of international uncertainty and tensions throughout the world, the payment of just compensation of vested property to its thousands of individual owners will have the worldwide effect of this country's reaffirmation to the concepts of international justice and the established rights of the individual. To do less in this instance will be to do an irreparable harm to this Government as a leader of the free countries of the world.

The full statements of Congressmen RICHARDS and HAYS are set forth below:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1955.

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe that Chairman RICHARDS of the Foreign Affairs Committee has already officially transferred to your committee House Joint Resolutions 264, 265, 268, and 272, together with documents and files pertaining to this legislation. It is my understanding that the testimony which was taken in two hearings before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee of which I was chairman are being printed and that the printed copies will be forwarded to you. Other members of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee were Mr. PILCHER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. VORYS, and Mr. BENTLEY.

Mr. RICHARDS concurs with my feeling that perhaps this supplementary letter will supply additional information that might be useful to your committee in initiating further hearings and studies in connection with the resolutions and bills. We recognize that your committee has become familiar with the subject matter in view of the fact that H. R. 6730 which, as I understand, embodies the views of the administration, was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Our subcommittee heard a number of proponents of the joint resolutions and also witnesses in opposition, including representatives of the Departments of State and Justice, both of which agencies indicated that they could not support payments for all of the properties involved. Instead, they expressed support for a limited return calling for payments to individuals up to $10,000 each, as set out in H. R. 6730.

Among the first witnesses supporting the joint resolutions was Dr. Charles S. Collier of George Washington University, and I was naturally interested in his point of view since he was my instructor in constitutional law at the above institution some 35 years ago. Perhaps the legal basis for the proposals will be found to be adequately set forth in Dr. Collier's statement. He and other proponents of the resolutions presented the viewpoint that in justice and equity there should be no arbitrary dollar limitation.

The committee's attention was also called to the Senate committee report (the Dirksen report, No. 1982, 83d Cong.) which reviewed this question and made certain criticisms of existing policy with reference to claims of German and Japanese nationals. I am sure you will find the Dirksen report and hearings contain much relevant testimony and comment regarding the pending bills. You will also want to review the testimony of a number of witnesses who had something to say as to the overall question of permanent seizure without compensation, it being their contention that the United States had up until World War II a firm policy of returning to former enemy aliens any properties that had been held during wartime.

The committee will also be inquiring into the applicability of the Paris reparations agreement and the Bonn convention to the issues to be presented. In the light of the present world situation, particularly the desirability of promoting close ties with the Governments of Germany and Japan, I feel that the matter of determining a correct policy with reference to these claims is something to engage our best thought and consideration. This points up the helpfulness of a current review of the history of these relationships. I am confident, too, that passages in the testimony referring to congressional debates following World War I will be called to the attention of your committee. Several witnesses urged the United States not to use funds of private German and Japanese citizens for the payment of debts owing by their governments to the United States. This is covered in the testimony which was heard by our subcommittee.

No one could question the policy of requiring the German and Japanese Governments to make payments for damage and personal injury inflicted on our own citizens and their properties, and I presume that this will be fully considered at all stages of legislation and treaty negotiations. Along this line, it was advocated during the hearings that any reparations paid should be paid by such nations as a whole and constitute a burden on all their people rather than a special burden on the few based on the circumstances of their having held assets in this country. This is a moral and policy question which touches foreign policy considerations and I am sure that your committee will want to explore the matter fully.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee which visited Germany in 1951 to study occupation policies, I acquired a

better understanding of the necessity for setting up conditions that would make it possible for Germany to continue a close alliance with the Western Powers and that the basis for this would be mutual respect and friendship. For this reason I feel that sources of major irritation between our countries should receive the attention of congressional committees. Due to the consideration of the resolutions so late in the session it became apparent that if the Foreign Affairs Committee was to consider the problem fully it would necessarily take a considerable period of time for study and historical review. It was the feeling of the full committee that the most propitious course would be to combine the broad foreign policy aspects of interest to the Foreign Affairs Committee with the technical and historical background of your committee, and therefore that the transfer of full information relative to these hearings should be made for the benefit of your committee. As I construe the action of our committee, this was the primary motive in having the matter referred to you, and I trust that it will be possible for us to give it an enlightened and proper consideration in the House early in the next session. At any rate, my own personal interest in the problem has been sharpened as a result of these studies and I want you to know that I am at your service if you find that I can be helpful.

BROOKS HAYS,
Member of Congress, Fifth District, Arkansas.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
July 21, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the latter part of March 1955 4 identical resolutions (H. J. Res. 264, 265, 268, and 272) designed to improve the relations of the United States with Western Germany and Japan by providing for the payment of equivalent value for the private properties of their nationals seized by our Government during and after the war were introduced and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As chairman of the committee, I designated an ad hoc subcommittee, chairmaned by the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, to consider this matter. Subsequently, on July 1 and again on July 11, 1955, public hearings were held by that subcommittee and all witnesses desiring to be heard were given an opportunity to present testimony.

At the outset, it was realized that the subject matter involved not only serious questions of highly important policy, but matters involving questions of possible concurrent jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As these resolutions had been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs it was felt that their importance warranted consideration as soon as possible. During the course of the subcommittee hearings a number of important facts were developed. Representatives of both the Department of State and the Department of Justice testified that they could not support payment for the full amount of properties seized. They supported payment to individuals only of a maximum of $10,000, as proposed in H. R. 6730, which had been introduced on June 8, 1955, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Testimony by various witnesses raised questions concerning the equity of the proposed payment of only a portion of the value of the properties seized.

It was brought out in the hearings that a Senate committee within the last 2 years had conducted an intensive investigation of this whole matter. See Senate Report 1,982, 83d Congress, 2d session.

Several witnesses traced the historical treatment accorded by our Government to such properties in the past.

Some questions were raised about the applicability of the Paris Reparations Agreement and the Bonn Convention to the problem at hand.

A number of witnesses contended that the United States ought not to be put in the compromise position of using private funds of private German and Japanese citizens for the satisfaction of any of the public obligations of the governments of these two countries.

As the subcommittee hearings developed, it became apparent that this entire problem, although of great concern to the Foreign Affairs Committee, was intricately interwoven with earlier legislation which historically has been handled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It also became evident that proper consideration of these joint resolutions by the Foreign Affairs Committee would take many more months of study than would necessarily be the case with your committee, particularly in view of its familiarity with the legislative origins of this proposal.

Accordingly, after the approval of the subcommittee and after conversations with you, it was decided, by unanimous vote of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that I would request that these resolutions be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In order that full advantage may be taken of the information developed in them, I am having the subcommittee hearings printed and copies will be sent you as soon as they are received from the Government Printing Office. It is hoped that this will facilitate the transition from our committee to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

If your committee desires any further information in this regard, I shall be happy to cooperate to the fullest extent.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. RICHARDS,
Chairman.

Chances for Ending the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the departure of the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the 80-nation conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on the peacetime uses of atomic energy, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very thoughtful and impressive statement by ex-Senator Frank Porter Graham, of North Carolina. Dr. Graham set forth his private views on the current chances for ending the cold war for the Charlotte, N. C., News, and his article was reprinted in the July 26 issue of the Chapel Hill Weekly. While he was president of the University of North Carolina, when he was a Senator, and during his present assignment in the United Nations, Dr. Graham has always raised his voice in the cause of peace and the brotherhood of man. Dr. Graham's words have such deep implications for the conference in Geneva on development of the atom for peacetime purposes, as well as for the many problems that lie ahead in our relations with other nations of the world, that I would like for the Members of the Congress to have opportunity to read his thought-provoking statement, which follows:

WORLD'S HOPE FOR PEACE IS DESCRIBED BY FRANK GRAHAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Former United States Senator and president of the University of North Carolina, Dr. Frank P. Graham put down his private views for readers of the Charlotte News recently on current chances for an end of the cold war. Knowing the interest in Chapel Hill in Dr. Graham and in peace, the Weekly reprints the article here.)

(By Dr. Frank P. Graham)

NEW YORK.—In seeking to answer your question as to the present prospects for relaxing the tensions of the cold war and for taking more definite steps toward peace, I wish first of all to say that I claim no special knowledge or competence. I speak with more of the general hope now felt by the people of the world than with any expert knowledge in the possession of the statesmen at Geneva.

The conference at Geneva has gotten off to a good start with friendly gestures on both sides. This itself is somewhat of a change from the blasts and counterblasts which have sometimes characterized the opening conferences of the two great power groups.

FIRST ISSUES

The immediate issues which divide the Communist and non-Communist world are: (1) the reunification of Germany with real freedom in elections and with real freedom in its own decisions concerning rearming and membership in the democratic community; (2) free elections in the Eastern European nations, promised in the Yalta agreement in accordance with the principle of the self-determination of peoples, which is also a basic principle of the United Nations; (3) the continuance of American bases in many lands as a part of the defensive strategy of the free world; (4) progressive and effectively enforcible disarmament of all types of forces and weapons of war and mass destruction; (5) the opening of knowledge and contacts between the two worlds; (6) the promised ending of subversion as part of an international apparatus; and (7) (not on the agenda but in the background of the Geneva Conference) the question of the admission of Communist China in the United Nations, subject to requirements of the United Nations, along with the question of admission of all nonmember nations as part of the goal of universal membership.

NONE INSOLUBLE

None of these issues are progressively insoluble except as adamant positions make them so. These main issues provide the opportunity for carrying out in action the good faith of the friendliness and good will with which the conference of the Big Four has auspiciously and hopefully opened in Geneva.

We must hope with good will and pray with faith that this outward friendliness has an inner and sincere significance. In this age of peril the year 1955 may become the year of hope which has three foundations: (I) The United Nations; (II) the Big Four conference; (III) the program of atoms for peace.

TEN HARD YEARS

I. The United Nations, after 10 troublous years, has been morally strengthened by the redeclaration by 60 nations of their interdependence on, their faith in, and their support of the United Nations. The United

Nations, with the full support of the United States led by President Truman, had made it clear, by its stand in Korea, that peace must not mean either appeasement of aggression and tyranny or drifting into a third world war. The United Nations, as a source of hope, had helped to achieve a ceasefire in Palestine, Indonesia, Kashmir, and Korea; had helped to cool off hot spots in Iran, Greece and Berlin; and is helping a little to cool the hot waters in the Straits of Formosa, and has helped many millions of people to achieve their own self-determination in Libya, Eritrea and Indonesia.

In quiet, patient work, day to day, the United Nations is helping people to find the moral equivalent of war in worldwide campaigns and programs against poverty, hunger, illiteracy, disease, unfair discriminations, colonialism, and the war system itself. With all its limitations and frustrations, the United Nations, by the support reaffirmed in the commemoration of the 10th birthday at San Francisco, is in 1955 a renewed source of hope for all mankind.

II. In Geneva this week President Eisenhower and Prime Ministers Bulganin, Eden, and Faure and their associates, open another chapter of 1955 as a year of hope of better things to come. This hope is based not only on the personalities of these leaders and the power of their countries for changing the climate of the cold war in a divided world. It is also based on the widening consciousness of the peoples of the earth that the third world war, now held off by the knowledge of its consequences for all people, might be started against design by some irresponsible spark in the global tinderbox or by some local war expanding beyond its boundaries which would precipitate the fear of a strategic jump ahead in the desperate potentials of atomic war.

Now that it has been made clear by the united strength of the 10-year policies for peace with freedom that no totalitarian tyranny of world empire can override free peoples, it is the prayer tonight of Buddhist, Hindu, Parsee, Taoist, Shintoist, Muslim, Jew, and Christian, that the negotiations at Geneva will mean a more decisive turn in world affairs toward the self-determination, well-being and peace of all people. It is the common prayer of people everywhere that the muster of nations decisively shift from the lineup of two worlds with arms and atom bombs against the family of man to one world of the family of man against arms and atomic bombs. This is the challenge and hope of the Big Four in Geneva. Prayers in the minds and hearts of people of many communities in many lands are for the efforts of our President and all the Big Four during the days to come.

III. While thermonuclear power, as presently directed, casts its lengthening shadow across the earth and darkens all the homes and hopes of men, the third hope of the year 1955 is in the effectuation of a real program of atoms for peace. The two worlds still tend to drift toward the narrow but deep abyss which might engulf all nations in the total annihilation of all people and their accumulated civilization. Man, nations, and the atom have the capacity for good and evil.

INHERITANCE

All the children of men carry in their subsubconscious, preconscious, and conscious natures the animal inheritance of hundreds of million of years and the savage inheritance of hundreds of thousands of years, deep and explosive beneath the nurture of a few thousands years of civilization. The nature of man, when explosive and uncontrolled in its capacity for evil, and the nature of the atom, when explosive and limitless in its power for death and destruction, might bring to an end this ancient man and his accumulated civilization after billions of years of slow evolution to the age of man the decade of the atom. In the providence of God the physical descent of man from lower species has been undergirded by the spiritual ascent of man in the image of God toward a deeper consciousness of one God and the equal brotherhood of all people.

The evolution of states from city-states to empire-states to feudal-states to nation-states has brought the people of the world to the alternatives between a totalitarian-world-police state or the more effective cooperation of nation-states in a more adequate United Nations for a more inclusive collective security of freedom, justice, and peace in the world. The evolution of atomic power in the hands of man in the absolute national state is the greatest threat which has come to the survival of the human species on this planet.

Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, Under Secretary Ralph J. Bunche, and Prof. Walter G. Whitman, Secretary General of the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, and representatives of all the atomic member nations in the United Nations, are working on policies and plans to make effective the President's suggestion of atoms for peace which was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Nothing less than (1) the spiritual depth of the power of the consciousness of the fatherhood of one god, (2) the democratic power of the breadth of the idea of the equal brotherhood of all people, and (3) the organic development of a more adequate United Nations, are all needed for the spiritual transformation of the nature of man, the democratization of society and the cooperation of nations for the use of science, technology, and the humane studies for a fairer and more creative life for all people.

WAYS TO PEACE

In competitive coexistence and in widening the areas of the cooperation of nations for health, education, technical assistance, economic development, reciprocal trade, cultural exchange, progressive and enforceable disarmament, and the humane uses of atomic power, will be the ways through which the universal yearning of the people for peace shall transform the high potentials of the world for war into the cooperation of nations for freedom, justice, compassion, and peace on earth.

In the love of God and man which transcends all races, colors, creeds, boundaries, and curtains, and with a sense of brotherhood with all people whether across the narrow streets, across the hard tracks or across the wide seas, we would, in spite of all illusions, frustrations, and fears, pray with faith and work with patience in the long and difficult pilgrimage of the people for peace and freedom in the eternal adventure toward the kingdom of God "who made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth."

What General Ridgway Finds Wrong With United States Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of a letter addressed to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, by Gen. M. B. Ridgway, retiring Chief of Staff of the United States Army, under date of June 27, 1955, which was released by the Department of Defense on July 15, 1955. General Ridgway has held three of the highest military posts in the world today—Supreme Allied Commander in the Far East and in Europe and United States Army Chief of Staff. He has pointed out that the United States must be ready to fight more limited wars and needs more mobile units; that our defense will suffer if too much reliance is placed on nuclear weapons. The destruction they cause is so great that nations may agree not to use them. Therefore, General Ridgway pleads for stronger ground forces in being.

The letter follows:

[From the U. S. News & World Report of July 29, 1955]

WHAT GENERAL RIDGWAY FINDS WRONG WITH UNITED STATES DEFENSES

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I shall depart from the active ranks of the United States Army on June 30, 1955, thereby vacating the offices I currently hold. Having spent 38 years as a United States soldier on active service around the world, I trust I may be permitted, as I terminate this service, to summarize for you certain of my concepts concerning the security and well-being of the United States, all of which I have expressed, in one form or another and from time to time, as Chief of Staff, United States Army, and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I do so within the statutory provisions of the National Security Act, as amended, which delineate my functions as a military advisor to you, the National Security Council, and the President.

I do so with full awareness of the quickening tempo of international intercourse; of the growing realization among all peoples of what the President brought into such clear focus when he said: "it seems clear that there is no longer any alternative to peace"; of the fateful developments which may have their genesis in the conferences which, beginning in New York and San Francisco, are to continue later in Geneva.

I am mindful of the great responsibilities that continue to devolve upon you as the President's principal assistant for national defense. I would be neglecting my duty if I did not reaffirm prior to my departure my convictions regarding the military defense of the United States. I wish to comment on the general nature of the Soviet threat, the variable strategy permissible to the U. S. S. R. for general war, the specific United States commitments in reaction to the Soviet threat, the United States strategy to meet these commitments, and a viable United States military strategy for "cold war" situations. Finally, I will discuss briefly my view of the role of a military advisor in the formulation of national policy.

GENERAL NATURE OF THE THREAT

In today's world-power climate, in spite of recurrent peace offenses, the scope and dimensions of the threat which faces America are measurable in terms of the fundamental attitude of hostility by the Soviet regime toward the free world and especially toward the United States; in terms of the Communist capability for conducting political subversion throughout the world; and principally in terms of the strength of all major components of the continually expanding Soviet bloc military power.

As a result of this continued increase in Soviet bloc military strength unmatched by a comparable increase in allied strength, the United States and its free world allies are faced by Communist armies, navies, and air

forces formidable in size, modern in material and techniques, and deployed threateningly along the periphery of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains from the North German plain to the maritime provinces of eastern Siberia. The dangers inherent in this situation, and particularly the dangers in the preponderant deployment of land forces, are evident at every significant point of contact between the Western World and the Communist bloc.

As long as the Soviet Communist bloc is on the offensive, it is able to retain the initiative in its undertakings; and the centrality of its power base gives it the strategic advantage of being able to concentrate with small risk of detection at any point on its perimiter.

In the nuclear arms race, the day of nuclear plenty for each of the two major world power groups draws nearer; the cost of fabrication drops; and hence the day when even smaller powers may likewise possess such weapons is already foreseeable. Common appreciation of the consequences of unlimited nuclear war may well result in general unwillingness to employ these weapons, in recognition of the mutual disaster which would follow wherein the peoples, property, and institutions of much of the world would vanish.

In a situation of nuclear plenty, mutual cancellation of nuclear advantage can occur in terms of mutual devastation; or, depending on the degree of parity, in terms of mutually limited use; or, finally, in common refusal to use nuclear weapons at all. It seems doubtful that the U. S. S. R. would initiate employment of nuclear weapons in the face of a preponderance of nuclear weapons possessed by the United States. On the other hand, should the Western nations initiate their use, the U. S. S. R. would have no choice but to respond in kind, in the hope that the resultant destruction to the West would circumscribe the ability of the United States to continue effective prosecution of such a war. In the light of this major possibility for the future, it is at least debatable whether the United States really has the freedom to rely preponderantly on nuclear weapons to exert its military power.

Moreover, it appears prudent to assume that Soviet strategists are even now giving consideration to a course of action which would put on the United States the onus of initiating the use of military nuclear firepower, making certain that the United States and its allies know they can reasonably expect retaliation with nuclear weapons by the Soviets, simultaneously with the initial assaults of the Red armies

Under these conditions, since national objectives could not be realized solely by the possession of nuclear capabilities, no nation would regard nuclear capabilities alone as sufficient, either to prevent, or to win a war.

VARIABLE STRATEGY PERMISSIBLE TO THE U. S. S. R. FOR GENERAL WAR

A mere statistical evaluation of the ratio of military power potentials between the Soviet bloc and the free world is not sufficient to determine detailed Soviet general war strategy. Instead, Soviet military potentials would first have to be translated into Soviet minimum military capabilities, and thereafter into Soviet general war strategy. For a general war within the next 10 years, the Soviets would have to gain their objectives of the defense of the U. S. S. R., the control of Eurasia, the severance of lines of communication between the United States and its allies, and the reduction of the warmaking power of the United States and Canada. The attainment of these objectives would have to be integrated in such a manner that the prizes the Soviets would hope to acquire would not be merely the pickings of a vast ash heap of devastated animal life, or of a human race debilitated by the effects of radiation. On the contrary, the prize would have to be worth the effort expended and the chances taken to get them; that is, they would have to materially improve the power position and the extension of Soviet dominance.

The Soviet potentiality for gaining these prizes is based on Soviet bloc military forces, which comprise large ground forces supported by integral tactical air forces, supplemented by aid-defense forces, and including a minor surface navy, a threatening submarine fleet, and a long-range air force growing in capability.

To use these forces in the attainment of Soviet war aims without modification to or retrenchment from their objectives, the Soviets would have to acknowledge conditions which over the next 10 years could vary from an extreme of clear United States nuclear superiority to full nuclear parity, with vast stockpiles of weapons and of delivery vehicles available to both sides.

Thus the greatest imponderable with respect to probable Soviet strategy concerns the Soviet capabilities and intentions with respect to the use of nuclear weapons. For all practical purposes, nuclear parity between the U. S. S. R. and the United States will exist when the U. S. S. R. achieves the ability to deliver critical damage to the United States-allied war-power sources with fusion weapons. In this situation, neither side will have a nuclear advantage, whether the lack of advantage is proven by mutual devastation or mutual withholding of use, or depending on the degree of parity, in terms of limited use. There is little reason to doubt that the U. S. S. R., like every other nation, would refer to avoid the use of nuclear weapons. For these reasons it is probable that as nuclear plenty is approached and as the relative advantage of United States nuclear superiority diminishes, Soviet strategy will be directed toward the creation of situations which will preclude the use of nuclear weapons on a worldwide basis.

The variable character which general war may assume over the next 10 years, then, makes the best Soviet strategy in each different circumstance the employment in their normal role of conventional Soviet ground forces, supported by the Soviet Air Force and the Soviet Navy. Such a strategy is completely consistent with Soviet war objectives, with Soviet strategic doctrine, with Soviet military potentialities, and with the physical nature of the great land mass it occupies. There is no reasonable basis for expecting Soviet strategy necessarily to duplicate United States-allied strategy, and thus to gamble on a capacity of accomplishing, by a single means, an extremely formidable task. This task, even if successful in accomplishing the reduction of United States warmaking power, would attain only one of the major Soviet war objectives. Again it seems logical to expect that all Soviet war objectives would be combined to form an integrated Soviet war aim.

I recognize that the foregoing position is not reflected in current United States strategy with respect to airpower. I recognize that, since United States power centers are beyond the effective reach of the Soviet tactical ground-air team, the Soviets, too, have been forced to develop a strategic bombing arm. I am well aware of the requirement for a continuing evaluation of all elements of the Soviet potential. I am also well aware that, in planning for success in war, allowances must be made for special circumstances and unpredictable actions.

My carefully considered position, long advocated, is based realistically on military factors that are associated with Russian and Soviet history, the tradition of the Soviet offensive-defensive, and the present Soviet military force structure and capabilities. Moreover, it is, I believe, consistent with the entire pattern of recorded military history to date, and, in the light of all human experience, will prove to be consistent with the pattern of the future. These factors must be accorded the full weight they demand by responsible United States planners both within and outside the military services.

UNITED STATES COMMITMENTS IN REACTION TO THE THREAT

In a world whose determination to combat the Communist menace waxes and wanes, the United States, by example, persuasion, pressure, inducements, assistance, and agreements, has established itself as the leader of the Western resistance. The United States has sought and signed allies around the world. For purposes of the common defense, it has entered into numerous commitments, some vague and some specific, to take actions, to deploy forces, and to provide material support to Canada, 20 Latin American countries, Berlin, West Germany, Spain, Yugoslava, 11 NATO nations, Libya, Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Iran, the 2 ANZUS nations, the additional 6 Manila Pact nations, Korea, Japan, the Republic of China, and to the United Nations organization.

No one knows when those ominous sight drafts may be presented for payment. No one can tell at this time the form or scope of performance these commitments may require of the United States. But they obviously may involve action by United States military forces in many different types of climate and terrain, such as the mountains of Greece and Korea or the jungles of Indochina.

UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO MEET COMMITMENTS

In general, the foregoing commitments express the intent of the United States:

(a) To meet force with force.

(b) To be prepared to meet and defeat limited aggression in small perimeter wars, whether or not nuclear weapons are used.

(c) To be capable of defeating Soviet bloc military forces if general war should occur, whether or not nuclear weapons are used, and in widely varying terrain and climates.

In my view, the present United States military forces are inadequate in strength and improperly proportioned to meet the above commitments, specific or implied, for the following reasons:

(a) The Soviet Communist bloc has created and is prosecuting a continuous state of conflict as a matter of national policy. They have shown the intention and capability to capitalize on subversion or on local war for military and political advantage in China, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Malaya, Korea, Indochina, and other places, in spite of the superior United States strength in long-range air forces, although this superiority has been obvious to the world since World War II. As the point in time approaches, possibly between 1958 and 1962, when Soviet nuclear weapon and delivery developments will give the Communist bloc the capability of inflicting critical damage on the United States warmaking potential, coupled with a concurrent improvement of Soviet air-defense capability, the United States nuclear-air superiority will have lost most of its present significance.

(b) The free world military forces deployed around the perimeter, other than those in Western Europe, are in the position of being military detachments, which are not mutually supporting, which have little or no strategic mobility of their own, and which are difficult to reinforce because of the lack of truly mobile and adequate military reserves.

(c) Present United States military forces cannot support fully America's diplomacy. If military power is to support diplomacy effectively, it must be real and apparent to all concerned, and it must be capable of being applied promptly, selectively, and with the degree of violence appropriate to the occasion.

(d) While a mobile ready force element is provided for in published policy statements, the actual development of a mobile

ready force must compete with increasingly emphasized continental defense, and with, in my opinion, overemphasized nuclear-air requirements; all of which are requirements related primarily to general war.

In view of the free world's appreciable manpower superiority over the Communist bloc and of the economic potential of the United States, it is my view that the free world has ample resources to confront the Soviet bloc enemy in whatever form of aggression the Soviets choose. The advantage of interior lines on the Communist side can and must be countered by the advantage of strategic mobility on the free world side. In addition to properly deployed strength, mobile reinforcements are the only effective means of countering the threats growing out of the Soviet ability to concentrate at will, and the United States is the only source of mobile reserves at the present time.

It is my view that the commitments which the United States has pledged create a positive requirement for an immediately available mobile joint military force of hard-hitting character in which the versatility of the whole is emphasized and the preponderance of any one part is deemphasized.

VIABLE MILITARY STRATEGY FOR COLD WAR SITUATIONS

Currently, the means made available for supporting the United States military strategy for both cold and general war are limited. The present United States preoccupation with preparations for general war has limited the military means available for cold war to those which are essentially by-products or leftovers from the means available for general war.

A wide choice of military means, resulting from properly proportioned, modernized forces, is required to fill the present large gap in effective deterrence resulting from United States preoccupation with long-range bombers as the principal deterrent.

United States strategy, backed by adequate and proper military strength, should make full provision for the following:

(a) Every physical action taken in furtherance of the basic United States military strategy should be taken only after considering, individually and in sum, the probable psychological effects of the action on the U. S. S. R., United States nationals, United States allies, and neutral nations. Such actions should be designed to counter the Soviet policy of instilling fear with a United States policy of creating confidence.

(b) A strong position of tangible free world strength must be maintained. Continued United States adherence to the concept of collective security is fundamental to the maintenance of free world strength; coalitions must stand shoulder to shoulder or suffer the danger of disintegration from within.

(c) An increase in the readiness and strategic mobility of uncommitted United States and British Commonwealth forces is required to support the strategy, and availability of troops of other key nations for additional deployments in United States and United Kingdom transportation to areas where they are needed is an important aspect.

(d) Soviet satellite aggressions should be treated as limited or local wars until the aggressor is defeated or the United States and its allies are prepared for general war.

(e) United States reaction to satellite aggression should not be conditioned by a fear of Soviet intervention or unduly prejudiced by a fear of possible maldeployments of United States forces. If sufficient forces are available from the outset such maldeployments could be readily and quickly rectified.

(f) The satellite cordon should not be reduced by military force as long as its existence produces advantages for the free world.

(g) The United States should give all practicable assistance to our allies in their efforts to suppress Soviet-Communist-inspired civil disorders.

THE MORAL ASPECT

I should like to add a word on the importance of the moral factor in all human relationships, especially when preparing a strategy to protect America's security. Just as the ultimate and most deadly threat of communism is the destruction of the religious and moral principles which, imperfectly as they may have been observed, yet have guided man to new heights of dignity and self-respect; in seeking to insure America's security, so also we find the same threat in the increasingly significant ignoring by our planners of the consequences of omitting the moral factor in considering the use of the immense destructive capability which now exists in the world. There is a responsibility on every one of us to evaluate this moral factor, along with all the scientific and other practical factors in seeking solutions to these mammoth problems.

MY VIEW OF THE ROLE OF A MILITARY ADVISER

In the foregoing pages, I have sought to outline a broad concept of the strategy which, as I see it, is most likely to serve United States interests. In doing so, it has been my intention to discharge my responsibility as a military adviser, from within the field sanctioned by law. In the light of current national military policies, this responsibility is not always clear, even to those to whom the responsibility is assigned.

In closing, I should like, therefore, to outline my view of the proper role of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, as a military adviser.

In March 1953, while still Chairman of the JCS, General Bradley expressed one view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff role as military advisers: "Generally * * * we should confine our part to pointing out the military implications and military capabilities * * *. Perhaps some people might feel that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should stand up and resolutely and strongly recommend a national policy which we would prefer, but to date I have not been convinced that this is a proper role for a military leader."

In his message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 6 on April 30, 1953, President Eisenhower expressed the view that "Professional military leaders must not be thrust into the political arena to become the prey of partisan politics."

Earlier, in 1951, on April 26 to be exact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were criticized publicly by Senator Robert A. Taft as being "absolutely under the control of the administration," and that their recommendations were "what the administration demands they make." During my period of duty as Chief of Staff, events have made it appear that the criticism once leveled at my predecessors might be better grounded in the future than in the past.

National policy matters which are discussed at the level of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as military advisers to the President, National Security Council, and Secretary of Defense, are seldom, in this day and age, separable into purely military and nonmilitary problems.

I view the military advisory role of a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as follows: He should give his competent professional advice on the military aspects of the problems referred to him, based on his fearless, honest, objective estimate of the national interest, and regardless of administration policy at any particular time. He should confine his advice to the essentially military aspects. When testifying as Army Chief of Staff before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in the Congress on June 28, 1947, General Eisenhower expressed the following attitude in support of this view:

"I appear before you only as a professional soldier, to give you a soldier's advice regarding the national defense. I am not qualified to proceed beyond that field; and I do not intend to do so. It is my duty as Chief of Staff to tell you gentlemen what I believe to be necessary for national security."

If the military adviser's unrestricted advice is solicited he should give his considered opinion, for in today's climate national security planning is broad and encompasses many aspects. The President, in the message to which I referred earlier, has stated that the Nation's military plans "must incorporate the most competent and considered thinking from every point of view—military, scientific, industrial, and economic." However, in my opinion, the military advisor should be neither expected nor required to give public endorsement to military courses of action against which he has previously recommended. His responsibility should be solely that of loyal vigorous execution of decisions by proper authority.

This aspect is perhaps the most difficult one for the military adviser, particularly as he strives to keep himself detached from domestic politics at the time domestic political forces attempt to use him for their own purpose. In his role of adviser, he gives his best advice. In his role as a commander, he implements decisions. Both roles must be respected by civilian officials, as he must respect theirs. In this regard, as the political climate shifts and changes, differing assessments will be made of his proper role; but whatever the situation, he must remain outside the field of partisan politics. It is incumbent upon civilian officials to see that he stays outside and to protect him from becoming involved.

I am well aware that my remarks here and elsewhere may be taken, indeed, they have been so labeled, as special pleading for outmoded special interests. I have been pictured in some quarters as opposing emphasis on airpower. The exact contrary is true, I am opposed to overemphasis on airpower. as I am opposed to overemphasis on any military force where dependence on that force exceeds its capabilities, and impairs the Nation's overall military potential.

As Chief of Staff, United States Army, it has been my duty to advance the primary interests of United States security over and above Service interests. While disavowing any Army claim to an excess of national interest, I would specifically point to the Army's long experience, past success, and tested judgment in fighting the wars of the United States with all forms of military power.

The Army has no wish to scrap its previous experience in favor of unproven doctrine, or in order to accommodate enthusiastic theorists having little or no responsibility for the consequences of following the courses of action they advocate. While the Army is adapting itself readily to the employment of new weapons and new techniques, nothing currently available or foreseeable in war reduces the essentiality of mobile, powerful ground forces, the only forces which can seize the enemy's land and the people living thereon, and exercise control of both thereafter.

The United States Army has for 180 years served America's security. It will continue under new leadership its proud tradition of loyal and dependable service.

It has been my proud privilege to have been a member of that magnificent institution in the profession of arms—the United States Army.

Respectfully,

M. B. RIDGWAY,
General, United States Army, Chief of Staff.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my position on the housing legislation perfectly clear. I am an advocate for public housing. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I sought to have that committee report an adequate housing bill. I feel that it is axiomatic that not alone in a city like the city of New York, but in many communities throughout the United States, there are hideous slums to be cleared. We cannot clear slums unless we have decent housing in which to relocate those displaced by the destruction of the substandard dwellings in which they lived. Private industry, by reason of the terrifically increased building costs, has been unable to do the job. Public housing is the only answer.

The United States Senate saw the light. Its bill provides for 135,000 units of public housing. In my committee we were only able to find approval for a bill which provided for 35,000 units of public housing. When this bill reached the floor today, the Republican leadership was unanimous under the guidance of the ranking Republican Member on the Committee of Banking and Currency in its determination to eliminate public housing from the bill entirely. I am sorry to say that with the help of some of my colleagues, it succeeded.

My first instinct was to vote against what remained of the housing bill because this was not a bill designed to provide decent housing for the great masses of people now subsisting in sordid dismal shelters; this bill was and is a continuation of the bonanza which has gratified the real-estate lobby.

The action in the House of Representatives today is unhappy. Many who have been pontificating about the necessity of doing something to curb juvenile delinquency ripped public housing out of the bill. Others who have successfully obtained literally billions of dollars in farm subsidiaries refused to lift a finger to clean up the blighted areas of the teeming cities of America. They called the housing program socialistic. They find nothing socialistic or paternalistic in farm subsidiaries or windfall handouts, while slums and blighted areas in our cities grow steadily worse and increase in size. My experience as a judge in a criminal court has convinced me beyond any doubt that crime, especially juvenile crime, is bred and fostered by the sordid, unhealthy conditions which exist in substandard homes and slum areas. It is in these areas that policing activities, fire and health programs are taxed to the utmost.

It is equally clear that Federal assistance is needed to help the State and local governments combat the growth of slums, provide adequate low-rent housing, and eliminate juvenile delinquency. I am convinced that the agencies concerned with the administration of our housing laws are in need of renewed direction by the Congress, and that our Housing Act itself is in need of legislative revamping. Last year Congress amended the Housing Act to include an authorization for the FHA to insure urban renewal and slum-clearance projects. The purpose of the law is obviously laudable, but despite many applications which have been made for Federal assistance, FHA has not approved a single one.

At the public hearings held by the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Cole, the Housing Administrator, was questioned at length by me. At first there was some question as to where the responsibility and the jurisdiction for slum clearance and urban redevelopment might lie. Mr. Cole indicated that the administration of section 220 of title I was primarily the responsibility of FHA.

He pointed out that when "a community desires to clear and redevelop a given slum or blighted area, it proceeds by going to the Urban Renewal Administration and asking for planning funds," and then stated:

> Heretofore there has not been very much of a closely coordinated effort between FHA and Urban Renewal.

I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to castigate the Federal Housing Administrator who stated at the hearings that he agreed with me and was himself "not satified with the swiftness of the program."

Renewed questioning brought out this fact: Not a single application for slum clearance and urban redevelopment had been granted under section 220 because the FHA had established no policy of appraisal or cost evaluation.

The bill which the House Banking and Currency Committee reported contains a provision which the Senate has already approved and which was contained in the bill I introduced earlier this year. The phrase "estimated value" is replaced by inserting "replacement cost." This change, together with a realistic allowance for builders' profits by the FHA should go a long way toward the rapid approval and construction of urban renewal and slum-clearance projects.

The committee report also emphasizes the fact that under the cost-certification provisions of the Housing Act there will be full protection against "windfalls" under section 220, multifamily rental projects. The cost-certification section has been amended by the committee by the adoption of a provision contained in my bill. This new safeguard will close a loophole which exists in the present law. Rental housing eligible for FHA insurance under section 200 containing from 5 to 11 dwelling units is made subject to the cost certification provisions of section 227 now applicable only to projects containing 12 or more units.

Thus, the builder, in his application for a mortgage, must agree that upon completion of the physical improvements to the mortgaged property or project, he will file a sworn certificate subject to the scrutiny of the Government's accountants as to the actual cost of the improvements, and if the mortgage loan exceeded the actual cost, the builder must promptly repay any excess, the "windfall" surplus, over the approved percentage, and apply it to the reduction of the principal amount of the mortgage. No excess could then find its way to the builder's pockets.

It is essential too, for the proper administration of this law, that the FHA overcome its investigation jitters and promptly proceed with a workable housing program.

There is another very important provision contained in the committee housing bill. That is the housing which we have approved for the educational institutions of the country. With the increasing shortage of trained scientific personnel the more we can do in any way to help foster and encourage higher education the better. This provision to aid in the construction of housing and other facilities at these educational institutions is modest indeed when the need is considered. As an indication of the gravity of the situation I would like to include here with my remarks, Mr. Speaker, a letter I recently received from the able chancellor of New York University, Henry T. Heald:

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
New York, N. Y., July 14, 1955.

The Honorable IRWIN D. DAVIDSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIDSON: I understand that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House has approved a bill dealing with the college housing loan program. A similar bill, S. 2126, has already been passed by the Senate.

This legislation is extremely important to American colleges and universities and I hope very much that it will be finally passed in this session of Congress. I know that the Congress has a great deal of important work to do in a relatively short time, but I hope that it will be possible to secure favorable action on the college housing legislation.

Thank you very much for anything you may be able to do to help.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY T. HEALD, *Chancellor.*

Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee considered another provision contained in my bill. I had proposed a study of the desirability and feasibility of establishing a program of insurance to protect small homeowners, whose dwellings are covered by mortgages insured under Federal law, against loss of their equity in their homes in cases where they are unable to make the mortgage payments as a result of economic conditions beyond their control. After discussion in executive session the committee determined that the question was worthy of further study and referred it to the housing subcommittee. I believe this a good start toward the establishment of an insurance fund to protect the small homeowners' equity.

I voted for the substitute housing bill because had I not done so, there would have been no chance for public housing whatsoever. At least now this emasculated bill will go, with the more realistic Senate bill, to the conferees. I am convinced that these conferees will come up with a bill far more in consonance with the aspirations of the people and far more consistent with what our people need and have been hoping for.

Fort Vancouver National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago I presented to Congress a bill to authorize the establishment of a National Monument to preserve one of the most historical sites in the entire western part of the North American Continent. Congress approved my request and authorized the establishment of Fort Vancouver National Monument.

By so doing, Congress preserved for future generations part of the history of our western frontier which stems from an act of a previous Congress some 145 years before.

In January 1803, the Congress of the United States appropriated, at the request of President Thomas Jefferson, the sum of $2,500 for an expedition to the Pacific ocean for the purpose of extending the external commerce of the United States. Thus was born the famed Lewis and Clark Expedition the sesquicentennial of which we are celebrating this year.

Meriwether Lewis and William Clark blazed the trial to the great Northwest frontier and were soon followed by a constantly increasing flood of pioneer settlers. This vast new country required trading posts and so the Hudson Bay Company's established Fort Vancouver which has been aptly called the cradle in which the civilization of the Northwest country was nurtured.

Fort Vancouver, established in 1825, was the largest Hudson Bay Company establishment, and was the headquarters for this company for all its activities between the crest of the Rockies and the Pacific Ocean, from Russian Alaska to Spanish California. From this post stemmed all the commerce and culture, the development and civilization of the Oregon country. Its historical significance transcends not only State lines, but international boundaries.

Fort Vancouver was the western terminus of the famed Oregon Trail, and it was here, under the guidance of the Hudson's Bay Company's famous factor, John McLoughlin, that the planning and intrigue was carried on by which Great Britain hoped to gain possession of all the country north of the Columbia. At the same time, his very fine administration of the area, and his many acts of kindness to the pioneer American settlers, endeared him to all the people with whom he came in contact.

After the treaty of 1846 placed this territory under the American flag, the site of the Hudson's Bay Post became Vancouver Barracks, the first United States Military Establishment in the Northwest. Fort Vancouver has inscribed for itself a long and honorable chapter of thrilling events of great significance to the historians and others interested in the preservation of early Americana. Here were stationed, at one time or another, such famous officers as Ulysses S. Grant, Phil Sheridan, George B. McClelland, George E. Pickett, Nelson A. Miles, Frederick Funston, and George Catlett Marshall; truly a famous roster.

The Army post at Fort Vancouver continues active to this date. Known variously as Camp Vancouver, Columbia Barracks, Fort Vancouver, and Vancouver Barracks, it long served as military headquarters and supply point for the Pacific Northwest. Though now much reduced in size, it commemorates the role of the United States Army in the settlement and development of the American frontier.

Its international recognition also continues, for Pearson Field at Vancouver Barracks was the landing point of the pole-vaulting Russian fliers in 1937, about whom the famous explorer Vilhjalmur Stefansson said: "They found the world of transportation a cylinder; they left it a sphere."

The Fort Vancouver National Monument will be dedicated on August 13, just 2 weeks from today. Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay will officiate at the dedication and an impressive ceremony and celebration has been planned. It is being sponsored by the Stockaders, a Vancouver, Wash., organization named in memory of the Hudson's Bay days and the original Fort Vancouver stockade.

In behalf of the Stockaders, Vancouver and Clark County citizens, I extend to all Members of Congress a cordial invitation to attend the dedication and celebration. You should by all means see first hand the results of actions taken by two Congresses of the United States over a span of 145 years.

More Notes on Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the July 28, 1955, issue of the Taylor Times, there is an editorial by Mr. Henry Fox, well-known author and writer who has always shown a keen interest in and an accurate understanding of the problem of the small farmer.

The editorial by Mr. Fox entitled "More Notes on Price Supports" is one which I consider very timely and which I know every Member of Congress will want to read.

I therefore respectfully request that it be inserted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MORE NOTES ON PRICE SUPPORTS

Even here in a farming area, you still find people who shake their heads and say they don't know about this price-support business, it sounds like artificially maintaining prices.

Well, maybe it is, whatever that means, but look at it this way:

The several million farms in this country are each a separate business, run by individuals who are mostly unorganized, and despite that they have succeeded in producing all the food and fiber that this country needs, with some to spare. But being individual units, they have no marketing system they can control, except through the agency of their Government.

It's one thing to say a farmer ought to grow what he can get the most for and trust to luck to make a profit, the same as other people do, only it doesn't work that way and very few others function under such a system.

Take the car manufacturers. There are only 3 big companies, doing about 75 percent of the total business, and all told only 5 or 6 companies. If there were only 3 big farmers in this country, raising 75 percent of the cotton, corn, maize, etc., and 3 or 4 others raising all the rest, they wouldn't need any government support prices, they'd just hold the food off the market until they got what they had to have.

Or take tractor manufacturers. The same thing is true. There are only 7 or 8 companies making all the tractors and other farm implements for all the farmers in this country.

And even so, car manufacturers and tractor manufacturers have price supports, in the form of tariffs.

As long as the farmland is divided up into small units, and we for one hope it will stay that way forever, because if there's anything that keeps a democracy functioning it's a lot of small people who are their own boss and are economically uncontrolled by anybody else, then there has to be some method devised to let a farmer know when he starts a crop about what he can get for it when he finishes it. It's the most stabilizing fact in farming today, and it is now being proved right here in Williamson County.

Our only complaint is that the present Agricultural Department, headed by Secretary Benson, doesn't have much faith in it. Secretary Benson has lowered the support price at every chance he got, contending for example that 70 percent of parity is better for the farmers than 90 percent. Parity as you know means a fair price, and what this means is that Secretary Benson believes 70 percent of a fair price is better than 90 percent of a fair price. When he ran for President, Mr. Eisenhower criticized the Democrats for supplying the farmers only 90 percent of parity, saying they were entitled to 100 percent. Now 100 percent of fairness never did seem like too much fairness to us, but it seems like at least 30 percent more than Secretary Benson believes in. Equal justice to all, except farmers, and 70 percent is enough for them.

HENRY FOX.

The White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of Congress will enjoy the address by Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, given at the national sales executive annual meeting in New York City on June 9, 1955:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Your President told me that the qualification for holding this platform is to have (as he put it) a wonderful idea. "Other vir-

tues which the speech should possess," he said "must be drama and spontaneity."

You can get all of these in a package, at a somewhat higher price, over at the 46th Street Theater. Such requirements, imposed upon a staff officer of the President of the United States, consecrated by tradition to seek complete anonymity, remind me of a young couple I heard about the other day.

This couple resolved to get married but the girl made one condition. That condition was that John should first save $1,000. Time passed and along toward the following June she asked him one day how much he had been able to save toward the $1,000. Thirty-five dollars, he said. Near enough, said the girl.

That is about the way you will have to settle with me.

We in the Eisenhower administration are not given credit for reporting effectively our accomplishments. These add up, if you enumerate them, to rather an impressive total. Too many people are critical not so much of what we do, but what we fail to say we do.

It is not my purpose to engage in any long exposition of the accomplishments of this administration. What I propose to do is to speak of our two principal objectives and how we have sought to attain them.

You gentlemen are professional salesmen. There is one thing that everyone of you know. You know that, while slogans and smart literature and slick sales talk help to sell, you nevertheless have to have a product. Sooner or later you know that the public, your consumers, must have confidence in that product. Your job is to see to it that your prospective consumers find out about that product.

We in the Eisenhower administration know that this is an important part of our job, too.

Now, there are two products, if I may paraphrase a little, which free government can sponsor and promote, which are infallible ingredients of a successful administration. They are not new. They are immediately accepted as basic criteria of a sound and progressive administration. No administration, demonstrably effective in convincing the people of its ability to deliver such products, has ever been repudiated. Those products are peace and prosperity.

I often think of the remarks a farmer in my native Vermont once made to a summer boarder. He lived up on one of those rocky side hill farms. His cow and old mare were not much but skin and bones, and he was as poor as a crow himself. One day a summer boarder whom he had known a long time came by. He was out harrowing among the rocks. She said, "Hiram, why don't you sell out up here and come down on some decent land where you can make a living?" "Well," said Hiram, "I ain't so poor as you think I be. I don't own this con-dummed place."

As sales executives you know the value of a product that can be relied on to stand the test of usage. Trade names soon disappear from the market places unless they represent sound and trustworthy standards of excellence.

In 1952 a vast majority of the voters of America, believing that things were not as sound and trustworthy as they should be politically, asked the Republican Party for a new demonstration of fundamental Americanism—a departure from radical design in government—a rededication to the more conservative and reliable political faith of our forefathers.

Inflation was exhausting the great economic heart of the Republic. The peace for which we had so long fought and so earnestly prayed continued to be mired down in the mud of Korea. Confidence in Washington had reached an alltime low with gimmick after gimmick being used in an effort to persuade the people that all was well.

Into this picture moved Dwight D. Eisenhower, one of the greatest patriots and one of the ablest and most devoted citizens this country had ever known—a new sales executive, if you please. His responsibility and purpose was to revive not only the soul of this God-fearing land but likewise to reconstitute its economic life. He gave the Nation's citizenship new cause to believe, not in gimmicks, but in the solid salable substance of basic American principles.

What have been the results—and for sales executives it's only results that count.

First, how well have we made out on making good on the prosperity question?

Sounder monetary and credit policies have steered us safely past the twin destroyers—depression and inflation.

Further, such policies have achieved a stable dollar, controlled the cost of living. They have provided prudent management of the public debt. They are reducing the expenses of Government; they will balance the budget.

New tax policies have added incentives to investment, encouraged capitalizing on opportunities, removed injustices from the overburdened.

Such policies have keenly accepted social responsibilities to care for the poor, the afflicted, the aged.

They have put Government out of competitive enterprise with its own citizens. The program for the disposal of rubber plants received international acclaim as a demonstrated achievement in getting Government out of private business.

Such accomplishments (which are by no means all) are measurable in results—in facts, figures, in cold statistics.

In May, 62.7 million people were employed—a million over April, and an all-time high for May.

Unemployment is dropping. Unemployment in May was down sharply, by almost half a million under April. It is 800,000 less than a year ago. If you are interested in percentages, it is 25.5 percent under last August.

Industrial production rose in April to an index of 136, one point below the all-time record. But listen, the figure for May is expected to show a further rise—perhaps a new all-time record. American business is planning great increases in plant and equipment in the second and third quarters of 1955. The third-quarter rate will equal or exceed the peak third quarter of 1953. The figure is something like 28.8 billion for the third quarter. Compare that with the first quarter rate of 25.6 billion.

The figures for personal consumption during the first quarter were at an annual rate of $242 billion. The figure for April will be about $3 billion higher. It is still going up.

Retail-store sales in April were up 7 percent over a year ago.

Personal income in April rose to a new record—an annual rate of $295.6 billion—a billion higher than March, and $11 billion higher than April of last year.

Disposable personal income—the amount you have to spend—reached an annual rate of $260.6 billion in the first quarter. In April it had risen to something like $263 billion.

These facts and figures are noteworthy as indicators of conditions today. Their greater significance is what they mean for tomorrow. Do they really carry the promise of continued public confidence?

There is one reason, of course, why there is in our time a greater degree of confidence not only for today, but for tomorrow. It is evident in public opinion polls, in stock market trends, in figures of industrial expansion, in countless other barometers that reveal what people are really thinking. That confidence finds its chief expression in the devotion of the country to its President, Dwight Eisenhower.

Yet there are reasons beyond personality or great capacity. These can be expressed in much more tangible terms. Our people today want to know about plans for the future. They want acts, deeds.

What is your Government for its part doing to inspire and promote this confidence for the future?

I promised not to tax your patience with long enumerations. What you are really interested in is what's ahead.

Let us give all due credit for today's bright picture to the brains of management, the skill of labor, and the driving force of creative selling. But let's look at what we in Government are doing to encourage an even greater prosperity.

First, let's look briefly at fiscal management. We have learned that certain acts have certain results. One of the techniques of fiscal policy is the application of the principle of flexibility to the decisions regarding discount rates, mortgage financing, management of the debt service, better control of the levels of Government spending.

The majority of the people of this country like to live within their income. They think Government ought to, also. Balancing the budget has been no idle promise. It was our determination, and we are going to achieve it. And we will do it by no ruthless grinding down of necessary public expenditures. It will be balanced (and soon, we hope) by better management of the whole business of government, and we know there are a lot of improvements yet to be made.

We shall continue to eliminate Government from the field of competition with private business. In numerous instances the Government has already withdrawn from much activity. In the months ahead this effort will continue until the Government in this regard is once again within the limits of its proper function and purpose.

We have been watching lately the expansion of consumer credit. We completely removed the heavy hand of Government from this field of control. We don't propose to reimpose it. Yet we believe that sound credit growth is essential to a sound national economy. Yet we believe the adoption of more reasonable policies in financing certain types of loans is wise management.

Yet another act in which your Government is presently engaged is in the preparation of public works planning and projects. Tomorrow must bring better highways to America. We are earnestly trying to provide a plan for a national highway system consistent with our national needs. We believe that the American people are behind us.

In yet another field—public works—we are making a broad inventory of needed building construction, conservation, power, and flood-control projects to be undertaken not only by the Federal Government, but by the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments, and private initiative. I can report that the progress in this direction has already been substantial.

All of these facts and figures reflect present day progress, the plans and projects for tomorrow that are building a faith for the future that will carry us on to unprecedented goals.

Now about the second great objective, and the one that overshadows all of our concerted efforts. No audience such as this needs to be reminded that the struggle for a peaceful world is the great goal of our era.

Today we see peaceful overtures, but we are not complacent about their significance. We see prisoners being released—not enough, and too long held. We have not forgotten either the motives for their detention nor are we misled by the reasons for their release.

We have not allowed ourselves to be plunged headlong into a catastrophic war,

needlessly and uselessly. This administration will never involve American youth in a futile and avoidable conflict. But we resolutely continue to reject policies both of weakness and of vacillation. If there are in these brief remarks any grand ideas it will be the indelible impression left upon you that your Government is solemnly dedicated with its every resource to gain peaceful goals.

What are the evidences of this determination? Let me name three. The President a year and a half ago outlined a plan for the adaption of atomic power for peaceful purposes.

What has become of this idea?

A hundred and fifty years ago a merchant in Boston, then the center of the American whaling industry, said: "When the last whale is killed, the lights of the world will go out." Now lights are being lit by the ingenuity of man's creative mind. Not only are we preparing for the use of atomic energy for ourselves, but you will be interested to know that we have already initialled agreements with eight free nations for the exchange of information to permit them to earn the same privilege. Other such agreements are expected to be approved within the next few days, and others will follow.

In addition, we are at this moment actively engaged in developing plans for assisting other free and independence-loving peoples to acquire research reactors for peaceful uses.

What has this got to do with peace?

There are human instincts common to all people. Among them is the desire for self-expression and self-betterment. In the long run, our efforts for peace will be strengthened by plans designed to help other free people to help themselves—and to gain more and more of the advantages that modern science has discovered for the use of mankind.

The next policy pursued by this Government is in the field of foreign trade. Too often the word reciprocity is being mistaken for a one-way street. We are concerned, as we should be, when American workers lose their jobs through the competition of foreign products. Yet we ought better to understand that there are about 4½ million workers in industry and agriculture who produce and manufacture commodities and products that are sold in foreign markets. This is roughly 7 percent of the employed people of America's labor force. Yes, we are concerned with the displacing effects of competition of foreign goods, but we are equally concerned with failing foreign markets which displace American farmers and American workmen just as much.

The programs for military and economic assistance for our allies have strengthened the whole fabric of resistance to communistic aggression. Remember that the purchases of our own goods and products to supply the needs of these programs not only help to save our own scalps, but are as sustaining to the American worker and the American farmer as the products and commodities domestically consumed.

And now for the third great effort toward peace. As most of you well know, we still continue to find among the many free and neutral nations the belief that the United States is committing itself to eventual war. You and I, of course, do not think so. We think our best chance to deter war is a superlatively strong military program. Yet we seem to have lost track of one thing. Peace, like the preservation of freedom, or of equality of opportunity, or anything else that forms a part of the American heritage has to be worked for to be preserved. It isn't just handed out to us—ready-made and indestructible—as a reward, so to speak, for high motives and good conduct. It is just as important to have it clear to the citizen of India, for instance, as to us, that the cause of peace is our greatest and sole ultimate goal.

It, therefore, seemed appropriate to the President to put a man of extraordinary capability at work with his whole energy to solving one of the intricate problems precedent to the attainment of peace. This whole task lies, of source, within the framework of State Department policy. One great element of that task is set off for the time being in an effort to promote acceptable principles for disarmament. While disarmament is but one facet of the ultimate objective, it is the first and most important initial approach. This program has been entrusted to Harold Stassen, an official uniquely qualified to promote an understanding among ourselves, and among all people, of the peaceful policies of the United States.

Now, all this effort, at home and abroad, has brought us a greater prosperity and is bringing us closer to a peaceful world.

I am often asked this question—What can I do (or what can this organization do) to help?

In answer, let me say that you people, perhaps as much as any one group in the Nation, are especially fitted to make a contribution. Each in your own individual capacity is persuasive and able to exert an effect upon the opinions of other people. We ask no arbitrary conformity nor, indeed, the acceptance of any principle or program to which anyone is conscientiously opposed. But if you believe in these goals, if you think these products—peace with prosperity—are worth your effort, do what you can to support those public policies you believe best designed to achieve them.

There is not one of you but who has influence for good with others. Let me close with a parable that President John Dickey of Dartmouth College used to impress these principles upon the alumni of Dartmouth.

He said, "No man ever pursued the truth very vigorously without bumping into other men, many of them comfortably at rest, and others moving with equal vigor on the same quest, but in the opposite direction. In this sort of human hive in which we live each of us assumes a sense of responsibility for the realization of his individual greatness."

An old fable says all that needs to be said.

"The people who lived in a certain village having occasion to hold a feast in honor of one of their number who had returned from another country after long absence, and all of them being without great wealth, agreed among themselves that each should bring a bottle of wine which he might pour into a large cask which had been provided.

"One, thinking to save his wine to his own use, said to himself, 'If I fill my bottle with water and empty it with the others, it will not be observed.' But behold, when the villagers assembled and when the time arrived that the wine should be drawn off, only water flowed forth from the cask.

"All the people had acted with the same thought, each one saying to himself, 'Lo, my contribution will not be missed'."

Dixon-Yates Story—Creeping Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the July 28, 1955, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The editorial, entitled "The Repair Jobs Still Ahead," follows:

THE REPAIR JOBS STILL AHEAD

The logical next steps, now that Dixon-Yates is dead, are to repair the damage it caused, insofar as possible, and to set up safeguards to prevent similar damage from recurring bills to accomplish these purposes, have been introduced in Congress by two members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, the chairman, and Representative HOLIFIELD, of California.

The Anderson-Holifield bills would make it mandatory for all Atomic Energy Commission members to have access to all information concerning the Commission's business. Commissioner Murray has charged that AEC Chairman Admiral Strauss failed to tell him vital facts about the Dixon-Yates deal. Admiral Strauss neglected to consult Mr. Murray and possibly other Commissioners before asking the Justice Department to handle the settlement of the contract.

The latter matter is of continuing pertinence. The Dixon-Yates combine expects several million dollars—the exact amount has not been stated—in settlement; Members of Congress who opposed the deal declare the contract never became binding and no damages, therefore, are due. Admiral Strauss' maneuver in appealing to the Justice Department would have the effect of cutting off the joint committee's supervision of the settlement.

The trend to one-man rule of independent agencies which Senator ANDERSON and Representative HOLIFIELD are trying to halt in AEC is observable in TVA and SEC, also, Brigadier General Vogel, President Eisenhower's appointee as Chairman, has shown continuous hostility to the purposes of the agency he anomalously heads. He has set up a sort of martial law in the TVA board similiar to the regime Admiral Strauss has instituted at AEC. At SEC, Chairman Armstrong has acted as errand boy for Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, and, like Vogel and Strauss, withheld from his fellow Commissioners information essential to the performance of their duties.

This creeping dictatorship among the independent commissions can only be expected to spread to still others and to grow worse where it is already in effect, unless active measures are taken to root it out. When AEC, TVA, and SEC have been restored to their independent and nonpartisan status, the appropriate committees of Congress would do well to take a new look at all the other independent agencies as well, to make sure that their independence is not being encroached upon by the executive department.

Facts About Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the greater part of the opposition to this legislation, which proposes to amend the Natural Gas Act, is due to a lack of understanding of the true facts concerning the production and marketing of natural gas. I want to present just a few of the many facts which, I believe, are not fully understood.

During the debate argument has been advanced that the reason consumers in New York pay $2.40 per thousand cubic feet for gas is largely because of the cost of natural gas at the well. The record shows that the gas consumed in New York costs 8 cents per thousand cubic feet at the well. If that gas were to be delivered free of any cost into the pipeline and that item were to be entirely removed as a factor in the price to the consumer, the people in New York would still pay $2.32 per thousand cubic feet. The price paid to the producer is only 3⅓ percent of the price paid by the consumer.

There are about 8,000 independent producers of natural gas now supplying the various pipelines which carry the gas into the consuming areas. It is a highly competitive market, which means that no producer can demand and get an excessive price. During all of the years when there has been no Federal regulation of the price of gas at the well the cost has not been increased in proportion to the advance in price of the consumer. The records bear this out fully.

The reason for the close vote on this measure can be attributed mainly to the opposition voiced by governors and mayors in the gas consuming populous eastern States who fail to take into consideration what Federal control of this gas production at the well could involve. In the first place, exploration and production of natural gas is strictly a risk enterprise. Exploration and drilling are the only ways to develop fields which will insure a continued adequate supply for the Nation's consumers. A considerable portion of the money invested is expended in what is termed wildcat operation—searching for new supply sources—and brings no return when the operator fails to find gas. That happens frequently in wildcat operation. If this search for and development of new fields is continued the producer must receive a price for his gas which will at least in part justify the chance he takes. That is true of any risk business. When a fair and equitable return is not possible, these wildcat operations, which insure a gas supply, will cease. In fact the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Phillips case already has materially cut down this necessary exploration.

It is significant that the Federal Power Commission has pointed out that it has taken the position that Federal control of natural gas production was not intended by the Congress, is impracticable and very difficult to administer. Until the Congress acts to correct the law so that the divided and dubious interpretation made by the Suprem Court is nullified there will be continued and more serious curtailment in development of our natural gas resources.

From the purely fiscal standpoint of the Federal Government and the State Governments in the natural gas producing areas this curtailment of exploration and development of our natural gas resources is a serious matter. A considerable part of the gas producing fields are in the public lands States, where Uncle Sam owns from two-thirds to three-quarters of the lands overlying the gas fields. In addition the States themselves own a portion of these lands. The royalty return, therefore, goes into the public treasuries as a benefit to the taxpayers.

If these facts were generally understood I believe most of the opposition to this legislation would end. It certainly is not wise for the Congress to take any action which will jeopardize the future natural gas supply for the millions of consumers. That would be an economic disaster. Unless we approve this legislation and insure an adequate natural gas supply we are inviting that disaster.

White House Ceremony Commemorating Issuance of United States Postage Stamp Atoms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and pleasure to be included among those who attended ceremonies at the White House yesterday, marking the issuance of a postage stamp Atoms for Peace. This ceremony, conducted under the direction of the Postmaster General and the President of the United States, was most impressive and effective. I should add that representatives of foreign countries, in Washington attended the ceremony. I am sure Members of Congress, as well as others, will be interested in the statements of the President of the United States, the Postmaster General, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. They are included herewith:

REMARKS OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD

Mr. President, distinguished representatives of other great nations, fellow Americans, and ladies and gentlemen, the Post Office Department is highly honored in having this ceremony here at the White House with the President of the United States and so many distinguished guests in attendance.

We are gathered here to dedicate the atoms for peace United States postage stamp, which goes on sale in Washington today, and throughout the Nation tomorrow. Traditionally the postage stamps of a nation are pictorial representations of its glories. They serve as reminders to the citizenry of great men and women who have gone on before, of the natural wonders that Almighty God has bestowed upon the land and the accomplishments that have made the Nation great.

But, this stamp that we dedicate today is different. It is unique. It does not deal with the past. It is concerned rather with the future. It does not deal with material achievement. It commemorates an ideal.

It does not proclaim purely nationalistic glories. It expresses a hope for all the world. This stamp prominently features the quotation taken from the December 8, 1953, address of President Eisenhower before the General Assembly of the United Nations. Quoting the President: "To find the way by which the inventiveness of man shall be consecrated to his life."

This stamp is an ambassador of good will and of hope. It is truly a symbol of our highest aspirations. It carries the rallying cry of a great crusade for permanent peace which so long tragically has eluded mankind. The message of this stamp is America's answer to a fateful choice, that of a more abundant life rather than the catastrophe of atomic warfare.

We believe the issuance and the use of the 120 million of these atoms for peace commemorative stamps, each carrying its dramatic message will be a powerful instrument in humanity's quest for a permanent world peace on mutual confidence and trust. It is in this spirit that we dedicate the issuance of this atoms for peace stamp here today.

Distinguished guests, it is now my pleasure to present the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Honorable Lewis Strauss.

REMARKS OF ADM. LEWIS L. STRAUSS, CHAIRMAN OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. President, Mr. Postmaster General, and distinguished guests, a more fortunate moment could not be chosen for this ceremony to dedicate this stamp. In just 11 days, on August 8, there will be convened in Geneva the first International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, the conference which we had the honor to propose. There, the United States will join with more than 60 other nations in an exchange of information concerned solely with the benign and bountiful atom and not with its powers of destruction.

I am reminded of another international conference also held in Switzerland 80 years ago. On that occasion, nations large and small gathered to establish the Universal Postal Union. It is by reason of that international agreement that the stamp which we dedicate today will carry its message of atoms for peace across frontiers to the far places of the earth.

Over the years, the International Postal Union has become the most durable and perhaps the most successful of all agreements among nations, and it has contributed in large measure to the free communication of ideas, which is the bloodstream that nourishes science.

We hope most devoutly that, given good faith and cooperation, equally enduring and even more beneficent results will flow from this new gathering of nations in Switzerland to promote the peaceful atom.

In the inspiring words of your address to the United Nations, Mr. President—words now partly emblazoned upon this stamp which the Postmaster General and his Department have devised—we are determined to find the way by which the inventiveness of man shall not be directed to his death, but consecrated to his life.

ADDRESS OF HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Postmaster General, distinguished members of the diplomatic corps, my friends, as the Postmaster General has said, we have here a stamp that looks to the future, and its design has followed that conception. Yet, it tends also to pose to us a question that is as old as history: Shall the inventiveness of man be used for good or for evil?

Every discovery we have made, even the use of fire to warm our bodies, to cook our food, has also been used as one of the devastating weapons of war to bring destruction to enemies. Every single thing that man has discovered can be used for good or for evil depending upon the purpose of man. This would seem to imply that man indeed has to look within himself before he can predict with any certainty, with any possibility of accuracy whatsoever, before he can determine what will be the final results ofg a great invention such as the discovery of nuclear fission and nuclear fusion.

The United States, as you well know, has been attempting to do its part in promoting the peaceful, the good uses of this new science. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has outlined some of them to you. And, I should like to go further and leave no stone unturned in order to discover new ways in which all of us nations that love peace can, without threat to anybody else, without fear for our own security, move forward in this field.

Now, because of this belief, because of this feeling, because of this hope, I call your atatention to what I think is a fortunate feature in the design of this stamp. We have the world bound together by new forces, bound together by the natural forces of science, and of nature, not split by them.

I hope, I devoutly pray that this is an augury of what will occur in the future—that through these great benefits, there will become so deeply impressed upon our minds the benefits that can come from this new science, that finally men will look within themselves and find the courage to reject the impulses of their own avarice, their own selfishness, their own greed, be it individual or national, and attempt, at least in this kind of work, to proceed toward the good of us all.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL SUMMERFIELD

Thank you, Mr. President. It gives me great satisfaction to present to you, Mr. President, the first album of these atoms for peace stamps.

It is a pleasure to present the Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, with a similar album.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we take pleasure in presenting you with this album.

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, member, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we are pleased to present this album to you.

Congressman CARL T. DURHAM, Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, this album is presented to you with our compliments.

Congressman W. STERLING COLE, member, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it is a privilege to present you with this commemorative album.

Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, it is most fitting that we present you with this commemorative album.

Identical albums of these new atoms for peace stamps are being sent to representatives of the 84 countries invited to the United Nations International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy to be held next month in Geneva, Switzerland.

We are gratified that so many of these representatives have joined us in this ceremony today.

We are confident the conference starting on August 8 will be fruitful and useful to men of good will the world over.

Government Clinics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom every other year, during adjournment to hold government clinics in each of the 38 county seat towns in my district. These meetings are not political, but merely question and answer periods to give folks an opportunity to visit with their Representative and to ask questions. It also gives me an opportunity to report on my stewardship in Congress.

The first hour is devoted to school students, entitled "Youth Wants To Know." The last hour is for adults who may attend. Following is the schedule of clinics for the period from October 10 through October 20:

Monday, October 10: North Platte, 2 to 4 p. m,. (gas company building); Tryon, 7 to 9 p. m.

Tuesday, October 11: Stapleton, 2 to 4 p. m.; Thedford, 7 to 9 p. m.

Wednesday, October 12: Mullen, 2 to 4 p. m.; Arthur, 7 to 9 p. m.

Thursday, October 13: Chappell, 2 to 4 p. m.; Oshkosh, 7 to 9 p. m.

Friday, October 14: Grant, 10 to 12 a. m.; Ogallala, 2 to 4 p. m.

Monday, October 17: Brewster, 2 to 4 p. m.; Broken Bow, 7 to 9 p. m.

Tuesday, October 18: Lexington, 2 to 4 p. m.; Kearney, 7 to 9 p. m.

Wednesday, October 19: Burwell, 2 to 4 p. m.; Ord, 7 to 9 p. m.

Thursday, October 20: Loup City, 2 to 4 p. m.; Grand Island, 7 to 9 p. m.

All meetings will be held in the county courthouse unless otherwise indicated. The public is invited.

America Victorious in Propaganda Battle at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

AMERICA VICTORIOUS IN PROPAGANDA BATTLE AT GENEVA

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

GENEVA.—Judged by my standards the four-power conference has been an enormous success. Merely for the West to have got out of it with a whole skin having made no new unnecessary and dangerous concessions to the Russians would have been a real triumph. And this the West has accomplished. Here, thank God, is no new Yalta.

But our side has done far better. By skillful teamwork punctuated by the theatrical but effective appearance at the right moment of General Gruenther and Admiral Radford, Eisenhower, Dulles, and Harold Stassen have won the propaganda battle, the only sure struggle of this meeting.

The American disarmament plan has, in the words of one veteran observer, rocked Europe. The Geneva newspaper La Suisse, which is steadily on our side, commented triumphantly: "If suspicion continues to poison world politics it is not the fault of the United States."

The Paris Monde, neutralist and spitefully anti-American, called the Eisenhower offer a thunderclap. Certainly it caught the Russians completely off guard and floored them for the count of nine. During that period they lost the propaganda fight, in the opinion of the most experienced referees.

But is that all? What else, the reader may ask.

FALSE HOPES

What else did you expect? From the beginning it seemed to this student of world affairs that the high hopes raised of making real progress toward German unity, toward a European security system, toward any sort of disarmament which the West could accept without risking a surprise attack later on were without serious foundation.

The Russians came to this conference not to realize but to prevent German reunification on any but their own terms. They are working still to prevent the rearmament of West Germany, or at least to limit it and slow it down. Their idea of a European or a worldwide security system is one that will abolish thermonuclear weapons wherein the West is superior and stabilize conventional weapons on levels that will leave the Communist bloc looking down upon its enemies and intended victims.

Even in the easier matter of raising the Iron Curtain there has hardly been any progress. The Bulganin-Khrushchev-Zhukov troika had already raised the curtain some. They have not really gone farther.

CREEPING DANGER

But what of the thermonuclear fear that was supposed to have convinced even hardened Bolsheviks that henceforth no country can afford or presumably survive a major war? Haven't the Russians and the Americans shown each other that they intend no major aggressions?

Well, in my judgment, neither the U. S. S. R. nor the United States of America has ever really believed that the other would attack. The danger has been and is the gradual expansion of the Soviet system by a series of minor aggressions based on a mixture of subversion and force. That danger remains exactly as it was before this conference. As for the H-bomb, the Russians are good enough poker players—unlike their Western counterparts—to show no signs of the anxiety which they must surely feel.

Conceded, the Russians were amiable and obviously are seeking a period of less strained relations with the West. But for what purpose? To enjoy the benefits of growing cooperation, or to lull their opponents into a false security while the U. S. S. R. attains superiority in armaments?

That question is as unanswered as when the conference started. It happens to be the heart of everything.

Older people forget and young Americans have never realized that twice before the Russians have become all sweetness. The first was during the NEP period when the young U. S. S. R. absolutely had to have time to repair the damages of war and revolution. The second was in the thirties when the U. S. S. R., through fear of Hitler, joined the League of Nations it had hitherto scorned and sent Maxim Litvinov to Geneva to seduce the bourgeois peoples with sweet words and empty promises. None of this prevented the U. S. S. R. in 1939 from ganging up with Hitler in a pirate raid on civilization.

NOT AROUND CORNER

Others may think that atmosphere is important and the spirit of Geneva something wonderful. I am unable to believe that, because I managed to persuade an amiable Soviet radioman to drink a bottle of ginger ale, "The peace we fought for is just around the corner," as Paul Hoffman imprudently wrote recently.

In the words of France's former premier and foreign minister, Georges Bidault, "The cold war has been buried while the war of nerves gets hotter."

Or in the words of Italy's veteran diplomat, Ambassador Massimo Magistrati, "This

conference is remarkable because everything has gone exactly as expected"—expected, that is, by trained experts like Magistrati. Everything except the propaganda battle, which the American team has won handily.

The Most Wonderful Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the growing threat to the proper division of responsibility between our three branches of government. Many people express concern, but few people have given the problem the thought and study that the esteemed president of the State University of Iowa, the Honorable Virgil Hancher, has given in trying to warn our people of the dire consequences if present trends continue. He expressed his concern most eloquently in an address at Ohio State University recently. I am privileged to have a copy of that address. I ask that it be printed here so that all of us can have the benefit of the thinking of one of America's great educators.

The address follows:

THE MOST WONDERFUL WORK

(By Virgil M. Hancher)

It is a privilege and an honor to be invited to deliver an address in this series, so fittingly dedicated to the memory of the late Dean Walter J. Shepard. I am deeply touched by it because I have no claim, as of right, to stand in the learned and graceful tradition of which Dean Shepard and my predecessors in this series are the exemplars. It is now more than 20 years since Dean Shepard delivered his presidential address on Democracy in Transition to the American Political Science Association, an address which was witness enough, if witness were needed, to the breadth and penetration of his powers of observation, and to the equanimity and understanding with which he was enabled to interpret the transition from one political epoch to another. One is honored to stand in the shadow cast by his stature, and to have some part, however small, in keeping his memory alive.

Unhappily, 20th-century democracies seem little concerned to provide that leisure and reflection which many of us believe to be indispensable, if our society is not to rush headlong into the abyss. We are under a spcial debt of gratitude, therefore, to scholars and men of affairs who have distilled the wisdom accumulated from the knowledge and experiences of a lifetime into such form that we may absorb its essence in the most palatable way. In our own country I have in mind Walter Lippmann's book, The Public Philosophy, and the late Carl Becker's The Declaration of Independence, Freedom and Responsibility, and How New Will the Better World Be? We are indebted to the last century, and especially to Victorian England, for many successful men of affairs who wrote with distinction on political and related subjects. Such, for example, were Walter Bagehot, editor of The Economist, of London, and author of Physics and Politics, Lombard Street, and The English Constitution; and Sir Henry Maine and his Ancient Law and Popular Government; and Sir Henry Taylor and his little-known but classic work, entitled "The Statesman." Our society today seems not conducive to that happy line of doers and thinkers which was so prolific in the last century. The line is dying, and we can ill afford to let it die. Let us hope that the memory of Dean Shepard and the inspiration of his life and writings will bring forth a new generation of doers and thinkers so much needed in the hurried and heedless age in which we live.

My theme has to do with government, and on it I must speak as a layman. An undergraduate major in political science, a degree in jurisprudence from one institution and in law from another, 16 years in the active practice of law in a metropolitan center, and more than 14 years as the president of a State university may qualify one to speak as a doer, but hardly as a thinker or writer. Indeed, the circumstances under which a university president is able to think, if he ever finds occasion to think beyond the immediate problems of his office, are such that the result of his reflections would most appropriately be entitled "Meditations in a Boiler Factory." Knowing, as you must have known, that I was neither a scholar nor researcher in the field of government, you will not expect me to bring to you any facts or theories not known to those skilled in the science and art of government. Rather, I assume that you must have expected me to speak as one who has had practical experience in observing the operations of government, and who, from that experience, has developed certain hopes and concern about the governmental problems of our time. On this basis, I speak to you willingly, because good government, the very best government, is a matter of the most urgent concern to us all. Indeed, we may say, in a quite literal sense, that it is a matter of life and death. Fifty and more years ago the scope of governmental activities was so restricted that the decisions of government, while of concern to a particular person from time to time, only infrequently touched or concerned the general body of the citizens. Today its decisions affect the lives and fortunes of us all. At any moment decisions may be made which will determine the very existence of our civilization. If, as Tallyrand is alleged to have said, war is much too serious a business to be left to soldiers, so government has now become much too serious a business to be left to politicians.

I. One hundred sixty-eight years ago the Constitutional Convention of 1787 convened in Philadelphia, and began the deliberations which produced the Constitution of the United States. That document is said to be older than the constitution of any other presently existing government. Probably the framers of the Constitution never realized the durability of the instrument which they had created. Certainly some of them would have been satisfied, if they could have been assured on the day the convention adjourned that their handiwork would bind the States together in relative peace and prosperity for as long as 30 years. They could hardly have foreseen, although the more imaginative among them may have hoped, that it would serve as a frame of government for 166 years, during which the Nation would expand from the Atlantic to the Pacific, would expand from a population of 4 million to 164 million people, and would develop a material civilization unparalled in human history. So great has been the praise of this instrument that many have agreed with Mr. Gladstone, who once said:

"As the British Constitution is the most subtle organism which has proceeded from the womb and long gestation of progressive history, so the American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." [1]

As you will note, it is from this quotation that I have taken the title for my remarks.

Because under this Constitution we have had the good fortune to develop an economy which enables us to lead the world in material abundance, it is assumed far too often that our only contributions to Western civilization have been material ones. This I believe to be untrue. Indeed the prospect of material abundance with all hope and promise that it implies for the have-not nations is only one among our major American contributions to civilization. On another occasion,[2] as some of you are aware, I expressed the opinion that our country had made at least four significant contributions to Western civilization. They are:

1. The application of the Federal principle to the government of vast territories and large populations;

2. The doctrine of the judicial review of unlawful or arbitrary executive or legislative action as a safeguard to the citizens against tyrannical encroachments by Government;

3. The mass production and distribution of goods and services, requisite to the maintenance of a high standard of living; and,

4. The concept of universal opportunity for education.

The first two contributions were political contributions directly related to our Constitution and its interpretation, and they bear witness to political genius of a high order. It was the failure to invent and apply the Federal principle which undoubtedly made inevitable the ultimate dissolution of the Roman Empire and the transformation of the British Empire into an association of commonwealth nations rather than into a Federal union. And the doctrine of judicial review, while sometimes criticized, has undoubtedly been a safeguard against the arrogancy of power. But it is disturbing to recall that these two contributions were made, or at least had their inception, more than a century ago, and that, in the succeeding 100 years, we have made no comparable contribution to political thought or action. What has happened that this should be so? Have the wisdom and the cunning of the men of 1787 deserted us? Have we political knowledge and sagacity adequate to the tasks before us? These are relevant questions because we have no assurance that our destiny is written in the stars. If the study of history shows anything, it shows that nations are born and die, and that civilizations flourish and decay. I have stood at Byblos, as have countless others, and have seen the marks of seven civilizations which have flourished upon that site in 5,000 years. In our own time we have seen nations and empires fall, and rise, and fall again. Our Nation has survived many shocks and dangers. We trust that it will survive them all. But it has survived none more threatening than those which now will put it to the test.

We face the dangers of atomic power, and all the problems which arise from it, because the decisions of Government which once seemed far away and of little moment, now by one false step may bring us to unprecedented disaster. We face the peculiar dangers of communism, for although this is not the first time that we have been opposed to vast military power, we now face a different thing—different in kind as well as degree—half political, half religious—combining all the power of the soldier and the zeal of the missionary—quite unlike anything we have ever faced before. Finally, we face an unprecedented increase in popu-

[1] Gladstone, William E. Kin Beyond the Sea, North American Review, September-October 1878, vol. 127, p. 185.

[2] Commencement address, An American's Credo, University of Toledo, May 27, 1947.

lation. In 1789 the United States had less than 4 million people. We now have 164 million. It is predicted that 20 years from now, in 1975, we shall have 220 million. If my daughter, a junior in the university, lives her allotted 3 score years and 10, she may expect to be part of a population of 300 million. Here is something new in our experience—a fact quite as shocking and explosive as the atomic bomb.

We face the triple threat of the atomic bomb, of communism, and of expanding population. Are we prepared to meet and deal with them? Are our Governments—State and Federal—geared to their present and future tasks?

In my judgment we are not prepared for the problems that lie ahead, and we are not prepared because we have surrounded the framers of the Constitution and their work with an aura of sanctity and awe, without honoring them as they would have desired by bringing their wisdom and sense of reality to the needs of our time. After all, imitation is the sincerest flattery.

Our tasks are complicated because there appear to be certain developments now in progress which would set one branch of Government in opposition to another and would tend to weaken our Government as a whole at the very time when it most needs to be strong. I should like to discuss these developments with you, for although you have already observed them, they and their implications seem not to be understood by the wider public, and, therefore, they are matters for our concern.

II. The first and in some ways the most important of these developments is the revolutionary and unconstitutional struggle now in progress for the supremacy of the legislative over the executive branches of our Governments—Federal and State. Whatever your views may be about the merits of parliamentary government, there can be no doubt that the supremacy of the legislature is a constitutional heresy under our form of Government. No branch was intended to be supreme over the others.

The framers of the Constitution secmed clear upon two points—that the people cannot legislate and that the legislature cannot administer. They believed in a representative government and in the separation of powers. This was their faith, and what departs from it is heresy. Yet we are departing from it; for, unless the signs of the times are misleading, we have been witnessing for 20 years a gigantic struggle of increasing intensity and bitterness for the supremacy of the legislature over the executive branches of Government, both State and Federal.

This struggle is not open and above board. It is more covert than open, and probably more unconscious than conscious. No formal amendment to the Constitution is involved. It involves, instead, the slow, but irresistible, erosion of the power and authority of the Executive, as bit by bit the legislative power circumscribes and diminishes the range of Executive action. The intent with which this is done is immaterial, and the fact that it is often done by well-intentioned men is irrelevant. The result is the same whatever the intention. If you are killed in an automobile accident, you are just as dead when killed by a well-intentioned man as by a bad one.

Unless some new factor is introduced, the struggle will continue until a victory has been won. This may take fifty or a hundred years. Perhaps only the historian, viewing it from the 22d century, will be able to see when it began and when it ended. But as the battle now stands, there can be but one outcome. Inasmuch as the executive branch is without effective power to curb the legislative branch, and inasmuch as the legislative branch in a hundred small ways and some large ones, including the power of the purse, has effective means to curb the executive, the ultimate victory must go to the legislative branch under the conditions which now prevail.

The weakening of our governmental structure and functions, as this struggle proceeds, is regrettable in view of the triple dangers which we face. It is doubly regrettable because it turns on an issue which the framers of the Constitution thought that they had settled. As I have said, the men of 1787 believed that the people could not legislate and that the legislature could not administer. The people cannot legislate because they have neither the time, nor the information, nor the basis for a wise and considered judgment. The legislative power, therefore, ought to be exercised by those who can act for the people—for all of the people, the young and the old, the voters and the nonvoters, the rich and the poor, the weak and the strong, the living and the dead, and the generations yet unborn. The legislature cannot administer because there are functions in life that do not merge. The legislature can determine general policy; it cannot see to the specific application of it. It can say "when" and "why," but never "how." If it determines broad policy, it will have no time for specific applications. If it concerns itself with specific applications, it will become a many-headed executive that will be no executive at all. It will fail in administration and will have no time for policy. Thus the state will suffer. I realize that in Britain the executive has been developed out of Parliament without loss of liberty or effectiveness, but this is not true of France. Moreover, there is nothing in our history or traditions to indicate that our development would be as fortunate as the British, nor is there anything to indicate that Britain's sternest tests may not lie in the years ahead. In any event, the framers of our Constitution believed that there were three kinds of governmental powers and that in general they should be separated into 3 corresponding branches of government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branch. We now seem to be departing from the beliefs of the men of 1787, not so much by challenging their principles as by ignoring them, not so much by amending our Constitutions—State and Federal—in a direct and open way, as by subverting them and eroding them under the constant, accumulative pressure of legislative power.

What is the evidence upon this proposition? In the Federal Government, the pressure of the legislative power is exerted principally through congressional investigating committees and through the power of the purse. Congressional committees serve a necessary and useful purpose when they seek to determine sound national policy; but that function seems increasingly overshadowed in prestige and public attention by investigating committees designed to harrass the executive. What is the position of the Secretary of State on the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores? What is the position of the Secretary of the Interior on public power? What is the position of the Secretary of Agriculture on price supports for farm crops? What about the Dixon-Yates contract? What is the Secretary of Defense doing about the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force? What is the Secretary of the Treasury doing about the stock market? What is anybody, what is everybody, doing about subversives? In all of this the legislative branch appear to be seeking more than information. It is a reasonable inference that it is exhibiting doubt and distrust of the executive department, a doubt and distrust which is thereby communicated to our own people and to foreign governments, and that, by these harassing and embarrassing procedures, it seeks to bend the executive to the legislative will.

It may be appropriate to observe in this connection that by far the most significant fact about the Army-McCarthy hearings was never brought into focus for general public attention. This most significant fact was not the clash of personalities involved, or whether one was right or another was wrong. most significant fact was that the hearing was not a contest between equals. It was not a contest between equals because the Army is not free to deal with the Senate as the Senate is free to deal with the Army. It is not free because the Army is not free to apply pressure—subtle, indirect, difficult to prove, but pressure nonetheless—to the Senate or the House. Indeeed, under our form of government, it has no means of doing so. The Senate, on the other hand, both collectively and individually, has undoubted power in this regard. Consider, for example, the power of the purse. An aggrieved general has no recourse against the Senate, but an aggrieved Senator, quite apart from specific provisions incorporated in an appropriation bill or other law, can withhold or delay appropirations, and an aggrieved Senator can withhold his vote. No reason need be given. The Senator merely votes "No," or he fails to vote. This ever-present threat, in the Senate and the House alike, is a powerful weapon. It explains why even the most modest request from the Hill to any executive departments is almost invariably answered within the day, or why some explanation for the delay is forthcoming, if it is not answered.

It is within the bounds of reason to believe that congressional investigations and pressures upon the executive department will continue until 1 of 2 things happens: Either the President and his Cabinet must be chosen from the Congress, or they must appear before the Congress and be answerable for the conduct of their offices. In the absence of some striking change in law or opinion, this result seems inevitable.

The erosion of the executive power has taken a somewhat different form within the States. There the executive power is seldom great to begin with, and beyond the power to recommend budgets and legislation, to make appointments, to exercise the veto, and to act as ceremonial head of the State, the Governor often has little authority other than that given him by the prestige of his office and the influence of his personality. Frequently, too, the heads of other executive departments are elected directly by the people. They are coequal with and independent of the Governor. Thus, with the executive power of the State subdivided and weakened, the task of encroachment is an easy one. The chief devices in this regard are restrictive legislation, legislative supervisory or interim committees, and the power of the purse. Legislative supervisory committees, as the term is used here, are those continuing or perennial committees which possess power, between sessions of the legislature, to review the operation of state departments, boards and agencies, to appropriate funds for emergencies, to recommend appropriations and new legislation, and generally to exercise such other powers as are granted to them or which may accrue to them through the reluctance of those with whom they deal to challenge their assumptions of authority. Some of these committees may and do exercise as much real authority as the Governor himself, and the day may not be distant when the chairman of such a committee will be in effect the chief administrative officer or "prime minister" of the State.

Moreover, the legislative power over the purse is a hardy perennial. Appropriations can be and are passed in detail with provisos and stipulations as to their use. This is a dangerous practice and bad government, but there is nothing to stop it except the self-restraint and sense of justice of the legislators. While these attributes are characteristic of the vast majority of legislators, it may be doubted that they are characteristic of the bodies in which they serve. Disregard of legislative and consti-

tutional mandates for reapportionment, disregard of practices and procedures which they demand of executive agencies, disregard of orderly methods of procedure, and other similar actions are not indicative of that self-restraint and sense of justice which will hold in check encroachments upon the executive power.

Thus by various devices the legislative power seems destined through the years to erode the powers of the executive and reduce them to its will, or what is equally probable, to substitute its own committee structure in the exercise of real executive power—all without the trouble or inconvenience of amending the Constitution. Our ancestors thought that this was the way to oppressive, or even tyrannical, government. It is for our generation to decide whether they were right or wrong.

I have now dwelt at some length on one of the major constitutional heresies of our time. Next I should like to deal with another heresy, implicit if not expressed, in our Constitution. It is the heresy of the omnicompetent citizen.

The omnicompetent citizen is the citizen who is able to perform any or all of the functions of government without previous preparation and at a moment's notice. We do not indulge this theory in other walks of life. We assume that a dentist who pulls a tooth or a surgeon who removes an appendix should demonstrate some knowledge of the undertaking. Our reluctance to demand exact knowledge of public affairs from those who solicit our suffrage leads to strange and unfortunate consequences.

It plays a large part in the current struggle for legislative supremacy. It leads to legislation without basis either in knowledge or understanding. It leads to false economies and unwarranted assertions of waste and extravagance, for reasons outlined by Canon Liddon of St. Paul's Cathedral as long ago as 1879:

"Waste is a relative term. Before we can say with certainty whether or not a particular action involves waste, we must know what the agent thinks is best and what he is aiming at. Those who are in great enterprises generally appear wasteful to those who confine themselves to small ones."

And by Edmund Burke:

"Mere parsimony is not economy * * *. Expense, and great expense, may be an essential part of true economy * * *. Economy is a distributive virtue, and consists not in saving but in selection. Parsimony requires no providence, no sagacity, no powers of combination, no comparison, no judgment." [1]

Taxes can be saved by failing to build or repair highways, by closing schools and colleges and universities, by eliminating garbage disposal, fire departments, and police protection, in short, by eliminating the functions that government is designed to perform. But this is not the way to statesmanship. The genius of the statesman is seen in the making of wise choices. The "back to the grass roots" movement rests upon the theory of the omnicompetent citizen. But a thousand "grass roots" physicists would never have made the atomic bomb. Those who stand at the grass roots may be close to the problem, but far from its solution. The grass roots are always far from the mountain tops, and proximity may not compensate for breadth of view.

The theory of the omnicompetent citizen assumes that any man can do anything. We see two diverse, dramatically diverse, illustrations of it in our contrasting attitudes toward the Vice Presidency and the Presidency of the United States. The reasons which lead to the nomination of a candidate for the Vice Presidency, while rarely as frivolous as those recited in "Of Thee I Sing," are still not the reasons at work in the nomination of a President. The Vice President has no duty that could not be provided for by the Senate itself. And his only other function is to succeed to the Presidency if that office falls vacant. That being his prime function, should the Vice Presidency ever be vacant? Or, if it may be vacant some of the time, why should it be filled any of the time?

Of the 33 persons who have served as Presidents of the United States in the last 166 years, seven, or more than one-fifth, have come to the presidency by direct succession from the vice presidency. By this route we have acquired a new President on the average of once in every 24 years. Moreover, during that period the office of Vice President has been vacant for a total of more than 33½ years—22½ years of that time because of the succession of that officer to the presidency, and an additional 11 years because of the death or resignation of the Vice President while he held that office. An office which has been vacant for more than 33 years out of the last 166, or one-fifth of the whole period, can hardly be regarded as an office indispensable to our welfare, security, or safety. And if the succession can be provided for when there is no incumbent Vice President, why should there be a Vice President at any time?

Because of the increasing age and experience demanded of Presidents, and because of the tremendous burdens which we have placed upon them by the enormous concentration of functions in that office, it will be surprising if the number who die in office does not increase rather than decline in the years ahead' Should we not, therefore, provide for some mode of succession that would assure an incumbent more obviously fitted for the Presidency than is guaranteed by the Vice Presidential nomination of a political convention which considers that its work is done and desires nothing so much as to adjourn and go home?

Just as we demand too little of the Vice President and believe that any citizen who will take the office is competent to perform it, so we assume any man elected to the Presidency to be automatically competent to assume the inhuman burdens of that office. Consider now the principal functions of the President:

He is the Chief of State, that is, the ceremonial head of the state.

He is the political head of the state.

He is the administrative head of the state.

He is the Commander in Chief of the armed services.

He is the head of his political party.

The mere enumeration of these functions of the President without regard to other demands upon his time and talents should be enough to show that the office is too comprehensive, too varied, too exacting, and too isolated to be filled by any one man. Society has no right to place such demands upon any one man. The monarchs of Great Britain reign, but they do not govern. The Prime Minister governs, but he does not reign. Moreover, the Prime Minister is primus inter pares, the first among equals, and the authority and responsibility in which his office shares is a cabinet responsibility. The responsibility and authority are collective, not personal. But the President's authority and responsibility are personal and ultimate. He may delegate, but he may not share. He, and he alone, must bear both the authority and the responsibility.

Each of the above functions might be discussed at length. But it is not my purpose to do more than to show the need for a review and reevaluation of those aspects of our Constitution and governmental procedures which assume a competency that men cannot be expected to possess. No great business corporation would place upon its chief executive officer such a variety of exacting and responsible corporate functions as those concentrated in the Presidency of the United States. Must we admit that our great corporations are more solicitous of the brains and bodies and lives of their ablest men than are our people and their Government; and that those corporations, unlike the people and their Government, are wise enough to know that the best decisions are those made by men unwearied by burdensome and unnecessary duties and undistraught by overwhelming responsibility? Both our selfish and our unselfish interests lie in the same direction.

III. As has been abundantly clear throughout my remarks, I believe that we owe a very great debt to the men of 1787 for devising a frame of government that has proved to be both adaptable and permanent. I think we owe it to their memory to see that the Constitution which they gave us is adapted to new times and new conditions. If, in doing so, we abandon any of the basic political principles upon which their action was based, we should do so only after carfeul deliberation to assure ourselves that we are right and they were wrong; and, in any such event, I would hope to see us move directly and not by subterfuge. The framers of the Constitution were not infallible, but they had among their number many wise, experienced, and learned men. We shall do well, therefore, to be certain of our premises when we differ from those men.

What I have said so far makes it clear that the Constitution—that most wonderful work—has not prevented the rise of serious problems. There are many others. The consideration of them would extend this presentation unduly, but for the record and to keep them before us, we might take note of some of them.

Should the executive and legislative branches of our governments be immediately and constantly responsive to "the will of the people," that "will" which seems incapable of precise definition? Do we, for example, need some legislative agency, beyond the pressures of frequent elections and beyond the passions and prejudices of the passing mood, which can serve as a great council of state which will have power to review and improve, but not obstruct, proposed legislation?

How do we restore confidence and secure acceptance of governmental decisions? There is a spirit abroad which makes many people unwilling to accept any decision in which they have not participated or to which they have not expressly consented. This is the negation of the basis for representative government. It could lead to anarchy.

How can we make governments aware that the acceptance of their decisions rests more upon moral authority than upon physical force?

How can we have responsible government without intolerable oligarchy, or responsive government without mediocrity?

What about government at the grassroots? Are our local governments, city, township, county, and State, more honest and efficient and competent than the Federal Government? And what are local and what are national problems?

What about the problem of excessive units of government? The State of Iowa has approximately 2,650,000 people, and it has more than 7,000 units of government, exclusive of the State and its agencies, to govern them. It has 99 counties, because that was a sensible number in the horse-and-buggy days. The horse-and-buggy days are gone, and the 99 counties remain. The 7,000 units of government may have been needed before there were telephones, automobiles, and paved roads. Those units are costly. While the people groan under the taxation required to

[1] Burke, Edmund. The Works of the Right Honorable Edmund Burke; Little, Brown & Co., 1894, vol V, p. 195.

support them, it is only with the greatest reluctance that they will review the necessity or utility of such units. Why do our people who have a passion for the newest machines and latest automobiles have an equal passion for old and archaic machinery of government?

Why is the electorate so indifferent? Why, even in a presidential election year does it require the most strenuous efforts to get a substantial majority of the voters to the polls, and why is voting for local candidates in a primary election in an off year so low as to be a national scandal?

How much time and attention can the private citizen be expected to give to political matters? Do we ask more than we have any right to expect? Two of the most durable, orderly and successful organizations in the history of mankind—the Roman Empire and the Roman Catholic Church—have existed without popular elections. Is popular government too burdensome to work?

Certainly, with these and other problems before us, we have a call to action. Few problems are more pressing and urgent than those which might affect our Government adversely as we attempt to live with the difficult problems of the next half century.

Certainly we must recognize that we may have missed our great opportunity for world leadership toward peace and prosperity. In 1919 that leadership could have been ours for the taking. The nations of Europe were tired and battered; Russia was laid low by revolution; and Asia had not yet awakened. Opportunity knocked at our door and we turned her away. How different was the situation at the end of World War II. Europe—our natural ally—was devastated and exhausted; Russia had become a mighty power; and Asia had awakened. Now, if we lead at all, we can lead only half the world. Our great opportunity may never return. When the historians of the 22d century write the history of our times we may be described as "the nation that missed the bus," the nation that came to maturity and turned aside from its opportunity, only to discover upon looking back that the center of world affairs was Asia, and not Europe or America.

What was lacking in the years following World War I, when our great decision was made? It was not wealth or machines or factories or any material power or even constitutional arrangements (although our Constitution is not a model for the conduct of foreign affairs). It was men that we needed—great men, men of vision. And we did not have them. Even the best of constitutions will not work without good men.

And so a part of our task, as de Tocqueville and Macaulay and many others have pointed out, is to learn to seek out our best and to be governed by them. This is a prodigious task. Because so many of our ancestors fled from some oppression or tyranny, we have never grasped the fact that government can be more than the sovereign, that it can be the servant of the people. Opinion polls consistently show that not more than 1 parent in 5 wants his son to enter upon a political career. Somehow we must change that ratio. We must change it by changing the attitudes which produce it. We are certain to be governed by someone—if not by the best, then by the mediocre or by the worst. Dependent as we are upon government for the public functions and services indipensable to a complex and civilized society, we can hardly survive incompetence in government. Neither must we put an undue strain upon those good men who are now brooding over our affairs. We can lighten their load and relieve their burdens by recruiting good men to aid them in the tasks of government. And we can do this with a sense of work well done, because few things can be more rewarding than the maintenance of government of a high order. And, as F. S. Oliver wrote in his book, the Endless Adventure, nothing can be more fascinating than the endless adventure of governing men. To that adventure—the endless adventure of governing men—we must call the youth and ability of our time.

AEC Estimates Power Costs for Japanese Reactor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I filed a bill for the construction of an atomic reactor in Japan. In connection with that project, I directed an inquiry to the Atomic Energy Commission requesting an estimate of the possible cost of producing electricity from a reactor capable of producing 60,000 kilowatts. It is interesting to note that the reply of the Atomic Energy Commission estimates that if the power output from the reactor could be increased to 100,000 kilowatts without significantly increasing the capital cost and with fuel elements of longer life and lower fabrication costs which should result from further experience, the power cost might eventually be as low as 11 to 15 mills per kilowatt-hour, which compares favorably with the 12 to 14 mills per kilowatt-hour quoted for steam power in the Hiroshima area.

In order that the entire viewpoint of the Atomic Energy Commission may be known on this important matter, I attach its letter dated June 17, 1955:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1955.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YATES: This is in response to your letter of June 6, 1955, requesting information with respect to the construction of an atomic reactor in Japan.

The estimated cost of generating electricity can only be discussed in very general terms because many factors enter into the net cost of power. One must consider the exact location of the plant, the size of the generating unit, the way in which the plant is financed because the cost of money affects the "fixed charge" rate, and the plant-use factor or use pattern, as well as the cost of the fuel. Reliable information on electric power generation in Japan, and other foreign countries, is not readily available.

Construction costs in Japan do not appear to be very much different from those in the United States. We have made some studies which indicate that a second pressurized water reactor with minimum modification from the Shippingport plant, built in Japan, might show electric power generating costs initially as high as 40 to 50 mills per kilowatt-hour. This assumes a power output near the minimum 60,000 kilowatts specified for the Shippingport plant and current conservative estimates of fuel fabrication costs and fuel element life, as well as a relatively low plant-use factor typical of the average steam-power plant in Japan. Assuming that the power output from the reactor can be increased to 100,000 kilowatts or more without significantly increasing the capital cost and that fuel elements of considerably longer life and lower fabrication costs will result from experience and development effort, the net cost of electricity from this reactor might eventually be as low as 11 to 15 mills per kilowatt-hour, which compares favorably with the 4 to 5 yen (12 to 14 mills) per kilowatt-hour range quoted for steam power in the Hiroshima area. Whether or not such performance can actually be achieved can only be determined by operation of the Shippingport plant with continued effort on plant improvement. This is believed to be as realistic an appraisal as can be made at the present time, although admittedly it shows considerable uncertainty. Other reactor types currently under development present about the same picture. We are confident that expected advances will result in still lower power costs, but the uncertainties for any type are still large.

Your second question concerns possible risks of radioactive danger to the surroundings and possible diversion of fissionable material for weapons purposes. There is no serious amount of radioactivity discharged during normal operation of a properly designed plant, and the plant and building can be designed to contain any release of radioactivity resulting from the worst foreseeable accident. Precautions can be taken to insure that the hazard to the neighborhood would be no greater than with other industrial plants.

A nuclear powerplant can be so designed that its use for production of atomic weapons would be very difficult. The United States could not assist in the building or operating of a plant in Japan without the assurance by the Japanese Government that the plant or any nuclear fuel supplied would not be used to develop or produce atomic weapons. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to say that there was absolutely no possibility that a nuclear plant could be seized and modified to produce some weapon material. Any nuclear powerplant in the contemplated power range would produce weapon material if sufficient effort were expended on modification and providing the necessary separations plants and other ancillary facilities. It would be likewise misleading to deny that some future enemy might consider such a powerplant a target for attack. At the same time, any kind of power plant or any industrial plant might equally well be considered a target for attack.

We have attempted to put these risks in proper perspective. However, it would be the responsibility of the Japanese to determine whether the risks can be accepted.

I trust that these answers will be helpful for your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

K. E. FIELDS,
General Manager.
R. W. COOK,
Deputy.

Effects of Imports of Tuna on the American Tuna Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. H. F. Cary, gen-

eral manager of the American Tunaboat Association:

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., July 25, 1955.

The Honorable BOB WILSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: In our recent discussion you asked these questions:

(1) Does the tuna industries (producers and processors) import problem arise primarily or solely from the importation of canned tuna from Japan? (2) Do you consider that a limitation on canned tuna imports alone will relieve the situation?

The answer to both questions is "No."

This is the basis of our reply:

1. Tuna imports in all forms threaten the ability of the United Sates tuna industries (producers and processors) to continue in business.

2. Tuna imports in frozen form are heaviest, have grown most in recent years, and constitute practically the whole of the present problem.

3. Full remedial action designed to be both effective and equitable should embrace imports of tuna from Japan in all forms.

4. Partial, emergency remedial action to aid the group most affected, the producing industry, should be addressed to frozen tuna imports.

The course of international trade in tuna has been violently changed by trade agreements entered into by the United States. This bad situation has now been worsened, rather than improved, by the new trade agreement on tuna products.

These agreements brought a record total of canned tuna in oil into the United States in 1950, caused a shift in attention to frozen tuna thereafter which has brought successive record high imports annually, and also diverted canned tuna in oil trade largely to canned tuna in brine.

There is a basic inequity in comparative tariff treatment of all these products—this affects the tuna industries separately.

The producing industry (fishermen and boatowners) is affected by all forms of imports.

The processing industry (canners), represented by those who buy all or most of their frozen fish from Japan, is affected by tuna canned in brine and oil.

The processing industry (canners), represented by those who buy most of their supply from domestic producers, is affected by tuna canned in brine and in oil, and by frozen tuna imports to the extent that these same companies do not buy the same percentage of imports as others to equalize their raw material costs.

We have set forth what group is affected by any or all forms of these imports. Let us see what has recently happened and is happening to each form of import to determine where the burden lies.

In 1951 the processors and producers petitioned the Tariff Commission for an escape-clause action on one of the products from Japan—tuna canned in brine. This was rejected by a split vote. This is what has happened to imports of tuna canned in brine and in oil from Japan in each full year since that time:

	Pounds processed weight
1952	22,777,000
1953	32,363,000
1954	28,644,000

In 1951 the producers after conferring with the State Department sought the imposition of a tariff on frozen tuna. This was defeated in the Senate after opposition expressed by the State Department and processors. This is what has happened to imports of frozen tuna from Japan in each full year since that time:

	Pounds round weight
1952	50,985,000
1953	77,112,000
1954	98,060,000

There has been a relatively stable situation in canned-tuna imports (oil and brine combined). This may be analyzed by quarters, as follows:

[Processed weight in thousands of pounds]

Quarter	1952	1953	1954	1955
January-March	5,834	6,436	7,385	6,610
April-June	5,038	7,195	8,953	.....
July-September	5,498	12,276	5,869	.....
October-December	6,268	6,583	6,430	.....

A comparison by months will reveal the same relative stability.

There has been a rapid growth and no stability in imports of frozen tuna from Japan, which may be analyzed by quarters as follows:

[Round weight in thousands of pounds]

Quarter	1952	1953	1954	1955
January-March	7,712	9,550	15,822	23,781
April-June	9,711	23,510	35,777	.....
July-September	22,395	35,150	31,048	.....
October-December	11,167	9,152	15,322	.....

Let us compare imports of both canned and frozen tuna in terms of round weight for the first 5 months of 1955 with a comparable period for each of these years:

[In thousands of pounds round weight]

Period	Canned	Frozen
January-May, 1952	18,960	14,912
January-May, 1953	22,774	23,724
January-May, 1954	28,876	38,576
January-May, 1955	21,048	46,032

For these periods we find these comparisons may be made:

1. Imports of Japanese canned tuna in 1955 were 11 percent more than in 1952, 8 percent less than in 1953, and 21 percent less than in 1954, a consistent decrease.

2. Imports of Japanese frozen tuna in 1955 were 209 percent more than in 1952, 94 percent more than in 1953, and 19 percent more than in 1954, a consistent increase.

3. Imports of Japanese canned tuna represented 56 percent of the total of both canned and frozen in 1952, 49 percent of the total in 1953, 43 percent of the total in 1954, and 31 percent of the total in 1955—a consistent decrease.

Returning to the answers to your questions.

1. It is apparent from this information that imports of canned tuna are not the sole or primary problem in imports.

2. It is apparent from this information that a limitation on canned goods imports alone would not solve the problem of keeping an American tuna fishery.

3. It is apparent from this information that the lack of any equality of treatment of imports of frozen tuna, which enters duty-free or quota free, causes the full weight of all imports to fall almost exclusively on the domestic producer (boatowner and fisherman).

4. It is apparent from this information why processors who buy all or most of their fish supply abroad want nothing done on frozen tuna imports (which enter duty-free and which have steadily increased), and everything done on canned tuna imports (which are already dutiable and have recently decreased).

The Department of State has recently written that in considering this situation the Government intends to take into account the interests of all concerned in a fair and equitable manner.

This is what the producers have asked. They have suggested no solutions that would do otherwise.

Yours very truly,
AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
H. F. CARY, *General Manager.*

The Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we have failed to give the American public a much-needed highway program. I do not wish to point the accusing finger at any one group—for I sincerely feel that we must collectively stand responsible to the American public for failing to eleviate a problem that permeates our variated channels of commerce and industry.

I vigorously opposed the Eisenhower bond-issuing arrangement that was introduced under the rule by which the bill was brought to the floor. The committee's bill which provided for a "pay-as-you-go" tax plan sought to distribute the cost over the Nation as a whole, but met with defeat when extraneous matter was introduced that was designed to raise the ire of a large portion of the membership. I voted for the committee's bill on the grounds that the present emergency conditions of our Nation's highways required that some program be put into effect in the interest of public safety—if for no other reason. The death tolls on our highways, which for the main part are due to the inadequate accommodation of our roads, points directly to the necessity of remedial legislation for highway construction. It is reported that we daily kill 100 Americans and critically injure 3,000. The estimated economic loss approaches $4.5 billion annually. This type of negligence, I fear approaches moral culpability—and finds no justification on the grounds of partisan political considerations or for the need of providing a banker's bonding program.

Aside from failing in our moral obligation to the public we have also hindered seriously the economic development of our country. The automobile industry is the principal utilizer of highways; whether for travel, commerce or travel-communication. The vitals of our Nation are arterially connected by our roads and highways. Today we are producing 3 million vehicles in excess of the number we retire to the junk heap every year. Every year we compound further the problem of congested highways—but every year we fail to come forward with a workable solution. To continue this folly in the face of these startling facts can only be adjudged as governmental irresponsibility toward

the critical needs of our people and their economy.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the leadership and my colleagues to seriously contemplate the seriousness of this problem which is no longer merely economic, but moral as well. The needless loss of life and the economic waste which evolves therefrom should make firm our resolve to vigorously attack this problem next session and deliver to the people the means for providing adequate and safe highways.

Stockpiling of Anthracite Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that we are specially expert in preparing for past wars and that we always seem to have difficulty in anticipating the realities of future wars. In less than 40 years 2 great world wars have occurred in which this country found itself quite unprepared. It required in each case considerable time to marshal our productive forces and military might. The ever-present danger that another one will break out is now our greatest concern.

It is not difficult to identify at least some significant differences between a possible third world conflict and World Wars I and II. This would be the length of time that we may have to assemble our military power to meet the enemy attack. In those former times we were extremely fortunate that the fields of battle were a long way off. Also, we had powerful allies who were able to absorb rather fully the shock of the first 2 years of each war.

Fortunately, this gave the United States time to bring its industrial and military power into a state of readiness. It is a safe conclusion, however, that we will not have such an extended period for preparation in the future. Neither can there be any assurance that a future war will be fought exclusively on foreign soil. Instead the probabilities are that war will be brought directly to America first, possibly an attempted surprise attack. Our former leisurely process of preparation probably cannot be repeated. We cannot afford to be unprepared.

In both former experiences it was necessary that our great energy resources be quickly and completely mobilized for war. Petroleum supplies were at once reserved for their dominant military uses. This would be no less necessary for the future. Oils and gasoline are essential for our airplanes, our ships, and our mechanized land units. These military facilities would again make a first call upon the petroleum supplies of this country.

It is equally evident that a large share of the greatly increased energy needs for war mobilization would, as in the past, descend with great weight on the coal industry. The bituminous coal mines would again probably absorb most of the shock. Production of less than 400 million tons in the late thirties was expanded to more than 600 million tons by 1944.

Because of strategic locations of the deposits an important segment of this increased burden again would be shifted to the anthracite mines of this country. An annual production of less than 50 million tons before World War II was boosted to 56 million tons in 1941, 60 million tons by 1942, and almost 64 million tons by 1944. This large increase in mine output required time.

But fortunately there was time to prepare for increased production: To bring back discharged miners, to pump water from abandoned mines, to refurbish the facilities and install new equipment. In all probability time for such adjustments will not be available in a future war.

Under these circumstances, there is a most solid basis for legislation authorizing the Federal Government to accumulate an adequate stockpile of weather-resistant anthracite coal of sufficient proportions to absorb some of the early shock of expanded energy needs.

We should also recognize that a future war may quickly disrupt our transportation system and create an immediate need for many strategically placed mineral fuel stockpiles. The fuels most vulnerable to attack would probably be the oil and gas flowing in pipelines. A few well-placed bombs could disrupt the flow to the major industrial areas of the country of much of the supply of not only oil but also natural gas.

There is under way a continuous expansion in the consumption of mineral fuels but much of this new burden has recently been shifted to petroleum and natural gas. Petroleum especially would be required in large volume for many irreplaceable military uses in time of war. It would also be subject to the easiest destruction through bombs, since many oil pipelines are in vulnerable positions.

Fortunately many emergency fuel needs could be supplied from strategically located stockpiles of anthracite coal. This hard coal will maintain itself with almost no loss over periods of several years. Such stockpiles would be immediately available for many uses, both in essential industries and for heating homes.

A program of stockpiling, if properly synchronized with the present uneven and restricted production of anthracite coal, would do much to improve the economic health of vital depressed mining areas, and maintain them in a state of readiness in event of another great world war.

Our national stockpiling program has been directed preponderantly to the accumulation of various types of products, especially minerals that are available only from foreign countries or where major parts of the supply come from distant producing centers. Ocean-going shipping is especially vulnerable to submarine attack which can disrupt the flow of vital commodities. It seems equally important that we should also stockpile other essential materials which require time to produce.

The availability of adequate stockpiles of coal, especially of the anthracite variety, could add significantly to our preparedness. Such stockpiles would relieve the burden on other types of mineral fuel and permit rapid readjustment to stringent circumstances.

Even though we do have large reserves of coal which are adequate for all future needs, the unmined coal is not available to meet urgent needs. It will take time to rehabilitate an industry that has been subjected to unfortunate competition for so many years. It is this element of time that may very well be in shortest supply and also the greatest single determining factor in national survival.

Ebasco Costs at EEI Plant at Joppa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, last year I had occasion to place in the RECORD correspondence with the Comptroller General of the United States pertaining to my inquiry as to whether the Government of the United States was liable for additional costs in connection with the construction of the powerplant of Electric Energy, Inc., at Joppa, Ill., as a result of miscalculation or mismanagement by Ebasco Services, Inc.

I am in receipt of a further communication from the Comptroller General dated July 26, 1955, and in order that the record may be complete, I am attaching it as a part of my remarks:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 26, 1955.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. YATES: This is in response to your informal inquiry of July 14 as to whether there has been a change in my opinion expressed in a letter to you dated July 26, 1954, that the Atomic Energy Commission is legally obligated to absorb through power rate increases the increased construction costs of the Electric Energy, Inc., power plant, in view of the findings set forth in part I of our report on AEC contracts for electric power, issued March 31, 1955. I wish to advise you that there has been no change of opinion as to the Government's liability.

In my letter of July 26, 1954, I stated:

"Examination has been made of the contracts pertaining to both the Paducah and Portsmouth installations, and it is my opinion that the Atomic Energy Commission is legally obligated to absorb the increased construction costs of both power plants under the contract escalation clauses whereby the rates charged for power are based upon actual construction costs."

I also stated that no audit by this Office had been made of the actual expenditures involved but that our Division of Audits had made a survey as to the reasons for the increased construction costs of the EEI power plant and had concluded:

"An important factor in the cost increase was labor difficulty * * * The exact effect on

the increased construction cost of the strikes, slowdowns, and overmanning to prevent jurisdictional disputes as contracted with possible management efficiency in labor utilization and labor relations is not measurable. It is also possible that the initial estimates of labor costs were unrealistic. We can only conclude that labor costs make up the major portion of the overall increase in cost."

The findings set forth in part I of our report on AEC contracts for electric power, issued March 31, 1955, were based on a more complete and thorough review of the circumstances surrounding the large increases in the construction cost estimates of the Joppa powerplant; however, these findings are consistent with those included in my letter of July 26, 1954. The March 31, 1955, report states:

"Based on our review, we are of the opinion that the basic reasons for the increases in Ebasco's estimates are:

"a. The original estimate was based on inadequate information.

"b. The labor problems encountered were greater than anticipated.

"c. The management activities at the site were not adequately performed."

You might be interested to know that subsequent to the release of part I of our report on AEC contracts for electric power, the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, by letter dated April 21, 1955, advised the Comptroller General that a settlement between EEI and Ebasco Services, Inc., had been reached which provided for Ebasco to receive no profit for its services on the Joppa powerplant. The estimated reduction in construction costs is $2,882,000, subject to a final audit to be made. The AEC will receive the benefit of this reduction in construction costs through power rate decreases under the terms of the contract.

The General Accounting Office has now completed an audit of the actual expenditures made by EEI for construction of the Joppa powerplant through September 30, 1954. Our report on this audit will be issued in the near future at which time I will send you a copy.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

Need for a Veterans Hospital in the Washington Metropolitan Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from the Vice Commander, American Legion, Department of Maryland, which points out the vital need for a veterans hospitals in the Washington metropolitan area.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, INC.,
July 29, 1955.

MR. DEWITT S. HYDE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HYDE: We of the American Legion, and in particular those of the Southern Maryland District, whom I represent, are deeply concerned with the vital need for adequate veteran hospitalization facilities in the Washington metropolitan area.

Of particular interest is the fact there are an estimated 285,000 to 300,000 veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea living in an area which includes the District of Columbia, Fairfax, and Arlington Counties in Virginia, the city of Alexandria and the Maryland counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges. Of this number, 30,000 have service incurred disabilities, many of which will require future hospitalization.

This area is now served by Mount Alto Hospital which has only 300 beds available and is an extremely inadequate and obsolete facility. This was formerly a girls' school and was taken over in 1921 by the United States Veterans' Bureau to provide badly needed hospitalization for a much smaller number of veterans than now populate our area. It is my understanding that even the Veterans' Administration feels Mount Alto is obsolete and any expenditure for repairs or remodeling would involve a gross waste of Federal funds.

I would also mention that many of the veterans in the area will require hospital service in the future to which they are legally entitled because of their personal funds will be inadequate. While I am primarily concerned with the immediate problem of the Washington Metropolitan area, I would also point out that from the standpoint of Maryland veterans, relief is needed for the Fort Howard and Perry Point Hospitals. Additional facilities in this area would relieve the pressure at these other points and would further assure many veterans who now need hospitalization, an opportunity to receive the attention which would once again make them useful assets to the community and to our country.

We of the American Legion will be most happy to work with you in every possible way to bring to a full realization, an adequate structure, properly located, to serve the men who did not hesitate to serve the Nation.

With sincere appreciation, I am,
Cordially,

DAVID L. BRIGHAM,
Vice-Commander,
Department of Maryland.

Mrs. C. H. Woods, a Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of Congress know, each year the American Mothers' Committee of the respective States names a mother of the year. This year, the honor in Illinois went to a fine woman in the 22d Congressional District of Illinois, Mrs. C. H. Woods, of Lincoln.

To have achieved the Mother of the Year Award, a woman must have lived up to high qualifications designated by the American Mothers' Committee. One of these is that she shall be a successful mother as evidenced by the character of her individual children. She also must reflect a strong religious and spiritual integrity and, in addition, the traits of courage, cheerfulness, patience, affection, kindness, understanding, and homemaking. Such a woman must have a sense of civic and international understanding and be active in community betterment. Mrs. Woods combines all of these qualifications and truly represents the mothers of Illinois in all of her responsibilities attached to her role as State Mother of 1955.

The Illinois ceremony this year was held on the campus of Lincoln College and Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois, presented the certificate to Mrs. Woods as the Illinois mother of 1955. Under unanimous consent, I include herewith an article from the Lincoln Evening Courier of April 25, 1955, giving an account of this presentation:

GOVERNOR STRATTON PRESENTS AWARD TO MRS. C. H. WOODS

Highlight of the mother award ceremony here Sunday afternoon was presentation by Gov. William G. Stratton of a certificate to Mrs. C. H. Woods, of Lincoln, the Illinois mother of 1955. She represents, he said, the qualifications of motherhood: devotion, wisdom, courage, faith, and understanding.

It is these which are the sustaining qualities of life, Governor Stratton said. Motherhood is something enduring, something eternal yet all too often people wait until too late to honor their maternal parent. Motherhood is the highest honor which can come to any woman.

The Lincoln woman's greatest reward, the governor pointed out, is her children and grandchildren, who were seated in places of honor.

In presenting the Illinois award, the State executive said the tribute to Mrs. Woods embraces all mothers of Illinois. As the governor was presented by Raymond Dooley, who presided, the crowd stood.

In responding, the 1955 mother award recipient said it was a particular honor to receive the award from the governor. The occasion, she said, "is overwhelming and a wonderful thing, one reviving both sorrow and joys."

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald and speaker of the day, said it is the hand that rocks the cradle that moves and rules the world. While wars never settle anything and mothers' sons die needlessly, nevertheless they provide the chance to win the peace. "If they had failed, we would not be here honoring motherhood today. They have promised us a better tomorrow by an enlightened and enriched freedom."

Allocation of Contracts for the Construction of Vessels in American Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H. R. 7700, relating to the allocation of contracts for the construction of vessels in shipyards on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, and on the Great Lakes.

It is of the utmost importance that shipyards vital to the national security shall be capable of expanding, in times of emergency, to maximum capacity. Facilities alone are of no use unless trained personnel are available to build, repair, and convert seagoing vessels. This was forcibly brought out during the

almost 2-year delay in the shipbuilding program during World War II—trained personnel were not available to perform the work, even after facilities were available.

The ability to maintain a labor pool of skilled workers is dependent upon a continuing volume of shipbuilding, conversion, and repair work. Where these skills are developed in the shipyards through apprentice and training programs, the first reduction in shipyard work accompanied by even temporary layoffs of these skilled personnel results in their seeking employment elsewhere, usually in a more stable industry. Fluctuations in shipbuilding activity add to the difficulty of maintaining a nucleus of trained and skilled shipyard personnel for wartime expansion, or even for peacetime demands.

The problem is to maintain a nucleus of skilled personnel in strategic areas, capable of being expanded to maximum capacity in minimum time. The three main areas for the building, repair, and conversion of seagoing vessels are at present the east, west, and gulf coasts, and prospects for further development of Great Lake facilities appear good. In order to maintain a nucleus of skilled personnel, skilled workers must be induced to stay in the shipbuilding industry. The percentage of the total of skilled workers employed should, then, approximate the percentage of the total which would have to be employed in each area in time of emergency.

The purpose of H. R. 7700 is to assure, insofar as it is practicable, that ship construction, repair, and conversion work benefiting from Government subsidies will be distributed on a geographical basis to maintain shipyards and skilled personnel on all coasts in a state of at least minimum readiness for a national emergency.

At the peak of World II employment in 1943, a total of some 840,000 productive workers were employed in the industry, in both Navy and private shipyards. Geographical distribution was as follows: Pacific coast, 35.4 percent; Atlantic coast, 46.5 percent; Gulf Coast and Great Lakes, 8.1 percent.

Currently, approximately 99,100 persons are employed by private shipyards; approximately 15 percent of this number are nonproductive clerical and supervisory personnel. Geographical percentages are: Pacific coast, 14 percent; Atlantic coast, 55 percent; Gulf coast, 19 percent; Great Lakes, 2 percent.

The Department of the Navy has some 91,431 persons productively employed. Of this number, 53,692 are on the east and gulf coasts combined, and 37,739 are employed on the west coast.

The Department of the Navy has allocated funds to the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the purpose of collecting data concerning shipyard employment. The system was worked out by the combined efforts of the Navy, Maritime Administration, Bureau of Labor Statistics, anr representatives of the Shipbuilders Council of America. The purpose is to determine the number of people employed on a month-to-month basis, broken down as to the kind of contracts upon which they are working. The response from the private shipyards has been disappointing so far however, since only about 50 percent of the yards have cooperated in this effort.

On the basis of figures submitted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for employment in shipbuilding and repair for August 1953 and August 1954, the percentage of geographical distribution of employment was as follows:

	August 1953		August 1954	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Private yards:				
Atlantic coast	77,300	60	57,500	58
Gulf coast	24,700	19	21,400	22
Pacific coast	14,900	12	11,900	12
Great Lakes	5,800	------	4,500	------
Inland	5,400	------	4,200	------
Total	128,100	------	99,500	------
Navy yards:				
Atlantic coast	78,300	65	67,600	63
Gulf coast	----------	------	----------	------
Pacific coast	43,100	36	40,100	37
Great Lakes	----------	------	----------	------
Inland	----------	------	----------	------
Total	121,400	------	107,100	------
Grand total for all yards:				
Atlantic coast	155,600	63	125,100	60
Gulf coast	24,700	9	21,400	10
Pacific coast	58,000	23	52,000	25
Great Lakes	5,800	------	4,500	------
Inland	5,400	------	4,200	------
Total	249,500	------	207,200	------

On the basis of these figures, as well as the others noted in previous paragraphs, it would appear that in order to maintain, percentagewise, the proper ratio of employment of each coast to the others, approximately 54 percent of the total should be employed on the Atlantic coast, approximately 29 percent should be employed on the Pacific coast, approximately 9 percent should be employed on the gulf coast, and approxmately 8 percent should be employed on the Great Lakes. This ratio would assure that each coast had a nucleus of skilled workers as a basis for training others in time of national emergency.

If the provisions of H. R. 7700 are applied, there would be some safeguard against the shifting of skilled workers from the shipbuilding industry to another industry. When private ship construction and repair work is slack, Government contracts would be let in the area, thus keeping those skills occupied.

I have introduced this bill at the end of the session in order that the cognizant departments of the executive branch of the Government might have an opportunity to study the subject and report on the bill. It is quite possible that because of the specialized nature of the several subdivisions of the industry that a separation should be made between repair and construction, particularly since repair work is generally dependent upon the physical location of the ship to be repaired and is not readily controllable by law.

Obviously, any percentages determined to be valid would be subject to review. In this connection, in view of plans to improve conditions of access to the Great Lakes, it is conceivable that this area might develop in importance in the shipbuilding and repair field. It is also possible that further separation should be made between private and Navy yards, since employment in the latter is directly controllable by the Government and their function is to support the operational forces of the United States Navy, which bears little relationship to mobilization expansion requirements of the merchant marine.

It is my sincere belief that the provisions of H. R. 7700 at least suggest a solution to a very real national problem. I hope that it will be possible, after proper study by the departments, for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to direct its attention to this bill so that it may be properly improved and offered for the consideration of the Congress.

Double LL's of Pennsylvania Have Lots To Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Phil A. O'Neill, president, Crolly Advertising Agency, Wilkes Barre, Pa., in which Mr. O'Neill analyzes the market area comprising Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties. This article appears in the current issue of Markets of America:

LACKAWANNA AND LUZERNE MARKET—THE DOUBLE "LL'S" OF PENNSYLVANIA OFFER EVERYTHING AN ADMAN CAN ASK FOR

(By Phil A. O'Neill)

Scranton-Wilkes-Barre at a glance

Population (metropolitan area)	710,860
	710,860
Dwelling units	197,600
Retail sales	$628,000,000
Apparel store sales	52,680,000
Automotive sales	94,590,000
Drug store sales	13,310,000
Food store sales	173,108,000
Furniture and appliance sales	37,900,000
Gasoline service sales	18,340,000
General merchandise sales	71,356,000

Here in these two great industrial, mining, manufacturing, and agricultural counties is an unusual market of prime interest to every buyer of advertising.

The double "LL's" have the distinction of having 5 UHF-TV stations; 2 of these were the first 1 million-watt stations in the United States of America, which makes Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties one single market.

The first million-watt station is an NBC basic buy, the second carries ABC and DuMont shows (both are located in Wilkes-Barre). In Scranton there are powerful CBS and ABC affiliates and a good regional independent.

There are 11 radio stations; 7 major daily and 2 Sunday newspapers in the double "LL's" trading area, plus a host of English-speaking and foreign-language weeklies. There are many other attractive attributes about the double "LL's" little known to the national advertiser.

Here in the double "LL's" lies America; for almost every European and Asiatic nationality that ever landed on the shores of this country is represented here. True to the great American tradition, this heterogeneous mass of people from other lands work and play in concord, side by side, each retaining a portion of their picturesque native habits and culture, and at the same time blending harmoniously into the multicolored pattern of American life.

A warm hand of welcome and genuine hospitality is extended to you to visit here. We are proud of our double "LL's" and promise to dispell any false ideas you may have of the Pennsylvania hard-coal regions. A network of highways lead into the double "LL's," and the extension of the great Pennsylvania Turnpike now under construction, when completed, will make the double "LL's" one of the most important distributing centers in Pennsylvania.

Two nationally known bus lines and 10 railroads give direct connections with all parts of the United States. Here you will see fine homes, modern hotels, restaurants, stores, and shops, well-kept public parks, country clubs, lakes, and historically known landmarks, churches of every denomination, public and parochial schools, colleges, and private institutions of learning equal to or exceeding any in the United States. If you like to fly, come by plane on the wings of Allegheny, American, Colonial, or TWA Airlines direct to the double "LL's" modern airport.

Within the trading area of 50 miles is a population of nearly 2 million people. The double "LL's" are the most economical points from which to serve this vast population, and the logical distributing centers for the 17 counties of northeastern Pennsylvania's marketing area. Rich in history, resourceful in industry.

DIVERSIFICATION

The double "L's" with Scranton, Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton as the major cities are a beehive of action to transform these two anthracite producing counties into one of Pennsylvania's most industrially diversified sections of this great State.

In every city, town and borough, there are well organized forces of civic-minded men and women giving of their time, talents and money to make Luzerne and Lackawanna counties industrially secure.

Even the coal companies are no longer just "hard coal" minded. One of the largest anthracite producing companies in the world located here in the double "L's", recently changed its corporate name to make possible new and progressive developments of natural resources and other products so essential to the rebirth of the Pennsylvania hard-coal regions.

MANUFACTURING CENTER

This industrialized rehabilitation and manufacturing, instead of mining, now plays the prominent role in the economy of the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton trading area. The chamber of commerce of any of these cities will be more than glad to supply volumes of statistical material to show you the progress made since the end of World War II. A very substantial housing boom has accompanied this industrial expansion, and the number of new shopping centers with huge supermarkets is truly phenomenal, and new car sales in the double "L's" are fantastic.

A large labor pool is one of the double "L's" greatest assets. Upwards of 80 percent are American-born, with nationalities of the remaining percentage Polish, Italian, Austrian, Russian, Irish, Czechoslovakian, Welsh, English, German, and Lithuanian and at least one naturalized American representing all the other nations of the world, with plenty of inherent talents to be trained in any phase of manufacturing, distributing, or selling.

POPULATION CONCENTRATION

The double "L's" are the largest market in northeastern Pennsylvania, strategically located in an area of one of America's greatest concentrations of population forming a market for the national advertisers of untold potentialities.

A look at a map shows that the double "L's" are within convenient distance to all commercial nerve centers in the world, and with an approximate 40 million people living within a 250-mile radius.

So, if you have anything to sell it can be sold here. If you are an industrialist looking for a place to relocate or establish a branch plant, come to the double "L's". It's a Mecca for the merchandiser, the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and distributor.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, one of America's burdens of this decade is her responsibility of seeing to it that our great abundance of agricultural products finds its way into the hands of deserving, friendly peoples of the world. Unfortunately, our price support program has heaped upon us a great surplus of food which not only finds us hoarding our abundance, but being burdened by the very cost of storing it. That cost now exceeds $1 million per day. I am convinced that in the sight of God and the history of mankind America must either find a means of distributing this surplus or certainly face a penalty.

Recently, there has come a ray of hope for solving America's problem of her abundance. For the first time in the history of our price support program the Department of Agriculture, under Republican leadership, has devised an aggressive plan for reducing our inventory of surplus in a way which could prove to be an example to the rest of the world of the advantages of America's free enterprise system. The United States Department of Agriculture has announced the appointment of Francis Daniels as sales manager and vice president of Commodity Credit Corporation. We are finally preparing to distribute our excess of agricultural products throughout the world, not by dumping or wasting our abundance, but by sound, aggressive selling in the world's free market. America should be encouraged that this program is headed by a man who is a product of our free enterprise business system.

No doubt there are some who would profit by the continued growth of America's surplus stockpile. However, the majority of our citizens, I am sure, will feel relieved to know that something is being done about introducing this great store of food into the world markets where it is sorely needed.

No program such as this can be inaugurated without the strong opposition of some who, perhaps, have profited for many years from the continued accumulation of these surpluses. I, therefore, submit that strong support and encouragement should be given those men in our Department of Agriculture whose responsibility it is to dispose of them. The entire commodity stabilization program of the United States is under the immediate supervision of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, James A. McConnell. I believe a tribute should be given to this man's perseverance, hard work and personal sacrifice in this present service to our country.

No doubt Mr. McConnell's greatest personal desire would be to spend the remaining years of his life on his farm in northern Pennsylvania enjoying the companionship of his children and grandchildren. Many years of hard work and personal business success has earned for Mr. McConnel the right to such a life.

However, he, like many of us, feels that America's future may well be on trial at the present time and that unless we succeed in making democracy, free enterprise and our great productive resources of benefit to all, America's great gains of the past may be lost to the future. Here are some of Mr. McConnell's recent accomplishments concerning our surpluses which I feel are worthy of commendation:

First. He is singularly responsible for creating the position of Sales Manager and Vice President of Commodity Credit Corporation, the appointment of Francis Daniels to that position and the working out of an aggressive plan of selling America's surpluses.

Second. He has encouraged a policy of reducing the investment of our Government in storage facilities for these surplus products. In this regard, he eliminated the necessity of using 28 additional mothball Liberty ships from the San Francisco area for surplus-grain storage in the Northwest. I am informed that the grain originally destined for ship storage has either been sold or scheduled for storage in conventional grain warehouses located in California, at a greatly reduced cost to the taxpayer.

Third. Through Mr. McConnell's efforts a representative of Portland Commodity office has been located in California and has successfully reduced grain surpluses there to the point where it now appears that all oversupply in California may well be eliminated before next harvest.

Fourth. He has arranged for three representatives from California to be seated on the advisory board of the Portland office of Commodity Stabilization, thus giving our State of California representation in the matter of handling and disposing of surplus commodities.

Fifth. At Mr. McConnell's insistence over 500,000 tons of surplus grains have been sold on the Pacific coast during the past 30 days. Most of this has gone for export into trade channels of the free world.

For a long time I have been a critic of wasteful practices by some of our Government bureaus in the handling of

surplus commodities. I am encouraged that something is being done about it. I hope that Mr. McConnell's aggressive program and the selling job to be executed by Mr. Francis Daniels will be given the wholehearted support of the Congress.

GI Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum released by the Veterans' Administration today:

Effective today, July 30, veterans purchasing homes with the aid of GI loans will be required to make a down payment of at least 2 percent, and the maximum time for repayment of loans will be set at 25 years, the Veterans' Administration announced.

Similarly moderate credit requirements are being placed in effect by the Federal Housing Administration for homes purchased with FHA-insured mortgages.

Since April 23, 1953, the VA has had no mandatory down payment requirement, and the mortgage repayment period could run as high as 30 years.

Today's action, VA said, was taken after a thorough study of national economic conditions, especially those prevailing in the residential construction and mortgage financing fields. The new requirements are expected to help protect prospective GI loan applicants against increased prices of homes, overextension of credit and financial risks. Further, they should tend to stabilize the mortgage market by eliminating the 30-year no-down-payment loan which currently is being traded at widening discount margins.

The new requirements are not retroactive. They are not applicable to purchase of homes for which VA has issued certificates of reasonable value prior to July 30, or in cases where requests for appraisals actually have been received in VA offices prior to July 30.

Also, the requirements will not apply to GI loans made solely for the replacement or reconstruction of residential property that has been destroyed or substantially damaged by flood, fire, or other similar catastrophies, nor to repair, alteration, or improvement loans.

The most recent VA figures show that the average price for GI homes purchased with no downpayment has been about $10,500. Under the new regulations the downpayment requirement for such a house would be $210.

A VA study of the 407,000 VA home loans closed in 1954 revealed that veterans had made an average downpayment of $1,100. On those loans made in 1954 with downpayments, the average downpayment for new houses ran 11 percent, and the average for existing homes was 15 percent.

The study revealed that 2 out of every 5 new home loans, and 1 out of every 5 loans for existing dwellings were made with no downpayments. One-twelfth of the mortgages on existing homes and a little more than one-third of the mortgages on new homes had 26- to 30-year maturities.

On other occasions since the GI bill loan program was established in 1944, VA credit requirements have varied.

Credit controls were first imposed in July 1950 when a 5-percent downpayment was required for most GI loans. In October 1950, under the Defense Production Act, downpayment requirements ranged up to 45 percent, and the repayment period was limited to 25 years on homes costing under $7,000, and 20 years on homes over that amount.

Downpayment requirements were eased on three separate occasions—in September 1951, and June and October of 1952—before credit controls were removed entirely on April 23, 1953.

The VA emphasized that it would maintain a constant study of the housing situation, and make adjustments in credit requirements as might be indicated.

Encircling Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette, Hampton, N. H., Thursday, July 28, 1955:

ENCIRCLING MOVEMENT

The ponderous, long-heralded summit conference, from which the world expected little and hoped for much, will go down in history as the scene of the Eisenhower challenge, probably the greatest stroke of statesmanship in our time.

As western newsmen struggled desperately to send home reports of progress and optimism, when the key issues of German reunification and European defense had both been kicked under the table for resurrection at the the foreign minister level at some later date when Russia's Bulganin had once more repeated the threadbare Soviet formula for disarmament of other nations, when the meeting seemed hopelessly fouled up and rapidly disintegrating, President Eisenhower let the peace-loving Russians have it.

In the same simple, friendly, but deadly earnest manner of his earlier addresses in Geneva, he called upon the masters of the Soviet to exchange with the United States complete blueprints of each other's military establishments. Further, he invited them to take all the aerial photographs they wished over the United States—extending the same privilege to American flyers over the U. S. S. R. in return. He emphasized that the exchange of military installation blueprints was to cover the United States from end to end and to extend likewise across the vastness of the Soviet Union.

The jolt that turned the tables and placed President Eisenhower in command of the situation was received by the Russians in stony silence. Premier Bulganin, as chairman, adjourned the meeting.

Such a proposal is obviously not to the Reds' liking. But will they dare to reject it? If they turn it down, their protestations for peace and amity and understanding are forever gone with the wind that generated them. If they turn it down, they can never again charge us with warmongering. And if they should accept the President's challenge, the Iron Curtain comes crashing down. The secret fastnesses of the Urals, the slave camps of Siberia, the wretchedness and poverty of the Russian people and the Soviet satellites will be revealed to all the world. The days of the Kremlin hierarchy will be numbered. And if they accept, we suspect there is little about our Military Establishment for them to add to the intelligence data they already have.

Either way, General Eisenhower has taken the summit.

Republican Administration Imposes Unneeded Credit Controls on Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration is playing politics with the veterans' housing program. The Veterans' Administration announced that effective today, July 30, veterans' purchasing homes with the aid of GI loans will be required to make a downpayment of at least 2 percent and the maximum time for repayment of loans will be set at 25 years.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 specifies that a veteran's loan may be guaranteed for a period of 30 years and sets no requirement for a downpayment. The amount of downpayment and the length of the mortgage term are the prerogatives of the lender and may be set by the lender at his own discretion within the maximum and minimum prescribed by law. We now find the administration tampering with the veteran loan guarantee program and in fact imposing credit control on veterans who wish to purchase a home guaranteed by a VA loan. This action by the administration represents a victory for the mortgage bankers and certain of the lending interests who have been campaigning for several months to impose credit controls on veterans.

These attempts came to the attention of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and were the subject of hearings on April 26, 1955. I would like to read a statement which I made at the beginning of the hearings regarding the campaign by lenders and also the statement by Mr. Ralph H. Stone, Deputy Administrator, Department of Veterans' Benefits:

VETERANS' HOUSING PROBLEMS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1955.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a. m., in room 356, Old House Office Building, OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

For the past several months numerous items have appeared in the Wall Street Journal and various other business and builders' publications to the effect that there was an extensive boom in home building, and that the Government should take steps to curtail it.

Knowing that World War II housing benefits will expire in the next couple of years, of course this committee is very much interested in what happens along that line. I would like to read you a few of the statements that appeared in the different publications.

A spokesman for the Life Insurance Association of America made this statement [reading]:

"It is evident therefore that measures need to be taken promptly by Government and private groups to dampen down the boom in housing.

"The basic cause for this boom is excessively easy credit. This is certainly no time for 30-year, no downpayment mortgage loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Such terms are an open invitation to a boom-bust situation in home building, and they actually penalize the veteran by contributing to a high price for his house. We urge that Congress act promptly to require some downpayment and a shorter maximum amortization period on VA mortgage loans."

Fortune magazine has had a big spread, Is Housing Out of Hand? The sum and substance of what they say is: "A wholly unhealthy situation which calls for reappraisal and remedy."

The Kiplinger Newsletter, on April 16, 1955, had this to say:

"Government officials want to slow housing down, skim off the froth. They are convinced that the housing boom is moving a little too fast. They think they should act to take the edge off it in the near future, so that an excessive boom this year won't bring a sharp slide next year. We wrote you about this feeling some weeks ago—how it is crystallizing.

"How to go about it? Well, a number of things are now in mind: (1) Make the VA and FHA field offices tighten up on advance commitments to put a damper on speculation among builders of mass housing projects. (2) Ask Congress to give President power to set VA and FHA mortgage terms. (3) Get VA and FHA to boost the downpayments. ((1) and (2) are most likely.)"

Considerable publicity has been given recently to action by FHA to list certain cities throughout the country—Dallas, Tex.; Tucson, Ariz.; and others—as being overbuilt and as result curtail the issuance of commitments in those cities. There have been some reports that such action is contemplated by the Veterans' Administration.

These hearings were called in order that the VA may review the status of the loan-guaranty program and point out to the committee any aspect of the program's operation which it considers weak or undesirable and advise the committee of any plans which the Veterans' Administration may have to require downpayments, shorten the mortgage term, or limit the issuance of certificates of reasonable value in specific areas. If there is an unhealthy and undesirable situation in the veterans' housing program, the committee wishes to be advised of such circumstances. If such conditions do not exist, these rumors should be put at an end, since they have a detrimental effect upon the operation of the program as a whole.

Mr. Stone, we are glad to have you and your people with us. I am sure the committee's staff has told you generally what we would like to hear. With that, I will turn it over to you.

STATEMENTS OF RALPH H. STONE, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS; THOMAS J. SWEENEY, ASSISTANT DEPUTY ADMINISTRAOR FOR LOAN GUARANTY; AND P. N. BROWNSTEIN, DIRECTOR, LOAN MANAGEMENT AND LIQUIDATION SERVICE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. STONE. I will make a few opening remarks. I have a prepared statement here I would like to present to the committee.

Of course, there have been a lot of stories, rumors, articles in the newspapers, about the possibility of overbuilding. We do not feel that there is overbuilding in the veterans' field at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Anywhere in the country, Mr. Stone?

Mr. STONE. Not right now, no, not in the veterans' field. Some of the FHA reports referred to overbuilding and there apparently is some overbuilding in rental units. Rental units overbuilt will probably reduce rents in rental units; a lot of our veterans then may be content to stay in the lower-priced rental units. There may not be the urgent desire to find a home. That is purely problematical.

As far as we are concerned, we have no idea of recommending regulating or anything of that sort of a downpayment or shorter term of mortgage. We feel that is entirely up to the lending people. Our job is to do what we can do to secure the homes for our our veterans. We are going to continue that policy insofar as the Veterans' Administration is concerned.

The only thing that we will present in the statement, is the reasons for the VA actions to date and the proposals we contemplate which we have thought of doing, purely, as good business. We do not feel that closing costs add to a mortgage or have any part in the value of a house. We feel they should be paid in cash at the time of the sale, or purchase of the house. That is the only thing we have in mind at all of doing.

Mr. Sweeney will give this report to you. I just want to reaffirm insofar as our policy is concerned, we have no thought of any further regulations, of curtailing or even endeavoring to curtail anything. Our great number of applications are curtailing it enough, in just making the backlog in existing work.

It is apparent from the statement by Mr. Stone that the Veterans' Administration had no intention of imposing a down-payment requirement or shortening the mortgage term.

Mr. Stone stated that these policies are entirely up to the lending people and that the Veterans' Administration's job is to secure homes for veterans. We now find the Veterans' Administration in an about-face position, imposing credit restrictions on veterans, yet no facts have been presented which indicate that previous policies had been unsound.

We know that the administration had made a big point of credit controls when it was seeking office—in fact, part of its campaign was the removal of all credit controls. Yet immediately on assuming office, the administration started clamoring for standby credit controls. An attempt was made by the President to gain authority to control housing credits in the Housing Act of 1954 and the amendment was defeated by the House of Representatives. Apparently, the administration has now decided that it will be unable to get control of housing credit in the name of the President and is seeking to impose controls through the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration. The administration's new credit control will undoubtedly make it much more difficult for many veterans to obtain a home and will seriously impair the veterans housing programs right at a time when World War II veterans must act if they do not wish to lose their guaranteed loan privileges. The administration's new credit control will undoubtedly result in a windfall to lenders through increased discounts on VA guaranteed mortgages, with the veteran ultimately paying the bill. In view of the fact that the administration has been specifically refused authority to impose such controls, there is considerable doubt in my mind whether real authority exists for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration to exercise authority which was denied the President.

Changes in the veterans housing program should be based strictly on the needs of the veterans being served by the program and should not be motivated by the desires of mortgage bankers and lending groups, and the political ambitions of the administration.

Is This Economic Imperialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N. H., Thursday, July 28, 1955:

IS THIS ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM?

American businesses engaged in foreign operations are a pet hate of the Communists and their dupes. They are commonly denounced as economic imperialists, bent on ruthlessly exploiting the peoples and resources of the world.

American oil companies which conduct operations abroad are a standard target. That's quite logical—for oil is one of the most important weapons in hot wars and cold. The Iron Curtain nations would like nothing better than to see the free world short of oil. It would be a prelude to ruinous economic and military decay.

Actually, the record of American oilmen overseas is an inspiring one. A first-class example is found in the Saudi Arabian development, conducted by the Arabian American Oil Co. Enormous problems had to be faced and conquered—at tremendous cost and effort. Success has been spectacular. Last year production was almost 348 million barrels—an all-time record. Some 141 wells were yielding crude oil as 1954 ended. During the year the company spent the equivalent of $50 million for supplies, ocean and air freight charges, and related expenses, using nondollar currencies wherever possible.

Equally spectacular has been the social and economic impact on a country which had changed but little over the centuries until the oil men came. The company has undertaken great projects aimed at raising health standards. It has introduced modern farming methods and stimulated and encouraged local crafts and enterprises. Almost 65 percent of its working force of 21,858 people is made up of Arab nationals. They receive excellent wages, along with food, housing, clothing, and recreational benefits.

In short, American enterprise has brought wealth and civilization to Saudi Arabia—even as it has developed vast oil resources the free world urgently needs.

Excerpts From Memorial Day Address by Judge James L. McCrystal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the Memorial Day address by Judge James L. McCrystal, a very able lawyer and very able judge of the Common Pleas Court of Erie County, Ohio. The excerpts from his address were published in the Sandusky Register-Star-News on June 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY JUDGE MCCRYSTAL

At Memorial Day services at Oakland Cemetery, when Judge James L. McCrystal of Erie County Common Pleas Court, delivered the main address, he spoke of the evil forces of communism and of what America must do to combat it.

He said, in part:

"On this Memorial Day when the world is besieged by the diabolical forces of communism and the free peoples of the world are being slowly enslaved, it becomes increasingly apparent that this Nation and its people are the last hope to save the world and civilization. It we cannot turn back these forces of evil the world is doomed to slavery and barbaric destruction.

"As we honor our departed comrades today let us ask ourselves some questions. What was the spirit that motivated many of our comrades to give up their lives on the battlefield? What was it they were fighting to preserve and protect? What is that faith that carried this Nation from its humble beginnings to the leadership of the world?

"Another question often asked is: What has made us the greatest Nation civilization has ever seen? Is the answer in our great industrial power, great educational systems, the vast amount of individual and collective wealth and luxury that we possess? To some short-sighted individuals these are the causes of our greatness and the means with which we can best resist the forces of communism.

"These great accomplishments of this Nation of which we are justly proud, are not the causes of our greatness but only the effect and the result of the real cause.

"History records that the men who fought with George Washington, William Henry Harrison, Oliver Perry and Andrew Jackson did not posses much of this world's goods and luxuries or have the benefit of much formal education. During this early period of our history this Nation had no material, financial or educational advantages that even remotely compared with those of England and Continental Europe.

"Indeed it was not until a century or more later that we reached the top in these fields. Yet during that same period of history over 40 million people migrated from England and Europe to the United States. This migration might still be going on at an even faster pace had we not stopped it some 30 years ago by immigration laws. This migration was the greatest and largest in the history of the world.

"Why did these people leave the land of their birth where the material advantages far outweighed those of this barren wilderness? Why did so many of our ancestors give up good positions in the Old World to come here as common laborers? What is this great force that causes men to give up their homes and their lives? The answer to all these questions is a unique combination of religious and political benefits known as Americanism.

"This great faith is distinctly American. It never existed before and now exists only in this country. It was born in Independence Hall in 1776. The Declaration of Independence is the Bible of Americanism and the rock upon which this Nation was built and the foundation upon which rests the last hope for world peace.

"In substance this Nation is committed to a belief in God, that men are created equal in the eyes of God and the law; that men possess all the rights of this world and that governments in and of themselves have no rights or powers and only possess such rights and powers as are expressly delegated to them by the people.

"Unfortunately this political philosophy does not exist in any other nation of the world and is not recognized by the United Nations.

"Our great Nation subscribes to the principle that man is created in the image and likeness of God and can best work out his own destiny on this earth when he is free from the fear of arbitrary governmental power.

"It is the essence of Americanism that man is the master of his government and not its slave. We believe that spiritual and material freedom is the only possessions worth living for and that all the wealth of the world can never be a substitute for these ideals.

"We must therefore never lose sight of our most priceless possession, the spirit of Americanism. It would gain us little to defeat communism abroad if we lost our freedom at home. Let us never make the mistake of trading our freedom for material or financial gains or any other delusion of welfare or security or ever let the Government do for us that which we can best do for ourselves. This Nation reached its greatest heights when its people were jealous of Government and suspicious of arbitrary power.

"On this solemn occasion let us ask divine guidance and promise ourselves and our posterity that we will rekindle that flame of Americanism which led this Nation through much darker days than we face now, for if that flame of Americanism ever dies, the world we know will die with it."

Schedule of Conferences With Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever possible.

When the Congress adjourns next week, I expect to return home and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the Fourth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 9 a. m. and 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Lima, Allen County: Monday and Tuesday, August 15 and 16.

Wapakoneta, Auglaize County: Wednesday, August 17.

Greenville, Darke County: Thursday, August 18.

Eaton, Preble County: Friday, August 19.

Sidney, Shelby County: Monday, August 22.

Celina, Mercer County: Tuesday, August 23.

Troy, Miami County: Wednesday, August 24.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problem with, or opinion concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district in my Piqua office any time that the Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

TVA Power Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on the TVA power financing bill, on July 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LISTER HILL BEFORE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON TVA POWER FINANCING BILL, JULY 27, 1955

It is with a deep sense of responsibility to the record of the past and a keen awareness of the challenge of the future that I appear before this committee. You are considering important legislation affecting TVA. This is, I believe, the first time in 15 years that TVA has requested an amendment of its statute to adapt that basic charter to changing times and circumstances. The managers of this public-power system have come to this committee, composed of the elected representatives of the people who are the owners of the system, and have recommended that TVA be authorized to issue bonds to finance additional power-producing facilities. They are asking the committee and the Congress to sanction the use of higher-cost capital, at the same time stating their belief that the objectives of the act can continue to be promoted even though future capital additions are financed from bond proceeds, and not solely from earnings and appropriations by the Congress.

Now I have great confidence in the staff which developed the plan approved by the board of TVA, and which is, with minor changes, embodied in the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. KERR. I feel a deep sense of gratitude to the management of TVA, for they have translated into an unrivaled record of achievement the hopes and the faith written into the TVA statute when it was adopted in 1933. I was one of the authors of the act creating TVA. Today, I am the only Member of the Congress who served on the conference committee appointed to adjust the differences between the House and Senate when the TVA Act was adopted. I am the only one

who has had the satisfaction of participating year by year in the consideration of legislation affecting TVA, first as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, later from my seat on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Although my voice alone can be heard today, I know I speak for those who were my colleagues on the committees of the conference—for the great and lonely Senator from Nebraska, George Norris, who had the vision of this vast development first and who labored unceasingly for its realization. I know I speak for the late distinguished Senator from Oregon, Charles L. McNary, who gave his unwavering support to TVA, for the late Senator Kendrick, of Wyoming—for all of them—when I say that the reality of TVA's accomplishments has outstripped our dreams. Every member of this committee knows how often the result is otherwise.

If the committee will tolerate a little reminiscence, I should like to remind you that TVA is peculiarly a child of Congress. The TVA statute was not one of the many measures recommended by the Executive and adopted in early 1933 to meet the desperate emergencies of the depression. Twice in the preceding decade legislation foreshadowing the act of 1933 had been adopted by the Congress after extended hearings and debate. Twice such legislation had failed to receive the approval of the President. It was in Congress, not in the executive departments or the Office of the President, that the ideas embodied in TVA were developed. It was in the committees and on the floor of Congress that the act was written section by section, and I must confess when I reread it, I recognize the scars which bear testimony to the long and patient construction. It is not a slick job of professional drafting. It is prolix and repetitious. Its provisions were modified, strengthened and agreed to after weeks and months of public debate. The TVA idea was not conceived in secret meetings between persons who might be benefited.

TVA was not born out of selfish or sectional interest nor was it the conception of a single political party. The leaders in the fight to conserve the war properties at Muscle Shoals for the people and to make them the nucleus of a great development were not at first representatives of the area concerned. Nor were they members of the political party dominant in the area. We of the South joined statesmen from the Great Plains and the mountainous West, and the bipartisan support which had been cemented through more than 10 years' struggle in the Congress stood firmly together in 1933 as we endeavored to create a nonpartisan, nonpolitical, independent agency to undertake the development of the resources of the Tennessee Valley region for all the people's benefit. We were deeply concerned that politics should be kept out of TVA. Congress laid down the basic policies in the act with bipartisan accord. We wanted to make certain that those policies could be changed only by Congress and after public debate. So we made TVA an independent agency, corporate in form. We gave its board staggered terms of 9 years each and required of them a special oath of belief in TVA. We added a section then unique in Federal legislation, requiring that "no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency" (sec. 6).

In many respects the agency created was unique. To the best of my knowledge, TVA is still the only Federal agency directed by its statute to see the job of resource development as a whole, to consider the interrelation of land and water, of forests and mines, to unify and give leadership to a regional effort. There was nothing particularly new about most of the responsibilities assigned to TVA, particularly those related to water control. Other rivers had been made navigable through the expenditure of public funds. Flood control was not a novelty. Electricity was being produced at dams owned by the Federal Government, and distributed by preference customers to individual consumers. Federal programs of various sorts for the conservation of natural resources were being undertaken throughout the country in 1933. The tasks were not new, but the kind of agency we created to carry out the policies adopted was different.

We departed from the conventional Federal pattern of administration in many ways. Most importantly, we meant the TVA to be a bulwark against the steady push of centralization. Even then we realized, and increasingly we know today, too many decisions are made in Washington; too many papers are required; too much is decided by remote control. The men who decide are too far from the problems. In the TVA Act we specified that the headquarters of the Board should be located in the region, away from Washington, close to the work to be undertaken. We tried our best to make the Board's authority equal to its responsibility, to place the power of decision in its hands. We did not visualize its members as errand boys subservient to centralized control in Washington. We wanted to be able to hold the Board accountable for results. So we put TVA employees outside the regular classified civil service. We placed responsibility upon the Board directly for the selection, the training, the promotion, and the compensation of its employees, for the purchase and the sale of land and equipment. We permitted the agency to sue and be sued in the courts.

We were firm about policy in the act, clear, I believe, although at times perhaps verbose, about objectives, but we were silent on details. We did not try to foresee every situation which might develop and to prescribe the course of action to be pursued. So far as power production was concerned, we made clear that power was to be regarded as a tool—just as the fertilizer the Board was directed to produce at Muscle Shoals would be a tool, just as the navigation channel would be a tool—a tool to develop the economy of the area, to raise the standard of living of the people, to expand the economic opportunities of the men and women living in the region. TVA was intended to be a demonstration for the Nation of what can happen when power is so regarded, when rates are established at levels designed to promote abundant use and general economic growth and not to provide a maximum of earnings for the power systems' owners. TVA was intended to show what can be accomplished when there is a conscious effort to keep costs down—capital costs, operating costs, all the way from the generator to the consumer.

I have been disturbed a little recently because it seems to me that these basic objectives of the TVA power program might be forgotten in preoccupation with the financial success of its operations. I am proud, of course, when it is reported that TVA has earned an average of 4 percent on the power investment over more than 20 years, for I learned long ago that generation and transmission is the least lucrative end of the power business, and that is the part owned and operated by TVA. The distribution is by the municipalities and the REA cooperatives. I am immensely gratified to know that by the end of the current fiscal year TVA will have paid into the Treasury more than $200 million out of power earnings. But I am distressed when I read testimony or hear statements which indicate that because TVA, like privately owned power systems, shows a good record of net earnings accruing to its owner, it has assumed some kind of obligation to emulate the practices of private power companies in all respects. With all the earnestness I can command, let me suggest that TVA has a higher end to serve. The devoted efforts of the many men who labored for so many years would be dishonored if TVA came to be judged by the extent to which its financial structure, and its operating costs, resemble those of privately owned utility companies. That is not the objective of TVA. The reverse should be true.

When we worked to create the statute section by section, so far as power was concerned we hoped we were building something that would stand as a beacon, a goal for the private power companies to approach. TVA was created for a public purpose. It must be judged by the degree to which that purpose is upheld. We told TVA to make electricity available to the greatest number of consumers at the lowest possible cost, and to have particular concern for the domestic and farm consumer. You know that we have seen the percentage of electrified farms rise from 3 to 93, and the use of electricity on the farm increased from under 10 million kilowatt-hours to 1.5 billion kilowatt-hours a year. We have been the total number of consumers in the area now served by TVA rise from 275,000 to 1,350,000 and the average use of domestic consumers increase from 600 kilowatt-hours to about 5,000 kilowatt-hours a year. We have seen this area become the best appliance market in the country, and we know what that means in terms of living standards. This committee has heard the record from those representatives of TVA best qualified to tell it. Those are the figures that record the degree to which objectives have been realized. Those are the objectives which must be safeguarded as TVA moves to revenue bond financing. This Nation needs the TVA power system. Power consumers all over the country need it to lead the way, to pioneer in new ways to make electricity serve the people. To show what happens when the owners of a system direct that its operation shall be wholly in the public interest. That is the idea of the yardstick.

We talked about the yardstick endlessly when the creation of TVA was under consideration. I am startled now when I hear it interpreted by private-power spokesmen from the platform, over the air, and on my television screen. If I have not exhausted the committee's patience, let me explain just how we intended the operations of TVA to benefit consumers all over the country. Let me describe the problem we were facing. In the Nation as a whole there was too little electricity and consumers were paying too much. That was generally agreed. But no one knew what people should be paying, what a fair rate should be, a rate which would cover all the costs of operation which a prudent owner would incur and provide a fair return on the investment. Then, as now, the power business was by nature a monopoly free from the disciplines of competitive business. It had to be regulated in the public interest.

But the regulatory commissions were handicapped. They were limited in jurisdiction, and frequently concerned solely with restrictions on the rate of return earned by the companies after operating costs had been met. Nobody had the data to judge whether operating costs were accurately reported or prudently incurred. There was a special mystery about the costs of power distribution as distinguished from generation and transmission.

The truth is that nobody, including the private utilities, appeared to know how their rates were established and what their costs really were. They just knew they were making money. We did not know what TVA's costs would be, nor at what level rates should be set. We simply had faith that the prin-

ciple of low rates and high use would work. We prescribed protection against some of the abuses common in private operation, discrimination between customers, for example, and we made sure our objectives were clear. But we did not attempt to fix the rates in the act and we did not know what the financial results of the policies would be. We took a chance. And TVA has proved us right. The rates established in the contracts between TVA and its distributors have covered all the costs of operation, including depreciation. They have earned a rate of return, in addition, 4 percent to TVA, an average of 8 percent to the distributors. TVA has proved that a power system can be operated as a public service and stay in the black.

Now I do not remember a single suggestion that we expected TVA in some mysterious fashion to set ideal rates which should be therefore established throughout the country. That is the notion you would get from the utility propagandists. We recognized that the cost of producing electricity varies. In the Northwest, for example, it can be produced more cheaply than in the Tennessee Valley. We had one firm conviction—that electricity should be made available to the people everywhere in this country at the lowest possible cost for each power system. And we felt TVA could help. We determined that every cost incurred by TVA and its distributors should be reported. We hoped that the Congress, the State regulatory commissions, private power companies themselves, and the public generally, would learn to compare the cost items in the several categories, to discover the reason for variables, to the end that electricity rates should be established on the basis of fact about costs, not in response to pressure or propaganda. In 1935 we amended the TVA Act to spell out exactly what we had in mind.

Let me read from the third paragraph of section 14 of the act:

"For the purpose of accumulating data useful to the Congress in the formulation of legislative policy in matters relating to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy * * * and to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies, and to the public, the Board shall keep complete accounts of its costs of generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy and shall keep a complete account of the total cost of generating and transmission facilities constructed or otherwise acquired by the Corporation * * * and a description of the major components of such costs according to such uniform system of accounting for public utilities as the Federal Power Commission has, and if it have none, then it is hereby empowered and directed to prescribe such uniform system of accounting, together with records of such other physical data and operating statistics of the Authority as may be helpful in determining the actual cost and value of services, and the practices, methods, facilities, equipment, appliances, and standards and sizes, types, location, and geographical and economic integration of plants and systems best suited to promote the public interest, efficiency, and the wider and more economical use of electric energy. Such data shall be reported to the Congress by the Board from time to time with appropriate analyses and recommendations, and so far as practicable, shall be made available to the Federal Power Commission and other Federal and State agencies which may be concerned with the administration of legislation relating to the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy."

Perhaps we were naive. I do not know whether the reports so elaborately prepared and presented annually by TVA and its distributors are used as we intended. I do know that electricity rates have come down and use has increased, while power system earnings have risen. When I see a chart showing in concentric circles the extent to which rates have been reduced in the area surrounding TVA, when I check upon the financial reports of the companies serving those areas, I see the yardstick at work, if not in the studious and technical way we expected it would be, surely in a highly effective manner. When I remember that the electrification of rural America through REA had its beginning in TVA's first organization of farm electric cooperatives, I see the yardstick at work. When I contemplate the vast quantities of power provided by private companies for vital installations of defense and at less than their normal charge for industrial loads, I know the yardstick has been used, however grudgingly.

From this long background I testify today. I hope this committee will resist the temptation to limit the flexibility the agency will require to offset, at least in part, some of the costs of private financing by the more precise timing of system additions which freedom from the appropriation process should make possible. I do not believe that every issue of bonds should require the same slow process of justification and approval, that an appropriation request requires. These are revenue bonds. They will rely for their security upon a continuation of efficient management. I am deeply opposed to the suggestion that the power of decision should rest in the Secretary of the Treasury, not in the Board of TVA. The Secretary of the Treasury is not responsible for the TVA power system. He has not sworn to promote the principles of the TVA Act. This goes to the heart of TVA. I hope the committee will reject the suggestion. I am against the adoption of a policy under which the Federal Government as owner would demand excessive withdrawals of cash. I am for the Kerr bill. I believe that its adoption would be in harmony with the public purposes of the TVA, and I believe it embodies better business principles than do the revisions proposed by the Bureau of the Budget. It gives to management authority sufficient to discharge its responsibilities.

If this committee approves and Congress adopts the Kerr bill we can continue to hold the Board of TVA accountable for results. If we accept the Budget revisions we will have our choice of culprits if this power system fails to lead the way in responsible management in the future. We can blame the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committees of House or Senate, or the the Treasury. We will dilute the very quality which has brought TVA world-wide esteem. We will be giving this public power system something less than the best. We will be inviting delay and confusion. We will be going backward, not ahead. We must advance. We are not through pioneering.

Just 2 years ago I made an extended visit to TVA. I visited laboratories and workshops, multipurpose dams and giant steam plants. I talked to workmen handling great earth-moving equipment, to engineers and draftsmen. I met with mayors and businessmen, with editors and farmers. I wanted to see for myself to illuminate the mass of documents I read about TVA every year. I visited projects in Mississippi, in Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Alabama.

My heart was stirred every time we visited the majestic structures which hold the waters back until the river's flow can be usefully employed for man. At each one I stopped to read the simple plaque of dedication. The names of the members of the Board are not honored there. No engineer, or architect, is listed for credit. Each one has the same inscription—just one line which says: "Built for the people of the United States."

This is the people's power system, designed and built and operated for their benefit. TVA has earned our confidence and trust. TVA must be preserved.

Remanufacture of Imported Watches To Increase Their Jewel Count

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in view of recent discussions concerning the proposed bill H. R. 7466, which would prohibit the remanufacture of imported watches to increase their jewel count, the following is an excellent analysis made by the Tariff Commission under date of July 28, 1955. This report points out a number of weaknesses in the bill and stresses that it would establish a new precedent in customs procedures as well as "a departure from the general principle of encouraging processing of imported articles in the United States." The study further warns that "in practical effect, such increases in rates of duty would be the equivalent of internal taxes," that "the administration of the measure would involve added burdens not only on customs officers but also on importers" and that even "the title of the bill is incorrect."

I ask unanimous consent to have this analysis made a part of the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, July 28, 1955.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON H. R. 7466 AND H. R. 7467, IDENTICAL BILLS TO AMEND PARAGRAPH 367 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930 WHICH DEFINES SUBSTITUTES FOR JEWELS IN IMPORTED WATCH MOVEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The proposed legislation, if enacted, would amend paragraph 367 (i) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to read as follows (new language italicized):

"(i) For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph 368 the term 'jewel' includes substitutes for jewels. *For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'substitutes for jewels' includes, without limitation, each place in any movement, mechanism, device, instrument, assembly, or subassembly where a jewel (as defined in the preceding sentence) is placed or inserted and serves a mechanical purpose as a frictional bearing, whether such jewel is so placed or inserted in a foreign trade zone (notwithstanding the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C., secs. 81a–81u)), or in a bonded warehouse or otherwise in customs custody, or (except for the purposes of subparagraph (b) of this paragraph and paragraph 368 (b)) elsewhere within the United States within 3 years after the date of release from customs custody. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make regulations to enforce or otherwise carry out the provisions of this subparagraph, which regulations may include provision for any bond,*

and for any declaration or other form of proof, he deems necessary."

The amendment would "enter into force as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this act."

The proposed legislation is designed as a deterrent to "upjeweling" imported watch movements in the United States, which practice domestic producers of jeweled watch movements claim to be prejudicial to the sale of their watches having more than 17 jewels. This practice involves the importation of jeweled movements and converting them in the United States into movements with a larger number of jewels. A number of years ago, a practice developed of upjeweling in the United States imported movements with 1 jewel to movements with 7 jewels, but subsequent trade-agreement reductions in rates of duty and rising costs of such upjeweling brought the practice to an end. In recent years, upjeweling has been confined principally to converting important movements with 17 jewels to movements with as many as 25.

The earlier practices of upjeweling involved rather substantial processing in the United States. The imported movement had to be disassembled, the plates and bridges jeweled, markings changed, the parts reassembled into a movement, and the movement timed. In recent years upjeweling has been facilitated by technological developments in the watchmaking field, such as the Duo-Fix and similar devices. The utilization of such devices not only has facilitated upjeweling but also has improved the quality of the finished product.

RELATIONSHIP OF UPJEWELING TO TARIFF TREATMENT OF IMPORTED WATCH MOVEMENTS

The only important incentive to upjeweling at present is the wide disparity in tariff rates applicable to movements with 17 or fewer jewels and those with more than 17 jewels. The attached table 1 sets forth the rates of duty prescribed in paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified, on watch movements, assemblies, and subassemblies, and parts. The rates on all movements having 17 or fewer jewels (or none at all) vary according to the size of the movement, jewel count, the number of adjustments, whether the movement is designed to operate for a period in excess of 47 hours without rewinding, or is self-winding, or could accommodate a self-winding device. The highest rate possible on a 17-jewel movement totals $9.10, computed as follows:

On a movement not over 0.6 inch in width, inclusive of 7 jewels	$2.50
For the 10 additional jewels	1.35
For 9 adjustments [1]	4.50
For self-winding feature	.75
	9.10

[1] Includes 1 adjustment for isochronism, 2 for temperature, and 6 for position. Although 6 position adjustments are possible, even very high-quality watches ordinarily have no more than 5 adjustments.

Most watches that enter the country are marked unadjusted and are being admitted without the assessment of adjustment duties. All movements having more than 17 jewels are dutiable at $10.75 each, regardless of size, adjustments, etc. As long as the duty on a movement with more than 17 jewels appreciably exceeds that on a movement with 17 jewels, plus the cost of converting such movement into 1 with 18 or more jewels, the incentive to upjewel will exist.

The Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department issued a ruling (T. D. 53753) on March 16, 1955, that watch movements specially engineered, constructed, designed, or prepared to facilitate upjeweling after importation by omission of jewels and substitution therefor of metal caps, bearings, bushings, or bouchons contain "substitutes for jewels" within the meaning of paragraph 367 (i) in each position customarily occupied by a genuine or synthetic jewel, but in which a metal cap, bearing, bushing, or bouchon has been placed at the time the movements were prepared for exportation to the United States. The ruling, which became effective in June, may deter certain upjeweling practices encountered in recent years. However, it is no deterrent whatsoever with respect to other practices involving movements which, at the time of importation, have no "substitute" jewels in the places in the movements where the real or synthetic jewels are ultimately installed after importation into the United States.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The bills under consideration propose to meet the problem of upjeweling by defining the term "substitutes for jewels" in paragraph 367 (i) to include "each place" in a movement where a jewel or substitute for a jewel "is placed or inserted and serves a mechanical purpose as a frictional bearing, whether such jewel is so placed or inserted in a foreign trade zone * * *, or in a bonded warehouse or otherwise in customs custody, or * * * elsewhere within the United States within 3 years after the date of release from customs custody." Approaching the problem in terms of a solution based upon a completely arbitrary definition of the term "substitutes for jewels" is both indirect and confusing. A substitute for a jewel is a "thing," not a "place." The present definition of "jewel" in paragraph 367 (i) as including "substitutes for jewels," when coupled with the proposed definition of "substitutes for jewels" as including "each place" in a movement where a "jewel" is inserted or placed, literally could mean that a "jewel" is a "place" where a "place" is inserted or placed. This absurdity could be overcome and the substance in the first two sentences of the proposed paragraph 367 (i) could be more clearly and accurately stated if the following language was substituted:

"(i) For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph 368, (1) the term 'jewel' includes substitutes for jewels, and (2) any duties assessable shall be computed on the basis of the total number of jewels, so defined, as are incorporated into any movement, mechanism, device, instrument, assembly, or subassembly at any time prior to, or within 3 years after, the date of release from customs custody of such movement, mechanism, device, instrument, assembly, or subassembly."

However, even if the language of the bills was clarified as above indicated, there would still be involved a departure from the general principle that imported articles are classified for tariff purposes according to their character and condition at the time of importation. To the extent that the proposed legislation would increase duty rates by reason of upjeweling in the United States, the duty would not be one which is imposed upon, or by reason of, the importation of the movements, but rather one which is imposed upon domestic processing of the imported movements. This, again, represents a departure from the general principle of encouraging processing of imported articles in the United States. In practical effect, such increases in rates of duty would be the equivalent of internal taxes.

The Commission is not unmindful of the various provisions in the tariff laws which make the actual use of imported articles in the United States determinative of their tariff status. As far as the Commission is aware, however, all such provisions which have been enacted in the past grant preferred tariff treatment to certain classes of goods used (or processed) in certain ways in the United States and are clearly distinguishable from a provision such as is proposed in the bills under consideration which would affirmatively impose increased rates of duty on imported articles by reason of processing applied in this country after their release from customs custody.

To the extent that the proposed legislation would provide for increased rates of duty on watch movements by reason of their being upjeweled in the United States, such legislation, if enacted, would be inconsistent with obligations of the United States under the Swiss trade agreement, unless the President took the action which is provided for in section 2 of the bills.

Since almost any of the watch movements being imported with not over 17 jewels could be upjeweled in the United States after release from customs custody to movements with over 17 jewels, the administration of the measure would involve added burdens not only on customs officers but also on importers, including those who had no intention of participating in, or being a party to, upjeweling transactions.

Effectively plugging up tariff loopholes is often difficult. Legislation may overcome tariff avoidance practices previously encountered, but may not sufficiently anticipate potential new practices which importers may devise. The Commission wonders, for example, whether defining a substitute for a jewel as a "place" in a movement where a jewel is "placed or inserted" is adequate to provide for a domestic processing involving the complete substitution in the United States of a bridge with, say, two or more jewels for a jewelless bridge in the imported movement. In such a situation, the question would be whether jewels per se are placed or inserted in the movement. It also seems possible that importers might find in the provisions of paragraph 1615 (g), Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, a feasible method of avoiding the full impact of the $10.75 duty on watch movements having more than 17 jewels. Paragraph 1615 (g), as amended, provides for partial exemption from duty in the case of (1) any article returned to the United States after having been exported for repairs or alterations, and (2) any article of metal (except precious metal) manufactured in the United States or subjected to a process of manufacture in the United States, exported for further processing, and thereafter returned to the United States for further processing. Articles within the purview of paragraph 1615 (g) are dutiable only on the value of the processing done abroad.

The title of the bills is incorrect. It indicates that paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930 defines substitutes for jewels in imported watch movements. Paragraph 367 contains no such definition at the present time.

TABLE 1.—*Rates of duty on watch movements, assemblies and subassemblies, and parts*

Paragraph No	Description	Full rate [1]	Reduced rate [2]
367 (a)	Watch movements, and time-indicating, time-keeping, or time-measuring devices, instruments, and mechanisms, whether or not designed to be carried or worn on or about the person; all the foregoing, if under 1.77 inches wide, whether or not in cases, containers, or housings:		
(2)	Having no jewels or only 1 jewel and in width—		
	Not over 0.6 inch	$1.50 each	$1.35 each.
	Over 0.6 but not over 0.8 inch	$1.35 each	$1.12½ each.
	Over 0.8 but not over 0.9 inch	$1.20 each	$1.12½ each.
	Over 0.9 but not over 1 inch	$1.05 each	$1.05 each.
	Over 1 but not over 1.2 inches	93 cents each	93 cents each.
	Over 1.2 but not over 1.5 inches	84 cents each	84 cents each.
	Over 1.5 inches	75 cents each	
(1)	Having over 1 but not over 17 jewels and in width—		
	Not over 0.6 inch	$2.50 each	$2.50 each.
	Over 0.6 but not over 0.8 inch	$2.25 each	$2.02½ each.
	Over 0.8 but not over 0.9 inch	$2 each	$2 each.
	Over 0.9 but not over 1 inch	$1.75 each	$1.75 each.
	Over 1 but not over 1.2 inches	$1.55 each	$1.35 each.
	Over 1.2 but not over 1.5 inches	$1.40 each	$1.35 each.
	Over 1.5 inches	$1.25 each	$1.25 each.
(3)	Any of the foregoing having over 7 jewels shall be subject to an additional duty of.	15 cents for each jewel over 7	13½ cents for each jewel over 7.
(4)	Any of the foregoing shall be subject for each adjustment of whatever kind (treating adjustment to temperature as two adjustments), in accordance with the marking as hereinafter provided for, to an additional duty of.	$1 for each adjustment	50 cents for each adjustment.
(5)	Any of the foregoing constructed or designed to operate for over 47 hours without rewinding, or if self-winding, or if a self-winding device may be incorporated therein, shall be subject to an additional duty of.	$1 each	75 cents each.
	Any of the foregoing having under 7 jewels and having a bushing or its equivalent (other than a substitute for a jewel) in any position customarily occupied by a jewel shall be subject to.	The full rates specified above in respect of such article.	
(6)	Having over 17 jewels	$10.75 each	
(b)	All the foregoing shall have cut, die sunk, or engraved, conspicuously and indelibly on 1 or more of the bridges or top plates: The name of the country of manufacture; the name of the manufacturer or purchaser; in Arabic numerals and in words the number of jewels, if any, serving a mechanical purpose as frictional bearings; and, in Arabic numerals and in words, the number and classes of adjustments, or, if unadjusted, the word "unadjusted."		
(c) (1)	Parts for any of the foregoing (except bottom or pillar plates or their equivalent, bridges or their equivalent, and jewels) imported in the same shipment with complete movements, devices, instruments, or mechanisms provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph (whether or not suitable for use in such articles), but not including all the parts in such shipment which exceed in value 4 percent of the value of such complete articles).	45 percent ad valorem	
(2)	Bottom or pillar plates, or their equivalent	½ the duty for the complete article for which suitable.	½ the current duty for the complete article.
(3)	Assemblies and subassemblies (unless dutiable under (c) (1) above) consisting of 2 or more parts or pieces of metal or other material fastened or joined together:		
	Balance assemblies	50 cents per assembly	35 cents per assembly.
	For the purposes of this subdivision a balance assembly shall be an assembly consisting of a balance staff, balance wheel, and hairspring, with or without other parts commercially known as parts of a balance assembly.		
	Other:		
	For any jewels therein	15 cents per jewel	9 cents per jewel.
	For any bottom or pillar plates or their equivalent therein	The rate specified in (c) (2) above	The current rate in (c) (2) above.
	For other parts or pieces of metal or other material fastened or joined together therein (bimetallic balance wheels which are not parts of balance assemblies, and mainsprings with riveted ends, each to be considered as 1 part or piece).	3 cents for each part or piece	2 cents for each part or piece.
	The duty on any assembly or subassembly shall be	Not more than the duty for the complete article for which suitable, and not less than 45 percent ad valorem.	Same rule applied to current rates.
(4)	Other parts (except jewels)	65 percent ad valorem	55 percent ad valorem.
(d)	Jewels suitable for use in any article dutiable under this paragraph or par. 368, or in any compass or meter.	10 percent ad valorem	
(e)	Dials under 1.77 inches wide, for any article provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph, and imported separately.	cents each and 45 percent ad valorem	2½ cents each and 45 percent ad valorem.
	Dials for any articles provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph, whether or not attached thereto, shall have cut, die sunk, engraved, or stamped, conspicuously and indelibly thereon the name of the country of manufacture; which marking, if the dial is imported attached to any of the aforesaid articles, shall be placed on the face of the dial in such manner as not to be obscured by any part of the case, container, or housing.		
(f)	Cases, containers, or housings designed or suitable for containing any article provided for in subpar. (a) of this paragraph, whether or not containing such articles, and whether complete or incomplete, finished or unfinished (except containers used for shipping purposes only):		
(1)	Made of gold or platinum	75 cents each and 45 percent ad valorem	75 cents each and 30 percent ad valorem.
(2)	In part of gold, platinum, or silver, or wholly of silver	40 cents each and 45 percent ad valorem	40 cents each and 30 percent ad valorem.
(3)	Set with precious, semiprecious, or imitation precious or semiprecious stones, or prepared for the setting of such stones.	do	Do.
(4)	Of base metal and not containing gold, platinum, or silver	20 cents each and 45 percent ad valorem	10 cents each and 25 percent ad valorem.
(5)	Any of the foregoing cases, containers, or housings, if enameled, shall be subject to an additional duty of.	15 percent ad valorem	
(g)	The foregoing cases, containers, and housings shall have cut, die sunk, or engraved, conspicuously and indelibly on the inside of the back cover, the name in full of the manufacturer or purchaser and the name of the country of manufacture.		
(h)	For the purposes of this paragraph the width of any movement, device, instrument, or mechanism shall be the shortest surface dimension through the center of the bottom or pillar plate, or its equivalent, not including in the measurement any portion not essential to the functioning of the movement or other article.		
(i)	For the purposes of this paragraph and par. 368 the term "jewel" includes substitutes for jewels.		
(j)	An article required by this paragraph to be marked shall be denied entry unless marked in exact conformity with the requirements of this paragraph.		

[1] Rate provided for in Tariff Act of 1930.

[2] Rate currently in effect under Swiss trade agreement. This column includes increased rates proclaimed by the President in July 1954 on most of the movements in par. 367 (a), as a result of "escape clause" proceedings under sec. 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

The Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], last week conducted hearings on the freight car shortage, which this year will be the worst in several years. Yesterday the New York Times carried a detailed story on the shortage. The gist of the Times' findings are indicated by the subheads, which say: "Grain Movement, Industrial Boom Catch Railways With Their Rolling Stock Down. Shortage Is Growing. Peak Is Expected By October—Belated Race Is On To Rebuild Carrier Fleets."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times story, entitled "Missing Boxcars: "Who's To Blame?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSING BOXCARS: WHO'S TO BLAME?—GRAIN MOVEMENT, INDUSTRIAL BOOM CATCH RAILWAYS WITH THEIR ROLLING STOCK DOWN—SHORTAGE IS GROWING—PEAK EXPECTED BY OCTOBER—BELATED RACE IS ON TO REBUILD CARRIER FLEETS

(By Robert B. Bedingfield)

Just how big is the freight car shortage—if any?

The Interstate Commerce Commission has just called upon the railroads to cooperate in a national effort to get maximum service from the existing supply of freight cars—roughly, 1,700,000. This seems to assume a major shortage of equipment.

The same conclusion has been suggested in recent weeks by some Congressmen who have been denouncing the railroad for standing still in freight car numbers while accepting $1,597 million in Federal tax incentives for the 330,500 cars they have ordered since 1951.

These observations notwithstanding, the railroad freight car shortage is not all that it appears—in dimensions, cause or probable duration. There's no disputing, however, that the Nation's railroads in recent weeks have experienced a demand for freight cars that is greater than at any time during the past few years.

Even the Association of American Railroads, the carriers' official spokesman, acknowledges a shortage of 11,961 cars in the week ended July 9. This shortage was distributed among 41 of the 130 Class I roads. (These are railroads that have operating revenues of $1 million or more a year. They handle about 98 percent of the Nation's rail freight business.)

PEAK DUE IN OCTOBER

Some AAR officials think the shortage may increase progressively during the next 2 or 3 months until it reaches a mximum of about 20,000 cars in October. Then the corn crop will be moving and supplies for the country's annual big Christmas shopping spree will be speeding to store counters. The last time the railroads were so tight for equipment was in 1952, when Korean war supplies were being rushed to the West Coast.

The current tight freight car situation centers mainly in box cars, especially in the better grades and special sizes used for hauling merchandise, and more particularly the type of manufactured goods that moves in less-than-carload lots.

This is the class of freight that interstate truckers have been most successful in getting away from the railroads. The main reasons for its return to the rails are the months-long trucking strike on the west coast, settled only recently, and the shorter trucking strike in southern New England, just ended last week.

The latter strike was reflected in an increase of 38 percent in traffic of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad this July over July, 1954. But those who know him best agree that Patrick B. McGinnis, New Haven's president—who was a rail statistician in Wall Street long before he became a railroad president—is not a man to buy a fleet of new $6,000 boxcars just to stand by for possible truck strikes.

STEEL BOOM BIG FACTOR

Box cars also have been in peak demand in recent months as a result of the unusually heavy production schedules of the automobile and construction industries. This has lifted steel production to a record level and increased coal production by more than 40 million tons for the year to date. A relatively tight situation in hopper cars has resulted and there have been some shortages of gondolas.

The box car situation is the only real worry spot, however, and it has become more acute as the grain harvest has rolled north.

This year's wheat crop is not the record-breaker of some other recent years, largely because of drought in the Southwest. The railroads under normal traffic conditions probably would not encounter too much difficulty in handling it with the existing freight car supply. But conditions in wheat are not normal by any means. The Government's crop loan program has resulted in the storing of so many hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat that the 1955 crop has made and will continue to make a lot of false stops and starts.

Grain that normally would go into country elevators around Kansas, for example, and later be transshipped to flour mills in the North and East, has reached Kansas and stopped on the sidings. Elevators there already are overflowing with grain—grain stored in 1954. As a result, the boxcar becomes a warehouse until some arrangement can be worked out by the Government for relocating the old grain. One of the favorite storage spots again has been the mothball fleet in the Hudson River and on Puget Sound and the Columbia River.

This year there has also been a pressing need for cars to move several million bushels of grain from the Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri growing areas into Oklahoma and Texas, where drought has made some storage space available.

The railroads themselves, of course, can't entirely escape blame for car shortages. Only 28,405 new freight cars were placed in service by domestic carriers last year, the smallest number since 1939. The backlog of unfilled orders dropped to 13,624 cars by the end of 1954, from roughly 8 times that figure 3 years earlier. This, coupled with a higher rate of retirements than had been experienced in 3 prior years, resulted in the car fleet shrinking to 1,735,553 cars.

This was just about the number of cars the carriers had in 1950, when they agreed with the Government that for an economy based on partial mobilization the minimum goal should be 1,850,000 cars.

The carrying capacity of the railroads was further reduced last year by the fact that, with carloadings at their lowest levels in 16 years, many roads not only cut capital outlays but also slashed maintenance expenditures to the bone. As a result, a large percentage of the freight car fleets—and particularly those of some of the big eastern systems—lapsed into "bad order."

While a 5 percent bad order is considered normal, by April 1 this year more than 17 percent of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad's 86,603 cars were unserviceable and 16.4 percent of the Pennsylvania's 181,847 cars were out of operation. The New York Central, while it had only about 8 percent of its fleet in bad order on April 1, had scrapped more than 16,000 cars during 1954.

As traffic has increased, these railroads have announced sharply stepped-up repair programs and, with scores of other roads, have begun ordering new freight cars in volume. This reflects a decision reached in Chicago during June at a special meeting of members of the Association of American Railroads. The agreement was that the carriers before the year was out would place orders for 38,000 additional cars. Through June their orders had amounted to 27,102. Estimates are that another 11,000 cars had been ordered in July alone.

Meanwhile, the railroads have been wary of talking too much about the shortage, its cause or its cure. They want to hang onto the privilege to write off for income tax purposes in 5 years the cost of new equipment. This incentive has effectively allowed them to defer paying taxes on the increased earnings made possible by new equipment.

The increase itself is merely relative. The 3.2 percent on investment earned by the railroads in 1954 was about one-third the return enjoyed by many manufacturing industries.

Codification of Postal Service Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the bill H. R. 7768, to revise, codify, and enact into law title 39, United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service." This bill has been prepared under the supervision of Hon. Abe McGregor Goff, Solicitor of the Post Office Department, by Mr. Louis J. Doyle, Mr. Wendell W. Campbell, and Mr. Adam G. Wenchel of his office, in cooperation with the Willis subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary through its law revision counsel, Dr. Charles J. Zinn, and the assistant law revision counsel, Mr. Cyril F. Brickfield. I am glad to acknowledge the close harmonious cooperation of the Department with our committee.

The bill is intended to restate in one place all the existing laws relating to the postal service. During the coming recess it will be subjected to further study by the committee staff, the Post Office Department and other interested agencies, and if the need for further refinement develops, it will be taken care of before the bill is reported. The bill has been submitted to the Congress by means of an executive communication from Hon. Arthur E. Summerfield, Post-

master General, and the Department is aware that certain of the sections may need to be rewritten. The purpose of submitting the bill at this time is to have something formal before the committee upon which departmental reports may be requested with the view of having a perfect bill at the beginning of the next session.

Reduced Taxes Possible Under Hoover Economies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reduced Taxes Possible Under Hoover Economies," which was published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCED TAXES POSSIBLE UNDER HOOVER ECONOMIES

Throughout the extensive and detailed work of both Hoover Commissions, and especially during the course of the second and last one, the possibility of large and substantial Government economies has been inherent.

This is an issue that has never lost its importance, even though the interest it has attracted has more often been so much greater than any actual accomplishment resulting from it.

Senator BYRD, who since 1933 has never allowed the Nation to forget the wastefulness and prodigality of the Federal Government, has recently pointed out again just what this continued overspending means to us.

Perhaps the greatest direct evil is reflected in the loss of the purchasing power of our dollar. From 1940 through 1952, Senator BYRD has pointed out, the dollar lost 4 cents in value on an average in each of those years—48 cents in all.

This has meant an equally rapid rise in the cost of living and an equally restrictive and repressive effect upon all of those people who work for a living and especially those—mostly widows and others more or less dependent on a stable economy for economic safety—who must rely upon pensions, small fixed incomes, and even relief for existence.

This upheaval in our economy has forced wholesale readjustments. But more than this it has faced all of us with the dangers of temporary or permanent insolvency and threatened the value of our basic virtues of frugality and thrift, the foundations of our economic independence.

It has been accompanied by unconscionably high tax rates, and has made it impossible, even in these times of our greatest peacetime prosperity and prospects to reduce our Federal debt or to relieve our people of any substantial part of the scandalously heavy Federal tax burden.

Former President Hoover has said definitely that should a reasonable proportion of the recommendations his commission has made ever become effective, taxes could be reduced by several billions overall, and the Government still have ample funds with which to operate its necessary functions, including defense and the more and more extensive social obligations facing it.

This is a point for some serious public consideration. More importantly it is a point for some serious congressional and executive consideration.

The point will be resisted by those who now benefit from the waste and overlapping and completely unnecessary expenditures.

The good of the Nation, however, demands that some action be taken on the Hoover recommendations and that the country be saved from unnecessary future hardship because of current squanderings.

Conveyance of Certain Land to City of Milwaukee, Wis.

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is very simple. It is offered in support of our present foreign policy as well as to protect civil rights.

As you may know, I have not been so enthusiastically in support of our foreign policy as advocated by our former Secretary of State, our present Secretary of State, as some others.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. That includes the present administration, I assume?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Insofar as the present administration and the Secretary of State follow Dean Acheson in giving away certain of our liberties, surrendering our national independence, if it should be the policy, my answer would be "Yes."

Now if I may get back to the explanation which the Speaker so kindly thought I should make to the Members. Inasmuch as we have spent billions upon billions of dollars in trying to win the friendship of other nations and other places, it seems to me that recent activities in connection with the port of Milwaukee should have some publicity, and that the port of Milwaukee should be open, not closed to our friends and allies abroad as well as to our own people from other States.

On April 14, 1954, the Kohler Co., near Sheboygan was struck by the UAW-CIO. That is Walter Reuther's outfit—the same Reuther who with tongue in check, not so long ago announced that he was a friend of the farmer. His principal lieutenant, the secretary-treasurer of that organization, Emil Mazey, who has been a professional organizer since 1933, has been over in Sheboygan directing the activities of the strikers under the supervision of Mr. Reuther. There have been some 500 instances of violation of the law. Mazey, as far as I know, although he has been involved in many, and many a scene of violence and rioting, was convicted over there for the first time, something new, something amazing, something startling in labor circles—for seldom are the "brains" prosecuted or convicted. Usually it is just the poor misinformed, misguided picket—or innocent bystander who is nabbed and hauled off to jail. Then what happened? The plant continued operations and at a profit—and with local workers—and in spite of the failure of a mayor and a governor to protect the civil rights of the people of the city and State the pickets did not close the plant because they were not able to.

Then, just recently, 2 ships from abroad came over the Atlantic from our friends in Norway loaded with clay, which is absolutely necessary if the factory is to continue operations. They came over and 1 of them attempted to dock in Sheboygan, which is the lake port for the plant. It could not discharge the cargo because of the picket line and because the Socialist mayor would not give the people, who wanted to unload the ship, protection. Nor would the governor protect his own people while unloading. So that ship sailed away and it went to Milwaukee to the harbor where this land, which is owned by the United States, is located, and which is proposed to be given to the city of Milwaukee. What I am trying to do by this amendment is to make sure that the United States Government by making this gift to the city of Milwaukee, and putting this United States property under the control of the city of Milwaukee, must not by implication, lend support to this affront to Norway. Where is the State Department? What has it done to remedy this insult, this affront to Norway?

After the ship could not unload in Milwaukee, it went to Montreal. There it was unloaded. Then the cargo was put on freight cars and the railroad company attempted to send the clay down through the western side of Michigan via the Northwestern Railway. That is where I became interested. The union in Muskegon, still under the direction of Walter Reuther, a great patriot, or is he, attempted to prevent those cars going through Muskegon on the railroad, the Pennsylvania system, on down through the Fourth Congressional District. Well, they did not succeed. They finally moved the cars over to Sheboygan. I hope the gentleman from Texas, sitting in the front row here [Mr. PATMAN]—I hope you are getting this now—because while this has nothing to do with the Federal Reserve System, it does have something to do with our interstate and foreign commerce and the Federal Reserve will not be any good unless we can continue to carry on this intra and interstate commerce not only in this country between the States but with foreign governments. The cars got over again to Sheboygan and again the mayor failed to protect the railroad company in its effort to make delivery.

But more about Reuther, his lawlessness, and the harm he does the country, next week.

Conveyance of Certain Land To City of Milwaukee, Wis.

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that if I had known a point of order would be made, I would have objected to consideration of the bill. The bill provides that the United States convey a small piece of land which is adjacent to the harbor in Milwaukee. The amendment provides that title shall not pass until city authorities open the harbor to domestic and foreign commerce. An amendment is germane when it is akin to or relevant to the subject matter of the bill—Speaker Carlisle, March 17, 1880, Cannon's Procedure, pages 196–201. With as much reason might it be said that an amendment that the city should not take title until it paid the purchase price was not germane. But I will try to get my point across. When the cars to which reference has been made got back in Sheboygan, the pickets went out on the city streets where the rails crossed the street and stopped the cars from going to the plant. Mind you, this was the cargo that came from Norway—think of it, from our friends, our international friends, our allies, if you please. A fine way to create and hold good will, friendship. Milwaukee would not let a ship from our friends discharge cargo of dirt-clay here in an American port. A fine way to promote foreign trade. Perhaps if the clay had been unloaded a cargo of dairy products might have been sold by Wisconsin farmers—or a shipload of Milwaukee beer. Now if they sent those ships over to Grand Rapids where my colleague from the Fifth District [Mr. FORD] lives, or to the port of Holland, or Ottawa, or over in my district, they would get it unloaded because over there we enforce the law, and if they sent it down to St. Joe or Benton Harbor, they would get it unloaded. When someone said to me: "Well, the factory is not there," my reply was, "They can move their factory, and we will give them protection from these goon squads whether it is Walter Reuther, Mazey, or some Communist who directs the goon activities under the advice of the international officers.

Just recently due to the publicity which was given to this situation by the Chicago Tribune and the Milwaukee Journal, just recently, the Governor, whose name happens to be Kohler, but who has no financial interest in the Kohler firm, just recently he has said that if necessary he will call out the State troops to protect citizens and their property.

Now, it is a strange situation, is it not, when we have to call out State troops to promote international good will? But think, now, think of the situation where we not only with our billions of dollars but the services of our soldiers are trying to show to the other people of the world, trying to demonstrate to them our freedom and convince them we want them to be free; yet in Wisconsin they cannot unload their own cargoes, that our citizens are not free to handle the merchandise they send across the sea. What kind of capital do you suppose the Russians and the Communists will make out of that situation? Cite that situation as the lack of freedom here? Russia seeks foreign trade—we reject it—at the order of a union boss.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. The trouble we are having in Wisconsin has been stimulated from your State.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is right about that. Walter Reuther and Emil Mazey and our Governor, Mennen Williams, a Democratic Governor, who has refused the extradition of one of those goons, stands back of the Wisconsin goon squads.

Mr. LAIRD. Our Governor has shown very strong leadership in the past 2 weeks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just lately he has seen the handwriting on the wall; but our Democrat Governor, Mennen Williams, will not honor the request for the extradition of one of those goons who is harboring in Michigan, the city of refuge, not in the Fourth District, but over on the east side, which is the city of refuge for goon squads and racketeers.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman spoke of the other world a moment ago. Is he speaking of one of these satellites 250 miles out of our orbit?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is a new way to spend money. I had not heard of that until yesterday. But if we follow our present trend the goons, the racketeers, the extortionists of labor will control whatever situation may arise.

Settlement of Texas City, Tex., Disaster Claims

SPEECH
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has more merit to it than any claim bill which has come before the Committee on the Judiciary since I have been a member of that committee. Justice, equity, and compassion, it seems to me, compel this Congress to adopt this bill. If there is anything wrong with the bill, I would say it is the restrictions that the committee placed upon it; that is, restrictions on the amount of individual recovery. For my own part, I think it is rather unconscionable to put a limit on the personal injury damages such as has been placed in this bill, but, of course, I am obliged to bow to the will of the majority of the committee in that respect.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Is there any doubt whatsoever in the gentleman's mind on the proposition that if this explosion had occurred and the operator had been a private corporation, the private corporation would have been liable?

Mr. HYDE. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind in that respect. As a matter of fact, I put the same question to the attorneys for the Government who appeared before our committee and testified on this bill, some of whom testified at one point in opposition to it, and they did not express any doubt in their minds, either, in that respect.

Mr. WILLIS. I might say that I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, too, and that is my opinion. But I think that is very significant and should be considered by the House, that had the plant been in the operation of an individual corporation, there would be no question as to where the responsibility would lie for the accident.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true also that the Committee on the Judiciary as a matter of grace rather than as a matter of law has allowed these claims; and furthermore, the charge that is made that the insurance companies would profit is unfounded; that is, the insurance companies will not profit by this bill?

Mr. HYDE. That is absolutely right. The insurance companies will not profit. I think one of the misunderstandings about claims bills before this Congress is the matter of legal liability. If there is any legal liability then claims bills would not come to Congress. They would be adjudicated in court.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. The injured party has already exhausted his remedy at law, has he not?

Mr. HYDE. That is true.

Mr. BRAY. And this is not in the nature of any legal claim against the United States. It is a matter of relief according to who was responsible for the accident?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, that is right. I might say, however, that there probably would be some dispute here as to the matter of blame, but it is not a question of blame, and I shall try to explain that if I get sufficient time.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Is this claim based on any negligence on the part of the Government of the United States?

Mr. HYDE. No.

Mr. HAND. It is a matter of grace?

Mr. HYDE. This is a matter of justice.

Mr. HAND. Has the committee considered a similar situation in South Amboy, N. J.?

Mr. HYDE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman. We will see that you do.

Mr. HYDE. We will be glad to consider it.

I might say, on the question of negligence, that issue is not before the Congress. However, the fact remains that the courts have said that here was a product being shipped under a Government program, and it was a highly dangerous product, which cannot be denied, because the product exploded and killed over 560 people and injured over 3,000. As a matter of fact, the Supreme Court in that connection said this:

Following the disaster, of course, no one could fail to be impressed with the blunt fact that FGAN would explode.

In a dissenting opinion, the Court, on a matter of fact—this is not a question of opinion, now, but a matter of fact—said:

In addition, there was a considerable history over a period of years of unexplained fires and explosions involving such ammonium nitrate.

So you have a dangerous product, dangerously explosive, being shipped under a Government program and exploding in this little city of Texas City. It did all of this damage. To my mind it cannot be distinguished in any manner whatsoever from the Port Chicago disaster where an ammunition ship exploded and this Congress voted to pay claims in that case.

Disgraceful Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the San Antonio Light of Saturday, July 30, 1955, entitled "Disgraceful Performance." This editorial has to do with the action of the House in defeating the proposals for the establishment of a highway program.

The Light suggests that the President call a special session of Congress to deal with this problem. Having voted for the highway bill, I join in that suggestion. We should either stay here until the job is done, or the President should call us back to do it.

The editorial follows:

DISGRACEFUL PERFORMANCE

The performance of the House of Representatives in voting down any form of Federal highway legislation was sickening.

In 12 hours of action in 2 days on the House floor Congressman after Congressman expressed his great concern at the slaughter on our highways and the great economic loss the American people were suffering.

The need for a Federal highway bill, they kept saying to each other, is not in question.

Then, when their names were called, they voted down any form of Federal aid at all.

Some of them, when the final vote was announced, laughed aloud, as though they had done something amusing.

Up in the galleries, enjoying this display, were the lobbyists who today are being held responsible for the defeat of the various bills.

Many of them represented industries and associations that have fought for good roads for many years, but who found that they didn't really want them if they were going to cost any money.

The lobbyists won a battle but they lost the war because they represent industries that cannot survive unless the highways of America are made adequate within the next few years.

Down on the floor the Congressmen were running the lobbyists' errands and deserting their own party leadership.

Today many of them have the decency at least to be somewhat ashamed of themselves.

And the lobbyists are telling everybody that they really were for a road bill and that they didn't expect Congress would become so panicked under lobby pressure that nothing would result at all.

If these gentemen are to be accepted at their word—and that is a gigantic "if"—then we agree with Republican House Leader MARTIN that President Eisenhower should call a special session of the Congress and make it sit in Washington until it does its duty.

There is nothing funny or politically smart about sabotaging a Federal highway bill.

About 200 Americans died in our chaotic traffic while these Representatives of the people were issuing pious statements and finding a way to save their own political hides.

Now let them act like the statesmen they pretended to be.

Let them forget their miserable and petty differences.

Let them sit down together, with their eyes off the galleries, and do the job the American people are demanding of them.

And let them sit there until they do.

Write Your Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked to learn that even though our Armed Forces have the transportation equipment and facilities for mail delivery service to members of our Armed Forces overseas, and the Post Office Department is likewise supplied with such facilities necessary to provide such mail service, yet mail service to members of our armed services overseas is disgracefully lacking. Nothing is more important for good morale in the Armed Forces than a letter from home.

I received the following letter from a fine young lady of a prominent Jefferson City family on this subject as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *July 7, 1955.*

Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You have often heard the saying "Write your serviceman," yet how many of them never receive their mail?

I speak from experience for I have a brother stationed at Port Lyautey, North Africa, and even though there are planes arriving at their airbase daily from the States, there is only one plane a week that carries mail. This plane is limited to 180 pounds of mail—this includes military mail.

Most of these boys are not away from home and families from choice; therefore mail is especially important to them, and we gladly share all local news with them by mail.

I realize the complaints you receive are many, yet any help in speeding mail to our servicemen would certainly be appreciated and not forgotten.

Sincerely,

DORIS WALZ.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that this matter be thoroughly investigated.

Yalta and Potsdam Blind Spots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the evils of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements are becoming more clear. The ultimate damage to these United States may never be known. Apologists for the sinful conduct of our war leaders are on untenable grounds.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, an outstanding journalist, who has been right consistently in appraising the debacle at Yalta and Potsdam. His article appeared in the article section of Human Events on July 23, 1955:

HINDSIGHT, FORESIGHT, AND BLIND SIGHT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Those who as politicians or publicists bear some share of responsibility for the botched foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration have a standard retort when the disastrous consequences of Yalta and other appeasement deals with Stalin are pointed out. Such criticism, they declare, is based on hindsight. It is implied, or openly stated, that the critics are showing a cheap after-the-event wisdom, that there was no alternative at the time to the courses which were followed.

As the events of wartime diplomacy recede into the perspective of history, it becomes clearer that the conspicuous blunders of Roosevelt's political conduct of the war can all be traced to one master illusion. This was that the Soviet Union under its Communist rulers would be a trustworthy, reliable, peace-minded associate in the reconstruction of the world after the end of the war.

Had there not been this central blind spot of illusion, it is scarcely conceivable that some of the blunders of detail could have been or would have been committed. The ruling out of all diplomatic flexibility by the vainglorious "unconditional surrender" demand; the permanent industrial desolation of Germany contemplated under the Morgenthau plan; the failure to seize Berlin and Prague in the closing weeks of the war or to divert to the Balkans the forces which were wasted in a useless landing in Southern France—these mistakes all stemmed from the one big error: that the Soviet Communist dictatorship was a trustworthy ally and that Soviet penetration of the heart of Europe could be viewed with complacency.

The same observation holds true for the concessions in Manchuria and elsewhere at Nationalist China's expense that were fatuously made to bribe Stalin to enter the war in the Far East; and for the failure to consider the possibility of a quick peace with Japan which would have eliminated the necessity for the Soviet intervention in the Orient that opened up a Pandora's box of calamities, including the Communist conquest of China and the war in Korea.

Now when it is glibly asserted, as it was in the war years, as it still is by diehard apologists for Yalta like Walter Lippmann, that there was no alternative to the policy of Soviet appeasement that was followed, two questions may fairly be asked. First, did the Soviet record before Yalta suggest that a dominant position for the Soviet Government in Europe and Asia would promote the interests and security of the United States? Second, were voices of warning raised, pointing to the probable grave consequences of acquiescing in and sometimes underwriting the annexationist ambitions of a regime with the unlimited aspiration for world domination that is inherent in international communism? The answer to the first question is an emphatic "No." The answer to the second question is an equally definite "Yes." Let's look at the record.

Before the Yalta Conference, which took place early in February, 1945, there were no less than 8 major actions of the Soviet Government, well-known to official Washington, which should have inspired the gravest doubts as to Soviet intentions and good faith.

1. The Soviet Government, after posing as an irreconcilable enemy of fascism, signed a pact with Nazi Germany on August 23, 1939, which cynically divided up eastern Europe between Communist and Nazi tyranny.

2. In violation of a pact of non-aggression between the two countries, the Soviet Red Army invaded Poland in September, 1939. The Soviet authorities behaved with the utmost brutality in the part of Poland which was annexed, deporting over a million men, women and children to slave labor under such bad physical conditions that about a quarter of them perished.

3. In violation of similar treaties, the Soviet Union overran and annexed the small Baltic Republics, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, in 1940. There was a repetition of the mass deportations which had been practiced in Poland.

4. Again in violation of a non-aggression treaty, the Soviet Government attacked Finland on November 30, 1939, fought an aggressive war for 3½ months and annexed about one-tenth of Finland's territory, land that was historically and ethnically Finnish.

5. The Soviet Government, even when it received increasing amounts of American and British aid after Hitler's attack in 1941, consistently refused to consider making good the wrongs that had been inflicted on Poland and the Baltic States.

6. The Soviet Government, with characteristic cynicism, took the exposure of one of its own most revolting "war crimes," the massacre of some 15,000 Polish officer war prisoners in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, and elsewhere as an excuse for breaking off diplomatic relations with the legitimate government of Poland. This occurred in the spring of 1943; from this time the Soviet Government intensified its efforts to impose on Poland a Red Quisling regime, dominated by Communists.

7. When the Red Army approached the Polish capital, Warsaw, in the summer of 1944, the Soviet radio broadcast appeals in Polish for an uprising. When the Polish underground forces, nationalist in political sympathy, went into action against the German garrison the Red Army stood still and the revolt was suppressed with frightful loss of life, accompanied by the complete destruction of the city of Warsaw.

8. After overrunning Bulgaria in 1944 the Soviet authorities took care to shut out the United States and the other Western powers from any effective voice in the negotiation of a Bulgarian peace settlement. This was in line with the general Soviet policy of setting up puppet Communist-dominated regimes in every country "liberated" by the Red Army.

Surely these were "Stop, Look and Listen" signs which should have been heeded by American negotiators at Yalta.

And, contrary to a legend spread by the Roosevelt apologists, there was no lack of warning voices, voices of foresight, not hindsight, about the dangers of associating the American Republic with Communist tyranny in a phony crusade for the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter. On June 29, 1941, former President Hoover said, and he could scarcely have been more right in his prediction:

"If we go further and join the war, and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend over the world."

Senator Robert A. Taft was equally foresighted and farsighted. Here is an excerpt from his radio address of June 25, 1941:

"In the name of democracy we are to make a Communist alliance with the most ruthless dictator in the world. But the victory of communism in the world would be far more dangerous to the United States than the victory of fascism. There has never been the slightest danger that the people of this country would ever embrace Bundism or nazism. * * * But communism masquerades often successfully under the guise of democracy, although just as alien to our real principles as nazism itself."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, as early as September 12, 1943, was calling for "more spine and less servility" in dealing with the Soviets. And Senator BRIDGES challenged the whole appeasement policy when he said in the Senate on January 14, 1944:

"Americans want to know whether the national life and independence of any people in Europe—whether in the Baltic region, the Balkans, or Western Europe—have been endangered by American commitments or the failure to make strong American representations. Americans want to know how Poland, which was the only full ally England and France had at the beginning of the war and which has been so horribly ravaged, is to be rewarded for its loyalty and supreme sacrifices."

Human Events can point to a record of foresight, not hindsight and not the blind sight of the internationalist crusaders. In the issue of February 21, 1945, immediately after the contents of the Yalta Agreement were partially revealed, Felix Morley branded as attempted deception the inclusion in the Yalta statement of affirmation of faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, in an article entitled "For Yalta, Read Munich."

This writer can look back to a piece which he contributed to Human Events, "Shadows of the Holy Alliance" (issue of March 21, 1945) as an accurate analysis of the causes of the failure of the embryonic United Nations. An article on "European 'Settlements'," of October 3, 1945, points to the unjust boundary settlements and the mass deportations in Europe as "a far cry from the principles of national self-determination, equality of economic opportunity, and ultimate disarmament in the Atlantic Charter, and from the lipservice paid to freedom and democracy in the Moscow, Yalta, and Potsdam declarations."

American nationalists, sometimes misrepresented as isolationists, have nothing to be ashamed of in their estimates of the world situation, as the foregoing citations, and many others which could be added, show. The people who have been consistently wrong have been the crusading internationalists who got the country into two wars in pursuit of vague idealistic goals which most emphatically were not realized in the Treaty of Versailles, still less in the decisions of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It is among them that one must look for the true "illustrious dunderheads," to toss back a phrase which a writer of detective stories, Rex Stout—transformed overnight into a self-esteemed expert on foreign affairs—applied to conservative American nationalists.

The list of their mistakes is too long to be covered up, even though this group is in control of a disproportionately large share of organs of mass communication and public opinion. They exaggerated the danger from Hitler and they displayed a pathetic blind sight in regard to the danger from Stalin. In diplomacy and in war, they muffed one opportunity after another.

They were wrong in placing U. N. ahead of United States, regarding the United Nations as the cornerstone of American foreign policy. They were wrong in considering France, in the light of its showing in the Second World War and in the war in Indochina, as a bastion of American defense and pouring billions of dollars into the French sieve. They were wrong in hastily and almost gloatingly writing off Nationalist China. They were wrong in denying to American soldiers, fighting against big numerical odds in Korea, the full backing of American air and nuclear power. They were wrong in accepting German rearmament, if they accepted it at all, very halfheartedly.

It is not only for the sake of historical accuracy that the record of who showed foresight and who showed blind sight should be set right. For the man who once justified and still justifies Yalta will usually rise like a trout to the bait of Soviet appeasement and neutralism. Those who have been proved wrong so often in the past are not reliable guides for the future, whether their sphere is politics or the molding of public opinion.

The Abandoned Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am this morning in receipt of a letter from a Missouri farmer in which he says the price of hogs is lower than a snake's belly in a wagon rut. And he points out that when the price of hogs is down, the price of corn follows.

He says the price of wheat is under pressure but the railroads are charging more to ship it than ever before and then not supply half enough cars and his wheat is dumped out on the ground waiting and deteriorating until the railroads get good and ready to haul it to market.

He insists that the Department of Agriculture has done nothing for the farmer since they decided to get rid of the family sized farm and plough under the small farmer and his children. He offers to trade Secretaries with the Department of Labor and wants a Secretary that will raise farm prices every time they raise union wages.

He also is willing, he tells me, to trade some farm Congressmen for a few of these city labor Congressmen that are

doing such a wonderful job getting everybody's pay raised except the pay of the farmers who work harder and longer hours and render a more indispensible service than anybody else in the Nation.

He says these "danged Congressmen" over here in Washington are raising city pay so high that they are drawing all the farm labor into the city and he must rely on machinery to work his farm—and then they raise the price of farm machinery, and everything else the farmer uses, so high, and pay him so little, for what his farm produces that he does not have money to buy the machinery.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Secretary will ease up a little on the farmer and let him have enough income to at least keep his head above water in this wonderful prosperity and high wages and high prices everybody else in the countr, is enjoying except the farmer.

And speaking very seriously, Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to the fact that the farm Congressmen have throughout this session cooperated with the labor Congressmen in securing fair wages and adequate living conditions for the wage earners of the Nation. We did so because we feel that agriculture has a common cause with labor. Both are exploited by the same predatory interests. But turnabout is fair play and we hope that in the next session labor will return the favor and support legislation insuring a fair share of the national income to the farm men and farm women who are feeding the Nation more bountifully today than ever before in the history of America.

Helpful Echoes From Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Helpful Echoes from Geneva," written by Frank R. Kent, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday, July 31. I commend this excellent article to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPFUL ECHOES FROM GENEVA

(By Frank R. Kent)

Probably the most significant tribute to the success of the Geneva Conference and that of President Eisenhower in the dominant role which he played there came not from his friends at home but from his enemies. Particularly was this notable among the editorial and columnar critics who, from the start, had disparaged the notion that any good could come out of the meeting of the Big Four heads of state and discouraged the idea that talking with the Russians was a sound suggestion.

For many weeks these critics, for some curious reason, had joined with the Democratic National Committee publicity performers, aided and abetted by the propagandists of the ADA, the CIO, and Senators such as MORSE, of Oregon; HUMPHREY, of Minnnesota; and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, in a campaign of sneering and jeering at the President. They pictured him as a weakling who did not know what it is all about. They insisted that Mr. Dulles does all his foreign-policy thinking for him and that his mind was principally occupied with his golf game. Of course, none of this was true, but it was strictly along the Democratic committee line the intent of which was to lay a foundation for an antiadministration attack upon Mr. Eisenhower as a presidential failure who should not be renominated.

In the course of 6 working days at Geneva, Mr. Eisenhower changed all this. He at once became the outstanding personality at the conference and in the world. He did this not by asserting himself; not by "throwing his weight around"; not by ostentation or showmanship; not by propaganda. He achieved it simply by being himself. Beyond question he is the most completely honest, completely truthful, completely sincere man who has spoken for this country either at home or abroad in the last 23 years. He impressed these qualities not only upon his colleagues about the conference table but also upon countless millions who heard and read what he said; also upon the several thousand correspondents, editors, reporters, and publicists who were at the Geneva Conference and some of whom were hostile to him.

It is interesting to note that only one of these thousands thought it worth while cabling his paper that the President had sent for General Gruenther of the NATO to come to Geneva because he wanted to play bridge with him at night. Well, what of it? And why not? The overwhelming point of view of the journalists on the job at Geneva was that General Eisenhower had put on a performance of which all Americans had a right to feel proud; that largely due to his earnestness and sincerity, the Conference had had a measurable degree of success; that the prospect for a continuation of this period of peace is brighter than it was.

There will, of course, now that the President is back, be dissenters, both in his own party and in the opposition in Congress. And there will be trouble of various sorts in various fields. That is inevitable. But there will be few to deny that Mr. Eisenhower has added to his personal prestige and popularity by his conduct at Geneva and by his speech last Monday in Washington. No one worth heeding so much as suggests that there was any touch of politics about the Eisenhower performance at Geneva or since. No one can accuse him of a lack of leadership. No one thinks now he should not have gone or should have taken a different line. He has not, of course, settled the most difficult problems whiih disturb the world and threaten peace. But he has at least taken steps in that direction which the great masses of men and women everywhere approve.

In addition, he has so firmly and clearly placed the position of this Nation before the world that no one either in Russia or anywhere else can again accuse us of wanting war—or him of being a warmonger. The day of that anti-American propaganda has gone. The President shot it to pieces with his inspection proposal, his two speeches, and his personality. He comes home to find his critics still howling about the Dixon-Yates contract and he finds his Secretary for Air, Harold Talbott, facing some ugly and embarrassing charges. But the Dixon-Yates business has been so blown up as to have become a bore and the Talbott affair, while certainly unpleasant, not to say malodorous, is not as politically damaging as it seems. In a year's time it probably will be forgotten. Certainly, there is not in it the kind of issue which the Democrats have been looking for in 1956. The President's work in Geneva much more than outweighs all the little stuff the opposition publicity organs and agents have dug up in a year of hard digging.

One Foot on the Soil—A Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in line with the discussion which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I had the other day relative to the agricultural program, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "On Foot on the Soil—A Way of Life," written by Lyle L. Mariner, editor of the Western Colorado Reporter, and published in the July 27, 1955, issue of that newspaper.

Mr. Mariner is a farm reporter and operates a small newspaper in Colorado. He is a very thoughtful man, and I believe his editorial deserves very careful consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE FOOT ON THE SOIL—A WAY OF LIFE

(By Lyle L. Mariner)

Steel has gone up $7.50 a ton—that's in the pig state. A new round of wage hikes means finished products will advance many times more than that per ton.

Lambs dropped $1.50 per hundred last week.

Most wholesalers and retailers look with apprehension at each new quotation on equipment and appliances of all kinds. Many are up 5 percent or more, again.

Farm products price index shows overall 4 percent drop this year.

Where does this place the farmer in the economic picture?

Not long ago people spoke so glibly about farming being a "way of life" rather than a business. They pointed to the many advantages of living on the farm, and the education in self reliance it gave the rural youngster who later could excel in the city if he chose.

Today, the continuing downward trend of farm products in an economy that continues to spiral upward is forcing factory methods upon the busines of raising food just as it is fostering big business in the cities, as opposed to the small operator.

We see dairies becoming "factory to consumer" links with milk moving directly from the cows to tanks and the city distribution center. Handling the milk on the farm is almost a phase of the past.

We see feeding of livestock almost entirely a factory, with the feeders expecting losses a couple of years out of five. This means the small operator cannot afford to take the chance of any permanent operation which would sustain his farm because he could not afford to lose in those 2 years. One big loss in one year not long ago wiped out many small feeders.

Wheat growing has long since become a factory operation. In many cases not even buildings are to be seen on the farm. Planting crews move on in the late fall and the harvesters complete the job in the summer.

Fruit and vegetable growing is becoming a large-scale operation where small profit

per acre is the rule, thus excluding only the most efficient or forcing the small operator into working at a wage part of the year in order to maintain his family.

In some areas large retail groups handle almost every step from growing to the consumer.

Is it best for our economy that those who benefit from higher and higher wages should receive food at a level which means a loss or starvation living for small farm families? Generally the prices at the store are no less than before, because each round of wage boosts absorbs any lowering except at the producer end. However, at least the wage earner is allowed to keep more of his new increases to purchase more of the modern conveniences.

We know of many farmers and ranchers today who are showing losses. Probably most of them are, not counting those who are trying to stick it out in the worst of the drought areas.

What is the answer? Can the small farms be run more efficiently and better? Some can, of course. There are lots of farmers still failing to use modern methods, but they appear to be only a little less in trouble than the best. Many, like small-town businessmen, due to financial reasons are unable to make improvements or enlarge their farms as they would like because they must first support their families.

A family operation is bound to be rather inefficient in the light of meager profits to be had in farming today. A farmer cannot keep his tractor and other farm machinery going profitably more than a few months out of the year. The depreciation counts up much faster than if the machines were used constantly on large operations. The small farmer has to divide his time between too many tasks to make a streamlined factory operation out of any of them, and if he hires men he can only keep them busy part time compared to the factory-type agricultural units.

When then is the outlook for small farmers? On the brighter side, there are more and more getting out of food raising and going into towns. The future would appear to be poised for better prices and better living for those who remain, but how many will survive our present trend?

Perhaps the answer to some of our problems is at hand. For others, there appears to be no solution except in factory operation methods or a new system of Government supports.

Even the problems with answers would require some factory-type coordination and even Government regulation if they are to be handled in time to save some farmers and ranchers. We are thinking particularly of the economic loss of shipping livestock hundreds of miles and then shipping meat back to the very areas from which it came. The freight difference on the live animals alone would mean the difference between profit and loss for the grower. But, would he get the difference without some Government control?

Fruit and vegetable growers could probably get more for their products if more of it were canned and sold over a year-around period instead of within a couple of weeks at harvesttime. Other like examples are numerous.

Perhaps the final question to be asked in this brief discussion of current farm problems would be: Do we want more Government regulation, or do we want to continue as we are except possibly with the help of county planners who would work with individual farmers and help them share equipment and other items in order to streamline their operations? Do we want to keep the inefficient operators as competition, or should we speed the day when there will be fewer farmers and therefore more demand for products raised by those remaining?

Government supports as we have known them in the past only complicated the problems, and the surpluses accumulated are still aggravating the situation to a large degree. We are giving away millions of dollars worth of surpluses to other countries. We are allowing more millions to rot. Drought has stopped much production. And yet we are not reducing our surpluses enough to open up new markets for current production.

As each year goes by the surplus picture may change, although we are learning every year how to produce more on each acre. The facts still revolve around supply, demand, rising costs, and factory methods. Can we work out a program that will correlate these factors and develop a plan that would be flexible enough to aid the small efficient farmers?

We'll leave the discussion right there. Can intelligent people work out answers, or have we come too far down the road where only big business, monopoly, and big labor can exist?

Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Swiss became free on that historic August 1, 1291, when they declared to the Hapsburg monarchy and other tyrants that the cantons of Schwyz, Uri and Nidwalden were joined in an everlasting league against external oppressors. Later, this freedom was extended to include 19 other cantons to make for today's total of 22.

When the Swiss and the Americans signed their Treaty of Friendship and Commerce on November 25, 1850, there was cause for rejoicing in both these freedom-loving lands on either side of the Atlantic. The Swiss Government then hailed the pact as a treaty of friendship whereby the two freest people on earth will treat each other reciprocally on a footing of equality.

Five months before, in a letter to the United States plenipotentiary negotiating the treaty in Bern, United States Secretary of State Clayton characterized the attitude of the United States in these words:

> We regard as brothers and benefactors of the human family those enlightened patriots in continental Europe, who have continued steadfast in their purpose to give to their countrymen such permanent institutions as Washington and his contemporaries gave to America.

Switzerland and America have much in common despite the discrepancies in size and language, although many Americans still speak the major tongues spoken in Switzerland—French, German, and Italian.

Both nations have similar constitutions. They enjoy the highest standards of living in the world. Both believe in individualism, but maintain stable governments. Their national governments were created to serve the people and not the other way around.

Like the Americans, too, the Swiss have a keen competitive spirit. For the Swiss, the manufacture and sale of fine watches, precision instruments and fabrics play a major role because Switzerland has no natural resources to speak of. Consequently, the money needed to buy goods abroad must be made through high competence in manufacturing.

The Swiss, therefore, have sold us their precision goods and timepieces, and bought from us farm products, tobacco, automobiles, and other manufactures. And the trade balance in favor of the United States was nearly half a billion dollars in the years from 1936 to 1953.

But, since last year, a higher tariff on Swiss watches theatens to impair this favorable trade picture. Swiss watch sales in the United States went off about 30 percent in the 6 months following the tariff increase, and Switzerland is looking elsewhere for markets with the likelihood that it will switch some of its buying, too.

American protectionists, claiming that our watch industry is essential to the defense of the United States, were successful in getting the President to sign a bill raising the tariff wall 50 percent higher. Yet, it was revealed months later that Defense Department experts had declared that no special nor preferential treatment was owing to the watch interests here.

United States Planes Shot Down by the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the southeastern part of the State of Arizona, in the city of Bisbee, one of our oldest cities, and at the site of one the largest copper operations in the world, one of Arizona's most influential newspapers is published under a rather unusual name, the Brewery Gulch Gazette. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some philosophical observations of the Philosopher of the Brewery Gulch Gazette, of Bisbee, Ariz.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BREWERY GULCH PHILOSOPHER SAYS

The Russians remind me of something that happened in the early days of our neighboring community, Douglas, many years ago. A local citizen made it a practice to celebrate every payday, and whenever he got drunk he came out in a fighting mood; he was always arrested and given 5 days in the hoosegow (juzgado) to sober up and repent. One day he appeared before the police judge and requested permission to spend 15 or 20 days in the jailhouse, such time to count against any such sentences in the future when he might be busy and would not have time to serve out such punishment. His petition was denied, however. But now

with the Russians apologizing for shooting down one of our planes, it is conceivable that they might come up with 2, 3, or 4 apologies at one time, a sort of package deal. Our State Department might, and probably would say, "Why all of these apologies? You shot down only one plane this time." And the Russians could say, "That is very true, but the additional apologies and expressions of regret will be for the planes that we will shoot down in future. This will save some paperwork on the part of our apology-regret department, which is likely to be overworked from now on, considering the way things are likely to be going."

Exceptional Service Award to Assistant Secretary Milton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Army Times of July 30, 1955. It is entitled "Assistant Secretary Milton Receives Exceptional Service Award." Secretary Milton has a very outstanding record as Assistant Secretary of the Army, and we are very proud of his fine service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MILTON RECEIVES EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE AWARD

(By Steve Tillman)

WASHINGTON.—In appreciation of his outstanding contribution in the guidance he has given the Army in solving problems connected with the Reserve program, Hugh M. Milton, Assistant Secretary of Army for Manpower and Reserve Forces, was presented with Defense's Exceptional Civilian Service decoration by departing Army Secretary Robert Stevens.

This column of May 14 had as its lead item "Hugh Milton, Reserve Chief, Has Genius for Conciliation." On June 30 this story appeared in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the preparation of the citation, Mr. Stevens made reference to Milton's ability to bring together disagreeing factions with the statement, "Throughout, his achievements have been tempered by a human approach to all problems."

The citation that accompanied the decoration:

"For exceptional performance as Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Forces), from 19 November 1953 to 21 July 1955. He, by his diligence and industry, coupled with a wealth of military background secured as a citizen soldier over a period of 35 years, has promoted the welfare, efficiency, and training of both the Active and Reserve Forces of the United States Army.

"Throughout, his achievements have been tempered by a human approach to all problems, resulting in a vitalization program which assures a full military career for the greater majority of Reserve officers on active duty, the raising of pay and living standards of personnel of the United States Army, and continuity in our combat units by his support of operation Gyroscope. He has also been instrumental in educating the public and the Congress to the need for adequate Reserve Forces to support the Active Forces, as evidenced by his long and hard work on the National Reserve plan.

"Hugh M. Milton, by these and other equally important achievements, has distinguished himself and reflected great credit upon the Army and the United States."

Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are anxiously awaiting news concerning the progress of the recovery of our outstanding majority leader of the United States Senate, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. The reports coming from his devoted and faithful wife are good at this time and are received happily by many thankful hearts.

Editorials have appeared in practically every newspaper in the United States. One that I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, is from the July 28, 1955, issue of the Paris News, published at Paris, Tex., by Mr. A. G. Pat Mayse. The tributes quoted from some of the largest newspapers are typical of those which appeared in many other newspapers. I am in accord with the sentiments expressed by these editors and publishers, including Mr. Mayse.

The editorial follows:

NATIONWIDE PRAISE OF LYNDON JOHNSON

Sudden and serious attack of illness that took Senator LYNDON JOHNSON from his place in Congress resulted not only in his associates in Congress and every branch of government expressing sorrow, coupled with the hope that he would soon be able to resume his work. For hundreds of newspapers over the United States spoke of his ability and services, giving him recognition probably never before given a Member of Congress. Some of the one sentence tributes were:

Chicago American: LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, has been a leader of Republicans as well as of his own party.

Boston Post: Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON is one of our few high officeholders with the capacity of serving the Nation and his party, too.

Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune: The Texas Democrat has proved an outstanding leader not only for his party in the Senate, but for the Nation itself.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch: One of the ablest members of either branch, the Texan is largely responsible for the dispatch with which the 84th Congress has been doing its work.

New York Herald Tribune: As Senate Democratic leader, Mr. JOHNSON has won the respect of legislators in both parties as a capable and devoted officer of Congress.

Washington Star: By tact, good will, and level-headedness, he has managed to work with the Republican President and to make a creditable record for his party, too.

Texas may well be glad we have such a representative in the Senate, and also that the Senator will be able presently to resume his place unless providence should decree otherwise.

Central California Farmers and Conservationists Applaud Lostetter Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have on July 27, 1955, called to the attention of this House a flagrant instance of secrecy in Government and attempted deception by a branch of the executive arm of Government. I refer to the Department of the Interior's suppression of an important conservation document which completely contradicts the views of Fish and Wildlife Director John Farley.

Mr. Farley tried to explain away my attack on his Department's laxity in enforcing the Federal regulation against duck baiting on the ground that California club owners were feeding "hungry ducks" when they shot migratory waterfowl within 200 yards of their guns.

The suppressed document prepared by Clinton H. Lostetter, a career biologist for the Fish and Wildlife Service, described the California duck baiting as "a disguised attempt to circumvent Federal regulations—a deceptive maneuver by the duck clubs through administrative channels to get legalized baiting."

In a few days the Department of the Interior will be issuing its 1955 regulations on duck baiting. Yet the Lostetter report which so thoroughly punctures Mr. Farley's alibi for the game hogs remains locked up in the Department of the Interior.

I have received heartening news today from representatives of California rice farmers and conservationists that speaks highly of Clinton H. Lostetter and his efforts to help both the California farmer and our migratory waterfowl.

The telegram received by me today states:

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In regard to California duck-baiting attack publicized in Fresno Bee, July 29, and San Francisco Chronicle, July 30, please be advised Clinton H. Lostetter, biologist, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, has done an outstanding job in this district and has succeeded in coordinating the complete cooperation of farmers, sportsmen, and waterfowl conservationists interested in the wintering grounds of the Pacific flyway of wild ducks and geese.

Mr. Lostetter expressed the opinion of the great majority of our members who also feel the opening of the waterfowl season prior to October 22 in central California will be extremely detrimental to agriculture and not in the best interests of good waterfowl conservation.

RICHARD DES JARDINS,
President, Cal-O-Ro Rice Growers, South Dos Palos, Calif.; Cochairman, Fresno-Merced Counties Crop Depredation Committee.

J. MARTIN WINTON,
Waterfowl Representative, Sportsmen's Council of Central California, and Cochairman Crop Depredation Committee, Fresno and Merced Counties.

It is time that the farmers, duck hunters, conservationists, and the American people find out if the Fish and Wildlife Service has become the tool of duck-baiting interests, and if Director Farley has been fooling the public by his claims that violations of the Federal regulation against duck baiting are justified because hungry ducks need to be fed.

If Mr. Farley's skirts are clean, he should be willing to release the Lostetter report. But if Mr. Farley has been deceiving the American public, the Government should release Mr. Farley.

Money Rates Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article, written by Ralph Hendershot, financial editor of the New York World Telegraph and Sun, which appeared in the July 29, 1955, issue of that paper:

MONEY RATES UP—BANKS ACT AS RESERVE AND TREASURY EXPERTS FAIL TO EASE STRAIN OF LOANS

(By Ralph Hendershot)

On Wednesday several large New York banks lifted interest rates on loans to brokers and security dealers to 3¼ percent from 3 percent. The increase will apply on accommodations for the brokers and dealers themselves as well as for their customers. The action probably signalizes a general hardening of interest rates all along the line.

The accelerated rate of business has been placing a strain on available credit for the past several months. But bankers have been reluctant to lift interest rates because of the rather large amount of Government financing which must be taken care of this year. The situation could have been eased to some extent if reserve requirements had been lowered, but the Federal Reserve people are currently not in the mood to encourage borrowing.

Bankers generally are not disturbed by the credit situation, except in the case of instalment and home mortgage advances, but they are concerned over the reappearance of inflationary forces, particularly those let loose by the recent wage increases. Generally speaking, they would like to see the business boom slowed down a bit and, of course, they are not averse to larger bank earnings.

CREDIT POLICY CHANGING

Gradually over the past year or so, the Nation's socalled easy-money policy has been undergoing a change. Steps have been taken very quietly to place the economy back under the control of those who pull the credit strings. The Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board have been working closely together in that development even though they are credited with being completely independent.

This trend reflects the basic difference between the New Deal-Fair Deal thinking on money questions and that of the Republicans now in power. The change had to be very gradual, however, for fear of disturbing business. The former operated to a marked degree on the borrow and spend theory, whereas the latter sought to supplant inflation with business confidence.

But of late there has been danger of excessive confidence. The action of the stock market and the sharp increase in sales of automobiles have been looked upon by some as danger signals. The fear is that the business boom might build up to a point where a bust would follow. And the best way to keep the boom under control, the more conservative leaders believe, is by tightening up on credit.

EXPERT HANDLING EXPECTED

However, Wall Street bankers do not anticipate any sharp increase in interest rates. They hope that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury authorities will utilize their credit powers much like an expert driver takes a team of fast-stepping horses around a curve in the road. Moreover, they are confident this can and will be done.

Congressman Hand Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, for the information of all the people in my congressional district I wish to include in the RECORD a summary of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, with some comments thereon. Of necessity, this report can only touch the high spots and not all of them. It is well to remember that this is the first year of the session and that another full legislative year lies ahead of us before the work of this particular Congress can be properly evaluated. For the purpose of convenience I shall divide this report into sections, the first of which will be the national economy.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Under this head early actions of the Congress extended until April 1, 1956, the existing excise taxes, the so-called nuisance taxes or luxury taxes, and the 52 percent corporate income tax. While it appears that under the present state of the national debt and some unbalance of the current budget, such an act was necessary, its necessity was to be regretted, and I am very hopeful that early in the next session further relief can be given to the excise taxes which we modified in 1954, and that some relief can likewise be given to the excessive rate of corporate income tax.

The Federal minimum wage was increased from 75 cents to $1 per hour in connection with all activities in interstate commerce. This seemed to me to be very much justified since the former minimum scale had become unrealistic with the passing of the years. This is of particular importance to those engaged in the clothing industry and the textile industry in our district because it tends to increase wages in the South and thus bring them to a more fairly competitive position with our northern factories. This increase was advocated to me by an almost unanimous opinion of both labor and management in our congressional district.

In view of the enormous increase in commercial air transport, we have authorized a 4-year program of airport construction, providing in excess of $60 million a year in grants and aids to States for the improvement and development of local airports.

HIGHWAYS ARE UNFINISHED BUSINESS

It is regrettable in the extreme that in the closing days of Congress the House refused the final enactment of a multi-million-dollar program of highway construction. The President's program, which I supported, would have provided a splendid program financed at least in part by a bond issue. There was great objection raised to the bond issue feature on the perfectly correct ground that the issuance of bonds would add to the cost of the program by the payment of interest, but I was not able to see just what all the fuss was about, because this is the characteristic way that States and localities build their highways, and since highways last for a very long time, there seems no reason why they should not be paid for on this sort of basis rather than impose very drastic taxes all on today's motorists. It was the greatly increased rate of taxes on gasoline, diesel oil, tires, and other automobile use taxes which led to the final defeat of the bill, after the President's program was rejected.

At this time, it seems very probable to me that a proper program, probably on some compromise basis, will be enacted during the next session of the Congress.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The most important acts adopted under this head was H. R. 1, which extended until June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to make reciprocal trade agreements and to further reduce tariffs. As is well known, I doubt very much the wisdom of this type of legislation, which wholly abdicates the constitutional control of Congress over the tariff situation, and I am particularly concerned about its effect on our very large glass industry and the thousands of people employed in that industry in our southern New Jersey area, together with its effect on textiles and a number of other important fields of trade.

Recognizing, of course, the importance of foreign trade to our national economy, I still have not been able to see where this act is truly reciprocal and that we have gotten corresponding benefits from foreign countries. As I say, I think that an amendment should be written to it, which I have advocated for some time, which would restore to Congress the right of veto over any trade agreement which Congress considers dangerous to the economy of our country or to a section of it.

The other most important program was a continuance of the so-called foreign operations program, both military and economic. Whether you approve of this program or not, there is a dangerous situation which has developed and which continues to develop wherein the Congress has literally been appropriating more money to the program than the program can actually spend, and this

year the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, did succeed in cutting $500 million off the new money appropriated for this purpose. These cuts were fully justified and will still give the program more money than it can possibly use during the current fiscal year.

THE PRESIDENT AT GENEVA

By all odds, the most important accomplishment in the foreign field during the course of the year was not an accomplishment of Congress at all, but by the President of the United States at his so-called summit Conference in Geneva. While, of course, no agreements were entered into and no agreements were expected to be entered into, it is my opinion that the President did a magnificent job of diplomacy in Geneva and that he truly created a more friendly feeling than has existed between the United States and Russia for the last 20 years, and has laid a magnificent groundwork for future negotiations. It is quite conservative to say that the prospects for peace are better right this day than they have been for many years in the past, and under the inspired leadership of President Eisenhower there is reason to hope that we might be on the verge of great accomplishments.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The regular draft law, which has been in effect for some years, was extended another 4 years as the result of apparent bitter necessity. A very much modified and changed program of Reserve training was finally enacted which may or may not prove to be effective. Personally, I doubt it. A really effective law in lines of what the Pentagon wanted could not pass the Congress and the compromise result is not a very strong piece of legislation. Very frankly, I am not greatly impressed with the necessity of such a Reserve training program, for one reason because the Pentagon now has such a law which if they would administer it correctly would probably be sufficient for their purposes.

THIRTY-ONE BILLION FOR DEFENSE

To indicate the complete determination of the Congress to maintain our defenses at a very high level, we passed appropriation bills this year totaling about $31 billion, the major part of which was apportioned to the Air Force, and I am hopeful that in the very near future we can begin to reduce, to at least a reasonable extent, these enormous expenditures—which have nevertheless provided us with a first class fighting machine in case the necessity should arise. I have frequently commented that we should spend at least a part of our effort toward a real and concentrated effort to achieve the means of peace, and I am encouraged to observe that the President has created a new department, whose only duty is to provide plans for improving the prospects of peace. This is a healthy change.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Not a great deal of significant legislation was passed in this field, largely because the groundwork for proper assistance to millions of veterans has been very well laid in the past and the United States rightly has a program which is more generous than the program that any nation has ever adopted at any time, for our veterans and servicemen. The important thing that was done was, of course, the allowance of perfectly adequate appropriations for the Veterans' Administration which ought to permit them to carry on their work in an efficient and generous style. Among some of the specific acts which were adopted was providing substantial increases in incentive pay—anywhere from 6 percent to 25 percent—for members of the Armed Forces which, while an expensive bill, is in the long run an economy because it tends to keep highly trained personnel in the Services and induces them to reenlist, and in the long run is much less than the cost of training new and green recruits. Public Law 88 extends to June 30, 1956, the Veterans' Administration program for direct loans for purchase or building of homes. Public Law 118 extends to July 1, 1959, the provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act and in addition to that a new and thoroughly studied bill has passed the House, which sets up an entirely new, and I think improved system of dependents benefits.

The relationship of the New Jersey congressional delegation, both Republicans and Democrats, with our great service organizations, continues to be most pleasant and cooperative.

AGRICULTURE

The best accomplishment for agriculture in our own particular district is a negative one. The Congress passed by a very narrow vote an act which was designed to restore price supports for basic commodities so-called 90 percent of parity. I voted against this provision. It is contrary to the President's program and definitely contrary to the best interests of agriculture generally and certainly contrary to the interests of agriculture in our State of New Jersey. We, who are engaged in the production of perishable fruits and vegetables and eggs get no benefit whatever from it, and as a matter of fact the egg industry in particular suffers a detriment from it as the result of the artificially supported prices of feed grains which will gradually come down under the present program as support prices are decreased. I say this despite the passage by the House of this bill, because the Senate has not and probably will not take it up, and if they do, the President will undoubtedly veto it, which brings us back to the original law passed in 1948 which provides for the gradual reduction of the support program.

It is a matter of great regret to all of us who have been interested that we have not been able to get the Department of Agriculture to take any real steps of benefit to the egg industry in South Jersey, which has been severely hit lately by a number of factors including the high cost of feeds and overproduction, and of course their troubles were accentuated by the hurricane of 1954, causing a great deal of damage, but with fully expected decrease in the price of feed grains, the outlook for the future seems to be somewhat more hopeful.

The Agriculture Department appropriation bill seems to me to have quite adequate provisions for all legitimate purposes and includes for the most part all of the recommendations that I have had from my friends in the District and from the great farm organizations of New Jersey and the country.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

I have had the interesting experience of serving on the Appropriations Subcommittee for this department and I can report from personal knowledge that we have allowed very adequate appropriations for all of the departments involved, and especially for medical research into the cause and cure of the great killers of mankind, heart disease, cancer, and many others, and have just recently allowed very adequate funds for the further implementation of Salk polio vaccine to carry out the President's program that no child in America who cannot afford the vaccine will be denied its use.

MEASURES OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE DISTRICT

Of some unusual interest at least to the seashore area of our Second Congressional District is the culmination of my work to provide approximately a million dollars this year for beach erosion problems in Atlantic and Cape May Counties, and of interest to the entire district is additional appropriations to the Weather Bureau to permit them to greatly improve and implement their assistance for the early detection of hurricanes and a new law, Public Law 71, which authorizes the Government to make a complete study of the occurrence of hurricanes in New England, New York and New Jersey coastal areas, and elsewhere, to determine methods not only of earlier warnings but of other emergency methods to ameliorate the enormous damage which these great storms cause.

This report would be entirely too lengthy, as perhaps it already is, if I went into the hundreds of details which are involved in our appropriations bills, which are of enormous benefit to one or another groups of our people.

I can conclude with a personal note that I have had an extremely busy, interesting and, I hope, helpful year, and I am looking forward to seeing more of you in the months to come.

During the last few weeks of this legislative year, and especially during the last week or two, I had the privilege of serving on four separate conference committees with Members of the Senate in connection with various appropriation bills, and it is a matter of great personal pride to me that my colleagues in the House and I have been largely instrumental in reducing suggested appropriations by close to a billion dollars. You will permit me to have a real sense of satisfaction from having been a part of this very considerable saving of taxpayer's money.

The State of the Union is good:

America is enjoying peace, and an unprecedented prosperity.

Ninety-Dollar-a-Week Family Entoiled by Creditors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by J. A. Livingston, which appeared in his column, Business Outlook, in the July 30, 1955 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, is deserving of our attention:

NINETY-DOLLAR-A-WEEK FAMILY ENTOILED BY CREDITORS

(By J. A. Livingston)

This is the pathetic story of a couple who couldn't say "no" to a salesman—the story of a man, a wife and 2 children under 6, whose lives for the next 4 or 5 years will be entoiled by debt.

It's a grisly sample of man's inhumanity to man which could only occur during free and easy prosperity. Judge for yourself.

The husband, 26, earns about $90 a week in a factory near Philadelphia. But his boss threatens to fire him. Constant telephone calls and personal visits of collectors have been an annoyance. Desperate, he goes to a credit clearing house. The clearing house totes up his obligations to $4,075, as follows:

Finance company (A)	$517
Finance company (B)	478
Finance company (C)	338
Finance company (C), different town	287
Savings and loan association	1,080
Big city bank (A)	245
Big city bank (B)	419
Big city bank (C)	195
Small-town bank	85
Garage	48
Mail order firm	63
Fuel oil company (A)	59
Fuel oil company (B)	82
Department store (A)	96
Department store (B)	14
Furniture store (A)	35
Furniture store (B)	34

In addition, he owes $6,850 on his home. The original mortgage was $6,900, which is about the market value. So he has paid off only $50.

You wonder, How can anyone whose take-home pay, after deducting taxes, social security, union dues, etc., is hardly $300 per month and whose equity in his home is nil, find 17 business organizations willing—even anxious—to extend him credit?

You can understand what happened in the case of the garage. The man left his car to be fixed, promised to pay, and didn't get around to clearing up the account. Similarly, with Fuel Oil Co.-A. He ran up a bill, couldn't get any more credit, then switched to Fuel Oil Co.-B. These are involuntary creditors.

The same excuse can't be offered for the banks. Lending—sound extension of credit—is their profession. In one case, the wife bought a freezer on time and gave three references. The appliance company guaranteed payment to the bank. The bank, being protected by the appliance company, didn't check too hard on the reference. Ditto, 2 other banks, on other appliances. The fourth made a personal loan.

Another professional lender, a Federal savings and loan association, cheerfully provided the money when the couple wanted to modernize their home.

And how did the personal finance companies get into this story? Simple. As the husband got entoiled with banks, the furniture stores, the department stores, he decided to consolidate his debts. He borrowed from Finance Co.-A to pay Tom, Dick, and Harry, but not Paul. So, after a while he tried Finance Co.-B to take care of Paul, plus a new collection of Toms, Dicks and Harrys, and so it went. Two different offices of the same finance company made loans to the couple. Yet, a call from one office to the other—a routine check—would have revealed the debtor's plight.

The sellers wanted to sell. The lenders wanted to lend. Investigation would have delayed "progress."

And the denouement?

The credit clearing house has proposed a consolidated plan of payment—$100 a month. The wife's to go to work. Even so, it will take about 5 years to pay off, since interest on some of the debt continues.

Who's to blame? The husband and wife were indiscreet. They let their wants run away with them. But they were young and inexperienced with lenders. As I see it, the family was victimized. But not by loan sharks. These creditors are staid financial institutions, whose presidents stand for the sanctity of contract, safety of deposits, stability of investment and caution.

The incident poses questions for all of us and, particularly the Federal Reserve Board: Is this an exceptional case? Or, is it an example of caution to the wind—of credit and sales laxity, which comes in gilded ages when easy profits smother conscience and commonsense? Is it a signal—possibly a very early signal—that corrosion underlies this golden glitter we call prosperity?

Milwaukee Sentinel Endorses Fallon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel in a recent editorial praised the farsighted and courageous work of the House Public Works Committee. This editorial has an unusual understanding of the complex problem of financing adequate highways and endorsed the Fallon bill as the answer to this urgent national problem.

The editorial follows:

ROAD VICTORY NEAR

The enlightened action of the House Public Works Committee in reporting out an adequate Federal highway bill brings close to victory the campaign of the Sentinel and other Hearst newspapers for better roads.

The bill, written by Democrat Representative FALLON, of Maryland, still must be approved by the House and agreed to in conference by the Senate.

Its passage will climax nearly 3 years of continuous effort by these newspapers for an adequate highway system:

A system built to handle modern traffic safely—straight, wide, graded, divided highways with access control wherever needed.

One plan the Sentinel and the other Hearst newspapers published in February 1953, called for construction of the 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways entirely at Federal expense.

We said that if money was needed, why not use the $2 billion collected annually from highway users in gasoline taxes and the 10-percent excise tax we all pay when we buy a new car.

The administration bill of February 1955 called for construction of the interstate system through a revenue bond issue. The Government would pay 95 percent of the cost.

The Fallon bill of June 1955, levies tax increases and will pay 90 percent of the cost.

Because the Fallon bill will do the job and because the House Public Works Committee, despite crushing pressures, had the courage to report it after many days of intense and heated private discussion, we are for it.

Tribute To Harry M. Farrell, Late Enrolling Clerk of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a tribute to Harry M. Farrell, late enrolling clerk of the House.

Fresh from service in the Army of the United States, in which he served from 1917 to 1919, Harry M. Farrell began his service with the House of Representatives on July 4, 1919. His loyal, intelligent application to duty soon marked him as a capable, efficient employe of the Congress. His capacity for service was of the highest order and never varied during his long devoted career. He made notable and conspicuous progress in this chosen field as a servant of the legislative establishment.

Just prior to being placed on the roll of the House as Assistant Librarian, under the Clerk of the House, he assisted in establishing the first gymnasium for Members in the space now occupied by the legislative counsel. He was the first instructor in the gymnasium. Nature had well equipped this fine young man with a splendid physique. He had been an outstanding football player in college. Endowed with powerful shoulders he was a fast, natural boxer. Among the Members he engaged in boxing bouts with in the new gym was the former lightweight champion of the Navy, the late Honorable Fred A. Britten, who was then a prominent Member of the House and later to become chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Harry Farrell was possessed of a keen mind and strong character. He was direct in his conversations and his ready wit revealed the power of his intellect. His dry humor was intermingled with the vitality with which he tackled his duties every day.

From Assistant Librarian he was appointed assistant enrolling clerk, April 10, 1921. He became enrolling clerk of the House March 1, 1924, by appointment by the late Hon. William Tyler Page, then Clerk of the House. It was in this highly technical field of service to the House of Representatives that the mental stamina and infinite patience served him well, for it is in these little observed but highly important functions of the enrolling clerk where the slightest error may disrupt the legislative path of

actions by the Congress. He justified the confidence of his trust and is said to have been one of the most capable enrolling clerks ever to have served the House.

From December 31, 1931, until February 20, 1947, there occurred a break in his service with the House. During this period he was employed by the Department of Agriculture. Two years after his return to the enrolling clerk's position the House of Representatives created, on January 27, 1949, the position of minority enrolling clerk, in which capacity he served during the time his party was in the minority.

His death in Washington on June 24, 1955, removes from the service organization of the House one of the finest, most able, and steadfastly loyal servants of the House of Representatives. He will be missed by us all but his pattern will be remembered and is worthy of emulation.

Twentieth Anniversary of Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 14, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America will celebrate their 20th anniversary national convention at the Hotel Commodore in New York City.

The convention will see the report of progress made by this national veterans group in the fields of Americanism, Catholic action, leadership, veterans' affairs, and youth welfare. The high spot of the convention will be a gala testimonial banquet to honor the military vicar of the United States Armed Forces, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, at which time the Honorable James P. Mitchell, United States Secretary of Labor, will be the featured speaker.

In returning to New York City, the birthplace of the organization, Catholic War Veterans are stressing their 20 years of service "to God, to country, and to home."

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America was founded by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, LL. D., in 1935, "to promote zeal and devotion for God, for country, and for home," the basis of its constitution.

In the course of its two decades of existence, the Catholic War Veterans has to its commendable credit the fact that it has spotted and fought totalitarian and brutalitarian philosophies of both the right and left and stood firm on the solid stand of freedom of the individual and personal independence of its citizenry under the law.

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America have received many commendations from agencies in government, in business, in welfare and hospital work, in rehabilitation, in child guidance, in patriotic, fraternal, veteran, and religious spheres. It is recognized by the Veterans' Administration in the handling of cases before it.

It has been commended by several United States Presidents, and a great many American statesmen.

Programs have included: summer camps for youngsters; informative material exposing fascism, nazism, and the cancerous core of Communist propaganda, broadcast and information bulletins on veteran benefits; support of youth groups, establishment of scholarship; fight for veterans' rights and spiritual comfort of our comrades; proper burial for veterans and care for their widows and dependents; exposure of intolerance, bigotry, and disloyalty; promotion of activities which tend to strengthen the moral fiber of nation and its people, and build a greater spirit of faith and patriotism.

The current program of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America is strictly positive. The Catholic War Veterans are protagonists of right, truth, and justice. Their whole philosophy is based on the recognition of man's dignity and rendering to God the things that are God's. They insist on the recognition of the moral basis, underlying all political, economic, and social themes.

They believe in action. "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." No program, no matter how magnificent, can be effective unless it is acted upon. They remember this—and act.

The two decades of Catholic War Veterans' existence have proved fruitful for our American freedom; and the future of America is safe when public-spirited, patriotic citizens who have fought for their Nation in war can continue to serve in peace.

The Catholic War Veterans is organized to serve. Size is not the measure of their service, their reputation, their loyalty, their faith, their spirit of fellowship. They take pride in their past, and are confident of their future.

James C. Self, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, my neighbor and friend, the late James C. Self, Sr., was one of the greatest men it has ever been my privilege to know. He was not only an outstanding industrialist but a great humanitarian, philanthropist, and he was a great American.

I have traveled over the world, and I have never seen anywhere the equal of his splendid textile villages in my home town of Greenwood, S. C. His mills, his villages, and his workers all testify to his greatness.

Much has been said and written about James C. Self, Sr., "man of the South for 1952." The following article from the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser gives us a splendid résumé of his career and life of service:

MR. JAMES C. SELF, SR., NATIVE OF EDGEFIELD COUNTY, GREAT INDUSTRIALIST AND PHILANTHROPIST, BURIED IN GREENWOOD SATURDAY AFTERNOON

Final rites for James C. Self were conducted Saturday afternoon in the Callie Self Memorial Baptist Church, which stands as a landmark at entrance of model Mathews Village at Greenwood.

Friends from all walks of life filled the church and stood on the church lawn as the simple services for the 79-year-old textile leader were conducted.

Several thousand persons filed through the church on Saturday morning and up to the service hour to view the body as it lay in state before a mass of floral tributes.

The church sanctuary was filled a full half hour before services began, and soon after the balcony was filled to capacity.

The carillon bells which Mr. Self brought from the New York World's Fair and placed in the tower constructed to the rear of the church sounded out hymns preceding the services and for a short time after the rites in the church had been completed.

Jan Kwist, brought from Belgium to play the carillon bells, led the Mathews choir of about 50 voices in Rock of Ages to open the services.

The Reverend J. E. Willis, pastor of the church which Mr. Self built and dedicated to his mother, led in prayer, asking that others might catch up the torch of usefulness and service and carry it on.

Dr. J. F. Lupo, pastor of the Main Street Methodist Church, read the scripture from first psalms and the 23d psalm.

The choir closed the services with Onward Christian Soldiers.

The commital rites were conducted at Edgewood Cemetery in the presence of the immediate family only.

A large representation from Boston and New York representing textile and banking interests with which Mr. Self had been associated, was present.

The chamber of commerce president, the merchants association president and the mayor of Greenwood asked that the stores be closed during the service hour out of respect to the memory of Mr. Self. Mr. Self's mills were also closed during the service hour.

Self Memorial Hospital was his gift to the Greenwood community in 1951, honoring his father and brother, both doctors.

Mr. Self headed one of the largest privately owned textile companies in the world.

While at Durham he received one of the annual Horatio Alger awards sponsored by the American Schools and Colleages Association in recognition of rags-to-riches success stories. He was unable to attend the ceremony at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and a special presentation was made at Duke Hospital.

In 1952 the former farm boy and store clerk was named "Man of the South" by the magazine, Dixie Business, founder of the South's hall of fame for the living.

Greenwood Mills has 5 plants, all in Greenwood County, employing more than 6,000. Self's only son, James C. Self, Jr., is treasurer of the company.

He was a member of the first class at Clemson College 61 years ago, digging ditches at 8 cents an hour and waiting on tables to help pay his expenses. After 1 year he had to drop out and go to work.

"I made $8 a month in a general store and had to take half of the year's pay out in a horse," he once recalled. That store burned and he found a job in another one. There he worked for 3 years and saved $150. With

that he enrolled in a business college at Richmond, Va.

"I came back to Greenwood in 1898 with nothing in the world but 2 suits of clothes and $15, and got a job as clerk and bookkeeper in a hardware store," Self said. "The next year I went to the Bank of Greenwood as a bookkeeper and in 1903 it made me cashier."

Soon afterward he got into the textile business, in which he was to become one of the South's richest men.

The Greenwood Cotton Mill owed the bank $40,000 and could not pay it. In 1908 he was made president of the mill, with the goal of making enough money to pay the debt. The machinery was obsolete and prospects were so poor that an engineer he hired advised him to forget about the project. Instead, Self went to New England machinery manufacturers and persuaded them to sell him new spindles and automatic looms for stock and notes instead of cash.

For 8 years Self tried to revive the mill, while continuing his work at the bank. But he kept remembering a piece of advice from James B. Duke, founder of Duke Power Co.

"You'll never get anywhere lending $50 on a blind mule," Duke had told him. Self resigned from the bank and became a full-time textile executive.

By that time the mill had added a second plant. Five years later he bought and enlarged the Ninety-Six Cotton Mill. In 1930 he bought the No. 2 plant of Grendel Mills, naming it Mathews Mill and doubling its size. His mills went to 3 shifts daily in 1935.

In 1948 Self announced a $20 million expansion program, without outside financial help, and in 1950 he opened the $6 million Harris filament rayon mill.

Greenwood Mills manufactures fabrics of filament and spun rayon and carded and combed cotton. Cotton goods are finished outside and then sold directly by the New York selling house, Greenwood Mills, Inc.

The Greenwood Mill employee villages are regarded as models throughout the industry. Most of the houses are single-family units of 5 or 6 rooms, designed by Self and built by his huge construction department.

Self spent millions of dollars in building schools, churches and other facilities in the villages. He brought the carillon bells from the Netherlands' World War exhibit and installed them in a tower at Callie Self Church, named for his mother.

"I learned a long time ago that you can't take it with you," Self said 2 years ago. "And I don't think much of a man who makes money in a community and then forgets all about it."

Clemson College awarded him the honorary degree of Doctor of Textile Industries in 1951, compensating in a way for the degree he had to forego in his youth.

Reared as a Democrat, Self voted for Eisenhower in 1952. He remarked at the time that the Democratic Party "has gotten away from us."

Self remained optimistic about the future of the textile industry and the South.

Self returned to Greenwood from Durham a month ago and had been hospitalized since then.

Survivors in addition to his son, include his widow, the former Lura Mathews of Kirksey and four grandchildren, James Self III, Virginia, William Mathews and Sally Self, all of the home. They are the children of the younger Self and the former Virginia Turner, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. W. P. Turner, of Greenwood.

Mr. Self rose from the strained circumstances of the early death of his father to the ownership and direction of a tremendous industrial enterprise, built entirely under his direction.

His industrial creation preceded the very large expansion of the textile industry in this State in the last quarter-century. He was one of those pointing the way for this expansion. But he also kept pace with the growth of the industry to the north of him, in the Piedmont area of the State.

His era as an industrial builder and operator spanned the period of the making merely of "gray cloth" in South Carolina to printing and finishing, and he entered those fields, too, achieving success proportionate with that he had achieved in the days of mere clothmaking.

As Mr. Self built more and more plants in the Greenwood area, that area reflected it with its general economic growth. Greenwood's development is largely grounded in the development of the Self textile industries.

The industrialist provided well for the hundreds who were employed in his plants. A retiring, almost timid man, he never became too big to treat personally with those whom he employed. Plain in his tastes, Mr. Self drove around often in old automobiles of modest cost.

He was particularly proud of the fine brick homes he provided for the employees of his mills. These homes, set in their well-kept lawns, were considered models for mill workers. A great deal of Mr. Self's personal time was given to these homes. Also, outside of Greenwood, there were small farms for those workers who preferred to live in that fashion, and Mr. Self was particularly interested in these.

Dreams, practical skill, and perseverance were all needed in the climb of a fatherless lad of 10 in impoverished postwar Edgefield County to the assemblage in Greenwood where his fellow townsmen, men high in public life and finance and in his own field of textiles met to do him honor.

A short distance in space separates the two points and very little of Mr. Self's life was lived beyond them. And yet, within their confines, he grew to such stature that, as one speaker said "future generations will have a better life as they dwell in the lengthened shadow of this man."

The story of James C. Self has been told many times and in many ways, as each writer sees a different facet of the subject. But through them all runs a central theme of confidence in the future—the big dreams of which Reuben B. Robertson spoke at the Man of the South banquet—and the perseverance and skill to make those dreams come true.

These ingredients were the warp and woof of his life, intermingled as are the yarn and filling in the cloth which comes from the many looms in the textile establishment he headed. Giving warmth and strength and color to the fabric of his life were such things as his intense devotion to the South, the section from which he sprung; his love of a good story, and his concern for the men and women who make up the operating force of Greenwood Mills.

He was known as a doer, rather than as a speaker, but in his response to the Man of the South award, he let shine through in warm fashion one of the guiding lights of his life.

"I love the South," he said on that occasion. "I love the people of the South and the traditions."

"In my more than 76 years I have seen the South rise Phoenixlike from defeat and become an important segment of the Nation. The South is being reborn. Many in other sections are seeing in the South a great potential that can inaugurate a new era.

"Today, no one who knows the facts doubts that the South has become the Nation's greatest frontier. The South has played an important part in this Nation's history. Let us ever be grateful to our forefathers, those hardy patriots who established this great country," he said.

Mr. Self was born at Kirksey in 1876—a scant dozen years beyond Appomatox—the son of Dr. James Anderson Self and Mrs. Callie Holloway Self.

He was deprived of paternal support, however, in an accident rare to this section. Dr. Self, then only 36 years old, fractured his skull skating on the frozen surface of a pond one cold winter day and died from the injury in 1886.

Country doctors, particularly in the struggling South of that day, received few lucrative fees, and not any large part of the smaller ones due them. Dr. Self left his family chiefly a farm and a heritage of character, courage, and sense of public duty that his wife shared with him.

Mrs. Self, who had attended Due West Female College as a young girl, and who had been a schoolteacher, took over the task of rearing three fatherless boys.

Callie Self Memorial Baptist Church, at the entrance to the Mathews Mill village, stands today as a tribute to the devotion which Mrs. Self gave to her sons. The long years of practice which Dr. Self never had also are compensated for in some manner by the 179-bed Self Memorial Hospital which Mr. Self built and contributed without cost to this community. One of the sons, J. H. Self, became a doctor like his father, and the other brother, W. O. Self, was a banker.

There was work on the family farm, but there was schooling, too, and when Clemson College was opened in the summer of 1893, J. C. Self was one of the 446 young men enrolled. Times were hard, and he, like many other students, helped finance their college expenses by digging ditches on the raw new campus for 8 cents an hour.

When he went home in September of 1894 and found that four bales of cotton from his mother's farm brought less than $100 in Greenwood, he accepted the inevitable—his college days were over.

His was not an unusual case in that time, however, for when diplomas were given out in December 1896, only 36 of the original number graduated.

Fifty-seven years later Clemson College conferred on Mr. Self the honorary degree of Doctor of Textile Engineering, and one of the fortunate members of the graduating class, Dr. B. Rhett Turnipseed, was among the distinguished leaders who gathered here last year to honor him as he was presented the Man of the South Scroll.

His life as a college student ended, Mr. Self turned to his own area for employment, and took a job paying $100 a year as clerk at a country store operated by J. M. Gaines. This store burned, however, and he began work as a clerk in the Durst and Mathews store at Kirksey.

This store was owned by S. P. Mathews and W. L. and J. K. Durst. Two of this group have been honored by Mr. Self in naming textile plants. Grendel No. 2 was changed to Mathews in honor of S. P. Mathews when Mr. Self acquired control of it in 1930, and now the new print cloth mill is named Durst Plant in honor of W. L. Durst. This store continued in operation as one of the chief mercantile establishments in the Kirksey area until it burned a few years ago.

Mr. Self stayed at Durst and saved enough money to go to Richmond, Va., and enroll in a business school. With a business-school diploma in hand, he refused employment in Virginia and returned to Greenwood, a move he has never regretted and for which this community can be profoundly grateful.

His first job in Greenwood was as bookkeeper in the W. G. Gambrell Hardware Store. A little later he applied for and got the job as bookkeeper at the Bank of Greenwood, where J. K. Durst, one of his former employers at the store at Kirksey, was president.

J. K. and W. L. Durst had come to Greenwood to try their fortunes. J. K. turned

his interest eventually to formation of a bank in the hamlet of Greenwood, and W. L. Durst organized the Greenwood Mill of which Mr. Self became president in 1908, six years after the death of the man who had organized it.

Mr. Self was promoted to cashier at the bank and held that post at the time he was elected president of Greenwood Mill in 1908, a turning point in his life.

He was only 32 years old at that time, but he had with him the confidence of youth. He needed it. A consultant engineer called in to look over the plant advised him that the best thing that could happen would be to have it burn down.

The mill owed more than it was worth, being in debt $10 per spindle. Mr. Self realized that modernization of the equipment was the only hope, so with an issue of preferred stock, he began negotiating with equipment concerns in the East.

How he wrangled the new machinery and put the mill on its feet is a story which has been told many times. In looking back over those days, Mr. Self still does not know how he got up the nerve to face the equipment men with nothing but the stock of the run-down mill and the confidence that he could do the job.

The little mill got its equipment, however, the first step in an unending succession of replacements whenever better and more efficient textile machinery has been available. The confidence that saw him through that first crisis enabled him to resign as bank cashier in 1916 and devote his entire attention to the mill.

In March 1921, having acquired control of Ninety Six Cotton Mill, Mr. Self was elected president of that mill.

In 1930 he bought Grendel No. 2 and named it Mathews.

He announced plans for a new filament rayon weaving plant in 1948 and completed it 2 years later. Durst Plant was the fifth unit in the Greenwood Mills system.

In recent years honors have come fast for Mr. Self from his fellow citizens of this community and from outside the community and State.

He was elected "Colonel of Industry" by the Greenwood City Council "in recognition of his philanthropic work, his industrial developments, and innumerable civic achievements and gifts to his community and the city of Greenwood."

In 1949 he was elected Greenwood "Man of the Year" by the Rotary Club. That same year he was presented a Chamber of Commerce resolution honoring him for "using his industrial genius to benefit his fellow man in his own country and for his cooperation in every movement and enterprise for the best interest of the people of this section of South Carolina."

The Lions Club elected him "Man of the Year" in 1949, in recognition of "his benevolent genius which has built in this community a business organization which serves as a model for his industry and a source of never-ending benefits for his fellow man."

The Ninety Six Lions named him "first citizen" that same year.

The South Carolina Department of the American Legion presented him its Distinguished Public Service Award for the greatest individual contribution to South Carolina during 1951. Earlier that same month he had received from the University of South Carolina a degree of Doctor of Humane Letters and in November of 1952 he was awarded the Doctor of Textile Engineering degree by Clemson College.

Lander College conferred on Mr. Self the degree of Doctor of Humanities last June.

Last April Mr. Self received from Reuben B. Robertson, of Canton, N. C., a scroll as "Man of the South for 1952."

Iowa Newspaper Denounces Infamous Status of Forces Treaties and Secret Agreements Whereby United States Servicemen Are Sentenced to Foreign Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to find still another Iowa newspaper which is aware of the fact that American servicemen and their families, stationed in foreign countries, may be arrested and tried in foreign civil courts and, if convicted, sentenced to foreign prisons or made to suffer other unusual punishments. These treaties and secret agreements effectively destroy the constitutional rights of these Americans.

It is a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil:

UNITED STATES SERVICEMEN SENTENCED TO FOREIGN PRISONS

Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, recently testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in support of a resolution which he had introduced. It provides for revision of treaties and agreements which permit the trial of American servicemen and their dependents in foreign courts, and their incarceration in foreign prisons.

Representative GROSS pointed out that American servicemen may be tried in the civil courts of at least 14 foreign countries, including Japan, Libya, and Saudi Arabia.

There may be more than 14 countries in which American servicemen may be tried because the State Department admits the United States has concluded arrangements with other countries which, it says, in the national interest are classified. That means the names of the countries are kept secret and not even revealed to Members of Congress.

Several members of the committee expressed amazement that the United States had such secret agreements and questioned whether Representative GROSS had his facts straight. He then put into the official record a letter from the State Department admitting it to be a fact.

According to the Defense Department, 58 American servicemen were in foreign prisons on February 10 of this year. There may be more now.

Some 42 were imprisoned in Japan. It is indeed astounding that the United States would give any foreign country criminal jurisdiction over American servicemen, their wives, and children.

Incredible as it may seem, officials of the United States entered into such agreements without any real information regarding the trial procedures in the courts of these foreign nations. We do not know exactly what strange and unusual punishment is being meted out on American youth, drafted and sent into foreign service.

In some instances American boys are deprived of the protection they are guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Among other things, they may be denied the right to freedom on bail; denied presumption of innocence; denied a jury trial; denied counsel of their choice; denied a guaranty they will be convicted only if their guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt; denied any guaranty against cruel and unusual punishment.

Furthermore in some countries—including France—they may be at the mercy of Communist judges.

Do you realize that your son or your neighbor's son who has been drafted and sent overseas may be tried in a foreign court on some trumped-up charge, found guilty, and sentenced to a foreign prison without right of appeal?

Representative GROSS is trying to correct this situation. We believe it would be a good idea to write to Representative BEN JENSEN and Senators BOURKE HICKENLOOPER and TOM MARTIN and urge them to use their influence to cancel the treaties which permit such outrages.

The Imports Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Greenville News, published in Greenville, S. C., has a large circulation thoroughly covering the greatest textile manufacturing region in the world. Many of us here in Congress are exerting every effort to have the administration adopt import quotas on cheap Japanese textiles.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Greenville News ably points out the absolute necessity for an import quota on cheap foreign textile goods:

THE IMPORTS DANGER

In the light of the textile industry's prolonged price depression, its struggle to keep mills running and people working despite present stepped-up imports of foreign goods, and in view of fears that things will get much worse after new tariff cuts become effective in September, it seems high time official steps were taken to keep close tabs on the situation.

States whose economic well-being depends on the textile industry might profitably make use of a plan just now instituted in North Carolina. The Governor created a special three-man commission of top public officials to make a continuing study of the effects of United States trade policies on industry operations, employment, agricultural conditions, and the general economy of North Carolina. Factual information gathered in this manner should help guide those in Washington whose authority in trade matters has a direct bearing on jobs and living standards in the South.

Contrary to an impression voiced a good deal of late the textile industry has no margin of profit with which to combat foreign imports. Textile profits have been so slim for several years that there is no room in the profit margin to lower prices.

Official Government figures prove this. The data comes from the Securities and Exchange Commission and Federal Trade Commission. They report that industry profits, after payment of taxes, for the past year averaged less than 1 cent per dollar of sales. Profits on stockholders' investments in the same time averaged only 1.8 percent. So whichever way you measure industry profits, the answer is the same. They are low and

considerably below the average for all United States business and industry.

The insidious thing about the new tariff cuts, negotiated for Japan's special benefit, is that imports from low-wage Japan will hang a Damocles sword over American markets and American mills. Japanese goods, made at one-tenth of American labor cost, will cause a constant drag on American prices, wage rates, and industry operations. A ceiling will be set on progress, on earnings of American employees and investors alike resulting in forestalling textile plans for new equipment and new plants; a damper on confidence in the future.

Thinking ahead to the long-range aftermath of such a forlorn trend of events, the outlook appears grave. Obviously there is one effective answer to the problem: The setting up of quota controls so as to limit the inflow of foreign goods. Efforts are reported underway in Washington to that end. Meanwhile, the gathering of all pertinent facts on this problem, as they relate to this State, would seem imperative without delay.

What Price Integrity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States want honesty and integrity in their Government—in the officials who manage the affairs of our Nation. We want a Government that we can trust and respect. We want officials who will work for the public interest, and whose conduct will be above suspicion.

I realize full well that these objectives are difficult to attain at times because our Government is a mammoth organization, composed of over 2 million men and women who, while being capable of attaining many virtues, are also subject to human weaknesses. In an organization as large as our Federal Government, we sometimes encounter persons who step out of line and violate public trust. We cannot hope to maintain the integrity of our Government unless such persons are promptly separated from public service.

It was not so very long ago that we heard agonizing cries about the so-called mess in Washington. We heard about a mink coat, about several deepfreezers, and about the 5-percent racket. We were also assured that things of this sort would not occur if the Republicans were given the opportunity of managing the affairs of our Nation.

Judging from many reports, it would appear that some people are having difficulties in living up to those promises. While it appears that the price of influence peddling may have been reduced in some instances from 5 to 4 percent, and while there has been no mention during the past couple of years of minks and deepfreezers, the present administration has run into more serious troubles in other fields.

During the past 3 years, for instance, we have heard about public officials dipping into private slush funds provided by some generous benefactors;

We have heard about mismanagement and corruption in Government procurement, with alleged bribes to procurement officers reaching as high as $50,000, and with mountains of hamburger and veritable lakes of ketchup filling Government storage bins and warehouses;

We have heard about the mess in Government housekeeping functions, criticized by even such a stanch Republican organ as Fortune magazine;

We have heard about cheese manufacturers and distributors making an overnight windfall profit of $2.5 million at the taxpayers' expense, and about shocking windfalls in housing and in the disposition of Government surplus materiel;

We have heard about the abortive and ill-fated Dixon-Yates deal, and about attempts to raid our national resources;

More recently, we have heard about a Cabinet member using his position and official stationary to drum up business from Government contractors for a firm which has been paying him $50,000 a year in partnership profits.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to insert two editorials which appeared in the July 27 and July 28 editions of the Milwaukee Journal. They are a pretty good indication of many people's feelings about ethics in Government.

The editorials follow:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 27, 1955]

TALBOTT SHOULD BE KICKED OUT

No administration that claims to live by what President Eisenhower has called "an uncompromising code" can long tolerate Air Force Secretary Talbott.

The investigations of Talbott's outside business activities have produced evidence of serious improprieties that show up as tarnish on "the hound's tooth."

Talbott admits—and defends—the fact that he has written on Air Force stationery to firms with defense contracts in the interests of a management engineering company in which he is a partner. He has made phone calls to the same ends. At least one company, the Radio Corporation of America, refused to renew a contract it had with P. Mulligan & Co., without an opinion from the Attorney General that it was proper and legal to continue to do business with a firm in which the Air Force Secretary was a partner.

Talbott has told the Senate subcommittee that he had contacted David Sarnoff, RCA president, about renewing the contract. He also said under questioning that he had told the Air Force general counsel that he was "terribly disturbed" because RCA had questioned the propriety of doing business with the Mulligan firm and sought to involve the Attorney General.

It has been testified that the Avco Manufacturing Co. of New York has $200 million in defense contracts with the Air Force and Navy, about half the firm's business. The Mulligan firm landed an Avco contract and Talbott played a part in approaching company officials. Other firms that have employed Mulligan since 1953—when Talbott took office—include, according to the New York Times, the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., Olin Industries, the Greyhound Corp., and Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.

The Chattanooga Times has disclosed that another large defense contractor, the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp., was approached by Talbott by letter in the Mulligan firm's interest. Letters indicating Talbott's activities have been introduced in testimony—letters on Air Force stationery.

Talbott's connection with the Mulligan firm was brought out at the time of his appointment as Air Force secretary. He said then that he held a "special" partnership in the firm and would not benefit from any firms holding defense contracts. But he testifies now that he is a regular partner and that there have been no "special accounts" in which just Mulligan draws profit. Talbott gets at least $50,000 a year from the Mulligan partnership.

A few of the Republican Senators insist that there is no impropriety in any of this. Senator MCCARTHY even opposed Talbott's earlier offer to quit the Mulligan firm because it would be an admission "of guilt" when there is no guilt. In view of MCCARTHY'S strange concept of what is ethical, it is not surprising to find him defending Talbott's dealings.

The position of Attorney General Brownell is surprising, however. He says he was asked by Talbott for a ruling on outside activities after the matter had been raised by RCA. Brownell says that he gave no ruling, and that such requests would have to made formally by letter to receive attention. Here's queer cooperation and concern for the standards of the "team." What kind of protection is the Attorney General giving the President—who has said that an administration must depend upon its attorney general.

But, all these matters are secondary to the need now. That need is for Talbott's resignation. It is a basic tenet of public service that there be no conflicts of personal and public interests. Talbott fostered such interest. He allowed the appearance of serious improprieties to grow. His withdrawal from the Mulligan firm now is not enough. He should be kicked out as Air Force Secretary.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 28, 1955]

WHY WAIT ON FIRING TALBOTT?

President Eisenhower will wait until the end of a Senate investigation before considering the case of Air Secretary Talbott and his outside business interests.

Why? The Senate is pushing the probe to find out whether Talbott's case involves what may be violation of the conflict-of-interest law. As the President says, illegality has not yet been proved.

But the President's concern should be something else—the ethics of his aides. The President himself, in speaking of the Talbott case, has said that the actions of a public official must be impeccable and that he must avoid giving even the impression of wrongdoing.

Consider these matters already made clear by the investigation to date and Talbott's own admissions:

Talbott wrote letters on Air Force stationery and made calls from the Air Force offices to get business for the firm of Paul B. Mulligan & Co.—in which Talbott held a full partnership. He was shocked when Radio Corporation of America questioned the propriety of doing business with a firm in which the Air Force Secretary received profits. Talbott, an RCA official swears, said that RCA should stop being so high and mighty.

Talbott told the Senate committee that considered his nomination more than 2 years ago that he held a special partnership in the Mulligan firm and did not participate in profits from defense contract firms. Yet he has shared equally in those profits ever since and has aided in obtaining those contracts.

Mulligan is an efficiency expert. Yet he saw no inefficiency in paying half the firm's

profits to Talbott, who took no constant active part in the business. Why? Isn't there at least the appearance that Mulligan considered Talbott's position of value in seeking business?

Certainly there is the appearance of improper use of office. Certainly in acting from the Air Force office to aid in getting contracts there was actual impropriety and very questionable ethics on Talbott's part.

What more need the President know to act? Talbott's own admissions have been enough to show that he has violated the standards the President keeps saying he insists upon.

Minority Views on the Foreign Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several pertinent excerpts from the views submitted by four members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in a minority report on the mutual security bill—commonly known as the foreign aid bill.

This minority report, not having been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe that those who joined in voting against this bill when it was approved by the House would appreciate a restatement of some of the views set forth therein. The report was signed by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHURCH of Illinois, Mr. BENTLEY of Michigan, and myself.

Since, by the executive branch's own figures, there was unexpended on June 30, 1955, about $8.7 billion in foreign-aid funds, the need for additional funds at this time is the more difficult to understand.

Portions of the report follow:

This marks our third consecutive report of minority views on the mutual security program. The first was on the Mutual Security Act of 1953. The second was on the Mutual Security Act of 1954. And now we feel compelled on the basis of the same objections we have heretofore enunciated to express our minority views on the proposed Mutual Security Act of 1955.

It is true that we support certain programs in this bill. Technical assistance has now become, and must remain, a people-to-people program of sharing know-how and technical skill. Helping people to help themselves brings lasting benefits with which we are in full accord. Such a program builds self-respect for peoples and independence for nations and should build reliable friends for the United States, which we sorely need. We also support other self-help humanitarian projects, typical of which is the international health program for children and mothers in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Such programs are in keeping with American history and American principles.

Just as it is important for the Congress and its Members to restate our fundamental principles—we have done this recently in the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 149 on colonialism and Communist imperialism—so we feel we must voice our opposition to a program each time it is presented to the Congress when such a program continues its disregard of such principles. The bill before this House is such a program.

The mutual security program authorized to be continued in this bill demonstrates a shocking lack of confidence in the fundamental principles which have made our Nation great. Respect is not a commodity which can be bought nor can security be attained by a mutual security program which is based on false concepts.

THE NEED FOR REAPPRAISAL

In the past we have urged what to us has seemed natural and logical—a thorough study, a reappraisal, a redefining of foreign policies, techniques and statutes concerned with the goal of international peace and security, which we all seek. The executive branch has not seen fit to do this before submitting this bill to the Congress; nor has the Congress of the United States itself, which is directly responsible to the people who foot the bills, make the sacrifices, and fight the wars, undertaken such an analysis. This program, encompassed in the proposed Mutual Security Act of 1955, has been given less consideration from the point of view of legislative analysis and evaluation than in any previous year. This is true despite the fact that, as we have pointed out in our past minority reports, this program has no foreseeable termination date.

* * * * *

THE SUPPORT OF COLONIALISM

We do not agree with the further statement in the majority report that "There is today evidence on every continent that the mutual security program has begun to give us important foreign-policy advantages."

* * * * *

The mutual security program in this bill, more than ever before in its history, illustrates the almost complete abdication of our congressional constitutional and traditional powers. The Congress has lost control over the spending and over the policies adopted by the executive branch in spending the taxpayers' money.

Indeed, the executive branch itself has lost control over the programs which it is charged with administering.

* * * * *

THE BLANK CHECK

The abdication of congressional duties and responsibilities, as already instanced by vast transferability powers, is further glaringly evidenced by the proposed blank check which is given to the Executive in this bill. The hearings on the measure disclose little account of precisely how the money requested in this bill will fit into the new requirements.

* * * * *

We do not feel that there should be any authorization for a new mutual security program until the Department of Defense has reached the point where it can come back to the Congress and give us its detailed findings on the soundness of these past programs—programs against which, we again remind the House, we filed minority views last year and the year before.

The provision in the bill establishing the President's Fund for Asian Economic Development and authorizing approximately $200 million for such purpose is a further striking example of the abdictation of congressional control over the expenditure of funds by the executive branch. Do we know which countries in Asia will be receiving assistance out of this fund? And how much? Do we even have an estimate of how much each country will be receiving beyond some "conceivable" projects? Do we know what projects will be used for development purposes? Do we have any idea of what contributions the recipient countries themselves will be making? Do we know how much the executive branch expects to spend in fiscal year 1956 out of this fund? The hearings disclose no clue to any of these questions. What is certain, and what can be stated in certain terms, however, is that if such a fund is established, $200 million will be used, one way or another, by June 30, 1958, the termination date in the bill for the fund. But for whom, for what and how much we do not know. Nor do the administrators of the mutual security program. Under the provisions setting up the fund "the President is authorized to utilize the appropriations made available for the fund to accomplish in the free Asian area the policies and purposes declared in this act and to disburse them on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify to any person, corporation, or other body of persons however designed."

Nowhere in any legislation we know of has such sweeping and blanket authority been delegated on such unknown terms. We ask the Members of this House to read these quoted words slowly and carefully. We have read them slowly and carefuly. We do not feel that congressional authorization and appropriation for the continued concept of "blank check" in the mutual security program, so pointedly exemplified in the above provisions, would constitute the proper exercise of our responsibilities as representatives of our people.

Lecture Tour of Dr. Charles J. Zinn, Under International Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, Dr. Charles J. Zinn, has returned from a lecture tour of universities in Germany under the auspices of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State. I believe that the exchange programs are among the most effective means of communicating our American ideas and standards to the people of other nations and obtaining a worldwide understanding that is essential for peace.

Dr. Zinn has been law revision counsel since the beginning of the 76th Congress and has supervised and directed the preparation of all new editions and supplements of the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code and the various revisions of titles of the United States Code,, which is one of the important functions of the subcommittee, of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following letter of Hon. Russell L. Riley, director of the International Educational Exchange Service, to Representative CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, reporting on the success of Dr. Zinn's lecture tour:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 28, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: We have just received an excellent report from our Embassy in Bonn, Germany, reporting on the visit of Dr. Charles J. Zinn, under the International Educational Exchange program. First of all, we would like to express our gratitude to you

and the Committee on the Judiciary for your willingness to relinquish Dr. Zinn's services so that he could undertake this visit. Such an understanding attitude on the part of your committee adds great weight to the effectiveness of our efforts.

If I may, I would like to quote directly from the report concerning Dr. Zinn's activities and effectiveness while in Germany:

"His tour was a complete success, bringing together a happy combination of an excellent performer with something to say and superior audiences who were happy to see him and who understood completley what he had to offer.

"It was a real pleasure to arrange Dr. Zinn's tour. The contacts which he had made during a previous visit to Germany included high officials of the Justice Ministry, both Houses of the German Parliament, leading jurists and the deans of many university law faculties. These persons were, without exception, pleased to welcome Dr. Zinn back to Germany as a lecturer and proved valuable to us in arranging his tour.

"The value of Dr. Zinn's tour lies not only in his very good performances, but perhaps even more in the great number of private conversations which he had with German jurists and parliamentarians concerning codification of the law, the American balance of power doctrine and our legislative process. Dr. Zinn devoted almost all his free time to such discussions and we have seldom observed a person willing to work so strenuously for the program."

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL L. RILEY,
Director, International Educational Exchange Service.

Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to call the attention of this body to Switzerland's Independence Day.

A country in central Europe, Switzerland has maintained its independence since 1291. During the 664 years the Swiss people have shown the world how peoples of different languages and nationalities can live together peacefully and democratically.

We may expect this small, industrious country to serve as host to many great international conferences in the future, enabling, we hope, the governments of the world to catch the spirit by which the Swiss people govern themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity of submitting the following proclamation issued by G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan:

PROCLAMATION—SWISS INDEPENDENCE DAY

In this 664th year of their independence, the democracy of Switzerland continues to be a beacon of freedom to all those who aspire to the benefits that only a truly democratic society can provide. Its strength is derived from agriculture and modern industry as well as the continued preservation of personal liberties within the framework of states rights. The varied nature of its population, customs, and religion has continued throughout its history yet there is a sturdy national character as distinctive as its rugged terrain.

It is important that freedom-loving peoples everywhere take this opportunity to reaffirm their determination to maintain that freedom. The Swiss democracy, dating from 1291, with a revision of the constitution in 1848, has inspired other people to seek and establish democratic government. The friendship that the United States of America and Switzerland share can do much to preserve our freedom from those who seek to destroy true liberty. Continued devotion to these high ideals by our peoples will be an inspiration to others.

Each year it is customary to observe August 1 as Swiss Independence Day.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Monday, August 1, 1955, as Swiss Independence Day in Michigan, and urge all our citizens to join with their brethren of Swiss descent in paying tribute to the great history of the Swiss democracy.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 29th day of July, in the year of our Lord, 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

They Speak Peace, but Mischief Is in Their Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the Western World has been witnessing a most remarkable spectacle. Soviet Russia, it seems, has set out upon a course to convince the world that it really does want peace. In every conceivable manner, Soviet leaders have taken pains to give the appearance of substance to the shadow of the long-heralded Stalin "peace" offensive. No efforts have been spared to show the world that the men in the Kremlin are really reasonable, peace-loving, and trustworthy men.

However, peace—a real peace as we interpret its meaning—in order to be lasting, must be based upon trust, confidence, and mutual good faith. These are fundamental requirements for peace. I would like to believe that the Soviets want a real peace because the alternative—war in the hydrogen age—raises a specter of horror. But I cannot believe that the leaders of the Soviet Union meet the requirements necessary for the attainment of a real peace; that is to say, trust, confidence, and good faith. They have never been trustworthy. They cannot be trusted now. The long catalog of broken treaties and agreements concluded during the existence of the Soviet regime is convincing evidence of that fact. The Bible tells us, in the words of King David, in the 28th Psalm:

Take me not off with the wicked, with those who are workers of evil, who speak peace with their neighbors, while mischief is in their hearts.

Unlike the freedom-inspired nations of the world whose foreign policies are rooted in the desire to live at peace, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is a military campaign, the ultimate objective of which is world conquest. To the Soviet leaders peace is never absolute; it is never an end in itself. The political philosophy of the Soviet State is not based upon the concept of good-will towards men, but rather it is based on the belief that all mankind is at war with itself, that the millennium will come only with the conquest of the world by communism. Communists thrive on conflict, disorder, and disharmony, and when they seek peace it is not as a permanent goal. To them peace is a tactical weapon. It is only a diversionary tactic to gain time to recoup their energies before striking with greater force.

The recent conference at Geneva was a major attempt of the Soviet leaders to demonstrate to the world their new policy of peaceful co-existence. Meeting the most powerful leaders in the West, Khrushchev, Bulganin, Molotov, and Zhukov did their utmost to convince them and the entire world of their sincere desire for peace. Indeed, the leaders of the Soviet Union came to Geneva with a smile on their faces, but there was malice in their hearts. At every turn they gave the appearance of sweet reasonableness but they conceded nothing in the course of this conference. From their mouths which have spewed forth some of the most vicious, libelous, and malicious criticism of the West, and especially of the United States, there came forth now the honeyed propaganda platitudes of the peace campaign.

What was accomplished at Geneva? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. All the Soviet leaders did after a week of talking was to create the illusion of agreement.

On the surface, Soviet tactics have changed, but while Soviet tactics have changed Soviet strategy goes on unchanged. The Soviet Union seeks world conquest; it seeks the destruction of all the positions of strength created at such great cost in time, energy, and treasure by the United States and the West; it seeks, above all else, the destruction of the United States. Let it never be forgotten that America is the principal adversary of the Soviet Union. This Nation, first and foremost, restrains the predatory ambitions of the Soviet leaders. Let it never be forgotten that the threat of war is always with us so long as the Communists do not cleanse their hearts.

In the months ahead America must be on guard. We must view all these current Soviet gestures of amity with caution and with realism. Let the President remember those wise words of King David:

Take me not off with the wicked, with those who are workers of evil, who speak peace with their neighbors, while mischief is in their hearts.

The United States should keep wide awake because the soft tones could be a Russian lullaby.

We permit ourselves to be drawn into talks with Russia. It is like playing with a rattlesnake in its coil. No good can come of it and we are bound to get hurt.

Schedule of Official Tour of the Fourth Indiana District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the first session of the 84th Congress, I wish to announce plans for my official tour of the Fourth Indiana District.

During my service in the Congress, I have made it a custom to tour the eight counties comprising the district I represent, to obtain first-hand reports on legislative and governmental matters and information from the people I serve.

These official tours, I have found to be of tremendous value in informing me of the grassroot sentiments. Opportunity is also afforded for free discussion of governmental problems in which my constituents are vitally interested.

It has been my policy to be present in the various courthouses and invite the people of these counties to meet with me.

To assure good government, I have always believed that we should keep it to the extent reasonably possible at the local level where every citizen can take part and express his views on current legislation or national problems.

I am looking forward to visiting the various county seats of the district again this fall and extend a warm invitation to all who are interested to visit with me when I am in their locality.

The 8 counties in the 4th Indiana District are: Allen, De Kalb, Whitley, Steuben, Lagrange, Wells, Adams, and Noble. I shall hold these courthouse conferences on this official tour at the following times and places and hope to have the pleasure of meeting with all interested constituents:

September 19, courthouse, Bluffton.
September 20, courthouse, Decatur.
September 21, courthouse, Auburn.
September 22, courthouse, Angola.
September 23, courthouse, Lagrange.
September 26, courthouse, Albion.
September 27, courthouse, Columbia City.

I shall be in each place from 10 until 12 and from 2 until 4 and other appointments may be made by special arrangement.

Upon the completion of the tour, I will open an office in the Federal building, at Fort Wayne, room 310, to carry on my official duties as Representative of the 4th District, and want the public to know that they are welcome to call at the office to discuss their personal legislative or governmental problems. My office in Washington, located in room 1511 House Office Building, also will be open during adjournment to enable me to carry on my obligations and responsibilities and to assist constituents.

This has been an important period in our national history and I feel we have come a long way in achieving peace and prosperity for our people. We must continue all efforts in this direction.

Fishing For Kids Only—West Branch, Mich., Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, up in the 10th Congressional District of Michigan the small community of West Branch, nestled in the hills of Ogemaw County, has set an example for the Nation in interesting young America in the sport of Izaak Walton.

The community has armed itself with a strong weapon against juvenile delinquency, against boy gangs, and against atheistic communism.

A few years ago a group of West Branch citizens, whose interest in youth went beyond the mere talking about the youth problem, set about to do something for the youngsters.

The result was "fishing for kids only," which in West Branch means that the waters of the trout-abounding Weidman Creek, which winds its way through the town, is set aside for fishing solely by boys and girls under 16 years of age. And 24 property owners along the route of the creek have cooperated by hiding their "no trespassing" signs insofar as applying to the kids fishing from the creek banks of their land.

The idea of "fishing for kids only" which was pioneered in West Branch caught on quickly in Michigan and now about 40 communities are sponsoring similar projects.

Just how the proposal caught fire is described in the Kiwanis magazine as follows:

> Two years ago, Kiwanian Mickey Duggan decided he wanted to do something to keep juvenile delinquency out of West Branch, Mich. Remembering how he liked fishing as a boy, Mickey thought it might be a good idea to give the local kids a private fishing preserve. West Branch gets its name from a trout stream that cuts through the heart of town, and Mickey's plan was to restrict fishing there to boys and girls 16 years old and under. He explained his idea around town, and everyone liked it. The State conservation department stocked the stream with trout for the kids.
>
> Then West Branchers collected enough money from local sources to buy a 10½ acre plot of land bordering the stream. The kids went for the idea in a big way. Although thousands of trout were dumped into the stream at the beginning of the season, another load had to be planted.
>
> Said one parent: "We used to worry about what our children were doing after school. But now, when we know they're fishing, our worries are over." The West Branch club, meanwhile, has been busy answering letters from educators, youth leaders, law officers, and park officials all over the country who want to learn more about the West Branch project.

So when a West Branch dad's favorite trout rod is missing he usually hikes for Weidman Creek and tries to locate Junior and the rod. A lot of pops and moms got the habit of trailing junior to the stream but in some places the going was pretty rugged for mom because much of the shoreline was brush covered and much more had been used as a dumping place so out of that came another benefit for the community. Some ten and a half acres of land along Weidman Creek were donated to the city by the West Branch Kiwanis Club, the Producers Refining Co., the Precision Manufacturing Co., and Mr. and Mrs. Paul Keeler.

Today this area is a beautiful spot known as Irons Memorial Park. There are signs on the larger trees, identifying them. There is an artesian well, fireplaces, picnic tables, log catwalks across the stream, and "old swimming hole."

Some civic-minded people donated money and others donated equipment, supplies, and labor to make the park possible. The park was another fruit of "Fishing for Kids Only."

But back to "fishing for kids only."

There has been another product of the program. The youngsters of the West Branch area have come to realize the value of clean streams and streams free of tin cans and garbage so they are doing their bit to keep their favorite fishing grounds free of litter.

The "fishing for kids" program is now sponsored by the retail merchants division of the West Branch Chamber of Commerce and this group has erected signs along the protected area of the stream proclaiming:

> Mr. Fisherman, you are on your honor. This stream is reserved for boys and girls 16 years and under.

The Michigan United Conservation Club publication had this to say about it:

> Some said the project would be a passing fancy—that there wouldn't be enough kids on the stream to make it worthwhile. A few days before the season opened the stream was stocked with legal size trout.
>
> When the opener rolled around the youngsters were out on the stream by the hundreds. Being a little short on tackle, they were angling for trout with willow poles, casting rods and almost any type of fishing rig. Others rushed home and "borrowed" Dad's fly rod, net creel, and boots. Some 8-year-olds on the stream were almost hidden in their big boots.

The program has the approval of the Michigan Department of Conservation and Gerald E. Eddy, director of that department, says:

> In many places, interested civic groups have set up and reserved stretches of natural public waters for kids. The State conservation department encourages this sort of natural use wherever it appears justified. Not unnatural ponds or stocked waters, but stretches of stream where Dame Nature is still chief stockholder. It's a project that service clubs, chambers of commerce, sportsmen's clubs, and other interested civic groups might find singularly profitable.

The project is being copied by other communities in Michigan and I hope my colleagues in the House will call it to the attention of some of your civic minded constituents because I am sure my friends in West Branch do not want to monopolize the idea. I am interested in young America. I want to do what I can to interest him in baseball and other competitive sports and in fishing and in conservation and in God's great

out-of-doors. If we can direct the attention of our youth along these lines we will have need for less national concern about some of the youth problems that have been discussed on this floor during this session of Congress.

I invite my colleagues to come to the Tenth District of Michigan after Congress adjourns and enjoy our out-of-doors and our recreational areas. We have beautiful streams abounding in trout, our fresh-water lakes with game fish awaiting your lure, and beautiful Lake Huron with its perch and other fish.

The Low-Income Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that this Congress has failed to provide the money requested by the administration to help get the low-income farm program under way. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains speech after speech about the needs of family farms—especially the small farmer. But when it comes to action the low-income farmer is again the forgotten man.

The price-support and stabilization programs during the past year cost over a billion dollars. I want to make it clear that I am for price supports. The benefits went primarily to 2 million of the larger, more prosperous farmers, the ones best able to care for themselves.

There are 1½ million farmers with incomes of less than $1,000 per year. They get little or no benefits from price supports. The administration announced a program for these low-income farmers and asked for a modest fund of $3 million, plus $30 million for loans. This Congress was in the process of denying any help for this program.

It was only after Senator AIKEN spoke out in protest at the last minute on July 26 and an amendment was submitted by Senator THYE that $15 million with administrative expenses was provided for loans to the low-income farmers. The rest of the funds were denied. These low-income farmers can get additional help only by borrowing. Again they are the forgotten people.

Senator AIKEN said:

The President pointed out ways in which the low-income farmers could be helped, and he has asked for a very modest amount of money to be used in helping them. * * *

I had hoped that Congress would respond to the President's request. More than 1,000 counties, or about one-third of all the counties in the United States, are low-income counties; that is counties in which farmers who are hard up live. I regret very much that after the President had made this request of Congress, the House recently eliminated every dollar of appropriation, I believe, which would have enabled the several departments which would have cooperated to have helped improve the lot of the 1½ million low-income farmers.

I am more than disappointed, upon coming to the Senate today, to learn that the Senate Committee on Appropriations also has eliminated the funds which would have helped the President to carry out his program to improve the lot of the 1½ million low-income farmers.

President Eisenhower in sending the program to Congress said:

We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our million and a half farm families with extremely low incomes—for their own wellbeing and for the good of our country and all our people.

This Congress will go home to find that all across this country, prominent leaders agreed that the rural development program for low-income farmers was sound. They will find disappointment and regret that Congress provided only one-half the loan funds requested and denied other modest requests of $3 million to help low-income farm families.

The Sweet Uses of Adversity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Ashville Citizen of Thursday, July 28. This editorial was written by Mr. Paul A. Rockwell, and concerns a bill which I introduced to aid the last surviving Confederate veterans.

The editorial follows:

THE SWEET USES OF ADVERSITY

(By Paul A. Rockwell)

Congress very justly passed last May a bill to pay all medical expenses of Albert Woolson, 108 years old, the sole surviving veteran of the Union Army of the 1860's.

A similar bill was introduced in Congress by Representative PAT W. JENNINGS, of Virginia, to aid the last three remaining Confederate veterans, Walter W. Williams, 112, of Franklin, Tex.; John Salling, 109, of Slant, Va.; and William A. Lundy, 107, of Laurel, Hill, Fla. Action on Representative JENNINGS' bill has been slow. Perhaps Congress believes the ex-Confederates still are able to look out for themselves.

The men who wore the gray have been taking care of themselves for a long while. After the surrenders at Appomattox and Greensboro and elsewhere throughout the South, those who had fought so long and so well went home to scenes of desolation without parallel in extent in the history of our race. The Scotch highlands after Culoden and the passage of the "Butcher" Duke of Cumberland and his English troopers may have been somewhat similar but on a vastly smaller scale. An entire civilization had been swept away, gone with the wind forever. The ex-Confederates found ruins, devestation, mourning on every side. All the South had left was courage, pride in a cause well defended, land—if taxes thereon could be met—and hands (often only one to a man) with which to labor.

For a long time the Confederate veteran often went hungry, but he had been hungry throughout most of the 4 years of war. Only after he had grown old were the various States that had seceded sufficiently recovered to vote him a tiny pension. From 1865 until his death, he usually knew what want and worry were, for they were his constant companions.

The North, on the other hand, was swollen with victory, wealth and the spoils of war. The defeated South was occupied for over 10 years by blue-clad troops, and whatever of value war had left there was gobbled up by the carpetbaggers and their henchmen. While the South suffered and struggled to remain alive, an unprecedented wave of industrial expansion, railroad building and prosperity set in at the North.

The veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic quickly banded themselves together and became a mighty political power, more formidable in time of peace than they had been on the battlefields. For over a third of a century, a man who had not worn a blue uniform in the 1860's had slight chance of living in the White House, or representing a northern State in the Halls of Congress. The slackers and war profiteers did not "have it so good" as they did between the two World Wars.

The Union veterans voted themselves and their widows the most generous pensions ever paid in the history of any nation. None of them needed to go hungry, or worry about the future. In truth, "to the victor belonged the spoils."

Under such favorable conditions, one would think the Union veteran would outlive the Confederate veteran. According to the Adjutant General's figures, 2,698,304 men and boys wore the Federal uniform during the war against the South. Many Confederate Army records were destroyed in the war, but 625,000 men is the generally accepted estimate of the soldiers of the Confederacy. Judging from the relative strengths of the two opposing armies, and granting equal stamina and average good health, there should be 13 Union veterans alive today to the 3 Confederates.

Perhaps prosperity, easy living, lack of want and worry do soften a man, make him more vulnerable to disease, an easier prey for death. If it is a privilege to live to an advanced old age—which is disputable—ex-Confederates Williams, Salling, and Lundy may be saying with Shakespeare, "Sweet are the uses of adversity."

The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this is heralded as the year of America's greatest prosperity. Unquestionably America does enjoy great prosperty. It is a time when Government income should reflect this optimistic picture with a resultant balanced budget and a reduction in the national debt. Actually we do find Government revenues up—but so are Government expenditures. While business prosperity generates more Federal income, United States spending happily absorbs the increased receipts. Instead of a reduction in the amount of the national debt, we find that it continues to mount. If we cannot now have fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget, when may it be expected? The outlook is not in any sense one to encourage con-

fidence in the Nation's fiscal management.

The job of finding ways to reduce spending has gotten tougher just since last January. While reductions in the year just past were sharper than the President planned 18 months ago—in January 1954—they did not measure up to what Mr. Eisenhower predicted in January 1955.

Specifically, the President foresaw this outcome in his budget message just 7 months ago:

Income was to be $59 billion.

Outgo was to be trimmed to $63.5 billion from $67.8 billion the year before.

The deficit was to be $4.5 billion.

Now, with the year over, you can see how it came out:

Income was $60.3 billion.

Outgo was $64.5 billion.

The deficit turned out to be $4.2 billion.

Income, in other words, was up $1.3 billion from the January estimate. An end to the business recession—a vigorous upturn—did that for the administration.

Yet spending was up almost as much, a billion dollars, from the January expectations.

Actually, the $64.5 billion of spending represents not an upturn in spending, but a failure to slash outlays as sharply as expected.

Despite this record, the fact is that spending cuts were substantially smaller than the President predicted in his January 1955 budget message.

The failure to reduce spending is raising questions as to whether the administration will balance the budget even during its fourth year in office.

Revision and Extension of Sugar Act of 1948

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7030) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I explained in the outset, because of the pressure of time, it is not possible for me to discuss, with any degree of satisfaction, the details of this complicated bill. I am glad to provide for the record detailed information which I hope will be beneficial and helpful. I have prepared a statement in the nature of an analysis of the bill, which I hope will be carefully considered. Here is the statement:

PRESENT SUGAR ACT

Objective: The major objectives of the Sugar Act are to maintain a healthy domestic sugar industry, to assure adequate sugar supplies to consumers at reasonable prices, and to promote our general export trade.

Outline of major provisions: The total supply of sugar that may be marketed in the United States is determined annually by the Secretary of Agriculture at a level, which, in conjunction with existing demand conditions, is expected to produce a price fair to both producers and consumers. Shares in the total supply are assigned to domestic and foreign sugar-producing areas. Whe necessary, domestic quotas are subdivided into marketing allotments for each qualified marketer. Also, when necessary, the quota for each domestic area is subdivided into proportionate shares assigned to individual producers of sugarcane and sugar beets. Government payments are made to domestic growers who comply with the condition prescribed in the act.

Determining sugar requirements: Each December, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to determine how much sugar will be needed to meet United States requirements for the subsequent calendar year. A public hearing is held at which all interested persons, including consumers, industrial users, wholesalers, refiners, sugarcane and sugar-beet processors, and producers may present views and recommendations on the matter.

Establishing quotas: After requirements are determined, each domestic and foreign producing area supplying the United States with sugar is assigned a quota representing its share of the United States market. The law establishes fixed marketing quotas for the five domestic areas and the Philippines and residual quotas to Cuba and other foreign countries. Cuba receives 96 percent and other foreign countries 4 percent of the residual quota. Fixed quotas for the domestic areas are as follows:

Area:	*Short tons sugar (raw value)*
Domestic beet sugar	1,800,000
Domestic cane sugar	500,000
Hawaii	1,052,000
Puerto Rico	1,080,000
Virgin Islands	12,000

On the basis of an annual sugar requirement of 8,400,000 tons, domestic areas supply about 53 percent and foreign countries supply about 47 percent.

Establishing marketing allotments: One important function of the sugar program is to promote orderly marketing. This cane sometimes be accomplished through quotas alone. However, quotas may not suffice, especially when supplies in the producing areas materially exceed the quotas. If the Secretary believes that the pressure of supplies in an area is likely to result in disorderly marketing, he must allot the quota fairly among persons who market Sugar. This allotment assures each marketer of an equitable share of the market, and permits the conduct of business on a more stable day-to-day basis.

Establishing proportionate share—acreage allotments: When the indicated sugar supply for a domestic area is greater than the quantity needed to fill the quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, the act requires the Secretary to divide the market among individual producing farms. The total amount of sugarcane or sugar beets that may be harvested for sugar on a farm, is known as a farm's "proportionate share." The establishment of proportionate shares assures that each eligible farm in the producing area will receive its fair share of the market and at the same time, bear its fair share of any required adjustment in production. Among other conditions, producers are required to market within their proportionate shares if they wish to qualify for conditional payments.

Making conditional payments: In addition to the price protection afforded growers under the quota system, the act provides for direct payment to growers ranging from 80 cents per 100 pounds of sugar for production of less than 350 tons of sugar per farm, down to 30 cents per 100 pounds for production in excess of 30,000 tons per farm. The average payment for all domestic producers is about 67 cents per 100 pounds. In addition to these payments, the act affords a degree of protection to producers with respect to bona fide abandonment of planted acreage and crop deficiencies of harvested acreage resulting directly from drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease or insects. In the case of payment for acreage abandonment and crop deficiency, the payment is computed on the basis of specified percentages of the farm's normal yield.

Conditions of payments: To qualify for conditional payments, producers must fulfill a number of conditions. These are: (a) they must not employ child labor; (b) they must not market sugarcane or sugar beets in excess of farm proportionate shares; (c) they must pay fair wages as determined by the Secretary; and (d) if they are also processors, they must pay fair prices as determined by the Secretary for sugar beets or sugarcane purchased from other producers.

Processing tax: A tax on sugar provides funds to the Government which more than offset the total of all conditional payments plus the costs incurred in administering the Sugar Act. This tax is one-half cent a pound, raw value, on all sugar processed or imported for direct consumption.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H. R. 7030

Term of the amendment: The bill reenacts and extends for 4 years, to December 31, 1960, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, with further amendments dealing primarily with adjustments of quotas. The present act, in the absence of any action by the Congress, would expire December 31, 1956. The bill also extends for 4 years, to June 30, 1961, the applicability of the excise tax on sugar in the Internal Revenue Code. This tax finances the sugar-stabilizing program.

Major effects: This legislation's major effect is to open the way for United States domestic-area producers to participate with foreign areas in supplying the growth of the United States sugar market. The bill maintains unchanged participation of domestic and foreign areas in the present level of consumption in the United States market. Cuba, for a number of years, has enjoyed an increasing market for her sugar here—equal virtually to the complete growth

of sugar consumption in the United States. This legislation would open the way for United States producers to participate in the larger market constantly being created by the growth of our consumption of sugar. In addition, and to a lesser extent, other foreign suppliers would enjoy a part of the expanding market along with Cuba.

Method of assigning increases in the domestic market in 1956: An annual growth in the United States sugar consumption of approximately 135,000 tons is expected on the basis of past experience. For the calendar year 1956, the amount of the increase in our market above 8,350,000 short tons, raw value, would be apportioned 50 percent to domestic producing areas and 50 percent to the foreign suppliers—except the Philippines, which has a fixed quota—with Cuba getting 96 percent and all other countries receiving 4 percent of the 50 percent going to the foreign suppliers. The first 188,000 tons, or any part thereof, by which quotas for the domestic areas are so increased in 1956, would be apportioned 45.2 percent to the domestic beet area, 42.6 percent to the mainland cane area, 10.6 percent to Puerto Rico, and 1.6 percent to the Virgin Islands. If rising consumption should increase the quotas of domestic areas by more than 188,000 tons in 1956, the excess would be allotted on the basis of the present law's assignment of quotas.

Specific quota provisions for 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960: This bill—

First. Assigns between the domestic producing areas and the foreign suppliers additional quotas year by year each equal to 50 percent of the growth of the United States market above the current 8,350,000 tons of consumption a year.

Second. Provides that for 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960 the additional quotas for domestic areas producers—representing 50 percent of the growth in the United States market—will be distributed in accordance with the final quotas established for the calendar year 1956.

Third. Provide that in 1957 the total of established and growth quotas for foreign suppliers—other than the Philippines—would be distributed as follows: The first 175,000 tons to the foreign suppliers other than Cuba and the Philippines and Cuba to receive a quota computed by subtracting 175,000 tons from the sum of the quotas for foreign countries other than the Philippines.

Fourth. Provides that for 1958, 1959, and 1960 the additional quotas representing 50 percent of the growth assigned to foreign suppliers—other than the Philippines—would be distributed as follows: The first 45,000 tons to the foreign suppliers other than Cuba and the Philippines and Cuba to receive an additional quota computed by subtracting 45,000 tons from the 50 percent of the growth in the United States market which would be assigned to foreign countries.

Fifth. Provide that proration of their quota among the foreign countries other than Cuba and the Philippines be changed beginning in 1957—

(a) By assigning to those countries which exported to the United States less than 1,000 tons during the years 1953 and 1954 a fixed quantity equal to their average proration in those years.

(b) By assigning to the countries that brought in between 1,000 and 3,000 in those years a fixed quantity of 2,000 tons in addition to their further proration below.

(c) Countries whose average imports here were between 1,000 and 2,000 short tons in 1953 and 1954 receive prorations for 1957 equal to such average entries plus 30 percent thereof and for each subsequent year prorations for such countries are increased by an additional 30 percent above the prorations for the immediately preceding year.

(d) The balance of the quota for countries other than Cuba and the Philippines is prorated 37 percent to the Dominican Republic, 36 percent to Peru, 20 percent to Mexico, 5 percent to Nicaragua, and 2 percent to Haiti.

Special 100,000-ton program: To alleviate a surplus condition in the continental United States sugar-producing areas, this bill provides that the Government purchase or otherwise remove from the market 100,000 tons from the 1955 or previous crops in such areas for disposition outside the continental United States in such manner as not to interfere unduly with normal marketing of sugar. It is assumed this sugar will be distributed in the relief operations of the International Cooperation Administration.

New growers: Although the committee has not included in the bill any specific directive for distribution of additional domestic quotas to new producers, it is the belief of the committee that the act should be administered so as to benefit new producers and new producing regions as increased domestic acreage becomes available as the result of quota increases.

Restrictions on quota of foreign countries: Foreign countries which fail by a substantial margin to supply sugar to this market in years when the world price is higher than our domestic price are subject to quota curtailment in future years, unless the Secretary of Agriculture finds that such curtailment is unwarranted. Foreign countries which discriminate against the importation of agricultural commodities from this country are subject to quota suspension during each year when such restrictive measures are in effect. Foriegn countries which did not become participants to the International Sugar Agreement on or before January 1, 1957, are not eligible for increases in quotas or prorations above the 1956 level.

Direct-consumption sugar limitations: Provisions of the Sugar Act which limit the entry of direct-consumption sugar within quotas of both foreign and offshore domestic areas would be varied slightly to permit an increase in such allocations for the offshore domestic areas and to permit those foreign countries which have relatively small quotas—less than 7,000 tons—the convenience of shipping either raw or refined sugar to this market.

Proration of deficits in area quotas: The method of prorating deficits would be changed slightly to insure that increases which domestic areas receive through market participation but which they are not able to fill shall first be prorated to other domestic areas rather than to Cuba and the other domestic areas as is the case under the present act. In the event a domestic area is unable to fill a proration of a deficit assigned to it which results from increased quota due to market participation, the unfilled portion also would be apportioned to other domestic areas unless no such area is able to supply the required quantity in which case it would be added to the quota of Cuba.

Definitions and administrative provisions: The bill also contains a number of minor amendments which affect the administrative procedures under the act and other amendments which affect definitions. Sections 1 through 4 of the bill revise some of the definitions contained in title I of the act. Sections 15, 16, and 17 of the bill revise administrative provisions of the bill.

Liberalization of allotments and proportionate shares: Section 10 authorizes the secretary to consider and make allowance for the effect of drought, storm, flood, freezes, disease, insects, and other uncontrollable conditions when he allots any area quota or proration. Section 14 provides similar authorization with respect to the establishment of proportionate shares. Section 13 would permit the marketing of or processing of sugar beets or sugarcane for livestock feed in excess of the proportionate share for a farm.

Refunding of import tax: Section 23 provides for the refunding of the import compensating tax on manufactured sugar imported for use as livestock feed or in the distillation of alcohol.

Price consideration: Section 5 changes the base period for the consideration that the Secretary is directed to give to the relationship between the wholesale price of refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States from that part of 1947 when ceiling prices were effective to the generally accepted statistical base period of 1947–49.

BENEFITS TO VARIOUS AREAS UNDER SUGAR PROGRAM

DOMESTIC AREAS

Quantity: Under the 1948 act domestic areas receive fixed quotas totaling 4,444,000 tons.

Under H. R. 7030 they will receive, in addition to their fixed quotas, one-half of future increases in domestic requirements which will increase their estimated total quotas to 4,536,000 tons in 1956 and to 4,806,000 tons in 1960.

Benefits: Domestic areas receive the following benefits:

(a) Quota premium, $1.90 per hundred pounds.

(b) Tariff, 50 cents per hundred pounds.

(c) Sugar Act payment average, 70 cents per hundred pounds.

Each producer, to receive a Sugar Act payment, must fulfill the following conditions:

(a) Market within his proportionate share.

(b) Pay fair prices for any cane or beets purchased.

(c) Pay fair wages as determined by the Secretary.

(d) Employ no child labor.

PHILIPPINES

Quantity: Under the proposed bill the Philippines will continue to receive a fixed quota of 977,000 tons.

Benefits: The Philippine producers now receive the same quota premium and tariff benefit as domestic producers, but receive no Sugar Act payments. Under the trade agreement, the Philippines will begin to pay 5 percent of the tariff next January but will not pay the full tariff until 1974.

CUBA

Quantity: Under the Sugar Act of 1948, Cuba received 96 percent of all increases in domestic requirements.

Under H. R. 7030 Cuba will receive small increases which will bring its estimated quota from 2,900,000 tons in 1956 to 2,982,000 tons in 1960.

Benefits: Cuba receives the benefit of the quota premium of $1.90 per hundred pounds. It receives no Sugar Act payments.

Under the agreement of 1902 the duty on Cuban products imported into the United States is 80 percent of full duty which results in the present tariff on Cuban sugar of 50 cents per hundred pounds compared with 62.5 cents per 100 pounds of sugar from full-duty countries. Since the bulk of our imports come from Cuba, the Cuban rate is considered the effective one.

FULL-DUTY COUNTRIES

Quantity: Under the original Sugar Act of 1948, full-duty countries supplied only 1.36 percent of the increase in domestic requirements and under the amended act now in effect they supply 4 percent of such increases.

Under H. R. 7030 they will have fixed increases. The bill will increase the quotas of these countries from an estimated 120,000 tons in 1956 to 175,000 tons in 1957 from which point they will be increased from 45,000 tons per year to 310,000 tons in 1960.

Benefits: The full-duty countries receive the quota premium of $1.90 per hundred pounds. They pay the full tariff rate of 62.5 cents per 100 pounds.

SUGAR PRICES

Sugar prices are supported under the Sugar Act at levels which will maintain and protect the prosperity of the domestic industry without unduly burdening consumers.

Domestic prices are supported primarily through adjustments in the total supplies made available under quotas.

The total quotas or requirements are determined in light of:

(a) Past sugar distribution.

(b) Size of inventories.

(c) Population increase.

(d) Demand conditions.

(e) Trend and level of consumer-purchasing power.

(f) Comparative trends in sugar prices and the consumer-price index since the period of price controls in 1947.

Actual prices recently have been approximately as follows:

Raw sugar, 6 cents per pound compared with 6.32 under price control in 1947.

Refined cane sugar, New York, 8.55 cents per pound compared with 8.40 in 1947.

Beet sugar, Chicago, 8.10 cents per pound compared with 8.30 in 1947.

Amendment: The Consumers' Price Index has risen since 1947 while sugar prices have held about stationary. If sugar prices had risen with other commodities, refined sugar would now sell at 10 cents per pound.

To allay fears of consumers, H. R. 7030 provides that the base period 1947–49 shall be used rather than the first 10 months of 1947 while prices were under price control for comparisons with the Consumers' Price Index. The amendment will have the effect of reducing the formula price to just over 9 cents per pound.

COMPUTATION OF SUGAR ACT PAYMENTS

Basic payments: Sugar Act payments are computed on the amount of sugar commercially recoverable—(actual or average amount recovered)—from sugar beets or sugarcane marketed from farms in the domestic sugar-producing areas for the extraction of sugar. The basic rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds of sugar, raw value, is paid on the first 350 short tons of sugar produced on a farm. This rate is reduced progressively to a minimum of 30 cents on all sugar produced in excess of 30,000 tons per farm. The average rate of payment for all domestic areas on recent crops has averaged approximately 69 cents per 100 pounds of sugar.

Crop insurance type payments: In addition to the payments on sugar beets or sugarcane marketed, the act affords protection to producers with respect to bona fide abandonment of planted acreage and crop deficiencies of harvested acreage resulting directly from drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease, or insects. In case of acreage abandoned and approved for payment, the payment is computed on the number of acres within the farm's proportionate share at one-third of the normal yield of sugar per acre established for the farm. With respect to crop deficiency on harvested acreage which is approved for payment, the payment is computed upon the deficiency of actual production below 80 percent of normal production.

Payments in recent years: Sugar act payments per ton of sugar beets or sugarcane during the most recent crop for which information is available have averaged:

Sugar beets	$2.33
Mainland sugarcane	1.19
Hawaii	1.05
Puerto Rico	1.54
Virgin Islands	1.25

Total payments for recent years are shown below:

Area	Years				
	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
Domestic beet sugar	$26,587,114	$33,750,327	$25,894,874	$24,735,389	$28,978,787
Mainland cane sugar	7,100,263	7,826,148	6,467,540	7,976,607	8,608,333
Hawaii	8,437,594	8,471,073	9,143,041	9,398,138	10,155,590
Puerto Rico	17,509,831	17,148,123	18,922,493	16,965,951	16,710,000
Virgin Islands	65,586	138,509	97,776	145,089	170,844
Total	59,700,388	67,324,180	60,525,724	59,221,174	65,623,614
Portion of above total representing payment for abandonment or deficiency	898,500	1,192,900	1,764,800	639,700	1,025,800

Tax collections in recent years

1950	$75,087,101
1951	83,660,289
1952	82,077,127
1953	82,996,776
1954	80,197,761

ACREAGE RESERVES FOR NEW GROWERS

The proportionate share determinations issued for the producing areas wherein restrictions are in effect provide the following reserves for new growers:

Sugar beet area: A minimum of 1 percent of each State acreage allocation is set aside for new growers.

Mainland cane sugar area: Any new grower may market sugarcane from 5 acres.

Puerto Rico: Any new grower may market sugarcane to produce 5 tons of sugar.

WAGE RATES UNDER THE SUGAR ACTS

General: Fair and reasonable wage determinations by the Secretary of rates which producers of sugar beets and sugarcane must pay field workers, as one of the requirements for payments under the Sugar Acts, have been issued annually in most of the domestic sugar-producing areas since 1937. One sugar beet wage determination was issued in 1935, and determinations in the Virgin Islands were not instituted until 1942. From 1934, the average earnings of workers for all the areas as a group have increased slightly more than 4½ times, or from about 17 cents per hour in 1934 to approximately 80 cents in 1954.

By areas: The amount of increase has varied somewhat in accordance with conditions among and affecting the various areas. Foremost among these conditions is the extent to which productivity gains have occurred during the 20-year period in each area. Estimated average hourly cash earnings of all workers not including payments in kind or perquisites for 1954 and the percentage relationship to 1934 are shown below:

Area	Estimated average earnings per hour		1954 average earnings as a percent of 1934
	1934	1954	
Sugar beet	$0.30	$0.85	283
Louisiana	.12	.53	442
Florida	.15	.82	547
Hawaii	.12	1.42	1,183
Puerto Rico	.10	.41	410
Virgin Islands	.06	.55	917

The controversial sections: First, the provision for nonrecourse loans; second, the section directed at the Philippines; third, the provision directed at Peru, may all be deleted without doing real violence to the bill we are submitting. I repeat, however, that I am still in favor of a nonrecourse loan provision, but I am convinced that the other two sections I have referred to should be removed from the bill. If, however, the Philippines continue to discriminate against American tobacco, when Congress convenes in January, the Sugar Act which we are now considering may be again amended. I am not willing to tolerate longer this rank discrimination against a product upon the production of which my people depend for a livelihood. The Philippines have been treated fairly in the bill we are presenting, and in recognition of this fair treatment, the discriminatory provisions of the Philippine law should be forthright and immediately repealed.

Mr. Chairman, I have made some interesting calculations which indicate just how fairly Cuba has been treated. Certainly I am interested in Cuba and in the welfare of the people of Cuba, and I value the friendship existing between the people of Cuba and the people of our own country, but I maintain that Cuba should be delighted with the treatment which has been accorded her in this bill. Here are arguments, facts, and figures which I do not believe can be successfully controverted or denied:

First. The theory of the administration proposal was to provide a substantial participation in the growth factor to the domestic producers and to supply some increased participation in the growth factor to the full duty countries. At the same time the administration proposal took into account the importance of maintaining for the Cubans a reasonable and fair participation in the growth factor.

Second. The committee, in amending the proposed administration proposal, followed the philosophy of the administration proposal. However, the committee determined that it would be better to give to the Cubans a larger quota in the early years under the new bill so as to permit the Cubans better to adjust their planning to the future quotas. In other words, the committee has strengthened the position of the Cubans by giving to them a larger quota in the years 1956, 1957, and 1958 than is provided under the administration's proposal and reducing their quota slightly from the administration proposal for the years 1959 and 1960. In this way the committee believed that the Cubans would have a better opportunity to adjust to the new situation, the equity of which the Cubans themselves recognize, wherein the domestic producers and other foreign producers would have a greater participation in the growth factor.

Third. The end result, insofar as total tonnage of sugar to be supplied to the United States by Cuba during the years 1956 through 1960, is almost identical under the administration proposal and the bill as reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture. Thus, during this period under the administration proposal, Cuba would have exported to the United States 17,563,260 tons of sugar. During the same period, under the bill as reported out by the committee, the Cubans will export 17,551,480 tons of sugar, or a reduction of 11,780 tons in the entire period from that provided under the administration proposal. This reduction amounts to three-fourths of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Fourth. The following table reveals how the bill as reported out by the committee is a better bill for the Cubans than the bill as proposed by the administration:

Cuba's exports of sugar to the United States

Year	Administration proposal	Committee bill	Tonnage by which committee bill exceeds administration proposal
1956	2,891,760	2,900,640	+8,880
1957	2,898,240	2,914,000	+15,760
1958	2,934,600	2,936,500	+1,810
1959	2,971,140	2,959,000	−12,140
1960	3,007,500	2,981,500	−26,030
Total			[1] −11,780

[1] Net loss over life of bill.

In working out the participation in the growth factor, the committee has recognized:

(a) The importance of the domestic producers obtaining a substantial participation in the growth factor which never before had been provided to them.

(b) Giving a small increase in participation in the growth factor to the full duty countries whose participation up to now under the existing law had been limited to 4 percent.

(c) Adjusting the smaller participation that Cuba would have in the growth factor so that the cut would be a more gradual one than that provided by the administration bill and would permit Cuba to plan better its future sugar economy.

The ability of the committee to achieve this result for Cuba and at the same time maintain the philosophy that Cuba should receive a substantial part of the growth factor, is revealed by the following table:

Percent of Cuba in growth factor

Year	Administration proposal	Committee bill
1955–56	23.6	30.2
1956–57	4.8	9.9
1957–58	27.0	16.67
1958–59	27.0	16.67
1959–60	27.0	16.67
Average	21.9	18.02

Under the sugar legislation as it now exists, Cuba supplies 34.04 percent of the entire sugar consumption of the United States.

The administration, the committee, and the Cubans have all recognized that this participation must be reduced to some extent in order to permit greater participation to the domestic producers and some small increased participation to the full duty countries.

The administration recognized this factor since its bill, as of 1960, would have given to the Cubans the privilege of supplying 33.14 percent of the entire sugar consumption of the United States.

The committee bill has followed the principle recognized by the Cubans and as advocated by the proposed administration bill by granting to the Cubans in 1960 the privilege of supplying 32.85 percent of the entire sugar consumption of the United States. In other words, the committee bill reduces Cuba's share in the total United States market in 1960 by less than 1 percent, by 0.29 of 1 percent from the administration proposal.

Under the proposed administration bill, in 1960 the Cubans would have accounted for 71.06 percent of all the sugar exported to the United States.

The committee has followed this principle of recognizing that the Cubans should receive the larger share of the United States market insofar as all foreign countries are concerned. Under the committee bill, the Cubans in 1960 will supply 69.85 percent of all the sugar exported to the United States from abroad. The difference, therefore, between the proposed administration bill and the committee bill involves only a reduction of 1.13 percent insofar as Cuba's relative position as among all foreign suppliers is concerned.

The annual average of Cuban deliveries to the United States under existing legislation for the period 1948–52 is 3,061,000 tons as compared to the average of the full duty countries of 56,000.

Under existing legislation, for the period 1953–56, the annual average of the Cuban deliveries to the United States would be 2,812,000 as compared to the annual average of the full duty countries of 117,000.

Under the committee bill, the annual average of Cuban deliveries to the United States for the period 1957–60 is 2,939,000 as compared to the annual average of the full duty countries of 242,500.

Thus the Cuban position is bettered from what has been the case under the existing legislation.

Moreover, it is to be noted that the annual average of Cuban deliveries to the United States for the period 1948–60 under existing legislation and the committee bill is 2,947,000, as compared to the average of the full duty countries of 132,000.

In his testimony in 1951 Mr. Myers stated:

> The Sugar Act of 1948 was designed particularly to assist Cuba. It was feared in 1947 when the Sugar Act of 1948 was being drafted that a period of declining demand and retrenchment might lie ahead. Therefore, it was felt that the United States had a moral obligation to give the Cuban sugar industry every reasonable assistance during the period of anticipated retrenchment.

Thus Cuba was given substantial benefits under the 1948 act, which Cuba accepted, on the theory that these benefits would permit it to prepare for the necessary retrenchment.

The fact is that Cuba failed to retrench. Thus, in 1947, her annual production was 6,448,000 tons. The annual average production of Cuba for the years 1948–51 was 6,228,000 tons. Its annual production in 1952 was 7,964,000 tons. This production was equal to 99.98 percent of the total United States consumption.

The fact is, therefore, that while Cuba accepted the benefits of the 1948 act, it failed to undertake the obligation imposed by the theory of the act, which was for Cuba to restrict its production and prepare for the inevitable retrenchment.

It is important to note how much more the United States Treasury will obtain under the provisions of the committee bill as against the existing legislation as a result of additional tonnage being granted to the full-duty countries.

The additional tonnage granted to the full-duty countries is 474,740 tons.

This additional amount means that the United States Treasury gets $2.50 per ton more than would be obtained if Cuba were to ship this extra amount.

The total additional amount obtained, therefore, by the United States Treasury is $1,186,850.

It is important to study the history of Cuban sugar entries to the United States, both in terms of tonnages and dollars.

In 1948 Cuban sugar entries totaled 2,927,000 tons.

In 1954, Cuban sugar entries totaled 2,729,000 tons, or a reduction of 200,000 tons from her 1948 sugar entries.

The value of the Cuban sugar sales to the United States in 1948 totaled $271.6 million, as compared to $283.3 million in 1954.

Thus, although in 1954 Cuban sugar entries were 200,000 less tons than in 1948, she earned on her 1954 sugar entries $11.7 million more than in 1948.

In respect of total Cuban exports to the United States, Cuba exported, in 1954, $26 million more, including sugar, than she did in 1948, although her imports from the United States had decreased in 1954 by $12.8 million from her imports from the United States in 1948.

In changing the recommendation of the executive branch from 55 to 45, that is, 55 percent of our total consumption to domestic producers and 45 percent to foreign producers, to a division of 50 percent to domestic producers and 50 percent to foreign producers, we took away from our own domestic producers and gave to foreign producers far more than we have taken away from Cuba during the life of the bill we have presented. Fortunately, Cuba does not complain about the 100,000 tons which were given to our domestic producers, but some of the people interested in Cuba seem to be very unhappy and somewhat dissatisfied with the provisions of the bill we are presenting. Actually, Mr. Chairman, Cuba should be delighted. It should be realized that in 1955 and 1956 and all through the life of the program Cuba has been well cared for, and in 1962, if the present arrangement continues, Cuba will have a quota in excess of 3 million tons, while all of the full-duty countries put together will only have 400,000 tons.

I frankly believe, Mr. Chairman, that all countries and areas participating in this program should be pleased with the provisions of this bill.

It is not possible for me to tell you how much work has been done in connection with the bill and the problems involved. I have made just about every possible calculation that could be made, based upon different percentages and under different formulas and with different tonnages. Most of these calculations have of necessity been made without the aid or assistance of the statisticians and mathematicians and calculating machines of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture closes at about 5:30 in the afternoon, and only by laborious effort and by working into late hours of the night and the early hours of the morning was I able to present the various charts and calculations to the members of our committee for their consideration. I know, Mr. Chairman, better than anyone else how hard and how faithfully the members of our committee have worked on these problems. In making these calculations and in preparing these charts, if one figure is changed, then all the rest of the figures must be changed. I hope, therefore, that no effort will be made to change these figures and calculations and tonnages here on the floor of the House.

Many of the ares and countries participating in this program, and I might say most of the countries and areas participating in this program, have been well and ably represented by distinguished lawyers, economists, and lobbyists, but unfortunately some of the participating full-duty countries have had no lawyers, economists, or lobbyists representing them except the members of our committee who were determined to accord fair treatment to all areas. Some people seem to be dissatisfied because our committee decided to increase the quotas for our good neighbors south of the border. Mexico has not even been able to sell enough sugar in our market to earn enough dollars to buy enough machinery to operate the sugar industry of Mexico. The Dominican Republic has filled the quotas she has been given and has kept faith with our country. Panama was entitled to better treatment than had been accorded, and so our committee increased the quota to Panama. We did not forget Haiti, Costa Rica, Formosa, and the other countries who have participated, even in a small way, in this very important sugar program—even Hong Kong was given 3 tons and British Guiana 85 tons.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that our committee has done a good job. This bill is important. It should be passed as presented. It should be accepted by all countries and areas involved, and certainly it should be accepted by the Senate and signed by the President.

If this bill is forced into a conference we will adjourn without a sugar bill and relief will be denied to our domestic producers who are now temporarily in distress. Our labor will be lost and the sugar program may expire next year and we may face the chaotic condition that existed before the House Committee on Agriculture prepared and presented the first sugar bill more than 20 years ago.

This bill contains everything that the present Secretary of Agriculture has denounced, ridiculed, and repudiated. It is saturated with subsidies, it is permeated with controls and regimentations. Every phase of the industry is strictly controlled. Even the wages of the laborers in the fields are fixed. In this program we have acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and marketing quotas are fixed in tonnages. The refining of sugar is regulated. The price of sugar is fixed. Price supports are provided and prices are now being supported in the beet producing areas at 93.5 percent of parity. Import quotas are fixed. Refining quotas are fixed. Every possible thing affecting the production, harvesting, marketing, and distribution of sugar is firmly fixed by this law, and yet the Secretary of Agriculture, and even the President of the United States in a special message to Congress officially approves of the sugar program.

Yes, both the Secretary and the President recommended and approved the wool program, under which the production of wool is now supported at 105 percent of parity. But those of us who are primarily interested in the producers of basic commodities are told that 90 percent of parity for our farmers involves something that is evil, unholy, and un-American.

Consistency—oh, what a jewel. It probably depends upon whose ox is gored. Seventy-six percent of parity for wheat farmers, 93½ percent for sugar farmers, 105 percent for sheep farmers, and flexible supports for everyone else seems to be the price support program of the present administration. Why cannot we be fair with all farmers? Why cannot we be fair with each other? This thing we call 90-percent price support for basic commodities is obviously obnoxious to the present administration. The present administration talks eloquently about 100 percent of parity—in the market place—but the present administration has not been able to find the market place. The present administration is frightened by the abundance which the farmers of our Nation have produced, and the present administration does not seem to know how to deal with the problem of abundance. The fact remains that when this administration came into office, the overall price support program on basic agricultural commodities showed a net profit of more than $13 million, but under this present administration that net profit has disappeared, and now the program shows substantial losses. Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on talking about the weaknesses of the present administration, but let us come back to the matter before us. This bill must be enacted before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conclude in good conscience until I have paid at least a brief tribute to the one man who has been responsible for the proper administration of the sugar program, Lawrence Meyers, the director and administrator of the sugar program. Larry Meyers knows more about this bill and all other sugar bills and programs than any man in America. He has done and is doing a magnificent job. He has not and he will not yield to pressure from any quarter. He has well and faithfully discharged all of the great and grave responsibilities of the office he holds. He is held in high esteem by all men every-

where who have known him well. He is an upright, a forthright, trustworthy, and courageous "bureaucrat." He has devoted his life to public service, and he deserves a commendation of Congress. Because of Larry Meyers this sugar program has been an outstanding success and has operated so well and so successfully that it has not been criticized by men of either party. Larry Meyers is a public servant, and he has rendered service far beyond the call of duty. If he had rendered such valuable service in England instead of here at home, I am sure that we would now today be addressing him as Sir Lawrence.

Mr. Chairman, I want to publicly congratulate and commend Lawrence Meyers and publicly thank him for his constant interest in the problems here involved and for the great assistance that he has been to me and to the members of our committee in the preparation of the bill now under consideration. I do not know whether he approves of everything we have done or not, but I do know that he knows that we have a right to do everything we have done. If this bill is enacted, I am certain that he will, to the very best of his ability, carry out the true intent and meaning of every provision of this bill. Larry Meyers knows that legislation is the result of compromise, and while this bill might not reflect his views entirely, he appreciates the importance of the program, which must, of necessity, be continued. During our deliberations and the consideration of the problems involved, I have felt perfectly free to call upon him during all of the hours of the day and even at his home late into the night. I know that he has worked many long hours after he has finished his labors in the Department of Agriculture. Not only does he know the problems which here perplex us, but he understands the problems of the producers of sugar throughout the world. He is our representative at all international conferences, at which such problems are considered, and is recognized as a world authority. May the Lord bless and keep him as he continues his labors.

The Future of the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs Assured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the conception held abroad in almost every country that the United States is undoubtedly a fabulously wealthy nation but that it lacks any of the cultural aspects of a great nation is rapidly disappearing. That this misconception has lasted so long has been our own fault, for until recently we have done little or nothing to put an end to it. The Russian Government has spent $2 billion on international theater exchange alone since the end of World War II, an amount 700 times greater than the less than $3 million which the United States has spent on putting our own best foot forward.

The New York Times reports today that the State Department is preparing special facilities for handling the anticipated two-way expansion of cultural, scientific and social contacts with Russia and her satellites, the full extent of which will become known only when the Foreign Ministers meet in October. The Times goes on to say that plans are already in full swing in the State Department to handle the expected heavy traffic in persons and nonpolitical information. Groundwork for this was laid by President Eisenhower at Geneva.

Another important step was taken by the Congress last week when it appropriated $5 million for the cultural interchange program which is being carried on by the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs. So important did the Senate Appropriations Committee consider this fund that it recommended that hereafter this item be presented in the regular budget estimate.

Hearings have been held in the House on a number of bills, particularly H. R. 6874, which has just been introduced in the Senate by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, as S. 2613, which would make this strategically important fund a permanent part of the armament of our country in this cold war period.

The New York Times discusses some of the things that are handicapping the cultural interchange program. It points out that—

Another minor handicap, long most irritating to scholars and scientists in the United States and to persons specializing in Soviet affairs, has been the bureaucratic procedures of the New York customs officials. The New York custom house frequently holds up Soviet periodicals for months and months on end, regardless of the nature of these periodicals.

The President at his press conference on March 23, 1955, decried such bureaucratic censorship, and Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER on March 17 roundly condemned the Government for the censorship also. The censorship continues despite this criticism. I include here articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post dealing with various aspects of the problem I am discussing.

[From the New York Times, of Monday, August 1, 1955]

UNITED STATES TO SET UP UNIT ON CULTURAL TIES WITH SOVIET UNION—STATE DEPARTMENT IS DELUGED WITH IDEAS—TWO-WAY RISE IN CONTACTS EXPECTED

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

WASHINGTON, July 31—The State Department is preparing special facilities for handling the anticipated two-way expansion of cultural, scientific and social contacts with Russia and her satellites.

The full extent of the lifting of the Iron Curtain on such contacts between the United States and the Soviet Union will become known only when the Foreign Ministers meet in October.

However, plans already are in full swing in the State Department to handle the expected heavy traffic in persons and nonpolitical information. Groundwork for this was laid by President Eisenhower at Geneva.

The President, it is understood, is personally interested in this program and most desirous that it be given every possibility of success.

Even before the Geneva conference the State Department was accumulating more proposals for contacts between Russians and Americans than could efficiently be screened and handled by existing machinery.

MANY PROJECTS OUTLINED

In the last 6 months several hundred such projects have been put up to the State Department by individual Americans and organizations.

Many of these have been sound, well-conceived ideas—plans for exchanging visits of musicians, orchestras, theatrical groups, scientific personnel. Others have been the product of cranks and crackpots. One citizen had an elaborate scheme for sending a mission to Russia to teach the Communists how to make raspberry jam just like grandmother used to make—said this certainly would relieve the tensions of the cold war.

The task of studying and handling these proposals thus far has been borne by the regular personnel of the East European office of the State Department.

But the burden has become so heavy that it is interefering with the regular work of the section, which is entrusted with important and heavy responsibilities in the analysis of Soviet affairs. The State Department, therefore, has decided that special facilities and personnel will be necessary to handle the job efficiently.

It was expected that a special section in the Department would be organized for this purpose.

The section will be the counterpart in function if not structure of a Soviet organization, which long has been in existence, called VOKS. These are the initials of the All-Soviet Society for Foreign Cultural Relations.

It is allied with the Soviet Foreign Office and has the task of taking foreign visitors invited groups rather than ordinary tourists around the country, arranging for their visits to Soviet institutions, interviews with Soviet officials and scientists, etc.

The State Department section presumably would have more limited functions, serving in an advisory and screening capacity. It would work in close liaison with the existing East European section.

The expansion of visits between the United States and the Soviet is expected to come about in more or less orderly fashion. Much depends, of course, on the October discussions of foreign ministers. But the big increase is expected next year.

A number of excellent proposals are understood already to be under consideration. One of them concerns the possibility of sending to Moscow the American company of George Gershwin's Porgy and Bess. This group has had an enormous success in Europe.

The Porgy and Bess visit might be a prospect for next spring if all goes well. This is the type of project, it is understood, which the State Department might finance, at least in part, with foreign cultural funds.

A number of projects developed by medical and scientific groups are understood to be viewed favorably by the State Department. They have not yet developed to the point of public announcement. In a similar category is a project for inviting a group of Soviet housing experts to this country to inspect the products of the American housing industry. This has been advocated by a private group.

In general proposals made by private groups that have a solid and worthwhile basis are getting priority.

There are many details to be worked out in the coming months. One of them is the bothersome requirement of the visa law, which requires fingerprinting of all visitors to the United States—including Soviet visitors. The Russians have objected to fingerprinting as a demeaning procedure.

One way around the fingerprinting procedure is to give the visting Soviet groups official status—as in the case of the Russian agricultural delegation now touring the United States.

It was believed possible, however, that if the Foreign Ministers in the fall succeed in agreeing on the general principles of a broadened exchange that some effort might be made at the next session of Congress to ease this provision of the law.

Another minor handicap, long most irritating to scholars and scientists in the United States and to persons specializing in Soviet affairs, has been the bureaucratic procedures of the New York customs officials. The New York Customhouse frequently holds up Soviet periodicals for months and months on end, regardless of the nature of these periodicals.

One aspect of the program that it is hoped to develop will be a wider exchange of technical and scientific periodicals between Russia and the United States.

Russian scientists long have had difficulty in getting United States periodicals because of the restrictions of their government and are not normally permitted to subscribe to United States publications without special permission.

It is hoped that in the course of discussions with the Russians that the restrictions on receipt and distribution of United States scientific and cultural publications may be lifted, at least in part. At the same time it is hoped that a more efficient and reasoned procedure may be worked out by the customs officials so far as the United States is concerned.

The following is an excerpt from the stenographic transcript of President Eisenhower's news conference of March 23, 1955:

[From the New York Times of March 24, 1955]

HE DECRIES CENSORSHIP

Edward P. Morgan, of the American Broadcasting Co.: Sir, last week, Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, severely criticized the Post Office Department for seizing copies of Izvestia and Pravda in the United States mail.

Mr. WALTER said that, if he had his way about it, he would, on the contrary, have these papers translated into English and distributed to everybody so, as he put it, they could see how nauseating communism could be.

Colleges, too, have protested that this ban has complicated their research.

Answer. Yes.

Question. And it is reported that the CIA has had some difficulty in its own research thereby. Does this restriction have your approval, sir?

Answer. Well, let's make clear this: I am not going to disapprove it with no more than I know about it in detail at this moment. But I will say this: Ever since I found that war records, that is, military records, were hidden away and, apparently we were going to keep them from the American people forever, I have been against censorship.

I don't like censorship, and I don't know the reason for this one. It hasn't been brought yet to my attention, except through the newspapers. And, unfortunately, I haven't had a chance to look into it. I don't know what it is about, really.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 18, 1955]

MAILING URGED—WALTER FLAYS UNITED STATES BAN ON RED PAPERS

(By Robert E. Thompson)

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, blasted the Government yesterday for banning the distribution of two Communist newspapers and urged the publications be made available to all Americans.

WALTER, who heads the Un-American Activities Committee and a House Judiciary Committee, considering legislation to ban the distribution of obscene books, charged that no one could be converted to communism by the two newspapers, Izvestia and Pravda.

He told Post Office Solicitor Abe Goff that the department had made a serious mistake in banning the publications from the mails. Goff appeared before the Walter subcommittee to advocate passage of the legislation against obscene literature.

WALTER branded the two Red newspapers, both official organs of the Moscow regime, as "simply nauseating," and said they represent "the best remedy to make people despise and abhor the totalitarian way of thinking."

The Pennsylvanian declared: "If I had the power to do it, I would have every copy of Izvestia and Pravda translated into English and distributed through the United States mail."

Goff maintained that the ruling has been in effect since 1951, and that newspapers incorrectly reported recently that it is a newly instituted order. He explained that a law used during World War II to bar the distribution of Nazi literature was reinstated in 1951 to halt the dissemination of Communist propaganda.

(In reporting last Saturday on the effects of the ban, The Washington Post and Times Herald pointed out that the Post Office order had been in effect for some years. Recent efforts to implement it, specifically against Pravda and Izvestia, brought it new public attention.)

WALTER, whose Un-American Activities Committee has been investigating Red infiltration of American youth, said "Izvestia" and "Pravda" should be used by the United States Government to expose communism.

He advocated distribution of the Red publications "to everyone of those misguided youngsters attending some of our colleges and universities who are run by deans and professors who—I believe—might also be advised to read some of the vile, moronic stuff printed in Izvestia and Pravda."

He declared: "The reading of these two sheets convinces every thinking person of the abysmal fraud which is perpetrated upon the Russian readers, the Russian people, by their Communist masters."

Meanwhile, discussing the legislation before the subcommittee, Goff testified that obscene literature has become such a financial bonanza in the United States that 73 percent more obscene books were sent through the mails last year than in 1953.

He said there is big money in the sale of magazines containing lewd photographs, and the persons who compile collections of such photos get publishers to print them on a profit-sharing basis.

Goff said there is a need for legislation to halt all distribution of such lewd publications—whether by mail or by private carrier.

[From the New York Times of Monday, August 1, 1955]

SOVIET-AMERICAN EXCHANGE

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas was the target of a Pravda complaint this weekend, immediately prior to his scheduled visit to the Soviet Union. The justice, Pravda complained, had characterized some areas of the Soviet Union as "colonies." In doing so, the Communist newspaper says, he "retreats from the rule of personal observation" and bases himself instead on "false information from questionable thirdhand sources." Pravda seems to be sure that when Justice Douglas visits the Caucasus and central Asia he will find the non-Russian people there happy as larks and "equal members of the big family of Soviet peoples."

Pravda's praise for firsthand observation and its disdain for "thirdhand sources" conjures up some interesting thoughts. Pravda and other Soviet newspapers employ large numbers of experts on the United States who are constantly assuring their readers that this country is Fascist, that our economic system is about to collapse, and that poverty is widespread throughout our land. So far as we know, all, or most of these experts, have never been to the United States and are questionable thirdhand sources." Why not send them over here and let them check on their conclusions themselves? Conversely, if Pravda is unhappy about what Americans write about the Soviet Union, why does it not prevail upon the Soviet Government to issue visas freely to the American journalists, scholars, and others who wish to visit that country and benefit from personal observation"?

The hard fact is, of course, that the chief obstacle to "person observation" of the Soviet Union by Americans these last 10 years has been, and is, the Soviet Government. Refusal to grant visas has been, and is, one of the chief aspects of the Iron Curtain.

Fortunately, the situation has improved somewhat recently. More Americans have been permitted into the Soviet Union, and more Soviet citizens have been coming here. But the movement in both directions is still infinitesimal compared to that needed if the Soviet and American peoples are to know and understand each other. By their reception to the Soviet farm delegation now here, the American people have shown their enthusiasm for the widest possible exchange of persons and ideas with the Soviet Union. Is it not time for the Soviet Government to show a similar enthusiasm by issuing visas freely and promptly, by ceasing to jam American radio broadcasts, and by similar measures to improve communications between these two great peoples of the earth?

First Session Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, now that we are reaching the end of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the time has come to look at the record and total up the results.

It has been a good session. We have not been noisy or spectacular, but in retrospect, it has been a hard working session, in which we have overcome many obstacles to accomplish a great deal.

One of the principal accomplishments has been to prove that bipartisan control of our Government can work. Thanks to the very able and wise leadership here in the House as well as in the other body, we have shown that control of the legislature by a party other than the party in control of the executive branch does not mean that the national in-

terest must be sacrificed on the altar of partisan politics.

The Democratic Congress has cooperated with the Republican President and that cooperation has been especially excellent in the all-important area of foreign affairs. In this vital field this Democratic Congress has given the President more and better support than he had in the 83d Congress when his own party was in control.

I am highly pleased that much of this support came from the freshmen Democrats, who, in the numerical sense at least, represent the balance of power in this Congress. You could say that our presence here is what made the difference between the 83d and the 84th Congresses. I trust that the fact that the people saw fit to send us here has helped make this a better Congress. In any event it seems clear that we have not lived up to the advanced bad billing the Republican spokesmen gave us in 1954. You will recall that well before we were elected the prediction was made that a Democratic congressional victory would result in a political "cold war." Time and the record shows that this has not happened.

The record shows, Mr. Speaker, that the new Democratic Members of this Congress have given Mr. Eisenhower better than 75 percent support on key foreign policy issues. This is a better record than that given him by the Republican minority, and a better record than that given him by the then Republican majority of the 83d Congress.

Moreover, I believe the record will also show that the new Democrats were somewhat instrumental in strengthening the President's hands at Geneva. The support he received from the Congress in advance of his going to Geneva was sufficiently great to merit his favorable comment when he reported to the Nation on his return. Members will recall that a group of new Democratic House Members took the floor early in February, urging the President to shake off the shackles of domestic appeasement and to embark upon a bold, positive program for peace. Under normal circumstances this action on the part of new Members would constitute the brashest kind of tradition breaking. In our case, because we represented the numerical difference upon which control of the House hinges, it was not only desirable but necessary in the light of the cold war prediction.

I have the privilege of representing in Congress the district in which Mr. Eisenhower now resides. As I look back over the record, I find that I have given his views the same careful consideration as I have tried to give the views of any other constituent. In considering the merits of any measure, the question I have asked myself is not whether Ike wants it but whether the country needs it. It turns out that my philosophy of supporting the President when I think he is right and opposing him when I think he is wrong has built a record of being with him somewhat more than 50 percent of the time on all issues which have so far come before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it would require the entire space normally devoted to the Appendix of the RECORD to list and describe all the accomplishments of the "do something" 84th Congress. A mere summary of the highlights is in itself a formidable document.

AGRICULTURE

Congress completed action on a number of bills of interest to the farmers in Adams, Cumberland, and York Counties. We also had our disappointments. One keen disappointment came when President Eisenhower saw fit to veto a bill which would have prohibited the Department of Agriculture from predicting apple prices. This bill passed the House without a single dissenting vote. The Nation's apple growers, and especially those in the 19th District, were for it.

There has also been some disappointment that we have not yet enacted legislation to relieve from the penalty provisions of the acreage-allotment program those farmers who grow wheat solely for use on their own farms. I introduced legislation to accomplish this. However, the Committee on Agriculture gave very sympathetic consideration to this problem at hearings, and I have every reason to believe that a solution will be found during further studies during the recess. I am hopeful we shall be ready to enact legislation soon after the second session begins.

The repeal of the tie-in provision of the 1954 farm law, which made eligibility to participate in the agricultural conservation program contingent upon compliance with the acreage allotment program was a very meritorious piece of legislation. I was among those who sponsored the repealer bill.

Other acomplishment of interest to farmers include placing a ceiling on disaster loan interest rates of 3 percent, instead of the 5 percent rate established by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson; extending for 2 years the emergency loan program to farmers and stockmen suffering from "adverse economic conditions;" and extending for 2 years the disaster loans in drought areas.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Despite the sad lack of interest on the part of the administration in matters where the health and welfare of the people are concerned, we were able to make some progress.

Perhaps the most important advance in this field was the bill expanding social-security benefits by lowering the retirement age for women from 65 to 62, bringing disability benefits to workers aged 50 or more, and extending coverage to certain professional groups. This bill has passed the House and is ready for action in the other body when the Congress reconvenes. In one of her final acts before returning to her private pursuits, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Oveta Culp Hobby told a committee of the Senate that the time has not yet arrived for making these improvements. Here in the House we have found the improvements are needed, and I trust the other body will place little reliance in Mrs. Hobby's recommendation.

In the field of housing we ran into a great deal of opposition. Although we failed to enact a bill to construct 565,000 units of housing, we were able to reach a compromise in a field where any number of units, even the minimum of 35,000 recommended by the President, is of some value.

In the field of education, for the first time a bill authorizing Federal grants for school construction has been approved by a congressional committee. This measure is ready for debate, and I hope action, when we reconvene.

Meanwhile the Congress has completed action on amendments to the 2 Federal impact area laws, making them more workable and changing some of the language by which, through technical interpretations 27 school districts, including the Carlisle Area School System, were denied construction funds to which they were entitled. I introduced legislation to correct this situation, and I was pleased when the committee went on to include these amendments in its omnibus bill.

Other health and welfare bills passed authorize a 5-year program of research into the causes of air pollution; authorize research in the field of mental health; improve the administration of the surplus property program so as to make equipment available to educational and public health institutions; and to study possibility of preventing hurricane damage.

VETERANS AND GI'S

Legislation enacted of interest to veterans permit those in service as of January 31, 1955, to continue to build up GI schooling benefits until discharged from service; extends VA direct loan programs for 2 years, and broadens the program to include home improvements; extends to GI farm home buyers the same help—mainly mortgage guarantees—as city home buyers now have; and gives disabled veterans until October 1956, to apply for auto purchases while extending the privilege to Korean veterans.

For servicemen we passed the career incentive pay increases, providing raises in pay and benefits as incentives toward career military service and we provided legislation to give credits toward social security for military service before 1956.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Federal classified and postal employees, after a long wait, and following two Presidential vetoes, finally were granted deserved pay increases. Classified employees received a raise of about 7.5 percent, while postal workers were given raises that average about 8 percent. The daily travel allowances for Federal employees were increased from $10 to $12 and mileage was raised from 7 to 10 cents a mile. We corrected the inequities under Executive Order 10577 in the career conditional and career appointment program.

ECONOMIC

Much remains to be accomplished to shore up the national economy. Here, as in the case of human welfare, we met considerable opposition from the administration, where complacency and satisfaction with things as they are seem to be the rule.

The administration points to the 64 million people employed in June as compared with 63.6 2 years ago, and proudly proclaims we need do nothing to improve the economy. What is overlooked is the fact that in the 2 years intervening 1,400,000 have been added to the labor force, but jobs have been provided for only 400,000. Thus the administration is approving a "creeping unemployment" policy which, unless action is taken, could result in almost 5 million more unemployed by 1960.

The administration's complacency also overlooks the continued decline in farm prices in the face of increases in the cost of things the farmer must buy.

This philosophy of the administration has made it difficult to work out a program of full employment for labor, and full prosperity for agriculture and industry. Despite this we accomplished several things which should help.

The most forward step we took was to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour, despite Presidential insistence that we should increase it to only 90 cents. Few workers in the 19th District of Pennsylvania will benefit directly from this, since most earn more than even the new minimum. It will, however, be a retarding factor in combating the run-a-way industry problem and will enable our industries, particularly the soft-fiber industry, to compete on a more even basis with their rivals. Moreover, it will mean the spending of about $150 million additional dollars for farm products.

When the Congress extended the reciprocal-trade agreement authority, we strengthened the built-in protections against loss of jobs in those industries where the impact of foreign competition is most severely felt. This should contribute something to job and profit security in Adams, Cumberland, and York Counties.

Congress moved ahead toward a realistic highway program, but of course the failure to complete action was a disappointment. Legislatiton of this nature, where we attempt to establish a pay-as-you-go theory for financing needed public works, is comparatively new, and an excellent idea. It was to be expected we would have difficulties in working it out. I am confident the bugs will be worked out during the recess, and look forward to a highway bill in the next session.

The House completed action on a 4-year, $63-million airport construction program, which, when placed in operation will help stimulate our economic life.

MISCELLANEOUS

Other measures enacted, and worthy of special notice, include the following bills:

Increases the penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act from $5,000 to $50,000.

Permit the Government to recover damages in antitrust cases.

Created a nonpartisan 12-man commission to study Government personnel-security programs, a sorely needed commission as the shenanigans in the Small Business Administration prove.

Recommended action by States to facilitate absentee voting by servicemen and their families, and Government workers.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this session has been one that has worked hard and may be proud of its accomplishments. In many respects it has made history. As a new Member, it has been thrilling and exciting to have been a part of history in the making.

The Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues this letter stating the official position of the Republican Party of Wisconsin on the Status of Forces Agreements, the revision of which would be provided for under the terms of my House Joint Resolution 309:

MARSHFIELD, WIS., *July 22, 1955.*
The Honorable FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOW: You are to be congratulated for the part you have played in forcing reconsideration and hearings on the provisions of the status-of-forces agreements which surrender our servicemen to the criminal jurisdiction of foreign courts.

I am proud to state that Wisconsin Republicans were quick to recognize that these agreements deprive our boys of rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Last year, the State convention of the Republican Party of Wisconsin passed a resolution protesting the surrender of our servicemen to foreign courts and, interestingly enough, this was the only resolution which drew applause from the convention.

The resolution passed by the Republican State Convention was very similar in wording to the one passed at Appleton, Wis., May 19, 1955, by the Wisconsin Federation of Republican Women:

"Whereas the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, to which the Senate of the United States gave its advice and consent to ratification on July 15, 1953, deprives American servicemen and their dependents of the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution and the laws of the United States; and

"Whereas on July 15, 1953, the Senate of the United States advised and consented to ratification of two treaties granting sweeping immunities to diplomatic personnel and experts assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to its military headquarters; and

"Whereas criminal procedures, punishment for crimes meted out by foreign courts, and penal conditions in foreign courts, and penal conditions in foreign countries are radically different from those provided by the Congress in the Uniform Code of Military Justice: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Federation of Republican Women assembled petition Senators JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and ALEXANDER WILEY for a prompt review of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement for the purpose of securing as soon as practicable the denunciation, mutual rescission, or repeal of the criminal jurisdiction of said agreements."

Yours truly,

MRS. SALLY JONES.

Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, Agriculture's Great Leader, Proposed for Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the American people, and especially to the electors for the Hall of Fame, the name of Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, the greatest name in American agriculture of this century.

The late Dr. Knapp, whose devoted life spanned the years 1833–1911, is being proposed as agriculture's first member among the great Americans who are honored in the Hall of Fame.

I think that I speak for the total population of our farm people in urging this honor for a great American. I am sure the 100 leading Americans who are the electors for Hall of Fame will want to recognize agriculture's great contribution to the well-being of all our people, to the American way of life, to the strength of our institutions, and in their quinquennial election this year they will confirm Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, when his name and his works are forcefully presented.

Mr. Speaker, another greatly respected and much loved man of agriculture is leading in the sponsorship of this recognition of Dr. Knapp. He is Dr. Clarence Poe, editor and board chairman of the Progressive Farmer, a leader among the Nation's farm publications. Dr. Poe has written an article relating to Dr. Knapp and the sponsorship of his name for the Hall of Fame.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Dr. Poe's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend to the electors of the Hall of Fame that they recognize American agriculture by honoring its outstanding leader of our time:

DR. SEAMAN KNAPP FOR HALL OF FAME HONORS

(By Clarence Poe, editor and board chairman, the Progressive Farmer)

One of the most distinguished and inspiring memorials in the United States is the Hall of Fame for Great Americans overlooking the Hudson River in northern New York City. Every 5 years a group of distinguished American men and women choose three or more additional names of great Americans to be honored with tablets and distinguished sculpture in this beautiful building. Many celebrated scientists, educators, physicians, inventors, explorers, jurists, artists, philanthropists, and military leaders have been recognized—but never yet has any outstanding representative of American agriculture been recognized. Now for the first time, indeed a man whom agricul-

tural leaders all over America should delight to honor is expected to win widespread support. We refer to Dr. Seaman A. Knapp (1833–1911).

I

Every nation and almost every important group of people has been inspired by the life, work, and ideals of some distinguished hero. In the North it has been Abraham Lincoln. In the South, Robert E. Lee. In the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. In the Republican Party, Lincoln again.

Our farm people also need to recognize and honor their great heroes. In the years since 1900, there can be no question about what man should be called the outstanding hero of our American farm people. That man was Dr. Seaman A. Knapp.

At a time when the coming of the boll weevil had suddenly destroyed a great part of the income of farmers in Texas and adjoining States, Dr. Knapp, then 70 years old, was summoned to help distressed farmers make a living and get on a better footing for the future. Two things he decided must be done:

1. He must get the foremost farmers, the agricultural colleges, and the United States Department of Agriculture to agree on a few basic methods that would enable farmers to make a living in spite of the boll weevil and other hazards. (See his famous 10 commandments of farming.)

2. He must next get the greatest possible number of farmers to try these methods on at least a part of their crops, thereby demonstrating the soundness of the recommendations and encouraging other farmers to follow the same policies on a larger scale.

All over America, men and women in our cities, as well as on our farms, know of the revolutionary changes in the lives of farmers, farm women, and farm young people that were brought about first by this farm-demonstration work and out of it grew the continental program of agricultural extension now carried on by the present army of county farm agents, county home agents, and 4–H Clubs from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

II

Very few people now living knew Dr. Knapp personally as I did. Hence it is a pleasure to me to remind younger men of some of the outstanding qualities of this great leader.

What were the secrets of Dr. Knapp's success? Along with a practical, thorough, down-to-earth understanding of the farmer's problems, I believe, his success was primarily due to a genuine heartfelt love for people. As Tolstoy wrote long ago: "We think there are circumstances when we may deal with human beings without love, and there are no such circumstances: you may make bricks, cut down trees, or hammer iron without love, but you cannot deal with men without it." Without love, as the great Apostle said, we are but sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.

First of all then, Dr. Knapp loved folks. He had the gift of sympathy, which as Lord Bryce wrote, "is a key to unlock men's hearts." Dr. Knapp had the exceptional sort of sympathy which perhaps is never fully developed except through suffering (in his case a crippling accident which kept him on crutches several years). He did all his greatest work after he was 70. Although he was born in the North and became a great agricultural leader there and president of Iowa Agricultural College before ever coming South, he won the love of the southern people as few of the South's own sons had ever done.

III

Next to his love for people and sympathy for them, Dr. Knapp's next great quality was the ability to inspire men and States and regions with new faith in themselves. He did not waste time rebuking the mistakes of the past; he pointed to an inspiring vision of the future. Furthermore, he declared our farm people not only capable but teachable: "Some declare farmers a hard class to reach and impress. This is not my experience. They are the most tractable of people if you have anything substantial to offer—but they all want proof." So he stressed his demonstration work to teach farmers and farm women. "Seeing is believing."

Where other people talked the poverty of our farm people Dr. Knapp talked the possibilities of our farm people. While pessimists discouraged us with census figures about evidences of Southern backwardness, Dr. Knapp encouraged us with figures of his own about the rewards of southern progressiveness. Listen to him:

"EIGHT HUNDRED PERCENT GREATER FARM INCOME

"I estimate that there is a possible 800 percent increase in the productive power of the farm laborer in the average Southern State, and I distribute the gain as follows: 300 percent to the use of more and better mules and farm machinery; 200 percent to the production of more and better livestock; 150 percent to a rotation of crops and better tillage; 50 percent to better drainage; 50 percent to seed of higher vitality, purebred and carefully selected; and 50 percent to the abundant use of legumes and more economical feed crops."

IV

At a time when agricultural-college graduates were comparatively few, Dr. Knapp showed an almost uncanny gift for picking out the most susseccessful and most trusted practical farmers as his county farm agents. These he sent out into the highways and hedges of each county, thus getting farmers to agree to conduct farm-demonstration projects in line with the most progressive teachings of the USDA and our agricultural colleges. And Dr. Knapp urged every county agent to inspire the farmers: "Your value lies not in what you can do, but what you can get other people to do." Always, too, Dr. Knapp stressed the importance of simplicity. "When I talk to a Negro citizen," he said, "I never talk about the better civilization, but about a better chicken, a better pig, and a whitewashed house. * * * Get down to where people can understand, touch the bottom, and lift." The methods he sought to promote were also condensed into his famous 10 Commandments of Agriculture, which we reproduce, with slight rearrangement, as follows:

1. Produce all the food and feed required for family and animals on the farm.

2. Increase the livestock to the extent of utilizing all the waste products and idle lands of the farm.

3. Accomplish more work in a day by using more horsepower and better implements.

4. Carry out a systematic crop rotation with a winter cover crop.

5. Secure high content of humus in the soil by use of legumes, barnyard manure, farm refuse, and commercial fertilizers.

6. Use seed of the best variety, intelligently selected, and carefully stored.

7. Prepare a deep, well drained, and thoroughly pulverized seedbed.

8. In cultivated crops, give the rows and the plants in the rows a space suited to the plant, the soil, and the climate.

9. Use intensive tillage during the growing period of the crops.

10. Keep an account of each farm product, in order to know from which the gain or loss arises.

As we have already mentioned, Dr. Knapp was the pioneer promoter of what are now called our 4–H Clubs—clubs in which he hoped that self-reliance and all the finer virtues would be encouraged. To parents he said: "We don't let our boys and girls learn how to manage. Let the boy do, even if he makes mistakes. * * * Teach the boys how to regulate their forces, how to meet shocks, and have supreme courage to face the world."

V

In all these quotations from this greatest of American farm leaders in this century, there throbs a constant note of sympathy for all struggling people fighting against poverty and other handicaps. "I do not glory in the wealth of a few," Dr. Knapp said, "but rejoice in the general distribution of wealth and prosperity for the common people." Put in a single sentence, Dr. Knapp's one great aim, his dominant ideal, was to make rural America a vast democracy of thrifty, home-owning small farmers, every man sitting under his own vine and fig tree—and thus develop the ideal conditions for a mighty race of high-minded, stalwart, courageous people.

If the agricultural principles he taught were not new, it was new to think of going to the unlettered farmer and demonstrating their practicability and potency before his very eyes. And so it is the glory of Dr. Knapp not that he added another dry agricultural principle to human knowledge, but that for a great body of people, under the power of his organization, all formerly dry agricultural principles became live and potent as did the dry bones in Ezekiel's Valley when the spirit of the Lord brought bone to bone and clothed them with miraculous flesh and sinew. Such has been the miracle of "agricultural extension" in America these last 50 years.

To recognize and honor at this time the real founder of this vast program is a privilege all friends of American agriculture should delight to have a part in. Dr. Seaman Knapp's name would add honor not only to agriculture, but to the hall of fame itself.

But Keep Your Powder Dry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is heartiest approval both at home and abroad of the efforts of the President to secure collaboration of all nations in the establishment of a permanent and lasting peace.

But experience is a great teacher and in this moment of relaxed tension it may not be amiss to recall, in addition to proclamations first by Lenin and then by Stalin, the statement by Dimitry Z. Manuilsky, at that time a spokesman for the Politburo:

War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep.

So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist.

Revision of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include as part of my remarks on H. R. 7030 the testimony of Frank A. Kemp, executive committee chairman, American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, in behalf of the domestic sugar beet area, the mainland cane sugar area, the Hawaiian sugar planters, the Puerto Rican sugar producers, before the House Committee on Agriculture on revision of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, June 23, 1955:

Chairman COOLEY, members of the committee, my name is Frank A. Kemp. I live in Denver, Colo. I have been an employee of the beet sugar industry since 1923, and am now president and general manager of the Great Western Sugar Co., and executive committee chairman of the American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee—the industrywide organization of the sugar beet people.

I appear here at the request and on behalf of all four American producing groups: (1) The sugarcane growers and processors of Louisiana and Florida, (2) the planters and mills of the Hawaiian sugar industry, (3) the growers and processors of the entire production of cane sugar in Puerto Rico, and (4) the sugar beet growers and processors of the 21 States from Michigan and Ohio to California and Washington in which beets are grown.

There is attached to this statement a list showing in detail the organizations and the interests for which I appear.

These four great sugar-producing areas have consolidated their views on sugar legislation and have entrusted statement of their case to a single witness, proving that there is wide agreement in the American industry and that all of its producing groups are in full accord. Chairman COOLEY, that is a very considerable responsibility, and I hope the committee will bear with my effort to fulfill it.

Any witness here should recognize the long experience and the great contributions of members of the committee to the solution of problems of the industry. Chairman COOLEY, Congressmen HOPE and POLK were Members of the Congress when the first sugar act came before it in 1934. Congressmen POAGE, ANDRESEN, and GRANT have participated in the development of every sugar act since 1937. Other members of the committee participated in consideration of the act of 1948 and its revision in 1951. I express the indebtedness and gratitude of every domestic interest.

We can be certain of one fact—this is a changing world. There have been great and fundamental changes both in this country and in the world, and there have been continuing changes in our agriculture and in our farm economy.

On both of our appearances before you since the war, witnesses for the domestic-sugar industry said that their position at the time was based upon facts of the time and that they reserved the right, and recognized their duty, to come before you at any future time at which changed conditions in their judgment prompted reconsideration of sugar legislation.

I quote from the testimony on this point. During the hearings to amend and extend the act in 1951, the president of the Western Beet Growers Association, who is again in attendance today, formally entered the following reservation:

"If, prior to the expiration of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, it develops that the established quota of 1,800,000 tons of domestic beet sugar is acting as an effective deterrent either to the expansion of sugar-beet growing, or the construction of additional processing facilities, the Western Beet Growers Association reserves the right to seek and press for amendment of the established quota for domestic beet sugar."

Following this, the secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association filed a prepared statement with this committee in which he said:

"We recognize that there are many benefits contained in this act and, in view of the fact that all parties known to us who are representative of the sugar-beet industry have agreed to this program, we are also giving it our support. However, we would like to make the same reservation, which we understand is being made by the representatives of the Western Beet Sugar Association, i. e., that if it should develop prior to the expiration of the new law, the proposed quota should prove to be acting as a deterrent, either as to expansion of sugar-beet growing or to the construction of additional processing facilities, then we would like to reserve the right to come before the Congress and this committee urging an amendment with respect to the stipulated quota for sugar beets."

The unexpected changes that have recently confronted the domestic people, taken together with the fact that there has been a disposition in some quarters to read intent and effect into prior statements that were not intended, prompts me on behalf of all the domestic areas that I represent to make clear that if events or developments occur in the future which in our judgment prompt or make necessary or advisable change or revision of any sugar legislation, we shall bring such matters to the attention of the Congress and ask for consideration of them and any revision which they require.

This committee has twice made it clear in its reports on the 1948 and 1951 Sugar Acts that the basic structure of those laws was tailored to the conditions of the times and was not to be regarded as establishment of long time national sugar policy.

In its report on the 1947 act, this committee said:

"The committee believes that it should be made abundantly clear that the distribution of the American sugar market among the producers of the United States and foreign countries and the provision for the establishment of quotas for the ensuing 5 years on the basis provided for in this bill is not intended to establish, and should not be construed as establishing, a permanent production and distribution pattern, nor as waiving American producers' rights to such portions of the American market as they can supply at the conclusion of the 5-year period covered by the bill."

In its report on the 1951 Sugar Act, this committee said:

"This committee emphasized in its report that the Sugar Act of 1948 was designed to meet problems of the temporary postwar transition period and was not to be regarded as the establishment of long time national sugar policy."

In spite of the record, discussion in recent months with respect to needed changes in existing sugar law has produced some contention that the extension of the act by the Congress in 1951 was a contract, a commitment, or in the nature of a treaty, with Cuba, which carried a legal obligation, or, if not, a moral obligation, that it would not be changed.

Any such contention is based on a complete misunderstanding of the power and frequent actions of the Congress of the United States.

The State Department itself has publicly made clear that there is no substance to the contention. Under Secretary Herbert Hoover, Jr., so stated to representatives of the whole domestic industry whom he addressed some 2 weeks ago. On the first day of this hearing, Assistant Secretary Holland said that the law was not an international agreement, that it was not an agreement, and this was made still further clear by the State Department's proposal for change in quota provisions to take effect on January 1, 1956.

If necessary, further confirmation can be found in statements from Cuba. On January 29 of this year, the well-known Cuban sugar firm, Messrs. Luis Mendoza & Co., wrote as follows:

"The truth is that the Sugar Act is not a permanent treaty between the United States, Cuba, and all the other countries that participate in the American market, neither is it an act of mercy of the United States Government. The act is an example of conscientious legislation dating back to 1934 and modified in 1937, 1948, and 1951, and subject to further modifications."

The Mendoza family has a wide reputation for good humor. In any event, Mr. Mendoza went on to say that in all probability the present law would be changed, and concluded:

"No doubt, we would like to have it all for ourselves, but having to share it with someone else should not make us grumble too bitterly. This, of course, refers to future increases."

Secretary Holland said, however, that, while the Department of State recognized the predicament of the domestic industry and the need for its relief, the Department could not justify any improvement in the domestic share of this market in 1955. Secretary Holland said he based this position on two views which he advanced. First, that such a change would be retroactive; second, that Cuba in an expectancy of continuity of its rights under the law, had planned and programed its production in advance.

If the Congress takes action on sugar legislation this year there will still be a substantial part of the year lying ahead. The need of the domestic industries was brought to the attention of the State Department, the Cubans, and a great many others in the summer of 1954. Earnest attempts to discuss the problem with the State Department and full exposition of the facts and views of the domestic industries commenced again in November of 1954. In any discussion of alleged retroactivity, it cannot be overlooked that it was not until the second week of June that the administration's view was made known.

It would take but a look at the record of Cuba's cane plantings and sugar production over recent years to make clear to anyone that any claim that her sugar activity and operations are planned and programed on the increase in sugar consumption in this country is far-fetched. As was pointed out yesterday in questions asked of Secretary Holland, Cuba's production went up to the enormous total of 8 million tons in 1952, almost twice that of the prewar average. She has reduced her output since that year because she produced more sugar than there was market. Within recent months Cuba sold between 500 and 600 thousand tons of sugar to Russia. If, as has been intimated, Cuba expected some sales volume out of the 1955 increase of consumption in this country, the benefits to her from the Russian transaction clearly went beyond her plans. Actually, Cuba would like to have all of the 1955 increase of consumption in this country or as much of it as she can obtain, because she would not only get it for this year but under the State Department's proposal the

quantity would be permanently written into Cuba's future privilege for all time.

There have been great changes in the sugar world since 1951 which necessitate revision of existing sugar legislation. They include these important developments:

1. The United States has an ever-expanding population growing at the rate of approximately 2½ million people a year, as a consequence of which the market for sugar in this country increases annually in a substantial amount. It is also clear that increases in population and consequent increase in sugar consumption will continue well into the future.

2. Led and encouraged by technical and research findings of the great body of agricultural scientists, the domestic sugar industry, both cane and beet, through adaptation of improved farming methods, breeding of better seed, wider and more intelligent use of fertilizer, and other technological advances, has substantially increased its yields from the same acreage.

3. Restrictions upon production of other crops have led farmers to search for substitute land and farm machinery use, as a consequence of which there has been a material demand in recent years to shift to sugar beets and some to sugarcane, land formerly planted to restricted crops. For example, land once planted to cotton in southern California has been diverted to beets. Some wheat and small-grain acreage in the Red River Valley has been diverted to beets.

4. Fertile lands in a number of Western States recently have been supplied with irrigation water and this has made for the setting of these lands in family-sized farms and the building of new homes. Farmers making their livelihoods on these lands, if they are to succeed, must grow the crops best suited to the climate, the altitudes, and the seasons. In many of these areas the sugar beet is essential to sound crop rotation. These new farmers, many of them veterans from World War II and Korea, have demanded the right to grow beets. And that demand has been added to the needs of the thousands of farmers who have been in the beet-growing business for many years.

Let me show you the effect of these four major changes.

Experts tell us that the expanding population of the country now increases sugar consumption by approximately 135,000 tons every year. But the existing law was written just after the close of the war, before anyone know how fast our population would increase or how fast our sugar consumption would grow. This law set the share of the domestic sugar areas in this market at fixed, unchangeable figures which, except for the adjustments in 1953 in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands quotas, have remained the same since 1948 in spite of the tremendous increase in our consumption. The effect of this has been to deny the beet and mainland cane areas and Hawaii any share in the growth of the country since 1947 and to condemn all of the domestic areas to a life without prospect of growth. Deprived of the chance for any upward adjustment, they face the certainty of inevitable decline and deterioration. The domestic people believe they have the right as American citizens to share in the growth of their country and in its increased sugar demand. The increase should not, as is now the case, be handed over completely as a windfall to foreign suppliers.

The same acre of either cane or beets is producing more sugar than was formerly possible. Take the yields of cane sugar in Louisiana and Florida. In the 3-year period ending in 1950 an average yield of 1.54 tons of raw sugar per acre was produced. In the 3-year period ending with the crop of 1954, the average yield of raw sugar per acre in those States was 1.86 tons. That is an increase of 21 percent within the span of just 7 years. The beet industry has also achieved substantial increases in output per acre. The average yield of beet sugar, raw value, per planted acre for the 3-year period ending in 1950 was 1.92 tons. In the 3-year period ending in 1954, that yield had increased to 2.2 tons, a gain of 15 percent.

Traditionally in this country progress is rewarded. In our case, it will bring down upon our heads a stiff penalty—we must reduce the number of acres grown as we improve our yields. That is an impossible situation, because in the last analysis it will either halt adaptation of improved practices, which would be a terrible penalty, or will compel a further reduction in sugar acreage, which will add acres to the mounting totals of other crop production.

I would like the committee to know something of what has actually happened to the mainland cane and beet industries in acreage restriction in the last 2 years. First, take the Lousiana-Florida industry. For a number of years after 1948 the harvested acreage of the industry was relatively stable. In 1954 an acreage cut of 11 percent from 1953 was enforced. The industry was cut again the next year to a total reduction of 18 percent. With the exception of the freeze-damage year of 1951, the industry made more sugar than its 500,000-ton quota for each of the last 6 years and during each of the last 3 crops produced more than 600,000 tons.

In thinking of the effect upon farmers of sugarcane-acreage restriction, it should be borne in mind that cane is a 3- to 5-year crop in the United States and when a fixed reduction is ordered not only the right to grow is reduced but a capital investment may be destroyed. That is an additional reason why the mainland cane people regard so apprehensively the threat of further acreage restriction.

On January 1, 1955, the mainland cane area had an effective inventory of sugar equal to 80 percent of its annual quota. That meant that the industry as a whole could sell only 100,000 tons of 1955-crop sugar in that year, less than one-sixth of its annual production in each of the last 3 years.

Sugar-beet acreage in 1955 was cut 10 percent from the acreage of 1954 with some States suffering an enforced reduction of as much as 15 and 16 percent. Both areas are now faced with further enforced acreage restriction.

Actual facts show the predicament of individual domestic producers caused by production which they are forbidden to market. The Okeelanta Sugar Co., of Florida, has nearly 6,000 tons of sugar produced in the early weeks of this year that it will not be able to market until 1956. Its entire 1955 crop production will have to be carried, some of it to 1957.

The Burton-Sutton Co., of Louisiana, had stocks on hand January 1, 1955, equal to over 97 percent of its expected marketing quota for the entire year. It anticipates that when its 1955 crop production commences there will be no quota available after the second day of operation.

The Union Sugar Co., of California, had an effective inventory of 74,400 tons of sugar on January 1, 1955, but will be allowed to market in 1955 only 100 tons of sugar which it will produce this year.

I do not need to tell you that these congested stocks are burdens—expensive to store and care for, expensive to carry and finance.

A modest immediate increase of 20,000 tons in the quota of Puerto Rico is provided in the bill. Puerto Rico is being restricted in its sugar production for the fourth straight year, and since 1952 has had inventory problems. She likewise asks for some relief, some right to look forward to increased employment and greater productivity, which are points of great concern to that island.

Puerto Rican spokesmen listening to the figures given at the hearing yesterday to indicate a large buying power in Cuba growing out of her sugar sales to this country, have pointed out that, on from only about one-third as much sugar sold, Puerto Rico buys annually from the mainland $50 million more than Cuba's purchases in this country.

On one point introduced before the committee yesterday by a representative of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the Interior Department, touching on the production of direct consumption sugar, the Puerto Rican position is outside of the agreement of the four producing areas and will be briefly covered by a separate spokesman for that industry.

With the aid of one of the greatest agricultural research organizations on earth, the Hawaiians, already the world's top producers of sugar per acre, have made new records which a few years ago would have been regarded as completely unattainable. Surrounded by water, with much of the land on mountain slopes, Hawaii has almost no opportunity for acreage expansion. Actually, the needs of the nation in enlarging its military establishments in this strategic area resulted in the conversion of agricultural land to national uses. Even with her high yields per acre, Hawaii does not have an immediate inventory problem. Therefore, with great generosity she has said to the other domestic producing areas that she would join with them in support of the bills introduced with the understanding, and it is so provided, that, once the pressing needs of the other domestic areas are met, Hawaii will fully share the domestic part of our increased sugar market. Her past record in increasing yields shows that she will need this share of the increase as her industry moves into the future.

In my review of important changes and conditions affecting the domestic producers, I mentioned that restriction of acreage in surplus crops has created an insistent demand for greater acreage to produce sugar—a food of which we import nearly half our national needs. This demand for more beet and cane acreage was not stimulated by the industry itself, but was a natural consequence of the desire of the farmer gainfully to employ his land, his labor, and his farm machinery.

In 1954, 934,000 acres of beets planted in this country produced 1,978,000 tons of sugar, raw value, 178,000 tons more than the industry's quota. The 1953-crop beet sugar output exceeded the quota by 76,000 tons. Yet the planted beet acreage of the 1953 crop, as well as that of 1954, was less than that planted in 1933—more than 20 years earlier.

Beet plantings of the 1953 crop totaled 802,000 acres compared with 1,034,000 acres in 1933 a decline of 23 percent. Plantings in 1953 were 18 percent below the 984,000 acres planted in 1947, the year in which the Sugar Act of 1948 was passed.

You can readily see, gentlemen, how difficult it is for beet farmers to understand—no expansion, in fact a reduction in acreage having occurred—why it is necessary to take a further cut in their plantings.

I would like to compare the situation I have just mentioned with the situation in Cuba. The records show that 2,315,000 acres of cane were grown in 1939 in Cuba. The records also show that in 1953, the last year for which I have figures, the acreage of cane grown in Cuba was 3,890,000. In other words, in the 14 years from 1939 to 1953 the Cuban sugar industry took into its embrace over 1,500,000 acres, a gain of 68 percent, while the sugar beet acreage between 1939 and 1954 actually decreased 6 percent. These figures may help you to understand why American farmers are indignant that the more fortunate industry of Cuba should be preferred over any increase in domestic production.

In Washington, in Idaho, in Wyoming, in Montana, and in other Western States, new farms and new homesteads are taking form on the lands opened up to settlement on the Columbia Basin reclamation project, on the Hart Mountain and Big Horn-Hanover Irrigation Districts in Wyoming, on the Minidoka project in the Snake River Valley of Idaho, and in other Western developments. The men who are building these homes, many of them veterans who drew their farms by lot, simply do not understand why they cannot be given the right to grow an acreage of sugar beets adaptable to their enterprise and their rotation. These men are American citizens. The land is American. Their purchasing power is expended in the American market.

The Sugar Act in its broad terms has been sound and successful legislation. It was drafted with full recognition of the rights and interests of consumers which have been fostered and protected throughout the history of sugar laws and should be fostered and protected in any revision of them. The consumer has benefited through the stabilization of supply at modest prices. Measured in terms of consumer purchasing power, in the time that it takes an average workman to earn enough money to buy a pound of sugar, and in the relatively small increase that has taken place in the price of sugar compared to the increase in the price of other foods, the level of sugar prices in this country has been modest. In terms of consumer purchasing power, the American sugar price is lower than in any other major country in the world. A sound and healthy domestic sugar-producing industry has been an important factor in both the stabilization of supply and in the reasonable price level that has prevailed. During the war, beet and Hawaiian sugars were shipped to fill empty shelves in stores in Brooklyn. The modest changes in the present quota provisions of the law that have been proposed by the domestic industry fully protect the interest of consumers.

In the spring of 1954 the domestic sugar-producing groups commenced a long series of discussions with each other and with Members of the Congress and the executive departments in respect to a timely and sensible revision of the Sugar Act. Good friends in the Congress counseled postponement until 1955 of any suggested changes in the law, but at the same time strongly recommended that the situation be analyzed and proposals submitted for consideration by the Congress this year.

The 28 identical bills introduced in the House propose necessary changes in the law which should be considered in terms of related background and fact.

When the present law became effective in 1948, the total annual sugar requirement of this country amounted to 7,200,000 tons. The initial estimate of requirements for 1955 has been set by the Secretary of Agriculture at 8,200,000 tons, up 1 million tons since 1948—resulting largely from the steady increase in our population. Foreign suppliers, principally Cuba, got the entire benefit of this increase, except for the addition of 170,000 tons to the quota of Puerto Rico and 6,000 tons to the quota of the Virgin Islands decreed by the Congress to be effective in 1953. The absolute net gain in annual basic quota by foreign suppliers out of the sugar market increase between 1948 and 1954 was nearly 875,000 tons. The cumulative total gain over the 11 years was 4,800,000 tons.

The bills you are considering approach quota revisions on the premise that, since foreign countries have had all the increase in the American market for 7 years in the aggregate amount of 4,800,000 tons, it is entirely proper and just, in view of the plight of the domestic industry, that for a short time American producers receive the increase.

Present foreign quotas have been established for this year on the basis of the initial requirement estimate of 8,200,000 tons, which is approximately the amount of sugar that actually moved into the channels of consumption last year. Forecasts have been prevalent in the sugar trade for some time that the final requirement figure for 1955 will reach at least 8,400,000 tons, or 200,000 tons more than the initial estimate, and the Department of Agriculture has forecast a higher figure. The modest increases in domestic quotas proposed in this bill total only 188,000 tons and therefore would be absorbed by the anticipated growth in our market this year.

The bill proposes that the quota of the mainland cane area be increased 80,000 tons, the quota of the beet area 85,000 tons, the quota of Puerto Rico 20,000 tons, and the quota of the Virgin Islands 3,000 tons.

In other words, time and the increase having run for 7 years, all for the benefit of Cuba and other foreign suppliers—and having resulted in an 875,000-ton increase in the basic annual quota of foreign nations, we ask that the hands of the clock be stopped momentarily, until the domestic industry realizes from the market increase 188,000 tons—21 percent of the annual increase that has been conferred upon and is perpetually owned by foreign industry. That 188,000 tons is an increase of only 4 percent in domestic quota. It is slightly less than 4 percent of Cuba's volume of sugar sales to the United States and other countries last year.

And, since the anticipated increase in our requirements for this year exceeds the 188,000-ton increase proposed for the domestic areas, the bill will not reduce by one ounce Cuba's present quota, and will preserve for Cuba the full position she now enjoys in the American market.

After consumption reaches 8,388,000 tons, the bill directs that all further increases be divided between domestic and foreign suppliers on the basis of 55 percent for domestic and 45 percent for foreign. This restores approximately the same percentage sharing provided in sugar legislation prior to the Sugar Act of 1948.

We believe that this guaranteeing to foreign suppliers through American legislation, of a 45-percent share in the increase in our sugar market, is not only generous, but has few precedents in world trade. We are thus enabling foreign countries to continue to participate in the future expansion of the United States sugar market after a short interval required for the domestic areas to work out of their present difficulties.

The only effect the bills will have on Cuba's share in the American market is to give momentary pause to her increasing share and retard the rate of her future increase from the lion's share of 96 percent.

There are claims that the pending bill will disastrously reduce Cuba's present purchasing power in this country. A thing cannot be reduced unless it is cut in size. Cuba's current contribution to this sugar market is continued—from which it necessarily follows that her current purchasing power will not be reduced by the bill. It is true that her current purchasing power will not increase quite as fast, but the State Department proposal itself takes the position that this is in the overall interest of the country.

There has been presented to the committee by Secretary Holland the position of the executive departments on sugar legislation. This position recognized and endorsed all four basic principles the domestic industry has asserted and which are embodied in the legislation you are considering:

1. That there should be sugar legislation passed in 1955 to extend until 1962;

2. That the relationship between domestic and foreign producers should return to a percentage quota in order that the domestic producers could share in the added volume produced by our population growth;

3. That this relationship should return to a basis of 55 percent for the domestic producers and 45 percent for the foreign producers, which is approximately the relationship existing between 1934 and 1948; and

4. That any domestic deficits in the market increase be filled by other domestic areas ahead of foreign suppliers.

The recommendations of the executive department and the bills do part company in dealing with the precise time when the growth in our market is to be measured and at what level or benchmark, as Secretary Holland described it.

The executive departments in effect propose that the domestic areas be held back through the buildup of another 150,000 tons of growth to the Cuban industry and make no provision for any immediate quota relief to any domestic area.

We submit most earnestly that in the consideration of time and circumstances the proposal of the executive departments fall short of what is right. For months we have been talking about acreage cutbacks—past and prospective. Whatever relief by way of sugar purchase may have been intended, it holds no answer to that problem.

The provisions of the bills were arrived at after weeks of patient discussion within the industry, after repeated consultations between the industry and Members of the Congress. They represent a modest and moderate division of the growth of our market in which the domestic areas have in fact written down their just claims to what they regard as below the minimum to which they are fairly entitled.

The domestic industry and the sponsors of the legislation before you present the bills as a fair, honest compromise between the claims of our own industry and our wish to benefit foreign suppliers. By any test, they are in the best interests of the United States.

DOMESTIC SUGAR ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTS FOR WHOM THE WITNESS APPEARED

United States sugar beet industry: The Amalgamated Sugar Co.; American Crystal Sugar Co.; the Big Horn Basin Beet Growers Association; Black Hills Beet Growers Cooperative Association, Inc.; Buckeye Sugars, Inc.; California Beet Growers Association, Ltd.; Central Nebraska Beet Growers Association; Eastern Washington Cooperative Beet Growers Association; Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association (representing grower associations and processors of Michigan and Ohio); Franklin County Sugar Co.; the Garden City Co.; Goshen County Cooperative Beet Growers Association; the Great Western Sugar Co.; Gunnison Sugar, Inc.; Holly Sugar Corp.; Idaho Sugar Beet Growers Association; Layton Sugar Co.; Lower Snake River Sugar Beet Growers Association; Mason City District Beet Growers Association; Montana-Wyoming Beet Growers Association; the Mountain States Beet Growers Marketing Association; the Mountain States Beet Growers Marketing Association of Montana; the National Sugar Manufacturing Co.; the Nebraska Non-Stock Cooperative Beet Growers Association; Northern Montana Beet Growers Association; Nyssa-Nampa District Beet Growers Association; Red River Valley Beet Growers Association; Southern Colorado Beet Growers Association; Southern Minnesota Beet Growers Association; Spreckels Sugar Co.; Tongue and Yellowstone Beet Growers Association; Union Sugar Division, Consolidated Foods Corp.; Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.; Utah Sugar Beet Growers Association; Western Beet Growers Association; the Western Colorado Beet

Growers Marketing Association; Western Montana Beet Growers Association.

Mainland sugarcane industry: American Sugar Cane League; Florida Sugar Producers.

Hawaiian sugarcane industry: Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association.

Puerto Rican sugarcane industry: Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico; Puerto Rican Farm Bureau.

Justice for the GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the several daily newspapers in my district, the Alliance (Ohio) Review, has spoken out on the effort to revise the Status of Forces Agreements to provide greater protection to our men stationed abroad, under my House Joint Resolution 309. It is an unemotional and objective analysis of this important problem by one of the outstanding editors of Ohio, Mr. Clarence D. Steffy, managing editor of the Alliance Review. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I would like to call this editorial of July 27, 1955, to the attention of my colleagues:

JUSTICE FOR THE GI'S

It may take time, but we believe that eventually, Congress will adopt at least the theory espoused by Congressman FRANK T. Bow in his vigorous fight to obtain a revision in what is known as the Status of Forces Agreement.

This agreement gives foreign countries, which are a part of the agreement, criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces stationed within their boundaries.

In simple words, Bow is against the trial of American soldiers under the laws of the country in which they are stationed. If our men get into trouble, they should be tried under American justice, says Bow, and we agree.

Bow's contention is embodied in what is before the House as Joint Resolution 309. The administration has been fighting the resolution tooth and toenail, contending that the alleged injustices are exaggerated, and that any change in the agreement would menace our relations with the affected countries.

A hearing on the Bow complaints has been opened by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It is not concluded; in fact, top Pentagon officials are due to testify soon.

Both sides are sincere. Bow has been termed in some circles as unrealistic and reactionary; not internationalist enough. He contends, simply, that every American parent would want his son, guilty or innocent of the crime of which he is accused abroad, to be entitled to the same kind of law that the parent himself would be tried under, if the circumstances occurred in the homeland. He wants the American law to follow the American soldier. Is that being unrealistic, reactionary? We believe not. We believe it's a case of simple American justice, the kind that's been proved the most equitable in the world, the kind our Founding Fathers intended.

We also believe that either in this session or the next, Congress will adopt the principle. We believe that such an eventuality is merely the application of justice.

Congressman Bow deserves the support of his constituents in the matter.

Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent appearing in the Washington Star of July 31, 1955, entitled "Helpful Echoes From Geneva":

HELPFUL ECHOES FROM GENEVA

(By Frank R. Kent)

Probably the most significant tribute to the success of the Geneva Conference and that of President Eisenhower in the dominant role which he played there came not from his friends at home but from his enemies. Particularly was this notable among the editorial and columnar critics who, from the start, had disparaged the notion that any good could come out of the meeting of the Big Four heads of state and discourage the idea that talking with the Russians was a sound suggestion.

For many weeks these critics, for some curious reason, had joined with the Democratic National Committee publicity performers, aided and abetted by the propagandists of the ADA, the CIO and Senators such as MORSE, of Oregon; HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, in a campaign of sneering and jeering at the President. They pictured him as a weakling who did not know what it is all about. They insisted that Mr. Dulles does all his foreign-policy thinking for him and that his mind was principally occupied with his golf game. Of course, none of this was true, but it was strictly along the Democratic committee line the intent of which was to lay a foundation for an antiadministration attack upon Mr. Eisenhower as a Presidential failure who should not be renominated.

In the course of 6 working days at Geneva, Mr. Eisenhower changed all this. He at once became the outstanding personality at the conference and in the world. He did this not by asserting himself; not by throwing his weight around; not by ostentation or showmanship; not by propaganda. He achieved it simply by being himself. Beyond question he is the most completely honest, completely truthful, completely sincere man who has spoken for this country either at home or abroad in the last 23 years. He impressed these qualitites not only upon his colleagues about the conference table but also upon countless millions who heard and read what he said; also upon the several thousand correspondents, editors, reporters, and publicists who were at the Geneva Conference and some of whom were hostile to him.

It is interesting to note that only one of these thousands thought it worth while cabling his paper that the President had sent for General Gruenther of the NATO to come to Geneva because he wanted to play bridge with him at night. Well, what of it? And why not? The overwhelming point of view of the journalists on the job at Geneva was that General Eisenhower had put on a performance of which all Americans had a right to feel proud; that largely due to his earnestness and sincerity, the conference had had a measurable degree of success; that the prospect for a continuation of this period of peace is brighter than it was.

There will, of course, now that the President is back, be dissenters both in his own party and in the opposition in Congress. And there will be trouble of various sorts in various fields. That is inevitable. But there will be few to deny that Mr. Eisenhower has added to his personal prestige and popularity by his conduct at Geneva and by his speech last Monday in Washington. No one worth heeding, so much as suggests that there was any touch of politics about the Eisenhower performance at Geneva or since. No one can accuse him of a lack of leadership. No one thinks now he should not have gone or should have taken a different line. He has not, of course, settled the most difficult problems which disturb the world and threaten peace. But he has at least taken steps in that direction which the great masses of men and women everywhere approve.

In addition, he has so firmly and clearly placed the position of this Nation before the world that no one either in Russia or anywhere else can again accuse us of wanting war—or him of being a "warmonger." The day of that anti-American propaganda has gone. The President shot it to pieces with his inspection proposal, his two speeches, and his personality. He comes home to find his critics still howling about the Dixon-Yates contract and he finds his Secretary for Air, Harold Talbott, facing some ugly and embarrassing charges. But the Dixon-Yates business has been so blown up as to have become a bore and the Talbott affair, while certainly unpleasant, not to say malodorous, is not as politically damaging as it seems. In a year's time it probably will be forgotten. Certainly, there is not in it the kind of issue which the Democrats have been looking for in 1956. The President's work in Geneva much more than outweighs all the little stuff the opposition publicity organs and agents have dug up in a year of hard digging.

Aggression by Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., under date of July 28, 1955:

AGGRESSION BY NEHRU

Prime Minister Nehru, who preaches coexistence between Communist and free-world nations, has adopted a policy of nonexistence for Portuguese territory on the Indian subcontinent.

The Indian leader's long campaign of intimidation against the Portuguese state of Goa, on India's west coast, was climaxed this week with a demand that Portugal close its legation at New Delhi no later than August 8. India closed its legation in Lisbon 2 years ago, and Nehru's latest order amounts to a virtual severance of diplomatic relations with Portugal. The only surviving diplomatic links between the two countries will be a Portuguese consulate at Bombay and an Indian consulate in Goa.

Simultaneously, it was announced that the Government-owned Indian railways has suspended all freight and passenger service to Goa.

Last July a group of Indian nationalists seized the small Portuguese town of Dadra north of Bombay and held it for more than a week. In August of last year, nationalists from India threatened to march into the city of Goa, south of Bombay, but the scheduled demonstration did not materialize as few marchers appeared.

In each of these incidents Nehru refused to allow Indian police or troops to quell the demonstrators.

Nehru said last month he will not resort to violence to oust the Portuguese, but whatever method is used—violence or intimidation—the objective is wholly unjustified aggression. Nehru's plan to seize the Portuguese holdings by means other than armed force does not alter in the slightest the fact that India has no reasonable claim to the territory.

Portugal has occupied its small holdings in the Bombay area continuously since 1510—110 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth. Nehru's attempt to seize the Portuguese territory is comparable to the American Indian tribes who once roamed Massachusetts now claiming title to the Commonwealth.

Goa and neighboring Portuguese cities were built by people of Portugal upon territory that was a wilderness when they arrived. There was no country of India then, the Indian subcontinent being divided into scores of independent states, much as the American continent of the same period was occupied by many Indian tribes with diverse languages and customs.

About 250 miles south of Bombay, Portugal holds 1,301 square miles, slightly larger than Rhode Island. Some 100 miles north of Bombay, Portugal controls 216 square miles. Both territories border on the Arabian Sea and thus can be entered without passing through India.

For administrative purposes, Portugal's holdings both north and south of Bombay, plus a tiny Portuguese island 140 miles off the coast, are incorporated into one Portuguese state called Goa. It is not a Portuguese colony but is part of Portugal. Goans and European Portuguese have the same citizenship rights and are governed by the same national laws.

Nehru's design against Goa is an attempt by him to extend the authority of his government over more than 1,500 square miles of Portuguese territory and 600,000 Portuguese citizens against their will. Portugal's steadfast refusal to yield to the intimidations of the Indian leader merits support of all nations that recognize the right of self-determination of peoples.

The Cost of Polio Shots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I enclose an editorial dated July 25 from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Following the debate on H. R. 7126, and the unfortunate injection of politics into the issue, it seems important for everyone to look into the future.

No one surely would want to deny the benefits of this new and proven vaccine to needy children and existing agencies could handle this problem. The greatest danger is the fact that people of means will be most apt to avail themselves of these vaccine shots and the large percentage of the needy people will continue to be without it.

No precedent should be established and every caution should be exercised to avoid socialized medicine by this approach.

The editorial follows:

THE COST OF POLIO SHOTS

Is $30 million enough to pay for free antipolio shots among children whose parents cannot pay for them? The administration says yes, the Senate Democrats say no, and the debate has strong political overtones.

At a time of peak prosperity, we cannot believe that for most families the major question about antipolio shots is how to pay for them. The great majority of parents, once convinced that the Salk vaccine is safe and effective, could meet the cost. And so the administration's $30 million proposal seems reasonable to us. If the fund actually proved inadequate, there is no reason why it could not be later increased.

Instead of making a grandstand play to increase the fund, the Senate Democrats could make a much more useful contribution if they would undertake to make sure that the Government in spending the $30 million gets full value for its money.

According to the Reporter magazine, Canada's free innoculation program costs the Canadian Government only $1.50 per child, whereas privately purchased and administered vaccine in this country costs the individual from $4.50 to $7.50 or more. If our Government is going to buy vaccine it certainly is entitled to the lowest possible price, and there is no visible reason why it should not get a price at least as low as that available to Canada.

At $1.50 per child, a $30 million fund would take care of 20 million children, which is plenty. Why not write into the law a requirement for controlling the cost of free inoculations?

The McCook Family Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and to the country a significant recent addition to the Library of Congress. Through the generosity of Mrs. Katherine McCook Knox, of Washington, D. C., former daughter-in-law of the late Senator Philander C. Knox, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the Library of Congress has obtained the first installment of the McCook family papers. The active role in American history played by the descendants of George McCook, an early settler of Pittsburgh, is interestingly documented in this collection of letters, photographs, and clippings.

Many of the letters received by the Library of Congress relate to Gen. Anson G. McCook, father of the donor. General McCook, famous as one of the 15 "fighting McCooks" of the Civil War, was elected to Congress for three terms from 1877 to 1883. General McCook subsequently served for 10 years as Secretary to the United States Senate, having been chosen by both Democrats and Republicans.

The papers reflect General McCook's active life and include official and private correspondence with Presidents Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt. President Harrison writes interestingly of his early reaction to Presidential campaigning; President Hayes discusses the woes of the ex-President, and President Cleveland gives his personal hunting plans and preferences. Other friends prominent in United States public affairs are among the correspondents—Levi P. Morton, Thomas Nelson Page, William T. Sherman, Mark Hanna, and Admiral Robley D.—Fighting Bob—Evans.

The McCook family has been known for generations for its contribution to the legal profession and the ministry. Attorney George W. McCook was a law partner of Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War in President Lincoln's Cabinet; Attorney Daniel McCook, Jr., was a law partner of Gen. William T. Sherman and Gen. Thomas Ewing. The Reverend Henry C. McCook became a leading Presbyterian minister in Philadelphia. By his outside hobby in the field of zoology and biology, he has contributed substantially to the early research on the ant and spider species. Two other members of the McCook family have been commemorated as pioneers in the naming of McCook, Nebr., and McCook County, S. Dak.

The McCook family papers will be of interest to military and political historians as well as to students of American cultural history. The papers already in the Library's custody are available for study by permission of the donor, which may be requested through the Chief of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress.

It is hoped the outstanding contribution of Mrs. Knox will encourage other prominent families to make such valuable and interesting papers available to the Library of Congress and the general public.

Friedrich von Schiller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, May 9, 1955, marked the 150th anniversary of the death of a great playwright, poet, and philosopher, Friedrich von Schiller. His was a short life in the number of years on this earth, only 46, but his death did not mark his end. He lives with us today in his works and is truly immortal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include what is, in my opinion, a very keen analysis of the life and work of Friedrich von Schiller, prepared by Mr. Hermann Wolf, of Cleveland, Ohio, and Baltimore, Md., a member of the Steuben Society of America:

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FRIEDRICH VON SCHILLER, GREAT PLAYWRIGHT, POET, AND PHILOSOPHER

When we Steubenites, good Americans of German origin, pronounce the name "Fried-

rich von Schiller," we think not only of the greatest playwright in the two-and-a-half-thousand-year-old history of western civilization; rather, we identify him as part of the indescribably bubbling, intellectually sparkling stream of artistic expression of his time.

After the powerful, revolutionary intellectual stream ceased to flow, which, owing to the urge for enlightenment, had produced, through Reformation and Renaissance, the enormous contract between the philosophy of experience and that of pure reason, we find Schiller, together with Goethe, Herder, Kant, and Beethoven, viewing this contrast from a higher plane so as to overcome it with the aid of drama, poetry, and music.

The philosophers of their day received from Schiller and Goethe, the poets, their deepest aesthetic impulses.

The incomparable greatness of Kant is impressed on us Germans particularly keenly when we sense the impact of his teaching [discipline] of the categorical imperative on his contemporaries and weave their clearly cut, perceptive criticism into a web of profound thinking of our own. As compared with the philosophy of hedonism and the morality of utility of the past eras [generations?] it meant revolution of things traditional; it signified human destiny emanating from a higher power whose rigidly severe demands placed in man a responsibility for his deeds such as had never been known in the history of mankind. And it was precisely this severity which pulled out all the stops in Schiller's thinking and feeling, to shape, through artistic [artful?] criticism, his faculty of judging the value of poetry and drama.

In the winter of 1782, Schiller the playwright, wringing his hands, rushed through the dressing rooms of the performers in the Mannheim Opera House, crying out in a loud tone of voice: "The rigidity of Kant's discipline of duty is scaring all the graces out of my mind." He was searching for an equilibrium [a catalyst] between the demand for morality and the sensual lure of beauty.

This in itself manifests the enormous stature of Friedrich von Schiller; he found the eternally valid solution in moral graciousness, in the grace of the intellect; by weaving together science and poetry Schiller educated and uplifted the spirit of the human individual; it was beauty in which Schiller's sensual as well as supersensual [spiritual?] nature found its deepest satisfaction.

Schiller expressed in terms of sensual beauty, for the world of emotion, that which was actually the basis of Kant's philosophy, for example, the domination of practical over theoretical reason.

Beethoven's unique criticism, rejecting almost all standard literature within his reach, was due to his dissatisfaction with the motives of ethics [morality]. Schiller's high clerical concept of art and artistry caused Beethoven unhesitatingly to set his words to music. We sense Beethoven, Kant, and Schiller walk[ing] hand in hand through the music of the Ninth Symphony.

In the history of German literature, the man of intellect is kept in a state of breathless suspense by Beethoven and Schiller. Even if bountiful Mother Nature had not endowed one with the gift of music and the other with that of poetry, their pure humanity in itself would force us to bow our heads in deep reverence. He who is contemplating [listening to?] Beethoven places the musician above the man is ignorant of Beethoven's true self; he who in reading his works prefers Schiller the poet and [to the?] playwright can never hope for complete understanding [of Schiller the man?]. While totally submerging ourselves in both there is no possibility of establishing a proper relationship to their works unless we have previously acquired complete clarity as to the [earth] man in them. Every single one of their works represents a deep confession of a most personal nature; hence, it cannot be separated from the outside conditions which have produced it.

Two poets found in their innermost soul the fountain of truly artistic re-formation after the urge-ahead period toward the end of the 18th century—Schiller and Goethe.

Goethe and Schiller—those two cannot be separated here—represented the climax of the era of most abundant flowering of German literature, of the classic era, in a narrower sense. They brought about the harmonious flowing together of all those trends and contrasts which the philosophers had been trying to achieve in vain.

When Hegel effected a change in Schelling's teaching [discipline] of identity, i. e., when he led it to its ultimate consequences in that he joined together the unit [respective units?] of "being" and of "thinking" into the [ensemble?] "absolute," making it the guiding star for the last philosophical rays on our intellectual horizon, the scholars were shaking their heads because it was hard for them to accept this philosophy; when Schiller, however, almost simultaneously, through poetry, [i. e.,] through artistic expression, did likewise, those same scholars were jubilant and bowed their heads in deep reverence before the genius of the poet and playwright.

In order to make it easier for mankind to understand throughout the ages, Schiller had a particular predilection for presenting powerful individuals fighting for the achievement of worthwhile objectives. This sort of presentation corresponded to his very own, innermost nature. Primarily he was dominated by the idea [concept] of freedom. We sense this concept in all his works, and as Schiller progressed in his poetic and dramatic development, his concept of freedom assumed different facets. In his youth it was the longing for physical freedom of which he had been deprived by the world around him and which transferred into his poetry; in his later life it was the ideal [freedom], the spiritual freedom, whose scope in the world of ideas has extended much farther than Goethe's concept, and which, within this farflung scope pointed to the fighting and struggling of the nations, to things historical. That is why Schiller was considered the real creator [originator] of historical tragedy [drama].

Persons who break the barrier of comprehension in the history and in the intellectual life of the nations are fully appreciated only by the people coming after them. Only succeeding generations are able to recognize the full impact of their creative masterpieces on overall cultural development and to view it as a finished picture. This applies to Schiller, in particular.

Based on a thorough knowledge of his life and works, our time [our present generation] is capable of embracing the wholeness of the individual, Schiller, and his expansive world of ideas on whose significance our present way of life is based. All his works, conceived from his innermost experience, are a lasting testimony of his humanity and of his clerical concept of art and artistry. The inexhaustible richness of his spirit, his aspiration for ultimate perfection, for total development of his gifts, the struggling and fighting for spiritual freedom, truth, and proximity to mother nature [earthiness] which pervade his poetry, dramas, and ballads, show our present generation the way to peace.

Schiller did recognize the moral majesty and power of Christianity; yet, nevertheless, he cannot be measured according to the standards of narrow-minded, religio-dogmatic thinking. For him, the most important thing of all was to be aware of the revelation of the transcendental [supernatural] in the human individual and in morality, for whose earthly manifestation he was striving.

During his lifetime—a period of political defenselessness and conflict—he created a position of power for Germany and, simultaneously made it an entity in the realm of the spirit—these are the laurels which he shared with Goethe.

A son of Lieutenant Schiller and his wife Elisabeth, nee Kodweiss, Johann Christoph Friedrich Schiller saw the light of day at Marbach in Wurttemberg on November 10, 1759. Owing to a kind fate, which bestowed on his mother the gift of poetry, Schiller was born out of the same harmonic blood strain [blood composition?] as was Goethe.

Two years later the family moved to Lorch where Schiller's father was active as a recruiting officer. At age 10, Schiller attended the Latin school [ancient Latin] at Ludwigsburg. The ruler [of the principality] at the time, who was highly arbitrary in guiding the destiny of his subjects, brutally interfered in the life of the artistic boy, who had matured before his time, by ordering him to enter the institution established for sons of army officers on the "Solitude" near Stuttgart, which, later moved into town, was converted into a college and since 1781 has been known as Hohe Karlsschule. Under the influence of his ruler, Schiller chose the study of medicine.

Despite military discipline and strict isolation, many of the works of the poets, philosophers, and writers, who had lived before him, found their way into his hands and were read by him with enthusiasm in the dark of the night. Schiller commenced to work on The Robbers in 1777; in 1780 he graduated from college and was licensed to practice his medical profession. Ordered to Stuttgart to serve his duke as regimental physician, he completed his first youthful drama, The Robbers, which in 1782 was performed on the Mannheim stage with great success. Schiller attended the performance without previously asking his duke for leave. Enraged, the noble prince forbade him the writing of comedy.

The urge for personal freedom was undoubtedly the primary impulse for conceiving the honest and romantic plot hatched between Schiller nad his childhood friend, Andreas Streicher, the musician (who were later joined by Schiller's sister, Nanette, who became Streicher's wife), in order to effect their flight to Mannheim where he worked as playwright for 2 years and then proceeded to Leipzig, Dresden, and Rudolstadt where he met Charlotte von Lengefeld, whom he married in February 1790. Theirs was an unusually happy marriage.

In 1802, after a full and rewardingly active life, Schiller was made a nobleman.

Repeated illness at the beginning of 1805 and recurring attacks of fever prepared him for the end which occurred on May 9, 1805.

While his mortal remains rest in the Weimar Fuerstengruft, his works have become immortal.

HERMANN WOLF.

Beginning of May 1955.

The Small Business Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to urge that the Small Business Admin-

istration be continued for another 2 years. At the end of this period I believe Congress will decide that a permanent independent agency with increased authority is both necessary and desirable to assure the continued welfare of small business concerns in our economy. There is no doubt that many benefits have been derived from the financial, procurement, and technical assistance programs established under the Small Business Administration. Certainly there is no agency in Government which can approach the centralized function of assistance to small business that is presently performed by this agency.

All of us are aware of the increased economic power occasioned by the merger movement, the difficulty smaller manufacturers have in securing a fair share of the procurement dollar, the trials all types of small business have in acquiring long-term credit and of the continued need for managerial and technical assistance and advice. The Small Business Administration has made a good beginning in its efforts to correct and solve some of these difficulties perennially encountered by small business.

I am sure that my colleagues are familiar with what has been done by the Small Business Administration in its several programs.

It may be that some of you feel as I do that the results to date are not as completely satisfactory as we want them. Based on my close observations of the work of the Small Business Administration as a member of the House Small Business Committee, I can see certain areas in which improvement is necessary.

Although not a member of Subcommittee No. 2, I sat through the long hearings held by this committee because of my great interest in the problems presented and my desire to provide constructive solutions for them.

If there is one conclusion which may be reached as a result of those hearings—a conclusion of unanimous agreement—it is the absolute necessity of guarding the independence of the Small Business Administration.

The various duties and responsibilities, and the efficiency of the administration of the agency, can from time to time be examined and remedial action taken if necessary. As an adjunct to a regular department, the officials of a small-business office would listen politely to the Congress and then, as they should do, follow the direction of the department head.

Experience has taught us that an administrator of an independent small-business agency not only listens intently and with great interest to the findings and conclusions of the committees of the Congress but in addition acts upon congressional recommendations as well as the intent of the Congress as provided in the law.

Therefore, I should like to devote my remarks to certain aspects of small business and government which are not generally discussed. I want to emphasize why an independent agency devoted exclusively to service to small firms is both necessary and desirable.

It is true that virtually every large governmental agency has provided certain types of services to business concerns, including small business. The Department of Commerce, for example, has been interested primarily in the general problems of business as a whole. Collaterally, small-business problems are considered incidentally and as one part of the overall business picture. They are not the type of problems which are of the most immediate concern to the small firm, particularly in a period of economic expansion and rapid changes in products and processes. Small firms must be able to adjust quickly to new or improved methods or they fall by the wayside.

The type of assistance needed is not what an old-line agency, concerned always in the past with long-range help, is equipped to give. The entrenched procedures, fixed channels, and tier upon tier of reviewing authorities of the old-line agency frustrate efforts to give quick help in solving urgent problems.

The Department of Commerce itself seemingly recognized these facts when it transferred its own small-business unit from the Department proper to the National Production Authority soon after creation of that emergency agency and later to the successor agency, the Business and Defense Services Administration.

The experiences of World War II, as well as those of the present period, have shown clearly that small business does not receive effective help when responsibility for assisting it is assigned to one unit of a large agency that has many offices and many functions. When this is done, the small-business function of the agency is swallowed up among its many other duties.

It has often been stated that incorporation of a small-business program within a large agency would permit for effective representation. It is not true, however, that greater representation would result from such a move. Obviously, the Secretary of a Department would not personally guide the Department's small-business program. He would delegate this responsibility to another official, possibly an Assistant Secretary or an Under Secretary, but more likely to an office or division chief, as was the case in the past. Instead of having the head of an independent agency serving as its representative, small business then would be represented by an official of lesser rank who could not act on important matters without prior approval of superiors who could not approach the heads of other agencies on an equal footing and who could not report on small-business problems directly to the President and the Congress.

What small business needs is a separate, independent agency that can serve as a focal point of assistance to it, and that can act quickly and authoritatively in its behalf when the need arises. During the first years of World War II, for example, most military contracts were going to large producers. Small firms were being denied the opportunity to participate fully in the production of war materials. In response to the protests of small-business men, the Smaller War Plants Corporation was set up, as a part of the War Production Board, to help small firms obtain contracts. This Corporation was successful in getting a larger percentage of contracts for small business.

As in World War II, during the early months of the Korean war, small firms were being treated unfairly in the awarding of defense orders and in other phases of the defense program. Again, their protests led to the creation of an independent agency—Small Defense Plants Administration—which had no other function than to help small firms to overcome mobilization problems. Once again, a separate, independent agency proved to be what small business needed.

On the basis of past experience, it seems very unlikely that centralization of Government assistance to small business in the Department of Commerce would be to the advantage of small firms. In January 1946, for example, many of the functions of Smaller War Plants Corporation—functions which had proved of great help to small business—were transferred to the Department of Commerce and located there in a new and well-staffed unit, the Office of Small Business. A little over 2 years later, the small-business function had largely disappeared among the many other functitons of the Department. The Office of Small Business had been reduced to a minor unit of a large bureau and was staffed by only a handful of employees.

Further, the Department, in its previous opportunity to perform small-business functions, did not achieve success with them. In fact, its failure to perform the functions successfully, as attested to by hundreds of small-business men appearing before congressional committees, was a major reason for the creation of the Small Business Administration and the assignment to it of broad small-business responsibilities.

Virtually the same analysis may be made of the military services and the role of small business within those services. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all have small-business specialists, who are supposed to look after the interests of small business in awards of contracts. The fact is that the small-business specialists in the armed services are not as effective in behalf of small firms as an independent agency like the Small Business Administration.

One basic reason that small-business specialists in the armed services cannot do a fully effective job in behalf of small firms is that, after all, they are employed by the military branches and they must accept the policies and practices of the armed services. They are not in a position to exercise independence of action. They cannot formulate policies or even exert an appreciable influence on their formulation.

The Small Business Administration, on the other hand, is completely independent of other agencies and is devoted solely to the purpose of assisting small business with the special problems it encounters. It represents the interest of small business on various policymaking interagency committees, advises other agencies on questions affecting small firms, and serves as a "watchdog" in their behalf with respect to policies and activities of other Federal agencies.

Another basic reason why small-business specialists in the armed services cannot serve the interests of small firms effectively is the ingrained psychology in contracting offices which precludes adequate consideration for the small would-be Government contractors. Because so much of military purchasing is on a large scale, and so many items bought are products of such size that they can be made only by very large concerns—planes, tanks, trucks, big guns, et cetera—there is an inevitable tendency toward turning to the larger businessess for almost every kind of item. More accustomed to dealing with such concerns, contracting officers have too often adopted the attitude that it is easier to buy nearly everything from large firms. It is extremely difficult for small business specialists in the armed services to overcome such habits of thinking on the part of contracting officers and higher officials.

Small Business Administration representatives in the procurement centers, on the other hand, are not prevented by the circumstances of their employment from making all possible efforts to obtain contracts for small firms. Their allegiance is to the Small Business Administration and the interests of small business, not to officials of the armed services. It is their job to see to it that small firms have an opportunity to obtain contracts for any kind of purchase which they are capable of supplying. The difference in point of view matters a great deal.

Small-business men bring a great variety of problems to the Small Business Administration for help, usually involving dealings with other agencies. In numerous instances they have stated that they have tried repeatedly to get assistance from other agencies involved without success, and only by coming to the Small Business Administration could they get the help they needed.

Without an independent champion in the Government, small business would have no central agency to look to for assistance. Efforts in behalf of small firms would be widely diffused throughout a number of Federal agencies. The inevitable consequences, as in times past, would be confusion, loss of time, piecemeal efforts to assist small business, and inadequate and belated help.

This has been incontrovertibly demonstrated by experience. Efforts to deal with the problems of small firms through offices of small business or small business specialists in the regular departments of Government have been tried, and have failed.

The testimony of small-business men who have looked to the Small Business Administration for help and who have obtained it, truly indicates that an independent agency can cut through the confusion of scattered, piecemeal, inadequate efforts to assist small firms and make it possible for them to obtain quick and effective help.

Instead of an inefficient diffusion of efforts—always too little and usually too late—the Small Business Administration can provide a direct, central means of giving efficient assistance and representation to small business. Only through an independent agency can small business ever achieve proper recognition of its problems, with appropriate programs leading to a solution of these problems.

Disgraceful Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the defeat of an adequate highway bill last week has brought on a great protest from our American citizenry as well as, strong editorials criticizing the failure of this Congress to pass legislation that would not only improve the internal conditions of our country, but would be a great factor in reducing the wanton slaughter on our streets and highways. When you realize that 100 people every day are being killed, 3,000 per month or 36,000 per year, it is enough to arouse the entire populace of our country.

More people are maimed each year through accidents and more than $4 billion in losses is sustained each year, mainly attributable to unsafe and hazardous highways.

I wish to extend my remarks and include the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of Saturday, July 30, 1955:

DISGRACEFUL PERFORMANCE

The performance of the House of Representatives in voting down any form of Federal highway legislation was sickening.

In 12 hours of action in 2 days on the House floor, Congressman after Congressman expressed his great concern at the slaughter on our highways and the great economic loss the American people were suffering.

The need for a Federal highway bill, they kept saying to each other, is not in question.

Then, when their names were called, they voted down any form of Federal aid at all.

Some of them, when the final vote was announced, laughed aloud, as though they had done something amusing.

Up in the galleries, enjoying this display, were the lobbyists who today are being held responsible for the defeats of the various bills.

Many of them represented industries and associations that have fought for good roads for many years but who found that they didn't really want them if they were going to cost any money.

The lobbyists won a battle, but they lost the war, because they represent industries that cannot survive unless the highways of America are made adequate within the next few years.

Down on the floor the Congressmen were running the lobbyists' errands and deserting their own party leadership.

Today many of them have the decency at least to be somewhat ashamed of themselves.

And the lobbyists are telling everybody that they really were for a road bill and that they didn't expect that Congress would become so panicked under lobby pressure that nothing would result at all.

If these gentlemen are to be accepted at their word—and that is a gigantic "if"—then we agree with Republican House Leader MARTIN that President Eisenhower should call a special session of the Congress and make it sit in Washington until it does its duty.

There is nothing funny or politically smart about sabotaging a Federal highway bill.

About 200 Americans died in our chaotic traffic while these representatives of the people were issuing pious statements and finding a way to save their own political hides.

Now let them act like the statesmen they pretended to be.

Let them forget their miserable and petty differences.

Let them sit down together with their eyes off the galleries and do the job the American people are demanding of them.

And let them sit there until they do.

Reduction in Budget Estimates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bills are now through, with the exception of the legislative bill. As that is a comparatively small total of the whole, I have included what might be the result if the bill is passed. If it is not passed, and we have a continuing resolution, the total figure of budget estimates will undoubtedly be reduced by the continuing resolution by at least $10 million—just how much it is impossible to say.

I have prepared a table indicating the processes of the bills from the budget through the House and the Senate, which I submit herewith.

The table shows a reduction in the budget estimates of $2,003,361,014. In a great many ways, there have been things that have happened in connection with the appropriation bills that tend to wipe out the figures that appear on the surface. For instance, in the public-works bill, projects were initiated, many of them without any budget estimate, with an ultimate aggregate cost of upward of $3 billion.

In addition to that, in the agricultural bill, there were items above the budget aggregating $120 million that do not show. In the mutual security bill, there were items of reappropriation that were not known about beforehand that were reappropriated and took the place of direct appropriations out of the Treasury, involving approximately $300 million.

The concealed appropriations for the Agriculture Department and mutual-security items of reappropriation should really be deducted from the overall reduction in the saving that has been made, thus reducing the saving to about $1,500,000,000.

It looks to me as though, if we were careful, that the budget could be balanced in the fiscal year 1956, beginning July 1 next. The current picture for the month of July indicates that the income taxes, excise taxes, and customs duties have all begun to go up, and the overall

receipts of July were up nearly $150 million. On the other hand, the expenditures have gone up. The big increase in items is in the foreign-relief expenditures and the Veterans' Administration expenditures, but those figures should not carry through in that way all through the year, and the deficit should be much less than it has been.

Title	Budget estimates considered by Congress	Reported to House	Passed House	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public law
Regular annual:						
Treasury-Post Office	$3,360,385,000	$3,282,553,000	$3,282,553,000	$3,358,622,000	$3,358,622,000	$3,322,488,500
Treasury Department	604,398,000	595,818,000	595,818,000	603,348,000	603,348,000	599,598,000
Post Office Department	2,754,817,000	2,685,700,000	2,685,700,000	2,754,104,000	2,754,104,000	2,721,720,500
Tax Court of the United States	1,170,000	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	2,432,148,861	2,337,522,261	2,337,522,261	2,404,055,600	2,404,905,600	2,373,516,500
Labor Department	470,116,000	417,792,900	417,792,900	418,838,900	418,838,900	418,303,650
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,949,465,861	1,907,403,361	1,907,403,361	1,972,890,700	1,973,740,700	1,942,886,850
Related agencies	12,567,000	12,326,000	12,326,000	12,326,000	12,326,000	12,326,000
Interior and related agencies	314,523,056	298,271,246	297,825,546	327,987,088	327,987,088	317,573,627
Agriculture and farm credit	898,384,574	880,260,050	880,260,050	884,303,923	884,433,923	883,051,623
Independent offices	5,640,155,000	5,845,595,375	5,845,595,375	5,882,379,500	5,848,394,500	5,842,458,500
State, Justice, and Judiciary	483,531,912	450,398,227	450,398,227	481,985,418	481,985,418	466,302,415
State Department	147,267,197	126,769,977	126,769,977	147,549,608	147,549,608	137,450,905
Justice Department	201,485,000	197,525,000	197,525,000	200,445,000	200,445,000	198,735,000
Judiciary	30,279,715	29,603,250	29,603,250	30,640,810	30,640,810	30,116,510
USIA	88,500,000	80,500,000	80,500,000	88,350,000	88,350,000	85,000,000
Refugee relief	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Defense	32,232,815,000	31,488,206,000	31,488,206,000	31,836,521,336	31,882,915,726	31,882,815,726
Office of the Secretary	12,750,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,670,000	12,670,000	12,670,000
Interservice activities	682,250,000	672,250,000	672,250,000	682,250,000	682,250,000	682,250,000
Army	7,573,980,000	7,329,818,000	7,329,818,000	7,330,053,000	7,330,053,000	7,329,953,000
Navy	9,180,157,000	9,071,834,000	9,071,834,000	9,071,785,166	9,118,179,556	9,118,179,556
Air Force	14,783,678,000	14,401,904,000	14,401,904,000	14,739,763,170	14,739,763,170	14,739,763,170
District of Columbia	21,892,700	17,892,700	17,892,700	21,892,700	21,892,700	19,892,700
	(175,462,020)	(166,547,509)	(166,901,780)	(169,456,749)	(169,456,749)	(168,843,440)
General Government matters	28,777,700	21,890,700	21,890,700	27,166,300	27,166,300	27,166,300
Public works	1,801,465,000	1,285,746,242	1,372,122,800	1,377,491,000	1,377,571,000	1,365,613,500
Commerce and related agencies	1,366,393,000	1,121,435,000	1,123,685,000	1,314,617,300	1,317,192,300	1,215,360,000
Legislative	92,641,411	66,298,175	66,298,175	92,924,027	93,025,527	92,898,972
Mutual Security	3,350,541,750	2,701,275,000	2,701,275,000	3,205,341,750	3,205,841,750	2,703,341,750
The supplemental, 1956	2,123,351,072	1,648,876,128	224,276,628	1,826,111,614	1,830,678,614	1,656,622,892
Military construction	(1,480,000,000)	(1,402,329,000)	(0)	(1,280,377,300)	(1,283,044,300)	(1,193,869,300)
Subtotals	54,147,006,036	51,383,686,854	50,047,368,212	53,041,489,556	53,062,012,446	52,199,015,915
Deficiency and supplemental acts:						
Urgent deficiency, 1955	160,000	25,000	25,000	993,950	1,013,950	1,013,950
Second supplemental, 1955	952,002,718	855,212,429	857,187,429	938,402,835	945,412,835	898,805,875
Department of Justice	750,000	710,000	710,000	710,000	710,000	710,000
Second urgent deficiency, 1955	28,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475
House of Representatives		12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Permanent and corporation appropriations	7,711,162,199	7,711,162,199	7,711,162,199	7,711,162,199	7,711,162,199	7,711,162,199
Subtotals, deficiency and supplemental acts	8,692,338,392	8,592,385,103	8,594,360,103	8,676,544,459	8,683,574,459	8,636,967,499
Grand totals, session	62,839,344,428	59,976,071,687	58,641,728,315	61,718,034,015	61,745,586,905	60,835,983,414

A Tribute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an article by Mr. John C. Davis published as a part of his Washington column in the July issue of the Co-op Digest. Mr. Davis is a newspaperman of wide experience and one who has had an opportunity to observe congressional and governmental affairs for many years. During the past 3 years he has been here in Washington and in close touch with legislative activities.

In these times when one hears much ill-considered and unreasonable criticism of Government, and particularly of Congress, it is refreshing to read an article such as Mr. Davis has written.

I am happy that Mr. Davis made special reference to THOMAS A. JENKINS, our distinguished colleague of many years service, and a man who is respected and loved by every Member of the House.

The article follows:

The heart attack that struck down Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, gives this column a chance to say some things that it has long wanted to say regarding the men and women who man our Houses of Congress.

This observation is based upon more than 25 years as a working newspaperman, almost a year in a subcabinet position, and more than a year in the public relations field.

What I wish to do here is pay tribute to the men and women who handle our affairs in Congress. As a newspaperman I had contact with legislators for many years. Largely in this phase of the association they were humble men and women seeking to explain to a very cocky newswriter just why they had taken the stand they had on pending legislation, mostly agricultural since that was my special field.

As a newsman in the field I knew all the answers. I was very brusque with Congressmen, even Cabinet members, in criticizing their actions. I wondered, as I think you have, how the business of government ever got done with so many well-meaning but stupid people having a finger in the pie.

Then I came to Washington as an administrative assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture. In that position I learned intimately the problems facing officials in high administrative posts. I learned the real story in back of the hundreds, yes thousands, of dedicated men and women who carry on the every day affairs of our Government from very minor positions, unknown, unwept, and unsung, but nevertheless dedicated.

I learned about the men and women who represent us in Congress and it is to them that I would pay a tribute inspired by the unfortunate blow that has struck down LYNDON JOHNSON.

To begin with, you who know your Congressman or Senator only as a nice guy, or lady, whom you meet every 2 or 6 years when they come around seeking your vote, and accept them merely as such, realize but little of the real background of these people. You are apt to think of them as just someone who wants to hold public office, to drink at the public tap, with the blessing of the local political organization or boss, the latter able to tell them how to vote on critical measures or how to gain favor.

Nothing could be further from the truth as respects the great majority. There may be some who fit the picture of political hacks, but if there are I do not know them after 3 years here in Washington and an intimate contact with the men and women who "man" the Hill.

My observation leads me to say, without qualification, that the men and women in Congress are the hardest working single

group in the United States of America. They and their staffs put in more hours in their offices, more hours of work, than do any comparable group in the Nation, whether it be in private industry, labor, housework, farming, or any of the occupations that engage our citizens.

It is nothing for a Congressman or Senator and his staff to be at work at 8 o'clock in the morning, every morning, and to be still going strongly at 9 o'clock at night; not just 1 day but every day.

From a career that began on a farm, and included a couple of years as a laborer on an open-hearth gang in a steel mill, I know something about work. I want to say here and now that the Members of Congress work harder, physically and mentally, than any segment of our population.

What makes them do it?

At a recent meeting of the Ohio Society, at which I was a member of the reception committee, and TOM JENKINS, Ohio's ranking Republican Congressman, was the honored guest, I asked the Congressman why he stuck to his job. TOM, who represents Ohio's 10th district, and is in his 16th consecutive term which makes him the 6th ranking Member in the House, answered: "Jack, I am here because I like the service. Not a day passes but that I am able to do at least 50 nice things for at least 50 nice and deserving people. Where else could I perform so much service for good?"

The Congressman went on to say that he has never taken a campaign contribution from anyone, but he owes no man or interest, and that he casts his vote with a clear conscience for the public good.

By and large, TOM JENKINS is typical of the men and women who serve you in the Houses of Congress. They are deserving of our respect, admiration, and support. And when one of them has been stricken with illness, as has LYNDON JOHNSON, it behooves us to offer what prayers we may to whatever God we worship for his speedy recovery.

A Magnificent Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to my colleagues' attention the magnificent gift to be received by the Morristown National Historical Park under the will of Lloyd Waddell Smith. This park, incidentally, is located in my congressional district, and includes Washington's famous revolutionary headquarters in Morristown, and also the site of the Continental Army's encampment in nearby Jockey Hollow. The Jockey Hollow area, totaling some 1,000 acres, was given to the Government by Mr. Smith in 1933, thus laying the groundwork for the establishment of the Morristown National Historical Park.

The late Lloyd Waddell Smith, one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, has left to the Morristown National Historical Park his unique collection of Americana. Included in this collection are hundreds of letters written by George Washington, his sword, and estate records. As an avid and discriminating collector, Mr. Smith amassed also a magnificent collection of Indian relics, largely found in New Jersey. Many manuscripts, books, and documents of the Civil War period also have been left to the national park.

In the light of this immensely valuable legacy, it is especially pleasing to me to know that these articles will be housed in a new wing to the national museum, located on the grounds of Washington's headquarters in Morristown. Sufficient funds for this purpose just recently have been made available to build this wing, which it is expected will be finished in 1956. At that time, therefore, one of our most interesting national parks will be able to display adequately the priceless and irreplacable collection just left to the Nation by the late Lloyd Smith.

There Is Still Ample Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, there is still ample time for Congress to enact a sound and equitable highway program before the adjournment.

It is my conviction that we can still rise up to the situation and take favorable action on highway legislation. The pros and cons of the various proposals on this subject have been debated for many months. They are familiar to most if not all of the Members. It would not require any longer than 1 day to reconsider this legislation, and to reach some satisfactory decision.

I wish to urge my colleagues on the Public Works Committee, and the distinguished leadership of this House, to bring the highway legislation to the floor without delay. I am confident that the House will be able to complete action on this vital measure before adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel. This editorial, in my estimation, reflects the feelings of many people who are deeply disturbed by the recent action of the House, and who are very interested in seeing an adequate and sound highway program enacted without further delay.

The editorial follows:

DISGRACEFUL PERFORMANCE

The performance of the House of Representatives in voting down any form of Federal highway legislation was sickening.

In 12 hours of action in 2 days on the House floor, Congressman after Congressman expressed his great concern at the slaughter on our highways and the great economic loss the American people were suffering.

The need for a Federal highway bill, they kept saying to each other, is not in question.

Then, when their names were called, they voted down any form of Federal aid at all.

Some of them, when the final vote was announced, laughed aloud, as though they had done something amusing.

Up in the galleries, enjoying this display, were the lobbyists who today are being held responsible for the defeats of the various bills.

Many of them represented industries and associations that have fought for good roads for many years, but who found that they didn't really want them if they were going to cost any money.

The lobbyists won a battle, but they lost the war because they represent industries that cannot survive unless the highways of America are made adequate within the next few years.

Down on the floor the Congressmen were running the lobbyists' errands and deserting their own party leadership.

Today many of them have the decency at least to be somewhat ashamed of themselves.

And the lobbyists are telling everybody that they really were for a road bill and that they didn't expect that Congress would become so panicked under lobby pressure that nothing would result at all.

If these gentlemen are to be accepted at their word—and that is a gigantic "if"—then we agree with Republican House Leader MARTIN that President Eisenhower should call a special session of the Congress and make it sit in Washington until it does its duty.

There is nothing funny or politically smart about sabotaging a Federal highway bill.

About 200 Americans died in our chaotic traffic while these representatives of the people were issuing pious statements and finding a way to save their own political hides.

Now let them act like the statesmen they pretended to be.

Let them forget their miserable and petty differences.

Let them sit down together with their eyes off the galleries and do the job the American people are demanding of them.

And let them sit there until they do.

Where Does the United States Stand With Respect to Soviet Russia in the Race for Aerial Supremacy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to your attention, and to the attention of the Congress, a matter which has lately given me increasing concern. It is a matter which ties very directly to the question asked so many times this past month—where do we in the United States stand with respect to Soviet Russia in the race for aerial supremacy?

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the vast disproportion that has developed between the large expenditures for building new aircraft and the relatively much smaller expenditures for obtaining the basic research knowledge which, in the last analysis, determines their quality and their utility. The lumping together of research expenditures with the many times larger sums for the construction of the first models of new engines, airplanes, and guided missiles serves to conceal the relatively small effort the United States is concentrating upon research.

What we need is a better balance between our research effort and our development and production of new models of aircraft and missiles. Restoration of a realistic balance between the two—research on the one hand and development and production on the other—need not be expensive. In fact, I am convinced that such action can result in the saving for the American taxpayers of untold millions of dollars. It can save many lives among our test pilots and our youth who fly the planes in service.

More important still, achievement of balance between research and production of new aircraft and missiles can assure that the United States maintains its position of leadership in the world of aeronautics.

Let me give you a single illustration of the tragic consequences of the lack of knowledge, the lack of sufficient information coming from research. On a warm, sunny day in California last fall, one of our newest—and most promising—fighter aircraft prototypes took off on a test flight. This particular flight was the last of a series being made to demonstrate that the new airplane was able to perform satisfactorily the severe maneuvers which would be required of it in service use.

The pilot, one of the best in the business, climbed to a preselected altitude at which he began to perform the specified maneuver. Something went wrong: The airplane disintegrated in midair; the pilot was killed.

At first, no one knew what had caused this tragedy. But the most intensive studies of the wreckage and other available evidence finally revealed the cause. In the words of the chief engineer of the company which had designed and built the plane, the pilot "encountered some hitherto unsuspected mysteries of supersonic flight—and unexplainable phenomenon—a maneuver never before experienced under those conditions."

This strange maneuver, I am told, was a sudden and uncontrollable turn to the right. Instead of keeping its sleek nose pointed into the supersonic wind of a 100 times hurricane strength, the airplane suddenly turned and went into a violent skid. The result was that the terrific wind forces existing at supersonic speed battered the sturdy aircraft structure until it broke into pieces.

I have been relieved to learn that, in this case, a remedy was soon found. But I am disturbed when I reflect that, in cases like this, months of precious time, and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of engineering and production effort are being committed to projects where the line between success and failure is so narrow.

Even when the trouble can be soon corrected, the disorganization of the production line, and the great amount of additional engineering effort required, cost many millions of dollars. What is far more important, if the trouble cannot be corrected, the many years of effort that have gone into the development of the airplane or the missile are the same as thrown away.

We cannot win a technical race with Russia that way. And, whether we like it or not, the Soviet Russians have engaged in a race with us—to become first in the air. Assuming that we are still ahead in that race, I can find no reason to believe that we will long maintain the lead we now have, if we adopt an attitude of complacency or fail to make full use of our technical talents.

The instance of trouble with a new type aircraft that I mentioned is not an isolated case. During these past few critical years there have been other instances of airplanes which had to be grounded as a result of unknown faults that caused them to break apart in the air.

Why does this sort of thing happen? I am not an engineer or a scientist, and I do not pretend to know all the answers. But I will say this: I have looked into these accidents sufficiently to know that what is happening is that in our haste to bring about great improvement in the performance capabilities of our airplanes, we are forcing our aircraft companies to design for production on the basis of insufficient basic aeronautical knowledge.

In the decades before World War II, the United States was the acknowledged world leader in aeronautics. This was due to the research effort carried on during those years. At the beginning of that war, we had a backlog of basic aeronautical information which could be exploited readily by use in the design of new and improved aircraft.

But since the war, due to the supersonic possibilities implicit in the turbojet and rocket engine, our designers have had to accelerate their work to the point where the lead time between our aircraft research and our aircaft design and prototype production has been cut virtually to zero.

I am informed that our aircraft research people were just beginning to understand the nature of some of the problems that caused the tragic accident last fall at the very time the accident occurred. What I am saying is that, somehow, we must assure that our research people define these new mysterious problems and come up with the solutions, before new designs get to the flight stage, not after the airplanes begin breaking up in midair. And they should be able to do this in ample time for the designers to study and digest the research data before the design starts.

Our research effort has not kept pace. It is too thin today to provide the required lead time before design, and it is becoming increasingly apparent that this is a situation which has been worsening during the past few years.

In the postwar period between 1946 and 1953 appropriations for all military aircraft procurement—including airplanes and missiles—increased from $415 million to $15 billion—an increase of 3,500 percent.

During this same period, the appropriations for salaries and expenses of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, our principal aeronautical research agency, went up from $24 million to $48.6 million—an increase of 100 percent.

In 1946, we were spending about 6 percent of the procurement appropriation to insure the technical quality of our aircraft, compared to only three-tenths of 1 percent for such insurance in 1953. Today the picture remains much the same as in 1953.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are all agreed as to the necessity of spending the many billions of dollars required to construct and operate for peace great fleets of airplanes and missiles. But when we spend those billions, we must insist that they provide superiority in the air, in quality as well as in in quantity.

Our airplanes and our missiles must be able not only to meet their performance guarantees in the skilled hands of the expert company pilots. They must be able to operate, at performance guarantee levels, under the rigorous demands of military service.

The basic research required to provide the answers which will enable us to build supersonic aircraft that will be controllable, reliable and structurally sound—as well as sleek and fast—is an essential element in our airpower picture. We cannot afford to neglect it.

A Voluntary Health Plan for Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I had the privilege of being chairman, initiated a health inquiry to study what can and should be done to provide additional protection for the American people against the heavy burden—and all too frequent financial hardship—arising from sickness and accidents resulting in hospitalization and accompanying medical expenses.

This inquiry disclosed that although there had been a very rapid growth of the voluntary health-insurance movement, the committee was equally impressed that there was a need for extension of coverage to provide for broader ranges of benefits and to additional groups of people. One of these groups that needed coverage were the older people, who either found difficulty in obtaining health insurance or were unable to obtain it at all.

In both the 83d and 84th Congresses, I introduced several bills designed to help the American people to bear the burden of hospital and medical expenses, built on our existing system of voluntary insurance.

I have been informed that the health inquiry conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce dur-

ing the 83d Congress stimulated many in the insurance industry in their efforts to provide broader ranges of benefits and to cover additional groups of people.

I am particularly gratified to have learned that the Prudential Insurance Company of America, the largest insurance company in my State of New Jersey, and the second largest in the country, following the hearings last session of our committee, undertook a study of the possibility and feasibility of providing individual hospital-expense coverage at a reasonable rate for our older people and is now prepared to offer some time in September a special hospital-expense policy to both men and women between the ages of 60 and 70 which will help them pay their hospital, surgical, and medical expenses while in the hospital, with guaranteed lifetime coverage subject to the limits set forth in the policy.

For the information of the Members and my colleagues on the committee, I am including as part of my remarks the following letter received by me from Mr. Carrol M. Shanks, the president of the Prudential, relative to this new policy, the stimulus for which was provided by the work of the committee:

AUGUST 1, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It is a great personal pleasure to advise you that our company will provide a comprehensive program, based on private enterprise, for hospital and medical care for older members of our population. This new program which we call our senior hospital-expense plan, is designed to provide guaranteed lifetime coverage for persons between 60 and 70 years old on an individual basis through special hospitalization and medical-expense policies. They will be offered to the public by our sales forces in September.

There are probably some 21 million persons age 60 and over, but only a small number of them are employed by concerns which provide hospitalization benefits through group insurance. Generally, this coverage does not continue when the employee is retired. However, the number of employers who are providing hospitalization coverage after retirement is increasing. While individual, as well as family, policies are available in addition to group coverage, many companies limit their issue to applicants under age 60. A few companies have policies available to applicants at the older ages but, in most instances, the benefits at the older ages are on a limited basis and almost without exception the insurer reserves the right to terminate the coverage after age 65.

Since only a small number of persons 60 years or over are covered by hospitalization insurance, there is a great need for this type of protection. The frequency of hospitalization at age 60 and up is twice that below age 45. Moreover, the average duration of hospital confinement is twice as long at age 60 and over as it is for ages below 45. Taking into account these 2 factors, the cost of hospitalization at age 60 and over is almost 4 times greater than for persons under 45 years of age.

In my opinion, you and your associates on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, as a result of your hearings and exhaustive studies last year, deserve great credit in bringing to public attention the need for private enterprise to provide adequate assistance for our older population.

Following the hearings of the committee, the Prudential started the development of the program that is being announced. After an extensive study and great research concerning this problem of providing adequate coverage for the older persons, the company developed individual policies that will substantially meet their needs at reasonable costs. Most important of all, it seems to me, is that these policies are guaranteed renewable for life and the company cannot cancel them. The company reserves the right to change premiums because of the experimental nature of the coverages. However, any rate change may be made only on a class basis and not because of physical impairments or claims of any individual insured. I am enclosing a description of the major details of these new policies, which I think you will find interesting.

There are few, if any, more important social and economic responsibilities confronting our industry today. I am gratified to say that the Prudential, as an important member of the industry, is trying to meet this challenge.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

CARROL M. SHANKS,
President.

SENIOR HOSPITAL EXPENSE POLICIES

The following is a brief summary of Prudential's hospital-expense individual policies for older people. The policy should be referred to for complete details.

Available to eligible males and females aged 60 to 70, inclusive. No further premiums are due after the policy anniversary following attainment of age 80, but benefits are provided during the lifetime of the insured.

Company cannot cancel policy, but may change the table of premium rates. The right to change premiums has been reserved by the company because the experimental nature of the coverage makes the proper level of premiums uncertain and the coverage is one for which the cost trend is uncertain. Any rate change will be for the class of policyholders and not applied to any individual insured.

The coverages are available on two plans:

A. Daily hospital benefit $8 with maximum surgical benefit $200.

B. Daily hospital benefit $12 with maximum surgical benefit $300.

Coverage is offered either on:

A. Ordinary basis where premiums are payable quarterly, semiannually, or annually; or

B. Debit basis where premiums are collected monthly by the agent at the home.

Important features of the debit and ordinary plans are as follows:

A. Hospital-expense benefits:

1. Daily hospital confinement benefits: For room, board, and routine hospital services while confined as a resident inpatient in a hospital, with a maximum duration for all hospital confinement due to any one accident or during any one period of sickness of 35 days on the ordinary basis, and 28 days on the debit basis.

2. Additional hospital-expense benefits: For expenses actually incurred, while confined as a resident inpatient in a hospital, for items such as operating room, laboratory, X-ray and fluoroscope, medicines, drugs, surgical dressings, oxygen. The maximum payment for confinement due to any one accident or during any one period of sickness is 8 times the daily hospital benefit on the ordinary basis; and 5 times the daily hospital benefit on the debit basis.

3. Aggregate hospital-expense-benefits limit: Hospital-expense benefits for all hospital confinements, regardless of cause, may not collectively exceed during the life of the policy:

On the ordinary-basis policy, $1,600 when the daily hospital benefit is $8; $2,400 when the daily hospital benefit is $12.

On the debit-basis policy, $1,200 when the daily hospital benefit is $8; $1,800 when the daily hospital benefit is $12.

In each case, when the aggregate hospital-expense-benefit limit has been reached, no further premiums are required and the policy is continued in force for life for surgical-expense benefits only.

B. Surgical-expense benefits: Payment of actual charges up to the amount provided under the schedule of operations as shown in the policy.

PREMIUM EXAMPLES

For lives becoming insured at age 65, the premiums at the present table of rates are:

Ordinary plan (quarterly premiums): $8 daily hospital benefit with maximum surgical benefit, $200: Males, $19.18; females, $20.40. Twelve-dollar daily hospital benefit with maximum surgical benefit $300: Males, $28.77; females, $30.60.

Debit plan (monthly premiums): $8 daily hospital benefit with maximum surgical benefit $200: Males, $5.60; females, $6.02. Twelve-dollar daily hospital benefit with maximum surgical benefit $300: Males, $8.40; females, $9.03.

The Timeless Philosophy of a Great Commoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a remarkable address delivered at the Hotel Jefferson, Richmond, February 27, 1955, by Hon. Robert Crosser, one of the most influential Members of this House for more than a third of a century:

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE CONVENTION OF DISTRICT XVI OF THE KAPPA ALPHA THETA SORORITY, HELD AT HOTEL JEFFERSON, RICHMOND, VA., ON SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1955, BY ROBERT CROSSER, WHO, EXCEPTING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 4, 1919, TO MARCH 4, 1923, WAS A MEMBER OF CONGRESS CONTINUOUSLY FROM MARCH 4, 1913, TO JANUARY 3, 1955

Madam Toastmistress and members of the Kappa Alpha Theta Sorority, when the very estimable member of your organization invited me to address this convention, she suggested that I stress the importance of achievement by members of your sorority. I called attention, however, to the fact that achievement is often not unmixed good.

It occurred to me that a group like this, the most important service I might render would be first to call attention to the fact that many of the conventional notions in regard to the right purpose in life are fallacious. It seemed, therefore, that the best service which I might be able to render is to state what, from the standpoint of the absolute, is the true purpose or goal of mankind.

Let me say, then, without quibbling, that man's aim, purpose, or goal should be the realization of absolute harmony. I appreciate the fact, of course, that from the human standpoint, relative harmony only may be reasonably expected.

I am sure, however, that we can all agree that earnest devotion to and continuous support of one's best understanding of right, or truth, is the individual's most sublime expression of life.

Right means to be in accord with the Supreme Power of the universe. The terms "right," "truth," and "reality" all have the same meaning. Such constant support of the right by the individual, therefore, indicates also his recognition of the existence of infinite good and its action which he desires to manifest by his conduct.

When the individual becomes regularly conscious of his identity, he then experiences a continual eagerness to know the right, the truth, in order to be able to determine what is his proper course of conduct. In addition to his eargerness to know the right, the individual becomes vividly aware of the fact that the urge to do right, the truth, felt by him, is the activity of the cause, the power, which gave him existence, and is the only real cause or creator.

If the individual's thinking and activity manifest at-one-ment with, accordance with, the Supreme Power, then that thinking and action are right. Right or truth being the essence and law of action of the Supreme Power, the infinite mind is, therefore, all that is real. The real is that which is right or true. The philosopher Herbert Spencer said also: "That which is real is permanent; that which is not permanent is not real."

Now, my friends, to both you who have been, as well as you who are now, college students, it must be evident that the true purpose in striving for an education should be the improvement of our understanding of the right; to increase our knowledge of the law of life, of the way of action of infinite mind, and that means the truth which will make mankind really free. In brief, the purpose in seeking an education should be to acquire the knowledge of the law of life, and thus become conscious of our "at-one-ment" with infinite mind and so be better able to fulfill the Creator's purpose of our existence. William Thompson Seaton well said: "Manhood, not scholarship is the first aim of education."

The words "mind" and "spirit" are synonyms of each other. The terms "infinite mind" and "infinite spirit" are appropriate names for the universally present, all-knowing, omnipotent and only Power that exists. Others may designate the Power by such names as Creator of God, but there should be no quibbling about names or titles. That which is all-important is knowledge of the Power and its action.

Whether we are considering the conduct of the individual in what is usually regarded as private affairs, or, on the other hand, we are discussing his conduct as a member of the collectivity known as society, in the exercise of his rights, or in the discharge of duties, the true law of life is the law of action of the infinite mind.

Now, my friends, you will have concluded no doubt from what I have already said that I regard what is called matter as a nonreality, and in that conclusion you are entirely correct, although I prefer to say: "Matter is a misinterpretation of reality."

Today, no truly outstanding physicist contends that so-called matter and material objects have existence as independent entities. The nonreality of matter has been demonstrated from different viewpoints. John Fiske, late professor of philosophy at Harvard University, said: "Take away the cognizing mind and (then) the color, form, position, and hardness of the table before you * * * all the attributes, in short, that characterize it as matter, at once disappear. Apart from consciousness, there are no such things as color, form, position, or hardness, and there is no such thing as matter."

In 1934, when he became president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Sir James Jeans was reported as saying in his inaugural address, that the physical world has no objective reality apart from the mental concepts of it which man contrives with his mind. When asked to comment on the statement of Sir James Jeans, Sir Arthur Eddington, famous physicist, astronomer and professor at Cambridge University, England, promptly said that he agreed entirely with the statement of Sir James Jeans.

The two men whom I have just quoted were regarded in their time as certainly the outstanding authorities in the subjects of physics and astronomy.

Professor Oswald of Leipsig University, said many years ago: "Matter is only a thing imagined." Professor Max Muller has said: "To speak of matter as something existing by itself and presented to the senses, is mere mythology. And yet," he said, "we are asked by materialists to believe that the perceiving subject, or mind, is really the result of long-continued development of the object, or of matter. This is a logical somersault."

Many years ago, Prof. Osborne Reynolds, F. R. S., LL. D., M. Inst. C. L., a great mathematician and professor of engineering at Owens College, Manchester, England, published a carefully prepared mathematical treatise in which he proved mathematically the nonreality of matter.

If there are any who are inclined to scoff at those whose statements have just been quoted, let them note what has been said by two other very eminent men of science. Dr. Le Bon of the Royal Institute of Belgium in his notable work entitled "The Evolution of Forces" referring to what he called the fixed belief in the reality of matter, said: "Scientific ideas which rule the minds of scholars at various epochs have all the solidity of religious dogmas. Too often do we forget that the scientific idols of the present day have no more right to invulnerability than those of the past."

Dr. J. W. Heysinger, author of "Spirit and Matter Before the Bar of Modern Science," referring to so-called material science, writes as follows: "The dogmatism of theology finds a full counterpart and coworker in her newer sister, dogmatic science."

When I was a student in college, the world's physicists in general declared the atom to be the smallest particle of matter, although it had not been a great many years prior to that time when the molecule had been declared to be the smallest particle of matter. Emphasis was placed also on propositions as to the "indestructibility of matter and the continuity of energy." In less than 10 years after my graduation from college, however, every scientific publication in the world announced in big headlines that the electron had been proved to be the smallest particle of matter. It was soon thereafter demonstrated also that the electron consists of lines of force at right angles to each other. It was then proved that the ether, which had long been designated as the elemental form of matter, really consists of the total of the electrons in the universe.

What in all fairness, it may be asked, what had become of the so-called matter stuff? The answer is that it never really did exist. Matter is a misinterpretation of reality.

The age-long general belief in materialism was, of course, accompanied by a practically universal belief in the existence of innumerable, separate, and distinct beings, even insulated from each other. This very common belief led people in general to believe mistakenly in the inevitability, indeed, in the unavoidability of conflict because of a being's eagerness for personal advantage over others.

To believe in the existence of innumerable, distinct, separate entities is, of course, to believe in materialism. The usual definition of matter given by materialists themselves is: "Matter is that which is outlined." Since, as has been shown, there is no matter, it must follow logically that there is no outline, and of course, if there is no outline, then there can be no division, and if there is no division then it is clear that all that exists is a unit—one—and that one, as has been said, "is all in all."

It is logically certain also that the one power is mental. It must be mental, must be infinite mind, in order to know how to control the universe, created by itself, the one power. The only thinking that is possible is the thinking or consciousness of that which is true or real. All of reality is, however, inherent in the one mind. All thinking of consciousness, therefore, must be the consciousness or thinking about that which is real, or in other words, must be the truth existing in the Supreme Power, that is, the infinite mind.

The consciousness or awareness of infinite mind, of God, is necessarily the contemplation of himself, that is, His self-contemplation, His expression, His exact likeness, which is man.

As already stated, mind creates and controls by consciousness or thinking. The one mind must be eternally conscious of all reality and truth, must be constantly conscious of all true ideas and their action. If this were not so there would cease to be harmony. Absolute harmony is the perfect adjustment of all reality, all truth, of all real ideas. If harmony should cease to be, the result would be instantaneous and universal destruction.

Now, my friends, I am sure you will agree that our somewhat extensive discussion of what is basically true and what is false is not without justification. I am sure indeed, that a moment's consideration will convince earnest students that in the discussion of serious problems, the conclusions reached and advocated as the desirable course of action for the promotion of the welfare of mankind should be, and in fact such conclusions must be derived from fundamental principles, the soundness of which will have been established beyond doubt.

We have shown that infinite mind or spirit and its consciousness are one and all in all. The whole of reality, that is, all that is true or right, being inherent in infinite spirit, mind, has eternal existence. Creation is, therefore, complete, perfect and eternal.

It is evident, then, that no person really creates anything. He discovers creation. Man does not make truth but becomes conscious of, that is to say, becomes aware of truth. The discovery of the truth, that is, becoming conscious of the real, the right must be the constant, unchanging goal of man, the true aim of education.

The great importance of knowing the truth is recognized almost universally, and yet comparatively little rational, systematic effort has been devoted to the task of explaining and demonstrating the proper approach to the solution of the problem: "How to succeed in knowing the truth."

If, therefore, at the conclusion of my remarks to this group, I shall have done something worthwhile to indicate the logical approach to the solution of the problem: "How to succeed in knowing the truth," I shall be more than pleased.

I am sure that some of you have observed that, even when they are engaged in mental fields of activity requiring deliberation and reflection, many persons become almost frantic in their eagerness to evidence the fact that they are strenuous in their efforts. This is another illustration of the fallacy of the belief that the intense constant exertion of and reliance upon the human will can assure real progress. In fact, at the beginning of the present century, it became almost a fad to be strenuous from hardly any motive except the desire to be known as being constantly strenuous for strenuosity's sake. In other words, it was a fair illustration of the old saying: "Much ado about nothing."

It is clear that the consciousness or knowing of the truth, that is, of reality, is not the result of personal, finite contriving,

planning, designing, or the result of any other kind of mechanical effort. On the contrary, truth is the right, eternal action or expression of the One and Only Power, which may be properly designated also, as either Infinite Mind or Infinite Spirit, because the words "mind" and "spirit" are synonymous. The Master Christian said: "God is Spirit."

Many persons, notwithstanding earnest, even intense efforts to know the truth, fail in their sincere purpose because of their wrong approach to the problem. They assume wrongly that it is necessary for them to contrive, construct, yes, even to originate truth. The Supreme Power, Infinite Mind, and its action constitute all of reality and hence all that is right. The cooperation and mutual attraction of all the ideas in Infinite Mind are controlled by the constant and eternal action of the Supreme Power.

No person can ignore or disregard, with impunity, that which is absolute right or truth and its eternal law of action. Whether he be a person confronted with a task in the work-a-day world or a student concerned with his studies, if he depends upon materialistic notions which he has outlined as objectives, and upon his so-called personal will to accomplish such objectives, he will find himself ultimately to be distressed because of failure to make true progress.

If in accordance with what he may have decided to be advantageous from a material standpoint, a person endeavors to control the course of his life, there could be only one certain result. That result would be his failure to increase his awareness of the eternal verities of being, his failure to recognize progress toward the realization of his complete identification with all that is true, right, and good.

If, however, men will listen to and obey "the still, small voice," will "be obedient to the promptings of their own soul," as urged by William Ellery Channing, or as others have said, "be true to their best inspirations," if they will give heed to these wise pleas, then they will know the truth which will make them free.

When, however, in his quest for the truth, the individual will have acquired the constant attitude of being the receiver and not the creator of the good he enjoys, he will then no longer be hampered and harassed by the belief that he must struggle to contrive, design, and construct that which is required for his pleasurable existence.

The discovery of the truth, that is to say, the becoming conscious of the real, the right, must be the constant unchanging goal of man, the true aim of education.

No greater pronouncement was ever uttered than that which is expressed in the words, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Let me repeat that the right, the truth is not, however, the result of human contrivance. The fact is that the trials and tribulations of mankind are due to the erroneous notion that members of the human family can devise their conduct, can calculate their actions in such fashion as to present the appearance of right, notwithstanding the fact that their planning is for personal advantage. Regardless, however, of the plausibility of such action, those who regularly pursue such a course of conduct will be doomed to disappointment. They will finally realize that disregard of the promptings of their better consciousness cannot assure them harmony.

The experience of those who pursue such a course is well illustrated by a few lines of verse which came to my attention some years ago, from which I quote as follows:

"When you get what you want in your struggle for self
And the world makes you king for a day,
Just go to a mirror and look at yourself
And hear what that man has to say.

"For it is not your father or mother or wife
Whose judgment upon you must pass;
The fellow whose verdict counts most in your life,
Is the man staring out of the glass.

"You may be like Jack Horner and chisel a plum
And think you're a wonderful guy;
But the man in the glass says you're only a bum
If you can't look him straight in the eye.

"He's the one to please; never mind all the rest
For he's with you clear down to the end;
And you've passed your most dangerous, difficult test
If the man in the glass is your friend.

"You may fool all the world down the pathway of years
And get pats on the back as you pass;
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears
If you've cheated the man in the glass."

Individual or collective conduct may be discussed at length from the standpoint of ethics, political science, political economy, religion, metaphysics, or according to other formal treatises concerning mankind's conduct, but always and inevitably, the real desire of the individual is to know and to do what is right.

My friends, in order to manifest the harmony with which man has been endowed, we must realize, must live the truth otherwise called the right or reality. One of America's early and able writers concerning fundamental principles, urged the importance of obedience to the promptings of one's own soul. That was equivalent to saying be obedient to the direction or guidance of the Supreme Power, the One Infinite Mind. The promptings of the soul is the activity of the Infinite Mind as wisdom. The activity of the One Infallible Mind constitutes the true law of life. The relationship of the true ideas is controlled by the laws, or we may say, the ways of action of Infinite Mind.

Whatever aspect of the perfect government we may consider, the fact is that the consciousness or way of action of the One Unerring Mind is eternal. The action and control by Infinite Mind in creation is absolutely right, unchanging, and needs no statute books to prove its existence and authority.

The law or ways of action of Infinite Mind must be recognized by the individual as the true law of his life, if he is to live aright. It is therefore absolutely necessary also, if the conduct of human government is to be just, that it must constantly improve its interpretation of the perfect government, it must reflect the right as it prevails in the One Perfect Government.

In the light of what has been said, it must be clear that everyone has an unavoidable responsibility which requires him not only to live the right, the truth, but also that he must earnestly and constantly endeavor to disseminate the truth, and by so doing to hasten the universal realization of the reign of justice.

I realize the fact, of course, that some people seem puzzled and even disappointed when told that all truth, all reality has existed eternally. The vanity of some is offended by even the inference that the individual can create nothing. The disappointment of such persons is due in part to the misunderstanding of the word "indivdual" which has often been defined inaccurately. Instead of meaning a being which is apart and distinct from all else, the word is derived from the Latin prefix "in" meaning "not," and the Latin verb "dividuus" meaning divided. The word etymologically therefore means "not divided from." The individual is not divided from the one all-inclusive life. He individualizes the one life, becomes conscious of, or discovers creation, but does not make it.

Consider, then, the possible glorious experience of those whose attitude is in accord with the truth, with the real creation, as they realize the joy and bliss which unfold to them as a result of their constant and unending discoveries of truth.

This discovery, the awakening to the understanding and realization of truth is, or should be, the true aim of education as distinguished from schooling or training. The word "education" is derived from the Latin prefix "e" meaning "out of," and joined with the Latin verb "ducere" meaning 'to draw" or lead. The word education, therefore, means to draw out. Obviously, whatever may be drawn out must have been within. Education is, therefore, a spiritual process, as distinguished from training or schooling, which is largely mechanical in nature. People were formerly schooled to believe that the earth was flat, and as a matter of fact, during the Middle Ages in Europe, many people were executed, burned to death, because they disputed the statement that the earth was flat.

I have already mentioned the fact that many materialists scoff at the expression, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," and when the statement is voiced approvingly, they almost instantly bark the question, "What is truth?" When Pontius Pilate asked the question, "What is truth?" the Master Metaphysician answered, "He that doeth the will of the Father shall know of the doctrine" (the truth). He spoke of the Supreme Power as Father.

Let me quote also what a very distinguished scientist has to say about the truth, that is, the right. Dr. Warren Weaver is chairman of the Board of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation. For 20 years he has been responsible for a world-wide program in the natural sciences. Dr. Weaver said: "When I am trying to work out a problem of right and wrong, then God is a clear unambiguous voice, an unfailing source of moral guidance. I do not understand how these things happen; but I do know perfectly well, if I listen to this voice, what is the right thing to do. I have many times been uncertain as to what course of action would best serve a certain practical purpose; but I cannot think of a single instance in my life when I asked what was the really right thing to do and the answer was not forthcoming."

Alexis de Tocqueville, a distinguished French writer on the subject of political science, and author of a notable treatise on the subject "Democracy in America," came to America 120 years ago to travel and study. He was a great champion of democracy and once said: "The cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy."

During 1835, while speaking of America de Tocqueville said: "I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there; in her rich mines and her vast commerce, and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ceases to be good America will cease to be great."

Webster defines righteousness as the state or quality of being rightful or just. De Tocqueville uses the words right and good interchangeably. There is no doubt that the French writer understood the word "right" exactly as I have emphasized it during these remarks. He undoubtedly meant: "America is great because she is righteous, and if America ceases to be righteous, America will cease to be great."

Earlier in my remarks I called attention to the fact that William Ellery Channing had said, "Be obedient to the promptings of your

own soul." The Master Christian said, "Be obedient to the still, small voice." Others have said, "Be obedient to your best inspirations." The all-important implication in all of these statements is, however, the recognition of Infinite Mind's guidance, its proper direction of the individual. Some persons nevertheless argue that the still, small voice is not reliable. In answer to such statements we might emphasize the fact that the voice is always clear and readily understood, and that the difficulty, if any, consists of the person's failure to listen intently and earnestly; his failure to exercise regularly what we might facetiously designate as his listener.

Do not doubt for a moment that the earnest effort to know the truth assures the individual of true pleasure. Certainly, a receptive and expectant attitude will assure him of incalculable joy and bliss, which will cause him to become a veritable crusader for that which is right.

Enthusiasm for the right will fire the individual with an earnest desire to give proper account for the talents with which he has been entrusted, and make him eager to arouse the consciousness of truth in others.

Horatio Bonar expresses the idea well in the lines which I quote as follows:

"Thy soul must overflow, if thou
Another's soul wouldst reach;
It needs the overflow of heart
To give the lips full speech.
Think truly, and thy thoughts
Shall the world's famine feed;
Speak truly, and each word of thine
Shall be a fruitful seed;
Live truly, and thy life shall be
A great and noble creed."

Because of its transcendent importance, I feel that I may be excused for again emphasizing the fact that truth, reality or right is already complete, perfect, and has eternal existence. The real, the right is not the result or effect of any finite being's contriving or designing. Nevertheless, everyone is anxious to become aware of, that is, to know the truth, otherwise called the right.

For the assurance and acceleration of the awareness or knowledge of the truth, the most important requirement is the clear recognition of the existence of the one supreme and all-inclusive power which is spirit or mind and also properly designated as principle. The consciousness of that mind is not only right, but is also eternal.

All aspects of truth are expressions of the one mind. The consciousness of that mind constitutes the eternal, the unchangeable laws or ways of the perfect government which human governments profess to imitate.

When he is certain of the existence of the all-knowing mind and its consciousness, then the individual sincerely manifests not only the receptive attitude toward the truth but also becomes confidently expectant as to the realization of what is truly good, helpful, and gratifying.

Certainly it must now be clear that the practice of devising courses of action in order to secure self-advantage is wholly unscientific and results in disappointment and distress. In view of the fact that the cause of all creation and the law or way of its action are eternal, it follows logically that the duty of mankind is constant compliance with the direction of infiinte mind. The way of actoin of that mind is what constitutes right, the truth or the real, and disregard of that truth, reality or right by the person makes his punishment more certain than if he were to disregard the effect of gravitation with harm to himself.

The perfect government consists of the all-knowing, omnipotent mind and its action.

As college women you are eager, I know, to be as helpful as possible in the promotion of true mental development of humanity, in the clarification of the understanding. It is, therefore, of first importance to realize clearly the unity of creation, the allness of the one mind or spirit. When we realize clearly the oneness of infinite mind or spirit and its action, we then understand the necessity of determining our conduct according to what is right as determined by the eternal thoughts or ideas and their cooperative action in infinite mind. In other words, we shall then be knowing the truth.

We shall then cease to puzzle about the relative good or bad of so-called altruism on the one hand, of so-called egoism on the other. We shall clearly understand then that there are, strictly speaking, no others, as assumed by altruism, and actually no selves. All is inherent in the infinite and indivisible one mind. The Greek philosopher Pythagoras said: "Friend is another I." How wrong then, and how ridiculous even to consider injuring one's other "I," a so-called "self."

Serving the unity of creation, is the only concern of the really enlightened person. The ideal of universal brotherhood awakens in mankind not only the desire for the manifestation of that glorious order, but also the eagerness to experience the reign of justice prevailing therein. More important still, it awakens in him the willingness and the eagerness to obey the mandates and guidance of the supreme power of that realm of harmony.

As time goes on we shall be more and more impressed by the great truth as to the unity of creation, and by the ideal stated by the poet Burns when he said: "Man to man the world o'er shall brothers be for a' that." As men acquire increased understanding of the truth, their conduct becomes more and more like that exemplified by the Bridge Builder, described in the lines which in conclusion I quote as follows:

"An old man, going a lone highway,
Came, at the evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm vast, and deep, and wide,
Through which there flowed a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim;
The sullen stream held no fears for him;
But he turned, when safe on the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.
'Old man,' said a fellow pilgrim, near,
'You are wasting your strength with building here:
Your journey will end with the ending day;
You never again must pass this way;
You have crossed the chasm, deep and wide—
Why build you the bridge at the eventide?'
The builder lifted his old gray head;
'Good friend, in the path I have come,' he said,
'There followeth after me today
A youth, whose feet must pass this way;
This chasm that has been as naught to me,
To that fair-haired youth may a pitfall be.
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim;
Good friend, I am building the bridge for him.'"

Report on NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

(Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a report.)

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to be the chairman of the delegation to represent the House of Representatives at the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris last week. Also in that committee were the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. We have prepared a report on that meeting.

The report follows:

The NATO parliamentary delegation of the House of Representatives submits the following report:

The delegates arrived at Paris on Sunday, July 17, and immediately upon arrival, the chairman went to a meeting of the steering committee where rules and procedure were drawn up.

The Conference opened on Monday the 18th and each nation was called upon alphabetically to lay before the Conference any matter that it might consider pertinent. The meeting on the 18th at 10 was spent actually on organizing the Conference and electing officers. After which at 11, the briefing was given by Lord Ismay on the general organization of the Atlantic alliance, followed by a question period. After Lord Ismay's appearance, he was followed by General de Chassey on the military organization of NATO. This was followed by questions. At 12:30 a film was shown of previous NATO meetings. After lunch the delegates heard from Mr. Lowell Weicker, Assistant Secretary General for Production and Logistics. This was followed by a question period and then the delegates were briefed by Sir John Hodsoll, senior civil-defense adviser on the subject, Civil Defense—the Role of Parliaments and the Role of NATO. This was followed by a question period, after which the delegates heard from Ambassador Wilgress, Chairman of the Committee on Information and Cultural Relations. The morning session of the second day was taken up by a trip to SHAPE headquarters and a briefing by General Gruenther, Field Marshal Montgomery, General Brisac, and Air Marshal Dawson. The remainder of the time up to and including Friday afternoon was given over to general sessions and committee meetings. Many subjects of interest to the nations of NATO organization were discussed and a resolution was adopted unanimously on the subject of future meetings of members of Parliament from NATO countries. That resolution read as follows:

"RESOLUTION ON FUTURE MEETINGS OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT FROM NATO COUNTRIES

"This meeting of members of parliament from NATO countries:

"Recalling that the aim of the North Atlantic Treaty is both to encourage the defense of member countries and to contribute to the economic, social, and cultural development of the people united within the framework of the Atlantic community;

"Considering that achievement of the latter aim would be facilitated by closer relations between the members of the representative assemblies of the different countries and considering that this is particularly desirable in the case of the legislative branches of the member states who have by solemn treaty pledged themselves to the mutual defense and welfare of their respective peoples through the far-reaching initiative in international relations that is NATO;

"Believing that these discussions between members and the NATO authorities and between members themselves have already been of great value;

"Invites the speakers of the various parliaments concerned, according to the procedure

which they think appropriate, to send delegations to a similar meeting each year;

"Expresses the wish that the governments of the countries here represented facilitate through NATO Council further meetings;

"Considers further that before we separate, a continuing committee should be selected, composed of the present officers and other members of the steering committee, 15 in number, to include one from each NATO nation and with the right of substitution to make arrangements for the next meeting;

"This meeting further considers that such a continuing committee would require some secretarial assistance of its own. This should be, for the time being, on a part-time basis. The necessary finance, which should be quite small, should be provided by the participating governments or parliaments concerned on a basis to be mutually agreed."

The delegation from the House of Representatives unanimously felt that the interchange of ideas and problems among the members of the parliamentary bodies of the 15 NATO countries was indeed very beneficial. The committee believes the United States should participate in the future meetings and should not only participate but should also encourage and do everything it can to make these meetings worthwhile. Your committee believes that such future meetings will be mutually advantageous to the nations allied in NATO and will be productive of great good in the interchange of ideas. It was very obvious during the sessions that the airing of common problems and the effort made by the delegations from various countries to understand the problems of the associated nations would be valuable in the conduct of future consideration of the many questions faced by an organization such as NATO. It was pointed out by not only the committee from the United States, but by others that it is the belief of many that NATO has been largely responsible in deterring armed aggression and an outbreak of the third world war and that NATO can be as useful in the cold war as it has been in preventing a hot war.

The chairman of the United States delegation appointed the ranking minority member, Mr. LEROY JOHNSON, of California, as a member of the committee, consisting of one member from each country, to consider the resolution which has already been set forth in this report. Decisions and actions of the United States delegation were bipartisan in character and unanimous in all aspects. The final paragraphs are from a speech made to the Conference by the chairman of the United States delegation, Mr. HAYS of Ohio; which generally represents the sentiments of your committee:

"I also think that the United States Congress and the people of the United States are becoming more and more aware of the time that it is impossible for a nation to exist in isolation. I was interested indiscussing this matter just before I left for this meeting with some of our people. The point was made, and I think it is a cogent one at this time, that Democracies stand together very firmly in times of military danger, but in times of economic stress, and I would like to say parenthetically that I am not predicting economic stress in the immediate future in the United States or anywhere else, the point was made that in times of economic stress the democracies have a tendency not only to not stand together, not only to fall apart, but also to blame each other for their plight, and it seemed to some of us that were discussing this, that the economic aspect of this exploratory convention might be very worthwhile. It has occurred to me, and I am expressing only my own personal opinion, not that of the Congress or even of my own delegation, that perhaps an approach can be made to the problems, some of them at least, through this meeting, and other meetings of this type which we hope and believe will follow.

"It seems to me that it is most important that NATO not only continue, but that it be strengthened, and that it function more efficiently. We feel that a lessening of tension, which we think is very desirable, might have as one of its designs the collapse of this organization, and we certainly feel that that would be, and when I say this organization I am thinking of NATO, not this particular body meeting here, we think that would be a tragedy. We are prepared, I believe, to support NATO as we have in the past, to strengthen it and to show the world that democracies do have common interests, that they can sit down around a table and work out their problems, although there may be differences which at the moment of presentation might seem almost insurmountable. I was interested in what the gentleman from the United Kingdom just said about the evacuation of Soviet Forces from Eastern Europe. Many of us feel that a concession of that type from the Soviet Union would be a concession in name and not in fact, because if America—and Canada and the others—were to evacuate their forces from Europe it would be a terrific task to replace them on short notice, whereas, if the Soviet Union were to evacuate her forces it is a matter of almost hours, at least days, to get them back into position again. So, we think that that would be a concession that would mean very little.

"I was also interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Denmark about Spain, and while we from the United States delegation do not wish to indulge in a full-dress debate on that subject, I would merely point out that the resolution was unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives under a device known as "unanimous consent," whereby, one person by standing up and saying "I object" could have killed it, and that the resolution itself calls for the President to explore the possibilities of bringing Spain into NATO. I am sure that the gentleman from Denmark was not aware of it, and it is a peculiar coincidence, and I assure you it is a coincidence only, but it so happened that I was the author of the resolution which passed the House of Representatives. And it was my thought, and the thought of the sponsors, and there were 30 odd who sponsored a similar resolution, that NATO should not be an exclusive organization, but that it should work to bring its ideas to other nations and that it should hope, not immediately perhaps, not tomorrow, perhaps not next week, but that it should hope eventually to extend its benefits, and I think there are many, to all nations in the Atlantic community. Thank you Mr. President."

It is the unanimous belief of your committee from the House of Representatives, which attended the first NATO parliamentary meeting, that the United States should participate in the future meetings.

WAYNE L. HAYS.
VICTOR L. ANFUSO.
FRANK J. BECKER.
LEROY JOHNSON.
S. J. CRUMPACKER.
STEWART L. UDALL.

Don't Let Road Building Program Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, newspaper editors the Nation over are expressing deep disappointment over the rejection by Congress of legislation that would have given the Nation an expanded highway program.

Some blame the truckers and some blame the Democrats. The issue now, however, is not who was to blame but rather that of what can we do to get the highway legislation back on the road again.

Since it is obvious we will not get any action on a highway bill before adjournment, we ought to have a special session to get a highway bill passed prior to next year. Next year is an election year and any highway legislation brought forth then will become more involved in politics than highway legislation was this year.

Typical of many editorials appearing in the Nation's newspapers deploring the failure of Congress to pass highway legislation is the following one from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

DON'T LET ROADBUILDING PROGRAM DIE

Rejection by the House of both bills before it for massive new roadbuilding programs comes as a sharp disappointment. The action may mean that highway legislation is dead for this year and if that proves true hopes for speedy Federal appropriation for many needed road projects, including the Delaware Expressway in Philadelphia, will be considerably dimmed.

Declaring that differences over financing methods should not be permitted to "deny our people these critically needed roads," President Eisenhower has promptly urged Congress to reconsider the matter before the end of the present session. Republican House Leader MARTIN has said that he believes a compromise measure could still be worked out, "if we really want it."

There are obvious difficulties in the way. One is the short time left in the session now winding to a close. Another is the fact that the highway bills were defeated outright and not merely sent back to committee. Any compromise bill would have to be introduced and given a committee hearing, a time-consuming process.

Main obstacle is the evident disinclination of so many of the Democratic Members at this time to agree to any kind of a financing plan for an extensive highway-building program.

On straight party lines, the Democrats defeated the bill originally sponsored by the administration. But deserting their leadership, a majority of the Democrats also have voted against the alternative plan pushed by their own party.

The Republican bill was based on recommendations of President Eisenhower submitted several months ago. It would have set up a 10-year Federal-State program providing about $38 billion, including $25 billion for interstate superhighways. Costs would be met by 30-year Government bonds which would technically not be part of the Federal debt.

This financing feature of the Republican plan encountered opposition from the Democrats who presented their own pay-as-you-build plan. Under this, $50 billion in Federal-State funds would be granted for roadbuilding in 13 years. Costs would be met mainly from highway-use taxes, including additional levies on gasoline, diesel oil, tires, and tubes.

While administration heads naturally favored the Republican bill there were indications that they would not take any adamant position on it. If their own measure went down to defeat, chances appeared good of a compromise plan that would keep the highway program alive.

It came as rather a shock when 128 Democrats refused to go along on their party's bill and only 94 Democrats voted for it.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the Democratic floor leader, said that the voting had demonstrated that "everybody wants a road bill but nobody wants to pay for it."

It also demonstrated the power of the truck lobby and its allied interests, which did not like the added taxes on truck-size tires and tubes and other levies hitting truck operators and which have been flooding the Congressmen with protesting letters and telegrams. The lobby may check up for itself an impressive victory.

There is still time for passage of a highway bill if, as Representative MARTIN says, the Congressmen "really want it." A compromise should be possible, perhaps cutting the taxes proposed in the one bill and making up the difference from the proceeds of a bond issue somewhat smaller than that proposed in the other bill. If the Congressmen listen to the people who want new roads, instead of to the trucking lobby, they will get together on a worthwhile highway plan.

Let's Look at the Record—A Report to the People of the Fourth District of Wisconsin on the 1st Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of each session of Congress, I report to the people of my district on my votes and actions as their Representative in our National Legislature.

The report which follows contains a summary of the major issues which confronted the Congress during the present session, and indicates how these issues were resolved. It also reviews my position and votes on key legislation bills.

I have been submitting these annual reports because I believe that the voters have a right to know what their representatives did, and how they stood on important questions. Such information is necessary to enable the people to properly evaluate the work of their elected officials.

In the words of Al Smith, "Let's look at the record"—the record of the 84th Congress, and the record of the Representative from the Fourth District of Wisconsin.

THE 84TH CONGRESS

The legislative record of the 1st session of the 84th Congress was characterized by three general features. We should bear them in mind as we proceed to analyze the actions of our representatives in Washington.

In the first place, the Democrat-controlled 84th Congress showed more concern for the interests of the people as a whole than did the preceeding one. The farmer, the worker, the small-business man—the Mr. Average Taxpayer—will generally benefit from the bills considered during the 1st session. This was in sharp contrast with the attention shown to select groups by the 83d Congress.

Secondly, the Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress gave the President full cooperation on issues affecting national security and the overall national interest. In fact, those features of the President's program which were intended to benefit the common good, received more support from the Democrats than from the President's own party.

Finally, legislative progress achieved during the first session was moderate, when measured in terms of bills approved by both Houses and enacted into law. Nevertheless, considerable amount of work was exerted in laying the groundwork for the second session which will begin next January. Final action will be taken during the next session on a number of bills which were drafted, studied, and approved either by the House or by the Senate this year.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

In this realm, the 84th Congress approved an extension of the Selective Service System, continued the draft of doctors for 2 years, reorganized the military reserve system, provided for emergency appointments to fill congressional vacancies caused by disaster, and sharply increased the funds for the Air Force.

Considerable controversy raged on this last issue. Two years ago, over the strong opposition of the Democrats who were then in the minority, President Eisenhower cut Air Force funds by $5 billion, thereby delaying the build-up of our air power. When the Soviets demonstrated earlier this year that their air strength may exceed ours, Congress decided to take matters into its own hands.

Key administration leaders and military authorities were promptly summoned to a secret meeting on Capitol Hill. After the meeting was over, Democratic congressional leaders took immediate steps to speed up our jet production by 35 percent. Even with this development, we are two years behind, having lost that precious time because of the 1953 cuts.

On the question of the Reserve reorganization bill, the President wanted a law which would compel all veterans, discharged since the Korean war, to participate in active Reserve training. The Congress, however, decided to exempt present and former servicemen from compulsory training. Under the new law, Reserve training will be mandatory only for those boys who will enter on active duty in the future. Unfortunately, this provision is expected to delay the attainment of the administration's goal of an active Reserve of 2.9 million men.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In the field of Foreign affairs, Congress extended our Trade Agreements Program for 3 years, and took steps to simplify our obsolete and burdensome customs procedures which act as a deterrent to international trade. Further, the President was given authority to aid in the defense of Formosa against a direct Communist attack, and received adequate funds to continue our Mutual Security Program of military and economic cooperation with our allies. Congress also reiterated its opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and repeated its pledge that the United States will not support any colonial or imperialistic policies of other nations.

In general, cognizant of its role under our Constitution, Congress did not attempt to make foreign policy decisions for the President. There was evidence, however, of a growing measure of concern about recent developments in the field of foreign relations While everyone welcomed the apparent relaxation of world tensions, some people wondered if the Communists were not just stalling for time.

The anxiety to attain peace has already resulted in concessions to the Communists in Korea, in Indochina, and in the Formosa straits. More recently, the administration began to proclaim the virtues of "coexistence"—that very concept which the GOP condemned so heartily only a couple of years ago. It further appeared that the administration may be willing—in fact if not in word—to accept the status quo with respect to Soviet control of the once-free nations, and to make further concessions to the Reds. While we all realize that the road to world peace is not easy, the question still remains, will that goal be achieved by walking backward.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

While the 84th Congress did little to streamline the cumbersome machinery of the executive branch, it did initiate some important improvements within its own organization. In an effort to correct the abuses perpetrated during recent years, Congress took steps to establish a code of fair practices for congressional investigating committees. Further, much work went into the preparation of bills which will strengthen our laws governing Federal elections, and which are intended to curtail corrupt practices.

As far as the executive branch was concerned, the work of the second Hoover Commission continued without interruption. The many volumes of recommendations made by the Commission were assigned to different congressional committees for study, and steps will probably be taken to implement them during the next session.

The first session witnessed a comprehensive revision of Federal salaries, beginning with post office workers, classified employees, and reaching into the levels of higher administration officials, Members of Congress, and Federal judges. Steps were also taken to bring the retirement benefits of Government workers to a more realistic level by increasing them between 8 and 12 percent.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

In the realm of national economy, the record of the first session is rather substantial. Congress plugged up the loopholes in the 1954 GOP tax law, through which which the Government was losing over $1 billion in revenues to corporations; increased the minimum wage to $1 per hour; approved an expanded program of Federal aid to airport construction; extended the Renegotiation Act to eliminate excess profits on Government contracts; and increased the

penalties for violations of the antimonopoly laws.

There were two major instances, however, in which Congress failed to reach a decision. The first dealt with taxes; the second, with the highway program.

At the beginning of the session, the Democratic leadership in the House proposed a moderate income-tax reduction for the average taxpayer, to equalize tax relief granted to select groups under the 1954 GOP law. The bill passed the House, but failed in the Senate. There is every indication, however, that this legislation will be brought up again when the second session begins, probably with better results.

The controversial highway program legislation met similar fate. While everyone agreed that our highway system is in need of extensive improvements, a controversy arose on the question of financing the program. The administration wanted to pay for the improvements by bond issues, and thereby increasing the national debt. The Democrats proposed a pay-as-you-go program, financed out of increased taxes on highway users. Both proposals were defeated in the House during the closing days of the session.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Veterans and servicemen will benefit from a number of bills approved by the 84th Congress to date. Military salaries were increased, and the House approved a comprehensive revision of survivors' benefits. Further, those in the service as of January 31, 1955, were permitted to go on building up GI schooling benefits, and VA farm and direct loan programs were extended for 2 years.

In addition, Congress approved a law giving disabled veterans until October 1956 to apply for the purchase of special automobiles, and extended this privilege to the veterans of the Korean conflict.

Of particular interest to the veterans in Milwaukee is a bill which I introduced in the 83d and the 84th Congresses providing for the construction of a new VA hospital at Wood, Wis. I am pleased to report that considerable progress has been made during the past year on this project. Our present hospital at Wood has been scheduled for early replacement by a new structure.

AGRICULTURE

The American farmer has not been faring well under the present administration, as the farm income continued to drop for the third year in a row. In the meantime, the profits of food processors—and the cost of farm products to city consumers—have been steadily rising.

In an effort to help the farmers, the 84th Congress approved bills modernizing the REA loan allocation system, extending emergency loans to farmers suffering from declining prices, lowering the interest rate on disaster loans, and providing special assistance to low-income farmers. In addition, steps were taken to curb commodity speculation, and to curtail market manipulations in certain agricultural products.

The central issue of rigid farm price supports versus flexible supports continued unresolved, even though efforts were made in the House to replace the sliding-scale system put into operation by the administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Social welfare legislation received considerable amount of attention from the 84th Congress, but relatively few bills in this field managed to clear both Houses before the end of the first session. Final action will be taken on these measures when Congress reconvenes in January.

The Social Security Act amendments of 1955 were in this category. The House voted to extend social-security coverage to dentists, lawyers, and other self-employed professional groups; to provide a system of disability insurance; to reduce the retirement age for women to 62; and to continue monthly benefits to disabled children after they reach age 18. I have advocated the major improvements approved by the House for the past 3 years, and included them in my bills H. R. 1635 and H. R. 5057. Hearings on this legislation were held in the Senate, but final action was delayed until next session.

Congress further provided funds for the FHA program of insuring home loans, made Government surplus materials available to educational and civil-defense institutions, tightened the prohibition on the use of mails to transport obscene literature, and enacted a moderate housing program. However, legislation providing Federal aid to schools was bottled up throughout the session, and may be revived when the Congress reconvenes.

Voting record, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	Extension of the selective service system	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization and strengthening of our military Reserves	Became law.
Voted for	Registration of persons connected with foreign espionage	
Voted for	Stepped up production of jet bombers and fighter planes	Became law.
Voted for	Special funds to prevent 22,000-man cut in United States Marine Corps	Became law.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	The mutual security program to strengthen free world defenses	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution calling for United States aid to defense of Formosa	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution opposing admission of Red China into the U. N.	Became law.
Voted for	3-year extension of reciprocal trade agreements program	Became law.
Voted for	Simplification of our customs regulations and procedures	Passed House.
Favored	Aid to firms and workers harmed by foreign competition	Pending.
Favored	Revision of the Refugee Relief Act	Pending.
	GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Government Reorganization Act of 1955	Became law.
Voted for	Salary revisions for Federal employees, judges, and officials	Became law
Voted for	Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska	Pending.
Voted for	Code of fair practices for congressional committees	Approved.
Favored	Increased penalties for corrupt practices in Federal elections	
Favored	Improvements in the Federal employees retirement system	
Voted for	Foreign Service reorganization and improvements	Became law.
Voted for	Aids to absentee voting for GI's and Government workers	Became law.
Favored	Home rule for the District of Columbia	Passed Senate.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Income tax reduction for the average taxpayer	Passed House.
Voted for	Plugging up of loopholes in the 1954 GOP tax law	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour	Became law.
Voted for	Increased penalties for violation of antimonopoly laws	Became law.
Voted for	The highway program legislation	Pending.
Voted against	Exemption of natural-gas producers from Federal regulation	Passed House.
Voted for	Continued renegotiation of Government contracts to eliminate excess profits on Government procurement.	Became law.
Voted for	Bill to provide United States currency with inscription "In God We Trust."	
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen	Became law.
Voted for	Incentive pay increases and allowances for the Armed Forces	Became law.
Voted for	Revision and improvement of survivors' benefits	Passed House.
Voted for	Extension of VA farm and direct loan programs	Became law.
Proposed	New VA hospital for Wood, Wis	Pending.
	AGRICULTURE	
Voted for	Modernized REA loan allocation system	Became law.
Voted for	Relief for farmers for losses from economic disasters	Became law.
Voted for	Greater control over commodity speculation and manipulations	Became law.
Opposed	Multibillion upper Colorado River project with Echo Park Dam	Passed Senate.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Voted for	1955 Amendments to the Social Security Act	Passed House.
Favored	Federal aid to States for construction of needed new schools	Pending.
Favored	Assistance to States for the Salk polio vaccine program	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Increased authority for the FHA to insure home mortgages	Became law.
	1955 Housing Act	
Voted for	Surplus Government materiel for school and civil defense	Became law.
Voted for	Restoration of penalties for narcotics violations omitted from the 1954 GOP tax law.	Became law.
Voted for	Prohibition on use of mails to transport obscene literature	Became law.
Voted against	The Chicago "water steal" from Lake Michigan	Passed House.
Voted for	Aid for mental health research	Passed House.
Voted for	Aid to States for airport construction	Passed House.

Voting record, 84th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Rollcall record	Total rollcalls	Paired	Not voting	Absent on roll and quorum calls [1]
1st sess.	138	1	0	2

[1] Absence on quorum calls does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

United States Circuit Court of Appeals Decision Nullifies the Legislative Intent of the Housing Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to participate in congressional investigations and observe the administration of various of the laws enacted by Congress to stabilize our economy, and promote the public welfare.

Some shocking circumstances and abuses have developed through practices adopted purportedly by authority of congressional acts.

One flagrant example is in the Home Loan Bank System. More than 9 years ago, the then Home Loan Bank Commissioner seized a member institution, the Long Beach Federal Savings Association, and to this day the Government agency has failed to fully account for the seized assets. A meritorious trial of the issues has been denied on jurisdictional technicalities, a complete failure of due process.

Congress never intended to set up a bureaucratic sanctuary for arbitrary and capricious confiscation of peoples' savings, without trial, notice, hearing, or right of recovery.

The United States circuit court of appeals at San Francisco held the simplest amendment would correct this evil. Congress adopted in the Housing Act of 1954, far-reaching provisions, giving the courts jurisdiction to hear the complaints of aggrieved citizens.

The Senate 1954 housing bill, as originally adopted prior to conference, contained the restrictive language, as follows:

> Nothing in this subsection relating to jurisdiction, venue, service of process or suability of the Board shall be applicable to any pending court action, or suit, or to any action or suit involving the subject matter, or part thereof, of such pending action or suit.

The House considered and rejected restrictive language. The Senate and House conferees considered and rejected restrictive language, and both Houses reenacted the 1954 Housing Act without such restriction, and granted to the courts jurisdiction of the subject matter of new and old controversies alike.

In fact, the written documents considered by both Houses referred to the specific Long Beach Federal controversy—the subject of the United States circuit court opinion.

In spite of the legislative history and plain language of the 1954 Husing Act, the United States circuit court of appeals has just held, in July 1955, that such Housing Act does not apply to pending controversies, and, further, that the subject matter of new and old controversies is not submitted to the courts.

Thus, there has developed a conflict between the enactments of Congress and the enactments of the United States circuit court of appeals. The United States circuit court of appeals has usurped the functions of Congress; instead of interpreting the intent of Congress, its interpretation has in effect passed laws Congress rejected and rejected laws Congress passed.

Such United States circuit courts are a creation of Congress—an experiment to relieve the burden on the United States Supreme Court, the only constitutional appellate court.

Congress has heretofore found it necessary to withdraw from the United States circuit court of appeals the power to hold acts of Congress unconstitutional by injunction.

I submit that in the light of the circumstances related here, our congressional experiment in creating United States circuit courts of appeal has demonstrated a grave weakness.

The decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in this case is an example of complete disregard of the congressional intent based on the legislative history of the Housing Act of 1954, as well as the letter of the law.

Should not Congress correct this abuse by further restricting the power of United States circuit courts of appeal from nullifying or rendering ineffectual congressional enactments?

Ready for a Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, July 31, 1955:

READY FOR A DEAL

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is ready to sit down with Chou En-lai, the Communist Chinese Premier, and talk turkey about the matter of a cease-fire in Formosa Strait, so he says, if only the Chinese Reds show goodwill at the Geneva ambassadorial level meeting.

This is a fair sample of the effect of Soviet jollity at Geneva upon the thinking of our foreign policy spokesman. Secretary Dulles seems to strive to forget that Communist China has been officially branded in United Nations as an aggressor. This is only the least of the Red Chinese transgressions.

Red Chinese troops are still in North Korea, ready to pounce upon South Korea the instant the American vigilance is relaxed. Red Chinese troops and arms oppress Indochina. Red Chinese troops and arms threaten National Chinese Formosa with which we have a mutual defense pact.

Red Chinese jailers hold American prisoners in complete disregard of international conventions, and Chou En-lai has openly admitted that they are held as hostages.

Yet our Secretary of State says that if the Chinese show goodwill at Geneva he will sit down with the bloodstained monster and make a deal. It isn't the matter of bargaining with the Red Chinese that is objectionable, but the soft and supine way we offer to deal with them.

Nowhere in the discussion of the possibility of a cease-fire in Formosa Strait is any intention expressed of consulting the Nationalist Chinese. One must assume that whatever bargain Secretary Dulles may make with Chou En-lai will have to be good enough for the Chinese Nationalists. The somewhat sinuous reasoning of the administration is that this is acceptable to the Nationalist Chinese because they are already observing a cease-fire and are only firing back at the Communists to protect themselves. Heaven knows where the Minute Men of Lexington would have ended up under this kind of reasoning.

A few Russian smiles at Geneva can do great damage to this country. We seem to be so starved for love and affection that we are willing to buy it at the price of our honor.

Atomic Electric Powerplant for Northeastern Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record, Friday, July 29, 1955, which discloses that the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. is planning to build an atomic electric powerplant in northeastern Pennsylvania:

ATOMIC PLANT WILL BE BUILT BY P. P. & L. FIRM—SITE NOT DETERMINED; WESTINGHOUSE TO AID IN DESIGNING REACTOR

Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. will build an atomic electric powerplant of at least 150,000 kilowatts at a site not disclosed.

Charles E. Oakes, president of the utility, said the powerplant naturally will be located in our service area.

Nuclear generating plants generally are located along rivers and the north branch of the Susquehanna probably is being considered. P. P. & L. built plants at Sunbury along the Susquehanna and at Martins Creek along the Delaware River. Nearest generating plant is the former Scranton Electric Co.'s remodeled plant at Harding.

According to plans, the new plant will be pushing power into the distribution system about 1962.

Mr. Oakes informed Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, chairman, and Gen. K. E. Fields, general manager, of the Atomic Energy Commission of P. P. & L.'s decision to build a privately financed atomic electric powerplant using the homogeneous-type reactor on the basis that such a plant will be commercially competitive with generating stations using competitive fuels.

Mr. Oakes said a contract had been entered into with Westinghouse Electric Corp. as codeveloper with P. P. & L. in the design and as supplier for the pioneering reactor and its related electric generating equipment. The plant program will be known as the Pennsylvania advance reactor project (PAR project).

Mr. Oakes said "P. P. & L. for some time has been hard at work studying the AEC study agreement of generation of atomic energy as a heat source for electric power generation and more recently has been making studies of the various type of nuclear reactors. Our research leads us to the conclusion that the homogeneous type of reactor is economically a promising bet.

"It is one of the several types on which AEC has been working aggressively as part of its 5-year program. The present problem with each type is to convert the knowledge gained about this new heat source through research and experimentation into designs useful for full-scale commercial electric power generation.

"With disappointment recently expressed that no private utility had yet announced plans for building a homogeneous type atomic electric plant, we believe our plan for moving ahead in this field will become highly significant and a real contribution to technological progress."

P. P. & L.'s decision to proceed with this type of reactor, Mr. Oakes said, means "private initiative in the United States has now accepted challenge to make atomic electric power a reality and a substantial factor in the Nation's economic progress.

"In the homogeneous-type reactor the fuel is in liquid form. This liquid in addition to containing the radioactive fuel, also includes a coolant. The liquid circulates freely throughout the nuclear powerplant's system and supplies heat for the steam generators. Steam from the generators spins turbines which produce the electricity. The use of the liquid fuel system will permit the reactor and atomic furnace to operate continuously as new liquid nuclear fuel can be added while the reactor is running."

Mr. Oakes did not disclose the powerplant site but stated that "naturally it will be located in our service area" and added, "we look to this pioneering atomic electric plant as an effective addition to the P. P. & L. system in meeting some of the future requirements of our customers"

East Texas Institution Cares for Negro Waifs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, several days ago there was an article in the Dallas Morning News in regard to the St. Paul Training School, near Malakoff, in Henderson County, Tex. It clearly shows the wonderful results that can come from the work of a dedicated man and wife to give a full life to otherwise hopeless children, and helps them grow into useful citizens of our great Nation. Under unanimous consent I include the article in the RECORD:

ST. PAUL TRAINING SCHOOL—EAST TEXAS INSTITUTION CARES FOR NEGRO WAIFS

(By Eric G. Schroeder)

Let's suppose you're a dog, say a puppy. You have no pride of ancestry.

Nobody wants you because nobody ever really owned you. Neighborhood kids shy rocks when they see you and the iceman gives you the toe of his boot. You live on table scraps and pretty much sleep in the weeds.

Then one day a kind, gentle-eyed woman kneels in the dustry road and begins stroking your head and patting your gaunt, hungry ribs. At first you're a little afraid. Then you're palpitating from the first genuine show of affection that anyone ever showed you. A big, solid man standing beside her picks you up in his giant palm and asks, "How'd you like to come and live with us?" Now say, wouldn't heaven be pressing its warm ear pretty close to you?

Transpose this allegory into human terms and you have this substance of what's going on constantly at a little Negro institution near Malakoff, Tex., known as St. Paul Industrial Training School. The 120 children ranging in ages from 4 to 18 are in the main waifs picked up by probation courts and welfare agencies from all over the State and sent to Prof. and Mrs. J. W. Smothers for raising and schooling. The Smothers' hands are outstretched as long as there are inches of space in which to pack just one more little wanderer.

J. W. and Alice came to this school from Alabama as bride and groom in 1926. J. W. is a Hampton graduate with a B. S. in agriculture. Alice attended Tuskegee and Prairie View. The present site had a little two-teacher public school with one tiny building. The newcomers, with the aid of Rosenwald funds, built a campus home the next year and set up grades 1 to 6. Attendance was free to any colored child; in the fall of 1927 they took five little girl boarders.

Canning demonstrations furnished both money and publicity for the struggling school. J. W. and Alice cut wood, carried water 2 miles, bathed the children in the creek, and went to Payne Springs in an old wagon three times a week to wash clothes. That, in fact, was standard procedure up to 8 years ago when Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Fair, of Tyler, gave them a water system.

Word about the school spread. The Smothers have always believed in teaching the boys and girls how to use their hands. That meant constructing a vocational building, and the newlyweds put half their combined salaries into the project.

A curious thing happened the day after Christmas 1942. After a hot and humid afternoon the wind suddenly rose to cyclone force, picked up the four little campus buildings and rolled them around like tumbleweeds. The work of some 16 years was represented in disconsolate piles of tattered boards and bricks.

That cyclone blew St. Paul off the map but its shrieking winds ushered in a new era, too. J. W. and Alice surveyed the wreckage. Something drummed its way into both their minds. It has become the school watchword: "A quitter never wins; a winner never quits."

Alice could ring doorbells and get help—and she did. J. W. could make this land produce a complete living for the school—and he started in to do it. Within another year he thinks it will. Their greatest tragedy became their greatest triumph. "The Lord made the way," says Alice and she devoutly means it.

There are 1,000 acres in the school plant, 250 belonging to the institution, the rest rented. Every foot that can be spared is raising something. Professor Smothers' green thumb is making deep whorls on the countryside.

With 400 pounds of fertilizer and a normal year he can make this dry land produce 80 bushels of corn to an acre. With double this additive, he gets 100 bushels. When corn is waist high it receives a side dressing of from 100 to 150 pounds of ammonium nitrate and again just before it silks.

This year J. W. rented 4 acres of land for $150 and put it in cucumbers.

Of course, J. W. has a built-in labor supply. Everyone works, from the tiniest up to the oldest boy or girl. Even the tots learn to wash their clothing, do mending, and give themselves proper care. Buildings are bare of all except the direst necessities, but there is a shine and a polish to each that bespeaks cleanliness and discipline.

Boys and girls work in the fields, in the kitchen, build the brooders, milk the cows. In turn they receive money in proportion to the service they render. One 15-year-old girl can pick 800 pounds of cotton in 1 day and she profits accordingly. All earnings go into private savings accounts or trickle into the school commissary for sweets and goodies.

When produce is high J. W. sends as much as he can to market; when it is low the school's bill of fare expands accordingly. With 11 teachers and accredited grades running through high school the Smothers face a constant responsibility of making slender income cover expanding needs. Rooms are badly overcrowded with 6 children and 3 double-decker beds in many—no chairs, tables or any of the fanciful deckings of youthful whimsy.

J. W. and Alice can handle most students with "love and understanding." There is little illness, the school has never had a communicable disease. "Everyone keeps busy," says J. W. "Sleeping during the day leads to rambling around at night. This way when bedtime comes we are all ready for it. We make a game of our work, one groups tries to outdo the other."

Thoughts about desegregation have no place on the St. Paul campus. Asked whether she would welcome integration of the student body with white boys and girls, Alice answers simply, "we are happy with the way we have it here!" The Smothers are content to see the Negro earn his place in society. "We may be 50 to 75 years too soon in trying to force the issue," says J. W.

They believe they owe most of their progress thus far to the pockets of white benefactors. These are in Dallas, Houston, Tyler, Malakoff and other scattered points in the State. Once when Alice bought chairs for the schoolroom and didn't know where the money was coming from, she prayed to the Lord and wrote a Dallas benefactor. The next mail brought a check. There is an ever-present, almost desperate need for funds.

The only reward the Smothers want is to perpetuate the fruits of their labors. "We cannot live forever," says J. W., "but we would hate for the school to die when we go. If these children can make names for themselves and we never do, it has all been worthwhile!"

The Smothers have 5 children of their own, 3 boys and 2 girls. Two are in school at Prairie View, 2 in military service and 1 is a teacher of music at Pittsburg, Tex. Their own? Well, those are the ones they brought into the world.

There are hundreds more—farmers, teachers, cooks, seamstresses and housewives. They have scattered but always with the thought of home as a humble, almost stark

little school set in the midst of an East Texas clearing. There is one boy, not of their own flesh and blood, in the infantry in California. He wrote a long letter to Alice last Thanksgiving.

"Dear Mom," it started out, "I thank God for many things but first of all it is for a mother like you."

It ended, "I love you. May God bless you. I hope to be home for Christmas."

That, in J. W. and Alice Smothers' way of thinking, is pretty near reward enough in itself.

The Reclamation Program for 1955–56

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, we have in my State an earnest, hard-working man who is the Wyoming director of the National Reclamation Association. He is well acquainted with our western problems and an effective spokesman in our behalf. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting Mr. Earl Bower's address before the 42d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in June included as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Bower is certainly well qualified to outline the reclamation program for 1955–56, and his remarks will be of nationwide interest.

His remarks follow:

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM FOR 1955–56

(By Earl T. Bower, Wyoming director, National Reclamation Association, before the 42d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, June 1, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, a few days ago I was asked, as director of the National Reclamation Association from Wyoming, to talk to you about the reclamation program for 1955 and 1956. I have been an operator of irrigation farms and a livestock feeder in the Big Horn Basin in Wyoming for many years. I have been a director of the National Reclamation Association for 8 years. Our association has an active membership in each of the 17 Western States. Its objectives fundamentally are: To promote the development and preservation of water resources in the reclamation States, which are approved by the States and localities affected and to preserve the rights and interests of said States in their water resources.

The reclamation program for 1955–56 was outlined by NRA resolutions adopted at Portland, Oreg., last fall. The NRA is vigorously supporting this program. It includes among other things: land limitation legislation, extension of the sugar act, small projects legislation, loans for local districts to construct their own irrigation distribution systems, requiring Federal agencies to comply with State water laws, soil and water research, cost studies, and many others which we believe to be in the interests of settlers.

BUDGET CIRCULAR A–47

We have been especially concerned about budget circular A–47. We are advised that no new reclamation projects can be built if the Bureau of Reclamation is required to comply with A–47. In response to our request, the House Interior Committee held hearings on A–47 for which we are grateful. Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, at these hearings, made two very timely suggestions:

(a) "Since the usefulness of most irrigation projects extends far beyond the first 50 years we recommend that a longer repayment period be permitted for irrigation when justification is presented."

(b) "For irrigation projects we have found it desirable to include an evaluation of the secondary benefits because for the areas concerned these are often just as real as the primary effects of the project."

We consider these the two most constructive suggestions yet made regarding A–47.

STATE OF THE UNION AND BUDGET MESSAGES

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union and budget messages, made several noteworthy recommendations, among which are: 6 new starts for reclamation, 30 new starts for the Corps of Engineers.

His budget for fiscal year 1956 recommends more than $1,500,000 increase for general investigations in reclamation. President Eisenhower also recommended the upper Colorado River storage project and later the administration endorsed the Fryingpan-Arkansas and the Trinity projects.

Our National Reclamation Association is very happy with these endorsements by President Eisenhower.

We do not in any way consider the land and water resource development of the West now or in the future to be solely the responsibility of the Federal Government. We believe that the States as well as local governments and local interests should actively participate in the planning and development of our water resource projects.

The President and directors of NRA have been urging small-project legislation which will aid the States and local divisions of government in the construction of projects of a size that can be financed by the States, municipalities and other division of State governments, with provisions in the law providing for a loan of Federal funds, if necessary. We also believe that projects constructed by States and local interests should be credited with the national benefits that accrue from these projects.

Reclamation has always been required to show financial feasibility, that is—there must be revenues produced from the project sufficient to repay the costs to the Federal Treasury. We have always approved that plan but we also have endorsed the time-honored plan of utilizing all revenues produced from the project, including power, to assist in repaying the costs. The irrigator should not be asked or expected to repay the cost of national benefits that accrue as a result of a project.

The national benefits not only exceed the costs of interest-free money but in a very few years actually exceed the cost of the entire project. Reclamation repays its costs many times over, directly and indirectly. The water users on reclamation projects continue each year to repay a substantial amount. In addition to that, the power users make a very substantial contribution to the repayment costs of the project. The total amount paid by water users to date is $114 million, while the total power repayments are $265 million. Most of the power repayments have been made during the last 10 years. In fiscal year 1954, power repaid a gross of $50 million and a net of more than $30 million into the Federal Treasury. By far the largest return to the Federal Government, however, is in the form of income taxes and other taxes paid by the people who are living on Reclamation projects and in communities and areas which are supported and maintained by these projects. It has been estimated that the total income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury in this manner will repay the total cost of reclamation to the Federal Government about every 5 or 6 years.

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, in his first published annual report stated, regarding a study which had been made on 15 reclamation projects, "Thus far Federal taxes collected have exceeded the Federal investment in irrigation features in these projects by four and a half times. These revenues are in addition to the obligations voluntarily assumed by direct users of water."

The value of crops grown on Federal reclamation projects to date is about three times the cost of reclamation to the Government.

The following figures are based upon statistical information from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation. The total cost of reclamation to the Federal Government, up to and including fiscal year 1954, is $3,094,000,000. The amount returned to the Federal Government including the year 1954 by the water users was $114 million; by power users, $265 million; by Federal taxes, as a result of reclamation development, $4 billion; making a total return on the above investment of $4,379,000,000. The cumulative crop values produced by lands in reclamation projects, not including the year 1954, was $9,705,149,000. I ask, now, is there any doubt from these figures that reclamation pays its way and is a good investment for the Nation as a whole?

That the country needs reclamation to meet the needs of our growing population, to provide a balanced economy in the West and to maintain our present high standard of living, can hardly be questioned. However, I will present some authorities to substantiate this statement.

POPULATION GROWTH

The latest census report shows our population to be 165 million people. It is increasing at the rate of 2,800,000 per year or 235,250 every month. That means 7,700 more mouths to feed every day. We have plenty of food today, but our agricultural surpluses, although a menacing problem now, are only temporary.

AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture, in testifying before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations on February 1 of this year, pointed out that by 1962, and possibly by 1959 or 1960, we will have reached a balance between production and consumption. He further stated that "the excess of farm output over population requirements was probably on the order of about 6 percent overall in 1953. It was less than 6 percent in 1954 and will probably be even less in 1955."

LOSS OF FARM LANDS

The annual loss of farmland is another problem which should be considered along with that of meeting the needs of our growing population and agricultural surpluses. In the report on land facts by the Soil Conservation Service for November 1953, it is shown that the annual loss of soil originally suitable for crop production is 400,000 acres per year. The annual loss of additional acreage to cultivation as a result of other causes such as water logging, salting, sediment deposition, etc., amounts to 100,000 acres per year. But officials in the Department pointed out, however, that losses of good farm land through other causes amounts to several times the loss of soil erosion. These causes include land being taken over for suburban development, airports, military establishments, industrial developments and especially new highway construction. The Soil Conservation Service is making a survey of the soil losses through these causes. It is estimated that the total losses will amount to at least 2 million acres annually.

Some Western States are increasing in population at a tremendous rate and also making rapid gains in industry while some

other Western States which are dependent primarily upon an agricultural economy cannot go ahead without further reclamation. Further conservation of water is extremely important to the interior and and mountainous States for municipal as well as agricultural growth. A number of cities in the area are already concerned about a future water supply, including Albuquerque, N. Mex., Pueblo and Denver, Colo., Cheyenne, Wyo., and others.

SUMMARY

The reclamation program for 1955–56 which I have presented to you is of the utmost importance to the entire West and we believe equally important to the Nation as a whole. I appreciate very much the opportunity of presenting this program to you for your consideration.

The position of leadership and responsibility which has come to our Nation as a leader in world affairs makes it mandatory that we as a Nation remain strong. There is nothing that will do more to strengthen the economy of our Nation that the development of our land and water resources. We believe our reclamation program and the program of river and harbor development sponsored by your association will aid materially in maintaining that strength. The united support of kindred organizations such as your National Rivers and Harbors Congress and our National Reclamation Association is important to national security.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Coar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I was not on the floor the other day when Members were extending their congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Coar on the completion of their 20th year of service to Members of the House and Senate.

As soon as I came here in 1943 I started using the radio facilities of the joint Senate and House recording facility and, of course, I immediately got to know Mr. and Mrs. Coar. They are the kind of people who so identify themselves with an institution that they virtually become the institution.

I take particular pride in the fact that Mr. Coar had his origins in my own State. That, of course, adds to the very warm feeling that I have for him. But I am very grateful to both Mr. and Mrs. Coar for all the kindness and courtesy which they have shown to me and it is a great pleasure and satisfaction for me to be able to spread these sentiments on the RECORD.

I can testify that as far as I am concerned the recording facility is indispensable. At least every fortnight of every session since January 1943, I have projected myself onto its disks and, more recently, tapes. In all that period I have never known of a mistake or slip-up on their part. I wish Mr. and Mrs. Coar another score of years. And then another. I would not wish to be here without them.

Give a Green Light to Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the past year 36,000 Americans, many of them children, were killed in traffic accidents. The death toll in traffic accidents average 100 a day, or 3,000 a month. In addition, about a million Americans were injured in traffic mishaps, some of them being crippled for life. Ten to twenty percent of these accidents never would have happened, according to traffic experts, had the Nation possessed adequate highways—the kind of better, wider, and safer highways proposed by President Eisenhower in his expanded highway program.

Much of the credit for alerting the Nation to the need for better and safer highways belongs to the Hearst press. The Hearst press, with its many newspapers and millions of readers, several years ago embarked on an editorial crusade to awaken the country to the enormous waste of life, limb, and money that our deficient highway system is costing the Nation. Day after day, week after week, and month after month the Hearst press hammered away editorially at the need for more and better roads. The Hearst press, in so doing, rendered a great service to the Nation.

Despite the public's demand for more and better highways, Congress has failed to enact a highway bill during the present session of Congress. This failure was due to politics.

President Eisenhower had proposed financing the greatly expanded highway program by a bond issue to be paid off from present and anticipated future receipts from the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax.

The Democrats, as a counterproposal to President Eisenhower's bonding plan, proposed a pay-as-you-go highway financing plan with the imposition of heavy new taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, truck tires, and camelback.

The issue involving the two plans, the Eisenhower one of bond financing and the Democrats' plan of increasing taxes on highway users to pay for highways as these were built came to a vote in the House of Representatives last Wednesday.

When the Eisenhower bonding plan was voted upon, of 221 Democrats present only 5 voted for the President's bonding plan and 216 voted against it. The Democrats by a margin of 23 to 1 rejected President Eisenhower's bonding plan.

Then the Democrats' own taxing plan came to a vote. Of 223 Democrats present, only 98 voted for their own plan. The Democrats voted down their own taxing plan after having rejected the Eisenhower bonding plan.

This made it obvious that a majority of the Democrats wanted no highway bill at all. Apparently they preferred no highway program to one for which President Eisenhower would get credit.

If the people want a highway bill, and I feel sure most people do, they must contact their Congressmen and let their Congressmen know their wishes.

In my opinion, the only way to assure obtaining a highway bill within the next 2 years is to insist on a special session of Congress to enact a highway bill. If this week's rejection of a highway program by Congress is allowed to stand, it will be next January before the first steps can be taken toward launching anew procedures to get a highway program started. Congress, then, as usual, will dilly-dally and procrastinate. It will be April or May before any bills for a highway program reach the House or Senate floors. By that time the 1956 presidential and congressional election campaigns will be in full swing. Because of this the proposed highway legislation will become more deeply involved in politics than it now is and constructive action will be unlikely.

The following editorial has appeared in Hearst newspapers from coast to coast, pointing up the urgent need for better and safer roads and rightly, I think, demands that Congress stay in session until it gets a highway bill. If Congress does not stay in session now to get a highway bill then the next demand from the people should be that Congress come back in a special session and enact the highway bill it should have enacted before it went home on vacation.

The editorial, which appeared in Hearst newspapers from coast to coast, follows:

WHY IS A CONGRESSMAN?

If you don't want to think about the traffic jams you'll be in today as you and your family try to take a ride in the country, you might think about Congressmen.

As you notice the ambulances and wreckers and State police cars heading toward the latest highway disaster, notice also what went on last week in Washington.

Congressmen of both parties, stampeded by lobbyists representing industries that make good money from the use of the highways, voted down any attempt to get you out of the traffic chaos or to make the ambulance trips unnecessary.

The lobbyists and our representatives all piously agreed that better roads are absolutely vital.

They also agreed that it was absolutely vital that somebody else pay for constructing them and that it was absolutely vital that everybody get re-elected.

Realizing what they had done, after they had made sure they had done it, the Congressmen pointed at the trucking industry lobby as the villain.

And the truckers, after the bills were well sunk, issued statements that Congress should never have acted like that; that President Eisenhower was right when he criticized Congress and demanded reconsideration of its failure to pass a bill.

The same people who caused 100,000 telegrams to flood into Washington demanding the defeat of highway legislation, issued press releases that said the recipients of the telegrams must have misunderstood.

The 100,000 telegrams came from a tiny minority of the American business community.

We wonder what might happen if the American people sent in telegrams themselves, preferably after a frustrating, dan-

gerous day on the roads the Congressmen refused to improve.

In fact, why don't you do it right now?

We don't know whether you mean as much as a lobbyist does to your Congressman, but we're pretty sure a lot of you acting together mean more, much more.

Why not let your Congressman know what you think about the House action last week and tell him to start all over again, right now, and pass a bill?

And tell him to stay in Washington until he does.

Report of Projects Committee to Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 42d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington on May 30–June 1, 1955.

The permanent projects committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water-resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while here serving on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in time for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public-works program, and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session, follow:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS
PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Representative SID SIMPSON of Illinois, chairman.

New England Division: Member, Larry M. Hess, executive secretary, Taunton Association of Commerce, Taunton, Mass.

North Atlantic Division: Member, Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, United States Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.

South Atlantic Division: Member, H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer, Jacksonville, Fla., vice chairman.

Southwestern Division: Member, Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley Division: Member, Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, department of public works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central Division: Member, Al Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri River Division: Member, Alva C. Sconce, Missouri River division, Mississippi Valley Association, Omaha, Nebr.

Ohio River Division: Member, J. I. Perrey, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific Division: Member, George E. Thomas, assistant general manager, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.

South Pacific Division: Member, Timothy V. A. Dillon, Washington counsel, Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif.

Western Inter-Mountain Region: Member, E. W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Helena, Mont.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 42D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

JUNE 1, 1955.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on May 30, 1955, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 130 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 39 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $602,563,000. Nineteen proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 22 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports on such surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that the congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this congress. We find 21 proposals, which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization. Of the proposals investigated, we find 29 are without necessary data or sponsorship to enable the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion on their worth. However, we desire to give the applications sympathetic consideration, and, if possible, offer to the proponents the services of this congress in reaching a solution to their problems. We have, therefore, not classified these but have suggested that the Secretary communicate with the applicants concerned and request additional data upon the receipt of which further consideration will be given to their proposals.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

At the time of our national convention last year, the Congress of the United States was considering an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill. As you know, this highly important legislation became the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954, providing a valuable supplement to the existing Federal civil works program. The act authorized 165 projects having estimated Federal costs in excess of $1 billion. All of these projects have been found to be economically justified and the anticipated benefits will materially exceed the costs.

Since passage of the 1954 act, additional river and harbor and flood control surveys have been completed by the Corps of Engineers, some of which recommend construction of additional needed improvements for navigation, flood control and other allied water uses. Some of the pending recommendations are of high importance to the Nation's expanding economy, and should be provided as soon as possible. Your projects committee, therefore, recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to give consideration to the early authorization of these projects, and to the appropriation of funds for construction.

Of vital concern to the members of this convention are the water resources surveys and investigations authorized to be prosecuted by the various Federal agencies. Your committee is concerned over the large backlog of authorized surveys that have not been initiated due to insufficient survey funds. It is considered imperative, not only that a reserve of projects be kept on the shelf to be activated at such time as the economy of the Nation demands, but also that this reserve be maintained in a thoroughly healthy and up-to-date condition, in view of changing economic and defense requirements. This can be done only by an adequate and continuing program of surveys to permit prosecution of worthy investigations at a rate of speed sufficient to insure early completion. Your projects committee, therefore, considers it highly important that sufficient funds be made available by the Congress to carry on these survey programs, and it is recommended that the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriation Committees be informed of our opinions in this matter, which constitutes the heart of a sound public works program.

We have watched with great interest and considerable trepidation the gradual retardation of the navigation and flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers, not only for new work but also for maintenance and investigations. The appropriations made for fiscal year 1955 are buying only about half the same amount of project that those funds could have bought in 1946. The need for full-scale development now is greater rather than less. We would therefore suggest that this Congress consider the present and immediately prospective rate of appropriations merely in the sense of a pause, because of budgetary conditions, until an adequate rate of progress on all phases of the program can be resumed.

We wish to commend the various Federal agencies involved in the investigation and provision of water resource projects on their improvements in development of sound procedures of project analysis and formulation, and the increased cooperation among agencies and with the States and local interests. We believe that true partnership between the Federal Government and its citizens lies not only in a sharing of costs, but also from the common sharing of problems and their development and solution. An eminent example is the pending comprehensive survey of the water resources of the New England-New York region, soon to be submitted to the President and the Congress of the United States. Prepared under the chairmanship of the Department of the Army and the Corps

of Engineers, it reflects credit not only on them but on all participating Federal and State agencies, and demonstrates democracy in action at its best.

The committee believe that neither they nor the authorizing and appropriating committees of Congress can obtain an entirely clear view of any proposed project unless they are furnished with information as to any importance the project may have as an element in the national defense. Over a period of years we have fallen into the habit of accepting as the full measure of the strategic value of a project its usefulness in directly servicing some one or more military installations. As to other and often far more important aspects of a project in defense, we have been content to remain uninformed.

The committee regrets the continued absence of official data and opinion with respect to the strategic value (if any) of projects examined and reported by the administrative agencies. It is well understood that this results from the absence of any recognized criteria for measuring such values and the very real difficulty of establishing such. It may also be ascribed to the absence of adequate and appropriate legislation and administrative policy. The committee does not consider that the Corps of Engineers nor the Bureau of Reclamation, nor any other examining agency is to be blamed for this omission. It is due rather to the persistence of an obsolete point of view. The presently existing pivotal importance of the noncombatant elements in warfare makes it imperative that we examine and appraise all projects with due regard to whatever defense values they may have.

As a contribution toward the solution of this problem, the committee offers the following definition of strategic value:

"The term 'strategic value' shall mean all important reasonably predictable contributions by the project to the defense potential, and shall include, but shall not be limited to, foreseeable contributions of consequential importance in time of war to the transportation, power, or water use or conservation upon which are likely to depend any considerable segment of wartime civilian economy, war industry, or the movement or supply of the Armed Forces."

The committee further suggests that while strategic values must always elude precise measurement and must always be based largely on informed opinion, the degree of accuracy with which they may be gaged by such opinion is to no small degree comparable with that applying to estimates of peacetime economic benefits. As a working rule of thumb, and until some more acceptable method may be developed, it is proposed that all projects to be officially surveyed be examined for strategic values as herein defined, and that where any such are found, they be credited to the project as an annual benefit as war insurance in terms of a fraction or multiple of its total determined dollars and cents annual economic benefits.

The committee hopes to see taken such legislative and administrative steps as may be necessary to effectuate this policy. These should include the removal of all impediments to expressions by any department with respect to the strategic value of any project to such department in particular or to the defense potential as a whole. It should be possible for a department to make such expressions without prejudice to its budgetary requirements, unless such project is proposed principally for the benefit of such department.

The committee again calls attention to the imprudence of a policy which denies to the governmental agencies responsible for the maintenance of water use and conservation works representing Federal investment adequate funds for their continual maintenance at authorized capacity. The economic health of existing agriculture and industry wholly or partly dependent upon inadequately maintained public facilities, as well as the growth and development of their tributary areas, requires that sufficient maintenance funds be, and continue to be, available.

Respectfully submitted.

SID SIMPSON,
Chairman.

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

APPENDIX A

(Letter R following the project number indicates revision of a previous application.)

Class I—Projects endorsed

Endorsed: This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
632-R-4	New Haven Harbor-Quinnipiac River	Connecticut	Northeast.
794-R	Bayou La Batre	Alabama	South Atlantic.
795-R	Bayou Coden	do	Do.
852-A-R-2	Norfolk Harbor	Virginia	North Atlantic.
852-B-R-2	Thimble Shoal Channel, Norfolk	do	Do.
854-R	Central and southern Florida flood-control project (authorization of the entire project).	Florida	South Atlantic.
855-R	Savannah Harbor	Georgia	Do.
865-R	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River	New Hampshire and Maine	Northeast.
870-R-2	Delaware River, (1) Philadelphia to the sea, (2) Philadelphia to Trenton	Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	North Atlantic.
880-R	Nawiliwili Harbor improvements	Territory of Hawaii	South Pacific.
883-R (963)	Barre Falls flood-control project	Massachusetts	Northeast.
927	Port St. Joe Harbor (St. Joseph Bay)	Florida	South Atlantic.
950-R	Victory flood control, Connecticut River Basin	Vermont	Northeast.
953-R	North Hartland flood control, Connecticut River Basin	do	Do.
958	The island flood control, Connecticut River Basin	do	Do.
959-R	Ball Mountain flood control, Connecticut River Basin	do	Do.
960-R	Townshend flood control, Connecticut River Basin	do	Do.
963 (883-R)	Barre Falls flood control, Connecticut River Basin	Massachusetts	Do.
968	Gold Beach, Rogue River Harbor	Oregon	North Pacific.
971	Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill., flood protection	Iowa, Illinois, and Missouri	North Central.
972	Wilmington Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
973	Wrangell Harbor	Alaska	North Pacific.
974	Petersburg Harbor, north end Wrangell Narrows in southeast Alaska	do	Do.
975	Morro Bay Harbor	California	South Pacific.
980	Cross-Florida barge canal	Florida	South Atlantic.
984	Cheboygan inland route (Crooked and Indian Rivers)	Michigan	North Central.
985	Black River (Gogebic County), harbor of refuge	do	Do.
986	Port Austin harbor of refuge	do	Do.
987	Bullock Cove, harbor improvement	Rhode Island	Northeast.
995	East Barre, flood control reservoir	Vermont	North Atlantic.
996	Tampa Harbor	Florida	South Atlantic.
997	South Shore beach erosion control study	Rhode Island	Northeast.
1002	Bethlehem Junction	New Hampshire	Do.
1003	Otter Brook	do	Do.
1005	Hampton beach erosion	do	Do.
1009	Bayou Segnette Waterway	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1023	Chattahoochee River, Fort Gaines lock and dam	Georgia and Alabama	South Atlantic.
1024	Boggy Creek flood-control project, Enid	Oklahoma	Southwest.
1025	Owl Creek unit, Missouri River Basin project	Wyoming	Missouri River.

Class II—Projects classified as meritorious

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and open for further consideration by the committee.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
617-R	Purgatoire River Dam	Colorado	Southwest.
728-R-5	Morehead City Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
781-R-4	Juniata River and tributaries, Mifflin County, flood control	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic.
843-R-2	Levees east of Chandlerville (Sangamon River)	Illinois	North Central.
888-R	Long Beach, Plymouth Harbor	Massachusetts	Northeast.
924	Carrabelle Harbor, interior channel	Florida	South Atlantic.
925	East Point channels, Apalachicola Bay	do	Do.
926	Hillsboro River, Tampa Harbor (modification of existing project)	do	Do.
928	Rice Creek	do	Do.
929	St. George Island Cut, Apalachicola Bay	do	Do.
930	Scipio Creek Channel and Basin, Apalachicola Bay	do	Do.
931	City of St. Louis and vicinity (flood control)	Missouri	Lower Mississippi Valley.
932	Pepperell Cove, Kittery Point	Maine	Northeast.
981	Huntington Reservoir	Indiana	Ohio River.
1012	Posten Bayou	Louisiana and Arkansas	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1013	Bayou Chevreuil	Louisiana	Do.
1026	Peoria Reservoir, Mississinewa River	Indiana	Ohio River.
1027	Dora Reservoir, Salamonie River	do	Do.
1030	Seldovia Harbor improvements	Alaska	North Pacific.

Class III—Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes the Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite the report of its investigation and survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to classification by the Congress.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
98-C-R-2	French Creek Basin (resurvey)	Pennsylvania	Ohio River.
788-R	Waccamaw River	North Carolina and South Carolina	South Atlantic.
797-R	Perdido Pass	Alabama	Do.
798-R	Fowl River	do	Do.
810-R-2	Holden Beach (Lockwoods Folly Inlet)	North Carolina	Do.
883-R	San Juan Harbor, improvements to channel and turning basin	Puerto Rico	Do.
890-R	Kahului Harbor improvements	Territory of Hawaii	South Pacific.
970	Norfolk Harbor, Elizabeth River, Southern Branch, preliminary examination.	Virginia	North Atlantic.
982	Rio Grande River, channel storage control dams	Texas	Southwest.
983-R	Calcasieu River, low-water dam	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
991	Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, Flint Rivers, Flint River development	Georgia and Florida	South Atlantic.
1010	Barataria Waterway	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1011	Bank stabilization, Red River, Fulton, Ark., to Boyce, La.	Louisiana and Arkansas	Do.
1014	East point levee	Louisiana	Do.
1015	Freshwater bayou navigation canal	do	Do.
1016	Red River and tributaries—Kisatchie Bayou and Cane River	do	Do.
1017	Eastern Rapides and south central Avoyelles Parishes	do	Do.
1018	Amite River and tributaries	do	Do.
1021	Gilbert Dam and Reservoir and Lone Rock Dam and Reservoir	Arkansas	Southwest.
1022	Black and White River irrigation	do	Do.
1028	Shallotte Inlet	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1031	Turtle Creek Valley flood-control survey	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic.

Class IV—Projects recommended for survey

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
891-R	New Haven Harbor (review and restudy)	Connecticut	Northeast.
967	Port of Cleveland breakwall	Ohio	North Central.
969	Sachem's Head Harbor	Connecticut	Northeast.
976	New Bedford Harbor, flood control	Massachusetts	Do.
977	Ossipee Lake project	New Hampshire	Do.
978	Winnepesaukee Lake and Winnipesaukee River, flood protection, study of	do	Do.
979-R	Ocracoke Inlet	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
983	Southport waterfront retaining bulkhead	do	Do.
989	Point Judith and Point Judith Pond, harbor of refuge	Rhode Island	Northeast.
990	Wickford Harbor	do	Do.
991	Narragansett Bay area, hurricane damage and preventative work, examination and survey of.	do	Do.
992	New England hurricane protection	Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.	Do.
993	Narragansett Bay, hurricane tidal flood-control project for area	Rhode Island	Do.
998	Groton Pond	Vermont	Do.
999	Bloomfield	do	Do.
1000	Franconia	New Hampshire	Do.
1001	Cold River	do	Do.
1004	Rye Harbor	do	Do.
1005	Little Harbor	do	Do.
1007	Swiftwater	do	Do.
1029	West Two Bayou	Arkansas	Lower Mississippi Valley.

Waiting for the President To Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been waiting patiently for a week since President Eisenhower's return from Geneva, and are beginning to wonder how much longer it will take the President to decide whether or not he is in agreement with the great American tradition that "A Public Office Is a Public Trust."

Even since the publication of the following editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in its issue of Thursday, July 28, 1955, there have been further revealing if not startling disclosures that at least one Cabinet officer may know more about this case than was brought out in the public hearing.

Under leave to extend I am including the above-mentioned editorial from the Post-Dispatch:

WHAT THE RECORD SHOWS

The McClellan committee has now completed its hearings on Air Secretary Harold E. Talbott, and President Eisenhower says he will read the record of those hearings before deciding whether Mr. Talbott should stay in the Cabinet.

We do not see how the President can fail to be deeply impressed by three salient aspects of that record.

1. Secretary Talbott indubitably did use his official influence to aid a private firm for his private gain.

There is no question whatever about this. Letters went out on his stationery as Secretary of the Air Force, plugging for Mulligan & Co. Mr. Talbott personally telephoned officials of the Radio Corporation of America, who had questioned the propriety of dealing with Mulligan, and bawled them out for being high and mighty. He even rattled off a list of other corporations with defense contracts which had hired Mulligan to prove that RCA was acting unreasonably.

He now admits these activities were mistakes. They were worse. They were ethically reprehensible. If a courthouse hack sold insurance the way Mr. Talbott tried to sell efficiency expertism, he would be plainly denounced for low-grade political sandbagging.

2. In addition to misusing his own position, Mr. Talbott misused that of the Air Force chief counsel.

When he was pressuring RCA for being high and mighty, Mr. Talbott had the counsel, John A. Johnson, render an option that RCA could legally sign up with Mulligan. He even had Mr. Johnson (whose role was no more admirable than his chief's) try to get a concurring opinion from Attorney General Brownell. Neither the Air Force counsel nor the Attorney General has any business giving legal opinions designed to serve the personal interest of Mr. Talbott.

3. The Secretary's behavior since the investigation began has been less than forthright.

His first reaction was outraged innocence. Then he offered to quit Mulligan if the Senators told him to. Then he announced that he would quit Mulligan though claiming he had done nothing illegal or unethical. Even now, in the face of the record, he has the nerve to testify, "I never used my position to influence a living soul." Throughout, he has suffered lapses of memory on crucial points and has shown a consistent insensitivity to elementary concepts of what is and is not proper in Government-business relationships.

These are the main points that emerge from the record. In our judgment they permit only one conclusion—that a Cabinet officer who has so patently abused his official position and shown such a remarkable insensitivity to ethical principles cannot possibly be retained by an administration which claims to have established a high order of rectitude in Washington.

In Fairness to Howard Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, July 31, 1955, entitled "In Fairness to Howard Young":

IN FAIRNESS TO HOWARD YOUNG

Members of the Senate-House Committee on Defense Production say they cannot now make an evaluation of the record of Howard I. Young, of St. Louis, as a dollar-a-year man in Washington.

Their indecision threatens to leave the case in limbo until Congress meets next year. Such procrastination would be unfair to Mr. Young and unworthy of the committee.

Mr. Young is president of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., and during the Korean war was Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency. Recently Comptroller General Joseph Campbell reported to Congress that an apparent "conflict of interest" was involved. A General Accounting Office report strongly implied that Young in his official capacity had served his company as well as his country.

The case was splashed on national attention when Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, placed the GAO report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before the joint committee had a chance to hear Young's side of the story. When heard, Young denied every charge.

Since then the GAO has backed down on two of its major complaints: (1) That Young's own firm sold $60,000 worth of machinery to a company for which Young had promoted a Federal loan; and (2) that his firm sold 1,167 tons of zinc to the Government at a contract price above the market price at time of delivery. The GAO says the latter charge has only been reworded, not withdrawn, but does not make clear what offense is alleged.

Comptroller General Campbell also has told the committee that he would not accuse Young of acting in bad faith, but questioned whether "sound principles of public administration were exercised." This is a thorough retreat from implications of impropriety.

If the GAO is now so uncertain of some of its facts and its phraseology, why did it issue the report against Young in the first place? The public can only conclude that the report was a sloppy and reckless piece of work.

Nevertheless, the charges against Mr. Young have left their mark. And when a citizen's reputation is at stake, a congressional committee has no business allowing months to pass before justice catches up with the accusations. There has been too much carelessness of this sort for the rights and reputations of individuals.

If Mr. Young was wrong—and the GAO certainly has not proved it—the investigating committee should say so. But if Mr. Young was not wrong, then the GAO was totally wrong in bringing accusations which it could not support against a citizen who served his Nation without compensation.

Truth should not be permitted to trail far behind the charges. The congressional committee has heard both sides and should reach a prompt and fair conclusion.

Sale of A-Power Bears Watching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a recent column in a Washington newspaper is most deserving of the attention of the Congress. I refer to the column entitled "Sale of A-Power Bears Watching," by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, brilliant syndicated writer, which appeared in the July 30 edition of the Washington Evening Star.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be reproduced in the RECORD.

The article follows:

SALE OF A-POWER BEARS WATCHING—LAW ASSURING NON-PROFIT GROUPS OF PRIORITY IS BYPASSED BY AEC

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

About this time a year ago, when Congress was rushing pell-mell to adjourn and go home as it is now, a significant battle was fought in the Senate of which we now are having an echo.

A band of Senators resorted finally then to a filibuster against the administration bill for private development of atomic energy until they were able to write into it certain provisions to protect the public and consumer interest. In the case of this new source of energy they were determined to prevent the exploitation that was revealed by Government investigations a quarter of a century ago in the case of electric energy.

Among the protective clauses was a guarantee of preference for nonprofit groups—municipalities and other public agencies as well as rural electric cooperatives—in the sale of atomic energy from publicly owned projects, such as is already required by law in the case of electric power from public hydroelectric projects.

We thought that was all fixed and settled. But not necessarily, evidently.

Now for the echo. For that we take you to the town of West Milton, N. Y. You probably saw photographs in your newspapers of an event there. Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission, throwing a switch which started the flow of 12,500 kilowatts of electricity from an AEC installation into a private utility system, the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

This was an epochal event. For it was the first peacetime use of electrical energy from an atomic installation. To give a human touch that the usually stern-visaged Chairman Strauss is not sure of providing, there was an added stunt for the news photographers. This was a shot of a housewife at nearby Ballston Spa, a Niagara Mohawk customer, cooking a hamburger on her electric stove with the atomic power.

What was wrong with these pictures was spotted immediately by a group several hundred miles away in Chicago—the board of directors of the Cooperative League which happened to be meeting there. And lucky it is for us that such groups are on guard.

Members of the board are thoroughly familiar with the law passed a year ago by Congress and they knew also that two cities which have municipal electric plants, Illion, N. Y., and Holyoke, Mass., as well as the Delaware County Rural Electric Cooperative, at Delhi, N. Y., had applied for power from this first AEC reactor months ago, way back in January.

Under the law they are entitled to preference. They didn't get it. Niagara Mohawk is getting the power at 3 mills a kilowatt hour. The reactor, which is a model of one installed in the United States submarine *Sea Wolf*, produces enough power to supply a city of 20,000 people.

The cities and the co-op would need some way to get the power to them. Rather than build transmission lines to West Milton, they had decided upon the alternative of having it "wheeled" to them over lines of Niagara Mohawk. They offered a reasonable fee to the private utility for this service. But they were turned down—and it's easy to see why, with the company getting the power for itself so cheaply.

In a resolution it drafted, approved and sent to Chairman Strauss here in Washington, the Cooperative League's board of directors said that, under the law, the AEC itself should have hired Niagara Mohawk to wheel the power to the nonprofit groups which had applied for it under the preference guaranty. The co-ops and the cities then would have been charged for the service when they were billed by the AEC for the power. The board bluntly accused the AEC of violating the law.

What the Cooperative League is chiefly concerned about is the danger of a precedent being established which, it said in its resolution, "far outweighs the economic importance of the electric energy involved."

This might seem to be an exaggerated concern unless you know the eagerness of powerful private utilities to get their hands on this new source of energy, and how great now is their influence here in Washington.

You may recall that the AEC, under Chairman Strauss' direction, was the "broker" in the Dixon-Yates deal involving TVA which finally exploded in the face of the administration with the contract being canceled when it was shown to be the first step in a planned campaign to liquidate the great public multipurpose water resources program.

Because of AEC authority over atomic energy, that agency will bear constant watching to protect the public interest in private development of this new energy source.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—New Giant Corporations Have Changed Character of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make available to Members of Congress a genuinely important and most impressive research survey on the radical alterations that have taken place in the far-flung textile industry in the United States which has just been made by Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO. Mr. Barkin's survey and analysis has been made to assist Members of Congress now concerned with the dangers of monopoly in several areas of present-day industry.

Possibly because it is spread through so many States and such widely separated regions in this country, few of us are aware of the profound changes that are taking place in this oldest of our mass-production industries. I quote from Mr. Barkin's statement of June 29, 1955:

THE MERGER MOVEMENT IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Industrial giants created since the end of the war by business mergers now dominate the textile yarn, woven fabric, and finishing and converting industry, previously considered typically competitive. These new colossal corporations or interest aggregates are engaged in the production of a variety of fabrics, sell their goods, finance their sales, and control the output of many independents. They have radically changed the nature of the industry. Not only do they dominate price and production practices within the industry, but through their method of growth by consolidations they have substantially reduced competition. The large-scale movement of mill liquidation has enhanced their power. Through the skilful exploitation of our Federal tax laws the leaders of these enterprises have avoided Federal taxes and enjoyed large tax windfalls with which to build their industrial colossus. With the new centralized control over vast textile operations they are able to moderate the rigors of competition and control general industrial policy and practice. Their influence extends into the communities and Government and dominates the evolving industrial attitudes to labor and unions, which tend to be repressive in spirit and unprogressive in fact.

The merger movement is still in process. Newspapers report several impending at the present time, assuring the continuance of economic concentration in the industry. The appearance of the giant textile organization is significant not only as an indication of the change in structure of this industry, but as further evidence of the continued operation of the forces generating industrial bigness in our industrial society. Having begun at the start of the century in the high-capital requirement industries, the consolidation and big business trends have been extended to the very last bulwalks of small business. We cannot shrug off these developments as merely the continuation of an older trend, or remain complacent because the new textile corporations, like most big business, dominate without necessarily monopolizing their particular business areas. We should consider most carefully the economic and nonmarket uses of this corporate power and the conduct of the managements of these organizations to assure the proper discharge of this trusteeship in the public interest.

Prices and production policies of textile mills are now controlled by central organizations cognizant of the powers of their competitors. "Stabilized competition" and mergers have enhanced or maintained the competitive and financial position of the large units and reduced the number of independent units, particularly in the individual fabric divisions. Through their selling offices, factoring houses and personal contacts, their control is very extensive. Their competitive strength does not stem from any special competence, but from an ability to average out favorable and unfavorable market developments, to hold the larger buyers and maintain extensive outlets.

Their appearance has accelerated the process of mill closings and discouraged many from seeking to rehabilitate their properties and organizations after the letdown following the period of standardized production prevailing during the war and early postwar years. The alluring opportunities for profits through merger captivated many managements who feared the competitive path.

These organizations have given the industry little new leadership. They have provided little real support for fundamental research to promote the textile industry. The textile spinner and weaver continue to rely primarily on textile machine manufacturers, synthetic yarn producers, raw material interests and chemical concerns for innovations and inventions. Few new persons have been added to the top management ranks to provide vigorous leadership although the merger movement has made for high turnover of management personnel within individual organizations. Instead of reducing the ravages of poor management and inappropriate product merchandise approaches, they have magnified the harm they can do.

They have yet to prove their value in changing the tide in the use of textile products. Despite their growth and power and a growing economy and population, the industry continues to lose important domestic markets. Significant new uses have not been developed. The new textile giants have furrowed old fields at a time when invention is imperative. They have not duplicated the records of other industrial giants who have promoted growth and expansions.

The textile chains have remained fundamentally complacent. They have been satisfied to see their industrial finances strengthened irrespective of the cost to the Federal Treasury, the workers, the community and the industry. They have proceeded from the merger of one unit to another, bringing ruin in their wake, but indifferent to their responsibilities as trustees of American wealth and enterprise.

The new concentrated power has frequently been exercised quite ruthlessly to repress workers, to control industrial wage and personnel policy, to discourage unionism, and to relocate plants without concern for the destructive effects. With their new resources they have become dominant industrial factors and key factors in the political, educational, and social life of the areas in which they operate, to the end of assuring the continued predominance of their political outlooks.

The following course of action should be considered by your committee:

1. Remedial action to inhibit mergers primarily designed to exploit the tax advantages made possible by the tax-free position of pension funds and foundations, and by the special tax advantages provided under the capitals-gains and carry-back and carry-forward provisions of the corporation tax law. The 1950 revisions of the Internal Revenue Code affecting the use of foundations as a funnel for the operation of corporate enterprise must be reviewed to determine if it has eliminated the abuses. The tax-exempt position of the pension funds again must be carefully reviewed for their effects on industrial concentration and to assure fair competition. The changes in the 1954 corporation income tax law on the use of carry-back and carry-forward provisions must be reexamined to evaluate their sufficiency in the light of their continued stimulation of mergers.

2. Federal incorporation of giant corporations is imperative to accomplish more

uniform regulation and to develop a more appropriate code of managerial responsibility in this era in which so much economic power is concentrated in the hands of industrial management.

3. A Federal supervisory agency of such corporations should be empowered to review the conduct and policies of such organizations to permit public appraisal of their effects on competition, industrial progress, and worker and community interests.

4. A specific tax must be imposed upon the profits and financial gains of large organizations which abandon plants, the revenue from which should be used for the reconstruction and development of local communities.

5. Unorganized workers in giant industrial organizations, particularly in the textile industry, need specific protection in their efforts to form unions since their rights under the existing law have been flouted.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—New Giants Now Dominate Certain Sections of Industry

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in the second section of the important study on Mergers in the Textile Industry by Solomon Barkin, which I present today, the significant point is made that new giants that have grown up in this field have arisen largely as a result of loopholes in our tax laws which encourage mergers and acquisitions even though such combinations can make no contribution in the sense of offering better or cheaper products. I quote from the Barkin study of June 29, 1955:

TEXTILE GIANTS HAVE GROWN THROUGH MERGERS

Unlike corporations in other industries, which have grown large through internal expansion arising from economic growth, many giant organizations in the textile industry have arisen primarily through acquisitions and mergers engineered to take advantage of tax loopholes. With a handful of outstanding exceptions, these organizations have not built completely new plant structures. They have merely regrouped existing facilities under one ownership.

The merger movement is not completely new in the industry. It witnessed the formation of trusts during the first decade of the century and enduring mergers during the twenties and thirties. The latter sought to liberate individual mills from the financial stranglehold of the commission selling house, which frequently bled the textile organizations into financial bankruptcy. Studies of 1933 and 1937 data show that the concentration had significantly affected particular product branches without penetrating the industry as a whole.

While the prewar mergers were essentially defensive in character, designed to remove the economic dependence upon the commission house, the mergers during the war and postwar periods were basically expansionist in character. They were stimulated by the abnormal postwar circumstances which promised vast opportunities for automatic profits and the visions they fired among some for power and dominance within the industry. Large profits, fixed markups, and fabric shortages gave the mills great bargaining power to extend their controls forward. Textile buyers and converters had incentives for backward integration into weaving and finishing operations. Mills and selling houses were brought into a single organization. Skilled use of the capital gains provisions in our tax laws and charitable and personal trusts gave additional impetus to this movement. Operators or estates unwilling to continue in the competitive struggle found sales of mills an easy out. (For detailed description, see The Regional Significance of the Integration Movement in the Southern Textile Industry, Southern Economic Journal, vol. XV, No. 4, April 1949, by Solomon Barkin.)

The war and postwar movement began in 1943 and was in full bloom in the years 1945–48. It diminished toward the end of this period and lost much of its momentum in the years from 1949 through 1952 though scattered acquisitions occurred. A study of southern mill mergers indicates that at a minimum the total changes in ownership during the period from 1943 through 1948 represented almost 5 million spindles and 90,000 looms, affecting about 22 percent of the existing capacity. In North Carolina, 26 percent of the equipment, and in South Carolina, 33 percent changed hands, usually being acquired by a new interest in the process of building a new giant organization.

BASIC CHARACTER OF INDUSTRY CHANGING

The extent to which the traditional view of this industry, as consisting of isolated individual mill owners, had been dissipated by 1948 is shown by a study of the South Carolina textile industry. Fifteen interests then employed 88,733 persons out of the 133,408 in the industry. They controlled 67 percent of the employees, 65 percent of the spindles, 68 percent of the looms, 106 of the 227 mills in the State, and 12 of the separate finishing plants. The largest employers in the State were J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., with some 13,700 employees, Deering-Milliken & Co., and Springs Cotton Mills, with 13,407 and 12,000, respectively. These three represented 30 percent of the industry in the States. (See Textile Worekrs Union of America, Research Department, South Carolina Textiles: Southern Workers, Northern Bosses, 1949.)

TEXTILE COMPANIES ABSORBING NONTEXTILE CONCERNS

While sharing some of the characteristics of the war and postwar merger movement, the current one, which started at the end of 1952, has features of its own. First, its major emphasis is upon the further consolidation of giant units. Major corporations, the product of previous mergers, are now being joined into new mammoth structures. Burlington Industries, Inc., has acquired Pacific Mills, Interstate Hosiery, Goodall-Sanford, Hafner Associates, Mooresville Mills, and Peerless Woolen Mills. Similarly, Textron American, Inc., combined the American Woolen Co., Robbins Mills, and Textron, which itself had previously absorbed Gossett Mills in earlier years and then such corporations as Burkart & Newmarket Manufacturing Co. It is now reaching out into many other nontextile companies, three of which it has already acquired. J. P. Stevens has recently bought Cheney Bros., a 117-year-old textile organization. Mount Vernon-Woodberry Mills, the outgrowth of the original Duck Trust, now includes Arcade Mills and is reported negotiating for other potential additions. The Lester Martin interests, which center about the Consolidated Textile Mills and include several additional unconsolidated enterprises, have gained control of the giant Bates Manufacturing Co. United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., has brought into its fold, through a stock exchange, the sizable and diversified mill structure of the A. D. Juilliard Co. M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., giant converting and mill chain, now includes Wamsutta Mills, which had previously bought up Somerset Mills. The dominant New England fine-goods manufacturer, Berkshire Fine Spinning Associates, which was formed in the early thirties through an amalgamation of New England fine-goods mills, has now combined with the Hathaway Manufacturing Co. and had previously acquired the Lincoln Bleachery. It now dominates the fine-yarn section of the combed-goods industry. Botany Mills, Inc., has recently taken over control of the Gurney chain of mills in North Carolina and Alabama. Princeton Rayon Corp. has bought out the Century Ribbon Mills with mills in Pennsylvania and Virginia and a factoring organization. Gera Corp., associated with the Albert List interests which liquidated the William Whitman & Co. and other cotton, woolen, and finishing plants, has acquired the United States Finishing Co., which had previously absorbed the Aspinook Corp.

AT THE EXPENSE OF UNITED STATES TREASURY

The second distinguishing feature of the merger movement has been the exploitation of the tax advantages accruing from the absorption of mills in financial difficulties or sustaining continued losses. Such mills are being acquired not for expansionist motives but to capitalize financial gains at the expense of the Federal Treasury, for the purpose of gaining financial windfall advantages to the buying corporation. In the usual case, the purchasing interests have not followed such acquisitions with large-scale investments to modernize or revitalize the acquired properties and organization. Rather, the pattern has been to close several mills, consolidating the holdings and shrinking the operations. The immediate financial benefit has been the predominant interest. The present merger movement has to an extraordinary degree fed on the difficulties of textile mills in the rayon weaving industry which has been losing markets, the woolen and worsted industry which has been shrinking in size, and the divisions of the cotton industry which have been losing out to competitive products such as plastics, paper, and synthetics.

In this category there are such acquisitions as the following: The merger of Goodall-Sanford, Hafner Associates, and Mooresville Mills with Burlington; the acquisitions of American Woolen, Robbins and Newmarket Manufacturing Co. by Textron; the purchase of Cheney Bros. by J. P. Stevens; the absorption of the A. D. Juilliard & Co. by the United Merchants & Manufacturers; Gera Mills by the Albert List interests; the Susquehanna Mills by H & B American Machine Co.

EXTENDING CONTROLS OVER SALES AND BUYERS OF FABRICS

Diversification of fiber utilization and product has also been joined with new ventures into the factoring of sales. A number of the large corporations now have acquired factoring units, thereby extending both the areas of control and influence over sales and buyers of fabric. Thus, Textron American has Amwool Financial Corp.; J. P. Stevens, after forming their own factoring subsidiary, acquired the J. P. McGuire Co., Inc.; United Merchants & Manufacturers has the United Factors Corp.; the Tannenbaum interests have the Century Factors; the Iselin-Jefferson Co. has William Iselin & Co. These financial affiliates help entrench the position of the giant corporations or interest aggregates.

The present merger movement has accelerated the degree of industrial concentration in the basic textile industry. Several big textile organizations have grown larger through thhe acquisition of chains or individual mills. In addition, several new giant aggregations have been formed. The pattern of embracing mills processing all fibers and all processes from yarn production through weaving and through finishing has been strengthened. The new textile organization

now has its own sales staff and, in an increasing number of cases, its own factoring facilities.

BYPRODUCT OPPORTUNITIES FOR FINANCIAL MANIPULATION

Outstanding is the third feature, largely a byproduct of the opportunities for financial manipulation and tax avoidance or gains. A considerable proportion of the mergers involve northern and particularly, New England, textile properties. To a greater extent than in other areas the purchasing interests utilized the economic distress in which these mills found themselves for their own advantage. However, other purposes are also propelling this movement. Some larger mergers involved such New England properties as the Berkshire Fine Spinning Associates and Lincoln Bleachery and Hathaway Manufacturing Co.; the purchase of Goodall-Sanford by Burlington; the conversion of the United States Finishing Co. and Aspinook Corporation into the Gera Corp.; the purchase of the Newmarket Manufacturing Co. and American Woolen Co. by Textron, Inc., and the absorption of Cheney Bros. into the J. P. Stevens organization. More New England mills are now owned by companies with southern textile properties.

A number of large southern organizations also lost their individual identity by being consolidated into already existing giant units. Among these we would include the Erwin Mills, now controlled by the Abney interests; the Pacific Mills and Mooresvile Mills having been taken into the Burlington orbit; Arcade Cotton Mills, now part of the Mount Vernon-Woodberry chain; Dunson Mills having been engulfed by the Pepperell organization and Robbins Mills, now part of Textron American, Inc.

To a greater extent than in the previous era, the companies are extending their operations into additional fibers. Burlington Industries, which originally was predominantly engaged in the processing of rayon fibers, acquired cotton mills after the war and now has significantly broadened into the woolen and blended wool fields. Textron has similarly moved into the rayon suiting and woolen and worsted divisions. The United Merchants & Manufacturers have also entered into the woolen and worsted division and into corduroy production.

TREND TOWARD VERTICAL INTEGRATION

Another strong trend has been the completion of the vertical integration process through the acquisition of finishing plants: Berkshire Fine Spinning Co. (through Lincoln Bleachery); Burlington Industries (through Pacific Mills); Textron (through Robbins); United Merchants & Manufacturers (through A. D. Juilliard & Co.). Another example is the likelihood that the Bates Manufacturing Co. will make greater use of the printing and finishing plant owned by the Consolidated Textile Co., which owns a controlling interest in Bates.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—Close Examination Shows New Giants Have Monopoly on Certain Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in the third installament of Mr. Solomon Barkin's impressive and authoritative survey on monopolistic trends in the textile industry, which I present for the benefit of Members of Congress, the point is carefully and vividly made that although the textile industry has no monster units such as dominate automobiles, certain sections of this industry, recently thought of as highly individualistic, are now controlled by very few firms. I quote from Mr. Barkin's statement of June 29, 1955:

DOMINATION BY TEXTILE GIANTS

The current merger movement, beginning in 1953 and continuing into the present, has engulfed a considerable sector of the wealth and equipment of the industry. Embracing 70 companies and 171 mills, employing over 76,000 persons, they have impressively reduced the significance of existing independent units within the industry. The woolen and worsted division has been most markedly affected though the other divisions, particularly cotton, have also seen huge amalgamations.

The consummate effect of the past and present merger movements has been to create a total of 43 major textile interests, defined as companies employing 3,000 or more employees. The greater number of these aggregates, some 28 out of the 43, were not involved in the present movement. They had attained their preeminent position primarily during the war and post-war periods and have not yet been impelled to move further. Some of the latter were associated with specific consumer interests such as rubber companies, thread distributors, and merchants whose needs for vertical integration have, for the time being, been satisfied. But 15 of the large interests were involved in the mergers of the last 2½ years. Negotiations involving other large units such as Dan River Mills were not consummated.

It would appear that the total employment of this group of 43 interests in the basic textile industry with which we are concerned is 353,450 persons out of a total of 680,000 production workers, or 52 percent. The spindles operated are 14.45 million out of a total of 23 million and the looms available to these mills total 304,149 out of a potential of 510,000. These companies had 521 plants, including finishing mills.

The size of these operations is suggested by another tabulation indicating, from such information as we have been able to assemble, their net assets and net sales. From the point of view of assets, the largest unit appears to be Burlington Industries, Inc., with a total of some $430 million, followed by J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., with assets of $295 million; and United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., with $190 million. Textron American follows with $151 million.

The lineup for the organizations in terms of sales is slightly different: Burlington leads with net sales of $548 million, followed by United Merchants & Manufacturers, with $300 million, and then by Stevens, with $298 million. Textron American, Inc., had pro-forma sales of some $205 million, followed by M. Lowenstein & Sons, with $186 million, and then by Cannon Mills Co., with $180 million.

COMPETITIVE FACTOR DISAPPEARING

This record of concentration in the textile industry may not be as impressive as the singular domination by a small handful of companies prevailing in some industries. There are no corporations in this industry which compare with the size of the big automobile companies. But it is highly significant that these consolidations have pervaded an industry in which the giant organization was practically absent in the prewar years. They have taken hold of an industry which has been characteristically thought of as a competitive one and in which the trade associations still trumpet these same characteristics. The big corporation with its powers for control has invaded one of the last citadels of smaller independent industrial units. The process has not yet been completed. We know that further mergers are in the making. The nature of the competitive process and organizational structure have been substantially changed.

THREE CONCERNS CONTROL THREAD BUSINESS

The importance of size in the industry cannot be fully appreciated by comparing the equipment or sales of an individual organization with the industry total. More and more of the companies are entering the varied markets served by the industry. More of them are processing goods containing all fibers. Their equipment enables them to shift from one to another as style and market trends dictate. But there is a high degree of specialization which careful research and governmental data would disclose. For example, two of the major interests, American Thread Co. and Coast & Clark, Inc., together with another minor interest, Standard-Coosa-Thatcher, have almost exclusive control of the thread business.

The appearance of giants in this industry offers a serious challenge. It is transforming the industry and subjecting it to the heavy pressure of standardization which necessarily follows from the existence of gargantuan operations. Many doubt the economic appropriateness of this form of structure for the successful promotion of the industry. Financial and speculative gains, and the search for bureaucratic and personal power, have created an industrial structure ill-adapted to this industry.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—Concentration Accelerates While Industry Shrinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the merger movement now changing the entire character of the textile industry in this country is taking place while the industry in shrinking alarmingly. This is the principal point documented by Mr. Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America-CIO in the fourth installment of this study of June 1955 on the developments in the textile industry, which I am making available to Members of Congress. I quote from Mr. Barkin:

CONCENTRATION INCREASES WHILE INDUSTRY SHRINKS

The current merger movement in the textile industry has taken place at a time when many plants were being closed; specific segments have been significantly shrunk; and equipment has been scrapped as marked redundancies have become evident with the rise in the industry's productivity. New plant structures have been few in number. The consolidation of the existing establishments into fewer hands in face of the shrinkage in the industry's capacity, has definitely magnified the influence of the gigantic industrial corporations.

Total production has remained relatively stable during the postwar years, but employment and mill equipment in place and the number of mills have continued to decline. Except for the year 1949, total broadwoven fabric production has varied between 12 and 13 billion yards a year since 1947, with cotton goods production being maintained at the most stable level, varying between 9.5

billion in 1952 and 10.1 billion in 1951, except for 1949. Silk and synthetic yarn fabric production ranged from 2 billion to a maximum of 2.6 billion in 1950. But the woolen and worsted output has continued to shrink from 516 million linear yards in 1947 to a low of 281 million in 1954. In the first quarter of 1955 production rose seasonally to new high levels, but cutbacks in the second quarter erased the unusual advance and restored activity to within previous ranges.

This stability in the volume of production is being experienced in face of a rising population which increased from 144 million in 1947 to 165 million at the present time. Part of the production amounting to 925 million square yards, the difference between the volume exported in 1947 and 1954 (1,730 million and 805 million, respectively), was diverted from export to domestic markets. But fundamentally, domestic textiles consumption has not grown. Actually per capita textile fiber consumption for the years 1951–54 was 34 pounds as compared with 35.8 pounds for the years 1947–50. Per capita fiber consumption dropped slightly despite a per capita rise of real disposable income of 11 percent from 1947 to 1954.

RISE IN MAN-HOUR PRODUCTIVITY

While total production has therefore remained relatively stable, there have been vast shifts within the industry. Of even greater importance has been the sharp rise in man-hour productivity. New investment in equipment and rebuilding of existing structures with the minor additions of new structures, has amounted to some $4 billion in the entire textile industry and some $3 billion in the divisions under consideration. As a result, well over 70 percent of the machines operating in the industry are of postwar construction and are therefore more productive and automatic.

New management techniques in administration of work assignment, scheduling, quality controls, material handling, and layout have reduced labor requirements. New fibers requiring less labor for processing have been substituted for old ones. Whereas a worsted mill might require one-third of a man-hour to produce a yard of serge, a cotton mill would only need less than one-tenth of a man-hour to produce a yard of cloth.

All evidence points to an increase in man-hour productivity of about 5 percent per annum. An approximate measure is provided in table IV, where it is indicated that the yardage output per man-hour has risen steadily from 7.8 in 1947 to 8.8 in 1950, to 10.8 in 1954, and 11.2 in the first quarter of 1955.

With relatively stable total output, and sharply rising man-hour productivity, employment has shrunk markedly. From a total of 785,000 in 1948 in the broadwoven fabric industry, we have seen employment decline to 568,000 in 1954, rising slightly in the first quarter of 1955 to 572,000 but declining below 1954 levels in April and May. The contraction in employment has been approximately 200,000 or 25 percent at a time when total output has remained relatively stable.

SHRINKAGE IN EMPLOYMENT

The shrinkage in employment has been accompanied by widespread closings of mills and scrapping of equipment, with few new structures being erected. Figures on mill closings have not been assembled or published by any Goverment agency so that we have had to make such a tabulation. We have defined a mill liquidation as one in which the textile equipment has been completely removed, whether or not it was subsequently operated by a different business organization.

The mill closings have been of quite substantial numbers. In the divisions we have been studying, a total of at least 541 mills, providing normal employment for 147,000 persons, have been liquidated in the postwar years, distributed as follows among the various divisions: 248 mills employing 65,800 persons in the cotton-rayon division, 218 mills employing 70,000 in the woolen and worsted industry, and 75 mills employing 11,350 in the dyeing and finishing industry.

Equally indicative of the importance of the concentration has been the degree to which operating equipment has been reduced in the industry. Active cotton-spinning spindles dropped by half a million between 1947 and 1950 and an additional 600,000 by April 1955. Over the 8-year period, some 16,000 looms were scrapped in the basic cotton and synthetic division and 13,000 in the woolen and worsted industry. The latter represents a reduction of one-third of the 1947 capacity in the industry.

VERY FEW MILLS CONSTRUCTED

Very few new mills have been constructed during this period. Again, precise overall data on such new mills are not available. The Bureau of the Census reports that for the entire textile industry, expenditures on new plant and equipment for the years 1951–53 was $1,008,000,000. Of this sum only $23.7 million, or slightly more than 2 percent, was for completely new establishments. The cost of new structures was $12.6 million and the new machinery in these structures $11.1 million.

Since the close of the war 5 new integrated cotton and 1 cotton-yarn mills have been built and 2 are now under construction. The completed new mills have some 235,000 spindles and 3,500 looms. Several new rayon and synthetic yarn throwing and weaving plants were built. Our count shows 6 new integrated plants with 87,000 spindles and 2,200 looms, and 14 new weaving plants with 7,300 looms. In contrast to the tremendous contraction in the woolen and worsted industry, there are only 2 new combing plants (both under construction) and 18 new yarn and weaving mills with approximately 79,000 spindles and 1,400 looms.

The reduction in the number of textile mills and the scrapping of equipment and physical structures have coincided with the movement for concentration through mergers. The result is that each merger of existing mill organizations increases the degree of dominance and influence exercised by the remaining giant organizations within the industry.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—Tax Incentives Have Been Direct Cause of Many Mill Closings

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in this 5th installment of the searching and scholarly study of current trends in the textile industry by Mr. Solomon Barkin, which I am today making available to Members of Congress, the point is made that a whole host of mill closings are directly traceable to loopholes in our tax laws. I quote, as follows:

The leaders of the textile industry have chosen the road of mergers rather than internal expansion to maximize short-run profits. They have enriched themselves and their organizations not by creating new capacity but through the use of existing organizations, co-opting established competences, or through the manipulation of tax advantages and speculative profit opportunities. They are gambling on the success of big, diversified textile enterprises, which has not yet been established as the sound solution, while they break up existing organizations.

SPECIAL TAX INCENTIVES

Concerns which extend their operations to supply the greater needs which they have developed are performing a constructive function in our economy. They are contributing to the Nation's economic expansion. Some of the textile mergers or acquisitions are of this type. But fundamentally the cases which we have reviewed are not justified by this rationale. The drive for diversification is merely a search for security through bigness. It is a hope to overcome the risks of enterprise through the accumulation of multifarious activities under one financial umbrella. Past history does not confirm the soundness of this approach in the textile industry, which is essentially a service industry trying to feed the demands of the widest range of customers. The absence of a single, standardized, homogeneous market makes the soundness of such approaches through bigness highly doubtful. The advantages of such big concerns must therefore be found in the opportunities for financial manipulation and the satisfaction of power drives.

Whatever business motives there may have been for considering a merger as the solution of business and management problems, there is no doubt that in the textile industry the tax incentives and the facilities provided by institutions which are untaxed or advantageously situated from the point of view of taxes have accelerated the consolidation movement. Many operators have found this course an easy way to follow to meet personal and competitive problems. They were offered an attractive choice to the challenging one of meeting the problems of modernization and the recasting of merchandising and selling organizations and operations. The alternative of merging has been sufficiently financially attractive so that it has been seized upon with zest and profit both to the seller and the buyer though many communities have suffered.

CAPITAL GAINS

The capital gains provision of the income tax laws has been particularly attractive. Skillful lawyers, accountants, and financiers have recognized in it a means for converting ordinary business income and inflated business values into "capital gains" through sales of businesses thereby reducing the individual income tax of the sellers and permitting the purchasers to acquire significant tax advantages. During the current merger period, capital gains were taxed at a maximum effective rate of 25 percent, except for the period from 1951 through 1953 when it was 26 percent.

The capital gains provision has been a particularly active stimulant to consolidations during the war and early post-war periods, but continues even to date to exercise a considerable influence.

Mills have been sold to other textile operators or financial manipulators as a means of avoiding heavy tax liabilities. Since most textile mills have been capitalized at low prices inherited from the low-profit rates prevailing during the thirties the excess-profits tax fell heavily upon many. Older owners or trustees found it attractive to escape the heavy burden of taxes by selling out the mills. The owners were paid high prices, the proceeds of which could be classi-

fied as capital gains and taxed at a maximum rate of 25 percent. The purchasers could often pay off the sellers with liquid funds already available in the treasury of the acquired firm or from subsequent profits. While the excess-profits tax was operating they had high capitalizations which reduced their own tax liabilities. Increasingly, the capital-gains device is being used through long-term purchase programs which require little funds on the part of the buying organization and permit the old management to retain control of the concern and share in the profits.

It is difficult without careful evaluation and intimate knowledge of the specific cases to identify the mergers in this category, particularly as public information about many of them is scanty. In the unfolding of the operations of Albert A. List and his associates, there are a number of transactions which have clearly built on the capital-gains provisions. The acquisition of the Gurney mills by Botany Mills, Inc., was no doubt based on the capital-gains provision. Many other sellers such as the Dunson Mills of La Grange, Ga., which was acquired by the Pepperell Manufacturing Co., also had this advantage in mind. The sale by the Hutcheson family of Peerless Woolen Mills to Burlington Mills, Inc., was a means of reducing their tax obligations through conversion of stock.

CARRYOVER PROVISIONS

A second important tax provision which has accelerated the merger movement beyond any reasonable economic need, enabling many managements to throw in the sponge before they faced up to their own problems, has been the carryback and carry-forward provisions of the Federal corporation income tax. Originally designed to enable profitable concerns which entered into a period of business reverses to utilize their past taxes on profits to rehabilitate and reorganize, these provisions have been seized upon by speculators to enrich themselves without enhancing the position of the operations which had suffered. The merger process has been the convenient channel for gaining the privilege without discharging the appropriate responsibilities to the enterprise. Instead of conceiving, as the original provision visualized, the purpose as an aid to a business concern, the carryover provision has been converted through the consolidation process, into a mechanism for salvaging or enhancing the claims of the present owners and granting tax privileges to the buyers.

EFFECT OF 1954 AMENDMENTS

The 1954 amendments liberalized the existing provisions as well as freeing the corporations of many restraints previously placed upon them by the courts. For example, courts had held that "the surviving corporation in a merger is generally entitled only to the tax attributes from its own premerger experience and not from the experience of the other corporations merged," but in practice the House Ways and Means Committee declares that "this separate entity rule appears not to have been followed." The new rules provided by the 1954 act "enable the successor corporation to step into the 'tax shoes' of its predecessor corporation." (Report on H. R. 8300 in the 83d Cong., 3d sess. (House Rept. No. 1337, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, p. 41).)

There are many illustrations of the use of the carryover tax provisions in the textile industry. There is no doubt that the acquisition of this tax advantage has been the underlying motive for many consolidations and has accelerated the demise of important textile corporations. The most dramatic illustration of the impetus which this consideration has provided is the merger of the American Woolen Co., Robbins Mills, and Textron, Inc., into Textron American, Inc. The statement of January 6, 1955, issued in connection with the special meeting of stockholders to approve this merger contains the following:

"As at the end of October 1954, the portions of the consolidated net operating losses attributable to each constituent corporation which may be succeeded to and taken into account by the merged corporation are estimated at approximately $18,750,000 for American Woolen, $10,000,000 for Robbins, and $1,300,000 for Textron, or an aggregate of approximately $30,050,000. Such amounts will, subject to the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, be available as loss carryovers to be offset against future earnings for Federal income tax purposes. Such loss carryovers, to the extent not utilized, will expire at the end of 1956 to the extent of $200,000, at the end of 1957 to the extent of $14,250,000, and at the end of 1958 to the extent of $15,600,000."

MERGERS HAVE RESULTED IN MILL CLOSINGS

The merger of these corporations into a single unit has resulted in the closing of a whole host of mills. Some of these closings had been announced during the negotiations leading to the merger and others affected subsequently. The existence of this alternative diverted attention of the respective managements to the consolidation process. Of course, the American Woolen Co., according to one of its most ardent defenders and ultimately a member of the board of directors, had become a mass of wreckage, drifting toward its end, being scuttled by its management who had given up as a management. (*America's Textile Reporter*, v. *LXIX, No. 21*, May 26, 1955, p. 35.) But the solution of the problems within this corporation which had employed 25,000 production workers in 1948 could have been found by bringing in vigorous and imaginative management, as the union urged on several occasions. But, instead, Mr. Royal Little succeeded in scuttling the plans for bringing in Harold J. Walter, president of Bachmann Uxbridge Worsted Corp., and plunged into the successful fight to gain complete control, being driven by the abundance of cash in the till of the American Woolen Co., partly as Fortune magazine explains, "for working capital and partly to finance further diversification." But the investments he seeks for the funds accumulated in the treasury of the American Woolen Co. are largely outside of the textile industry. The fundamental result of the entire operation was to make funds ordinarily available for tax purposes accessible to Mr. Little for the enhancement of his own financial and management position. This was a new episode in the long history of financial manipulation characterizing Mr. Little's operation during and since the war.

ALBERT A. LIST'S OPERATIONS

In the same manner other acquisitions have been conceived to gain tax advantages. Albert A. List's operations particularly illustrate the financial operations of both the capital gains and the carryover provisions. In this connection we can quote the following from the letter to stockholders of the United States Finishing Co. (controlled by Mr. List) of January 28, 1955: "Your management has considered that if * * * a plan could be worked out on a basis which would provide for the stockholders cash and securities with an anticipated combined market value higher than the current market price of their stocks, such a sale would be preferable to continued operation by the company of its business, with its earnings subject to large income-tax payments and major requirements for capital expenditures."

The plan which was submitted was described as follows:

"Sale of the entire business and assets of your company for cash and 6 percent subordinated sinking fund debentures of Gera Corp. and the assumption of all of your company's liabilities. The aggregate cash and principal amount of 6 percent debentures is approximately $6 million more than the net amount at which the company is carrying its assets on its books. The acquiring corporation will consequently have substantially larger tax-free depreciation provisions available for capital expenditures. Furthermore, Gera Corp. had losses arising from other operations, which it is believed can be offset for Federal income-tax purposes against earnings from the business to be acquired from the company, and from its own electronics and other divisions, which otherwise would be subject to tax."

Mr. List, who was chairman of the board and president of the Gera Corp., was also chairman of the board of the United States Finishing Co.

TAX SAVINGS ACHIEVED

Another illustration of this same practice is provided by the United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., which declares in its financial report for the year ending June 30, 1954, that as a result of the acquisition of A. D. Juilliard & Co., Inc., and other interests:

"The Corporation estimates that the deductions of such liquidating losses (to the extent realized) and the use of carrybacks and carryovers of operating losses of subsidiary companies for purposes of computing Federal taxes on income resulted in a provision for Federal taxes for the year ended June 30, 1954, which was approximately $1,300,000 less than would have been required had such factors not entered into the tax computation. As of June 30, 1954, the unused loss carryovers of subsidiary companies for Federal and Canadian tax purposes approximated $14 million."

A spinoff concern of Textron, Inc., had apparently learned of the benefits of the tax provisions for the Indian Head Mills, Inc., which is substantially owned by the stockholders of Textron, negotiated the absorption of the Naumkeag Steam Cotton Co., an important bulwark of the bed-sheeting industry. In his letter to the stockholders of January 12, 1955, President J. E. Robison urged approval of the consolidation as follows:

"It should be pointed out in this connection, however, that in view of Naumkeag's losses, the combined company will have a so-called 'tax loss carry-forward' credit of approximately $2,700,000, of which $2,200,000 will expire by November 30, 1958; and the balance the following year, so that the profits of the new Indian Head Mills, Inc., will not be subject to Federal income taxes until this credit is used up."

The recent purchase of the Century Ribbon Mills, Inc., and its wholly owned subsidiary, Century Factors, Inc., had similar motives. The report for the last fiscal year indicates that the losses of 1953 and 1954 "may be applied as a reduction of Federal income taxes for future years under the carry-forward provisions of the Internal Revenue Code."

It can similarly be surmised that other acquisitions and consolidations have these fundamental tax considerations as the motivating force. Presumably, the J. P. Stevens Co. looked to the tax offsets of Cheney Bros. as an important advantage in this acquisition. M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., similarly saw important tax advantages in the purchase of Wamsutta Mills; as did Burlington Industries, Inc., in the acquisition of Goodall Sanford and Morresville Mills. Tax considerations were basic to the merger of the Crown Manufacturing Co. and the Arms Textile Manufacturing Co. More intimate examination of the finances of other mergers would disclose additional illustrations.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—Hundreds of Thousands of Workers Lose Jobs Through Financial Manipulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in this sixth installment of the startling and often shocking analysis of current developments in the textile industry by Mr. Solomon Barkin, of the Texile Workers Union of America, which I am earnestly requesting Members of Congress to study, the point is carefully documented that the fate of hundreds of thousand of workers has been utterly ignored while textile corporations have been mercilessly closed down or contracted by financial manipulations. I quote from Mr. Barkin:

The Senate of the United States investigated in 1948 the use of charitable trusts "as a means of tax avoidance and unfair competition with orthodox manufacturers." The inquiry conducted by the late Senater Tobey concentrated on the operations and "interrelations between certain so-called charitable trusts and Textron, Inc." However, the report properly underscores that "such use of trusts is not confined to this concern, but on the contrary, is a practice which is being indulged in to a large extent through the country by many concerns." The report concludes that "one of our largest textile manufacturing corporations and its subsidiaries has made wide use of so-called charitable trusts as a means of providing risk capital for itself." The result of these operations was to permit the corporation to purchase many textile mills and construct the giant manufacturing corporation of Textron, Inc., which as we have already shown, has subsequently acquired two other large corporations to create the immense Textron American, Inc. Through the fanciful use of these untaxed funds in the charitable trusts a dominant corporation was founded. (U. S. Senate, 81st Cong., 1st sess., Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, investigation of closing of Nashua, N. H., mills and operations of Textron, Inc., report No. 101).

While the tax laws have moderated the worst liberties taken with these funds, the control which individuals continue to exercise over these funds for the promotion of their own private purposes serves further to accelerate the merger and consolidation movement. These are truly public funds privately administered in questionable directions.

In the case of the Albert A. List operations, we shall illustrate further the use made of these charitable funds for financial manipulative purposes. A pension trust and the List charitable organizations owned two textile finishing plants at Jewett City, Conn., and Adams, Mass., of the United States Finishing Co., which have been acquired by the Gera Corp. This practice of selling physical assets to these charitable and educational trusts is becoming ever more common. Similarly, we learn that the Cannon Foundation developed by the Cannon family, which controls the Cannon Mills, has bought the Hoover Hosiery Mill. The list of textile compaies substantially dominated by such charitable foundations is quite impressive. Control is continued within the family group and new acquisitions of independent textile mills is facilitated by the large funds accumulated in these organizations. Serious problems of public importance are raised by these practices.

It is the responsibility of the Treasury Department to present all of these issues to the Congress and the people and not await congressional inquiries to gain enough courage to deal forthrightly on such issues. The Treasury Department required the Tobey hearings to bestir it, in the past. Another set of similar hearings should not be necessary to search out the uses of these funds for manipulative and tax avoidance purposes.

PENSION TRUSTS

What has been said of the charitable trusts is also applicable to the pension trusts. The funds available in pension trusts are growing to tremendous proportions. They are being controlled largely by industrialists and financiers. In some cases they are enabled to sell their own financial interests to the pension fund and maintain long-term management contracts and other advantages. These pension funds provide the funds and channels for mergers motivated by the desire for tax avoidance through the capital gains provisions of the tax laws. Mr. Royal Little controls several corporations acquired through the use of the pension funds maintained for Textron executives. Mr. Albert List has also made substantial use of these funds.

FINANCIAL OPERATORS

In addition to the above specific techniques, a number of individuals have developed a variety of manipulative devices for their enrichment at the expense of the workers and the community. They have acted as brokers of destruction. They have handled textile mills simply as treasuries of wealth to be mined for their own personal enrichment without concern for the ultimate effects upon the people who had been employed in them for generations. The traffic in mills has been continued with no concern for the welfare of the community. They were bought to be run, if at all, only until all the profit had been extracted and then abandoned. The financial manipulators have made a mockery of the trusteeship bestowed upon capital by society. They have exploited the tax loopholes to advance themselves at the expense of the United States Treasury, the workers, and the communities involved.

These men have bought mills to consolidate and destroy rather than to operate them. We hope that their operations will be closely investigated so that the appropriate laws will be passed and tax loopholes will be closed.

WHOLESALE TAX AVOIDANCE

Wholesale tax avoidance has been achieved by a variety of financical maneuvers including the use of collapsible corporations, split-ups and spin-offs. A chronological account of the transactions which have been publicly reported over the past 12 years is attached.

The results of these maneuvers may be summarized as follows:

(a) On an investment of $7 million in 1943, to which $2 million was added in 1953, List and associates have received nearly $53 million in cash and securities as a result of dividends and liqudations ($35 million in cash).

(b) The capital gains enjoyed by the group amount to approximately $35 million. Such income is taxable at markedly lower rates than ordinary income.

(c) The stockholders of National Refining Co. (the name of the enterprise in which List et al, invested $7 million in 1943) and successor companies, still retain securities with a book value of $3,670,000 and thereby control a corporation with assets of $29 million. This is in addition to securities which List and associates may have received from personal holdings of stock in liquidated corporations.

(d) In the process of pyramiding their investment, List et al. rode roughshod over the workers and communities involved in the plants whose securities they manipulated for their selfish interests. Nonquitt Mills, a textile plant employing 1,000 workers in New Bedford, Mass., was liquidated in 1949 by William Whitman Co., Inc., Massachusetts—a List enterprise—which owned the bulk of the Nonquitt capital stock. Nonquitt Mills had operated profitably since 1906, reporting earnings of $395,000 in the year before its liquidation, but the List group found it more lucrative to liquidate the plant and throw its workers out of jobs than to permit it to operate.

EIGHT THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED WORKERS THROWN OUT OF JOBS

(e) The William Whitman Co., Inc. (Mass.) had an excellent profit record, earning a total of more than $20 million, before taxes, in the 6 years ending November 30, 1952. Earnings before taxes during the 6-year period aggregated 128 percent of the net worth at the beginning of the period. And yet the List interests closed all 3 company mills in 1952, throwing 8,200 workers in Lawrence and New Bedford out of their jobs.

(f) Since late in 1952, when William Whitman Co., Inc., became the Carolet Corp. in order to take a tax loss on its change in name, List engaged in a series of transactions which transferred three additional corporations to his control: First the Aspinook Corp., with 2 textile plants; then the United States Finishing Co., with 3 textile plants, and finally, the Gera Corp., which had 1 large textile mill. Seven months after List acquired control over the United States Finishing Co., he closed 1 of its plants, displacing 250 workers in Sterling, Conn. Five months after gaining control over Gera Corp., he liquidated its mill with 2,000 workers in Passaic, N. J. Altogether, List has closed 6 textile plants in the past 6 years, throwing 11,450 workers out of their jobs. (Exhibit I, pt. A.)

(g) All of the List textile holdings have been consolidated in the Gera Corp. in order to take advantage of the loss-carryforward tax position which that firm had acquired previous to List's purchase and to which previous reference has been made.

But the above history of financial manipulation, subsequent consolidations, and frequent mill abandonments does not stand alone in the industry. Others have had a similar record. We have not prepared a detailed outline of their operations, but their manipulations have been extensive.

FATE OF MANY THOUSANDS HINGES ON FINANCIAL MANIPULATIONS

H. & B. Machine Co. sucked dry all the financial vitality of the Susquehanna Mills and then sold the physical assets. The United Industrial Syndicate, Inc. bought John H. Fead & Sons of Port Huron, Mich., and a few months later, closed the mills. The Overseas Discount Corp., engaged primarily in international trade, bought the Boott Mills and then closed it. The Horvath group has bought, operated and closed more than eight plants. Recently, they acquired the West Textile Mills in West, Tex., but announcement of its further sale has appeared in the newspapers. It acquired the Massachusetts Mohair Plush Co. of Lowell, Mass., the Dana Warp Corp. and the Profile Cotton Mills in Jacksonville, Ala. Detailed study of the latter's operations can further disclose how the abuse of the tax laws and financial manipulation have accelerated mill consolidations and concentration.

Big business is being advanced in the textile industry by persons seeking to exploit the immediate financial advantages gained primarily through the diversion of funds ordinarily destined for the Federal Treasury to the coffers of individual promoters or corporations. The result is an industrial structure with questionable economic justification. Even where ostensible economic

motives are present, the basic premise on which they are built; namely, the soundness of big business based upon product diversity and the averaging of risks, has not yet been proven in the textile industry. There is abundant evidence of the failings of bigness, as witness the collapse of several giant concerns in the past. The ability of big concerns to direct such diverse operations has not been established. We must be particularly careful, therefore, to remove special leverages, such as tax gains, which accelerate the trend toward the destruction of older organizations.

If these acts were only a matter of private concern relating to modest funds and affecting the lives of small groups of people, these ventures might be written off. But the fact is that there are hundreds of thousands of people involved in addition to huge tax funds and the very fate of many communities. The use of the tax system for promoting these ventures must be thoroughly investigated.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—Has Led To Destruction of Significant Know-How and Organizational Skill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in this seventh installment of Solomon Barkin's searching report on what is currently happening in the textile industry, one of the principal points that is made is that much significant manufacturing know-how has been destroyed or lost by consolidations motivated purely by financial consideration. This is of vital importance in an industry which is confronted with a shrinkage of demand and a rapidly changing shift in the type of product demanded by the public. Creativeness, a vital factor in stimulating textile sales, has been markedly lacking in most of big textile giants created by mergers, and so forth. I quote from Mr. Barkin's document:

The full impact of these mergers upon the industry cannot now be appreciated. The consolidations were motivated by opportunities for immediate profits, and only in some cases, for long-term goals. Personal drives for bigness must have been equally important in many cases. The soundness of the business judgment would be questioned in others. The effects upon the people, the communities, and the industry can be immediately appraised since the abandonment of mills and organizations has brought tremendous personal and social problems in their wake.

ACCELERATED MILL CLOSINGS

The merger movement has accelerated the early demise of many companies. A number of the managements, knowing the opportunities for sales and the tax advantages to the seller, did not face up to the possibilities for reconstruction. They conspired with the purchaser for the elimination of the mill organizations. The opportunities for rehabilitation are suggested by the few instances where public knowledge is available of merger negotiations which were not consummated and where the individual mills have subsequently worked out their own problems and continued their operations. But the many mills involved in mergers did not face up to this alternative.

The trail of mill desertions which have followed some of the financial manipulations is a most depressing one. We are attaching also a table showing the names of the 24 mills normally employing 21,300 workers, with 825,000 spindles and 15,800 looms, which the Textron interests have shut. Incidentally, we have been most conservative in the accrediting of such responsibility to this group. Also listed in this table are the liquidations by the Burlington Industries, which number 15, employing 6,400 persons, and representing 69,000 spindles and 2,000 looms.

These closing, of course, are not peculiar to these particular concerns. We have already referred to the liquidations which have followed the absorption of the A. D. Juilliard Co. by the United Merchants & Manufacturers; the closing of the Boott Mills by the Overseas Discount Corp.; the closing of the John L. Fead & Sons by the United Industrial Syndicate; the shutdown of the Goodall-Sanford operations in Sanford, Maine.

COMMUNITIES HARD HIT

The mill closings are not only disturbing because many shutdowns have no doubt been accelerated by the merger process, but also because they have been associated with considerable personal and community distress. In many instances the closed mills have been the mainstay of these communities for many generations. In some cases they have been the sole source of employment. The mill closing has meant that the communities have had to start to reorganize their economies and their employment pattern. This process is an extremely difficult one, particularly when such problems are numerous and duplicated in many communities in the same area. A number of the towns have tried to induce others to take up the mills and operate them again with community subsidies or finances. But the finances required to modernize a mill for active competition are most often beyond their resources. The despondency which these mill closings have created among the older population unable to move or to secure jobs within commutable distances has been described in a number of studies, e. g., William H. Miernyk, Inter-Industry Labor Mobility, Northeastern University, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, Boston, Mass., 1955.

The distress following these closings has generally not been alleviated either by separation pay or pensions or other serious financial tokens of appreciation for long service. People have been released by these mills to fend for themselves with only limited unemployment insurance and old-age pensions if they were of advanced age, or as a last resort, on community and family resources. Union contracts have in a few instances assured a modest termination pay. There are few pension programs in the textile industry and fewer which grant vested rights in pensions.

In contrast to the cold bloodedness associated with the abandonment of the workers and the community, the participants in the mergers have enjoyed attractive financial settlements either through stock exchanges or outright sale.

Tax avoidance has accelerated mergers and the Federal Treasury has, therefore, created a financial benefit out of the distress brought by mill liquidation. These private gains have never been shared with the workers.

BIGNESS HAS STIMULATED MILL MIGRATION

These mergers have also placed such areas as New England and other northern areas at a technical disadvantage. The new mill organizations, though not the finances, are now under the supervision of southern-oriented executives. Moreover, with so many of the mills of these giants located in the South, there is an additional impetus to consolidate holdings in the same region. The movement for northern mill closings has, therefore, been given additional strength. The new executives can rationalize the process as being required to effect better supervision and coordination. Bigness has in this instance advanced mill migration.

The transfer of mill properties through mergers has often led to the creation of interests not steeped in the textile industry or whose interests are primarily financial in character. They have looked upon the operation as primarily financial in character and, therefore, have not considered themselves responsible for new investment or modernization of the mill or other phases of the business. They have continued the operations while it suited their purposes to do so, and then abandoned them without any sense of responsibility to those who had worked in them or the communities which had depended upon them. Their own association has been too short to develop a true sense of obligation.

DESTRUCTION OF SIGNIFICANT KNOW-HOW AND ORGANIZATIONS

Some mergers raise serious questions concerning their economic justification. For example, the absorption of the Goodall-Sanford Corp. by Burlington has puzzled many. The organization had a special know-how in cloth production of mohair and mohair blends, a competence not widely possessed in this country, and was allied with a cutting organization which could supervise and be responsible for the cloth. All indications are that this know-how is being lost in the dispersion of orders through the former Pacific and Burlington Mills. Or, again, the Pacific Mills were known for their competent management, which had reorganized their properties into an effective and leading mill institution. Burlington Industries, Inc., apparently was not prepared with management to substitute for the existing operation and had to go outside to find new executives, both for this unit and for the entire venture. Unlike so many of the mergers in other industries, where the consolidation rests on a tried executive force, this company apparently had to collect one after the merger was consummated. Burlington's past history of executive turnover raises serious questions of its preparedness for this task.

Similar experiences have been observed in other instances. The financial motives have been dominant and when the new interests have taken over, the older staffs, particularly in merchandising and distribution have been destroyed. The dispersal of personnel has necessitated reorganization and rebuilding. The direct personal contacts were disrupted. While in some instances converter and sales organizations were bought to bring in established sales, they have been in the minority. With the low birth rate of new concerns in the industry, the older sensitivities to consumers have been submerged in the giant corporation. Perhaps this condition may be partially responsible for the loss of markets by the textile industry.

APPRAISAL OF THE NEW GIANT CONCERNS

The large, new concerns have not, by and large, made any outstanding contributions. An industry in need of outstanding leadership and invention to save it from its inertia and conservatism and to open new products and markets for it, cannot confidently speak of any special values offered by these big concerns. In fact, during the era of their existence the industry has failed to expand. Moreover, many striking records of manage-

ment failures are found among such giants as the American Woolen Co., the Robbins Mills, the old Botany Mills, the old Gera Mills, and A. D. Juilliard & Co. Large size brings with it the need for management especially competent for this challenge. Where it is unequal to this task, as in the above instances, the failures are more colossal and damaging.

PRICE POLICY

The effects on the market are difficult to appraise. Examination of the price structure would seem to suggest that there has been relatively less fluctuation in prices during recent years than before in earlier periods. A current study of price fluctuations in recent and previous decades indicates that this tendency is notable. This stability has been induced in part by the reduction in the range of fluctuations in the prices of the raw materials. But it must be also said that with the concentration of power in the hands of a smaller number of sellers, that there is a tendency for prices to become more stable.

PRODUCTION POLICY

The same control over production is also obvious. In prior decades reductions in production could only be effected through deliberate understandings. Such efforts failed in the period from 1930 through 1933. A concerted program was undertaken in 1938 and was successful when "97.5 percent of the (print cloth) mills which had operated a third shift within recent years * * * made declarations that they would eliminate the third shift by July 1, 1938." In 1939 similar efforts were again undertaken. The Government charged the print-cloth manufacturers with violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. After a 1-day hearing, they pleaded nolo contendre and were fined $100 each (Barkin, op. cit., p. 401).

No such open violations of the antitrust law are required now. In 1948–49 a successful reduction of production took place without obvious concert. The Journal of Commerce, in reviewing the curtailment in 1948–49, declared that "one of the very vital new factors in the textile industry is the demonstrated ability of cotton mills to make production adhere closely to actual demand." (Journal of Commerce, November 21, 1949.) In reviewing this experience the textile editor of this newspaper declared that "large production curtailments or cutbacks * * * provided a successful policy in 1949. * * * Most major producers curbed their output somewhat. In some cases, they resorted to complete shutdowns because of lack of visible business." (Journal of Commerce, January 31, 1950.)

Similar but less drastic curtailment was witnessed in subsequent years as demand declined.

EFFECT ON PRODUCTS

The effect of the present big business organizations upon styling of products is graphically described by the editor of the Journal of Commerce in an article entitled "Textile Industry Lags in Styling," March 18, 1955, as follows:

"Despite a rich background of materials to work with, and a wealth of engineering skills to back up the development of new ideas in styling, a great many of the fabrics produced today are not unlike the old constructions and colors our parents were familiar with. Frequently the only difference is that the modern versions have been 'watered down.'

"CREATIVENESS LACKING

"Especially in the United States, the cloth industry has been saddled with the system of mass production, which permits small latitude in specialization. The result has been that for many years the consuming public has been blessed with a plentitude of cheap fabrics which has made the American the most completely, if not the most stylish, clothed individual in the world.

"On the other hand, the failure of the textile industry to come up with enough new fabrics and fashions has a lot to do with its present condition."

FEW CONTRIBUTIONS TO RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

The large firms have not, except in few instances, made strikingly new products or innovations or contributions to research. The industry is still largely dependent upon the yarn producers for new ideas on fibers and raw materials; machinery manufactures for new equipment and chemical and finishing plants for new finishes. With rare exceptions, the mill organizations have been purveyors of other men's goods. The degree of innovation has been small. This situation is confirmed by the fact tht many fabrics have been introduced which have been disappointing to the consumer and the cutter because the mills have pushed new fibers, fabrics, and finishes without the requisite degree of responsibility. The industry has lost substantial markets, but has gained few new ones. It has seen substitutes displace it from areas it previously served without applying itself to regain them. Concerted research to hold these markets has been kept to a minimum. Textile giants have furrowed traditional grounds without breaking into new areas as has been true in other industries.

With the presence of so many large textile operations the industry is still awaiting the leadership and ingenuity from them which would open up a new area of expansion. Their continued unwillingness to ackowledge that the industry has been suffering while they have been entrenching themselves has been one major obstacle to the creation of an expanding industry.

The Merger Movement in Textiles—Anti-Labor Attitudes Intensified With Growth of Economic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in the final section of his noteworthy and painstaking analysis of the startling shifts in economic power in the textile industry, Mr. Solomon Barkin charges that anti-labor attitudes have been intensified as these giant corporations absorb larger and larger sections of productive capacity. I quote from Mr. Barkin:

In this era we must also become more conscious of the nonmarket uses of power. Management is employing this power to entrench itself. This financial power is, moreover, fortified by the provisions granting tax exemptions for educational and philanthropic grants. These they have increasingly employed to dominate communities and to influence the schools and colleges. We can declare quite categorically that many of the textile schools, particularly in the South, have been prevented by the large concerns from inviting labor speakers to the student body.

The use of the tax-exempt funds by the giant corporations to control and dominate our social, civic, and educational institutions is one which requires detailed study and appraisal. (See A Critique of Big Business, by Solomon Barkin, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, Dec. 30, 1954.)

ANTIUNION POLICIES

Another significant aspect of the implications of industrial concentration is the labor policies and practices of these large concerns. First, may I call your attention to the recent strike against Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc. and the Pepperell Manufacturing Co. We have peaceful and commendable relations with these concerns for more than a decade before the former was constructed as a merger. As soon as the merger was consummated, the attitude of the management toward the union changed and the new organization became the giant seemingly armed with a club to try to force wage reductions upon workers who were already receiving intolerably low wages (averaging $1.30 per hour).

Another illustration of the abuses of economic power to crush organized labor is provided by Mr. J. Spencer Love of Burlington Industries, Inc. He has an aversion for unions which is deep-seated and he enforces this attitude as he acquires new properties. He seems deliberately bent on preventing unions from arising at any of his plants and destroying them where they exist. We have won collective-bargaining elections in 18 of the mills but we have been unable to obtain any collective-bargaining contracts. He has fought this effort with four mill closings, with defiance of the War Labor Board, with prolonged negotiating sessions, with avoidance of legal responsibilities and with legal and economic pressures. When his workers move to form a union, every type of duress is applied to discourage their joining. Workers have been fired and intimidated. While the company has been willing to reinstate these employees when required by orders of the National Labor Relations Board, the prolonged battle has served the company's purpose of dampening the worker's ardor and discouraging the adhesion to the unions. Where plants were acquired with unions in them, they have been closed or decertification proceedings instituted. The entire economic power of this industrial giant is concentrated upon the destruction of independent collective action by its employees.

Burlington Industries, Inc. has recently acquired two plants with established union relations when it absorbed the Pacific Mills, one in Columbia, S. C., and the other in Lawrence, Mass. It is to be hoped that these long-established local unions will not have to fight the struggles of survival to satisfy Mr. Love's obsessive determination to have no truck with labor organizations in his own domain.

His rejection of unionism is so strong that he makes no effort to hide it. While he has had little contact with them, he is quite ready to declaim against unions as he did in a speech before the Spartanburg (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce in March of this year. He revealed his fear in this speech that the unions may ask his company, which presumably is one which he declares is "paying the best wages and giving the highest benefits," to pay higher wages and benefits. Despite his relatively more favorable competitive position and high profit rate he does not want to "pay much higher wages or give much greater benefits than the competition." To escape this possibility he launches a diatribe against unions. The request for higher wages he identifies as the "stirring up (of) strife within selected companies in the industry." Overlooking the overwhelming vote by workers in favor of union shops and the general acceptance of such provision through the length and breadth of the country, he condemns this provision as "compulsory unionism" and endorses the "right to work" laws. Instead of trying to work out a system of collective bargaining, he has preferred to wield the power to destroy unions so that he can completely dominate his employees and

assure himself the unchallenged power to hand out benefits and orders as he sees fit, denying the employees the established legal rights to union organization and collective bargaining.

The above anti-union attitudes are unfortunate since they inhibit the development of true collective bargaining. They preserve employer domination and archaic systems of industrial relations.

WORKERS DEPRIVED OF BENEFITS OF HIGH PRODUCTIVITY

The result of this system has been to keep wages and fringe benefits in the textile industry at low levels and to deprive workers of the fruits of higher productivity and advancing technology. Since 1950, the textile workers have not received any improvement in their wage standards or economic benefits. In 1951 the southern textile giants, acting in collusion, defeated the union in a strike, and thereafter, have used their powers to prevent any further economic advances by their employees. Now we find Mr. Love declaring for a 90-cent Federal minimum wage while he is paying higher wages, and asserting that the only way in which wages and improvements should come is through legislation. This is a strange position indeed for an apostle of "free enterprise" in a Nation where the law of the land and the spirit of our economic systems is to provide the right of self-organization to workers and to advance collective bargaining with a minimum of Government interference.

CONCLUSION

Big business has been stimulated by opportunities for great profit in the textile industry through the exploitation of fabric shortages during and immediately after the war and the utilization of tax loopholes throughout the entire postwar period. The industrial giants have grown primarily through mergers and acquisitions rather than internal growth. They have not stimulated the expansion of the industry or found new outlets for its products. Some large organizations have shown ineptitude and incompetence and have brought ruin in their wake. Others have established only mediocre records. While few have made outstanding economic contributions to the industry or proven their real worth, they have been able to grow because of the bargaining power within the market which has enabled them to preempt significant outlets and push out the independent mills. They have had advanages in price and new raw materials and finishes which have enabled them to keep ahead. But they have not measured up to the most important tests of helping the industry expand and prosper. The result has been that they have increasingly controlled the remaining textile market.

The major impetus to these mergers has been tax loopholes of various types. These must be closed so that mergers, if they occur, shall truly respond to economic advantage rather than the private gain of financial manilpulators at the expense of the public treasury.

The management of big companies is a public trust. These vast accumulations control much of the wealth of this country. They must not be permitted to despoil it solely for private benefit, particularly when in so doing they dissipate American know-how, creative organizations and accumulated experience and bring misery to dependent communities and thousands of American worksrs. They must account for their acts. It is therefore urged that the Federal Government provide for the incorporation of all large corporations and establish a supervisory agency which regularly reviews their conduct either on its own initiative or on the petition of the citizenry.

Need for Adequate Veteran Hospitalization Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a letter from David L. Brigham, vice commander, the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., calling attention to the vital need for additional hospitalization facilities for our veterans. The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, INC.,
July 29, 1955.

Mr. RICHARD E. LANKFORD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANKFORD: We of the American Legion, and in particular those of the southern Maryland district, whom I represent, are deeply concerned with the vital need for adequate veteran hospitalization facilities in the Washington metropolitan area.

Of particular interest is the fact there are an estimated 285,000 to 300,000 veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea living in an area which includes the District of Columbia, Fairfax and Arlington counties in Virginia, the city of Alexandria and the Maryland counties of Montgomery and Prince George. Of this number, 30,000 have service incurred disabilities, many of which will require future hospitalization.

This area is now served by Mount Alto hospital which has only 300 beds available and is an extremely inadequate and obsolete facility. This was formerly a girls' school and was taken over in 1921 by the United States Veterans Bureau to provide badly needed hospitalization for a much smaller number of veterans than now populate our area. It is my understanding that even the Veterans' Administration feels Mount Alto is obsolete and any expenditure for repairs or remodeling would involve a gross waste of Federal funds.

I would also mention that many of the veterans in the area will require hospital service in the future to which they are legally entitled because their personal funds will be inadequate. While I am primarily concerned with the immediate problem of the Washington metropolitan area, I would also point out that from the standpoint of Maryland veterans, relief is needed for the Fort Howard and Perry Point hospitals. Additional facilities in this area would relieve the pressure at these other points and would further assure many veterans who now need hospitalization, an opportunity to receive the attention which would once again make them useful assets to the community and to our country.

We of the American Legion will be most happy to work with you in every possible way to bring to a full realization, an adequate structure, properly located, to serve the men who did not hesitate to serve the Nation.

With sincere appreciation I am,
Cordially,

DAVID L. BRIGHAM,
Vice Commander, Department of Maryland.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to report to my constituents, the people of Berks County, the 14th District of Pennsylvania.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report deals with the work and the record of the 84th Congress and summarizes my activities, the position which I have taken on important national issues. I realize that my legislative record will not please every one of my constituents in every respect. That is to be expected in a democracy, where each of us has the right to his own opinion—a right that we must always respect and safeguard.

I sincerely believe that the voters have the right to know how their Representatives stand on issues of importance to all Americans. For that reason, I have made a weekly radio report on the activities of Congress and submit this summary report. I have conscientiously tried to keep the people of Berks County informed and to represent them honestly and well. In all of my actions I have tried to do what I thought was in the public interest and what would promote the greatest good for the greatest number of our people.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

During the 84th Congress I have served on two committees. One is the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on which I have served ever since coming to Congress. My other committee assignment has been the House Administration Committee, which has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the management of the House of Representatives and the House side of the Capitol. This committee also has jurisdiction over the expenditures of funds for House investigating committees.

ATTENDANCE

During this session my 98-percent-attendance record was again one of the highest in the Congress. A perfect attendance was marred by my absence one afternoon due to conflicting duties.

CASEWORK

Many individual cases and problems are handled by my office in behalf of my constituents. They include veterans' problems, hardship cases among servicemen, immigration cases, social-security and postal-service complaints, railroad retirement problems, and many other miscellaneous types of problems which arise between a citizen and his Government. It is a service which my office renders as promptly as possible with fairness and courtesy to all. I have endeavored to give every possible assistance to those seeking my aid and counsel. It is a distinct privilege to be of service to all

of my constituents whom I have the honor of representing in Congress.

WASHINGTON VISITS

It has been my pleasure to welcome many individual citizens and groups from Berks County on their visits to Washington. With the assistance of Mrs. Rhodes, I have tried to make their visits interesting, educational, and enjoyable. A visit to Washington to see our Government in action is one of the best ways for people to truly understand the priceless heritages of freedom and democracy which we enjoy. Numerous student groups, boy and girl scouts, women's and religious groups came to Washington from Berks County this past year.

COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

As part of my congressional duties during the session, I have appeared before various House Committees to offer testimony on various legislation. They have included such subjects as problems in the procurement of defense contracts for small businesses in Berks County, problems of retail gasoline dealers, investigation of economic difficulties of the textile industry, and minimum wage legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE

I have taken part in important degates on the floor of the House and discussed such questions as foreign trade policy, postal-pay legislation, foreign policy, student exchange program, Salk vaccine, farm-price-support legislation, Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, social-security amendments, public housing, and minimum-wage legislation.

SURPLUS FOOD PROGRAM

Along with other members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, I sought a reversal of the Agriculture Department's order to curtail the scope of the surplus food disposal program among the needy people of Berks County and the State of Pennsylvania. We were successful in convincing Agriculture Department officials that the humanitarian operation of the program should be continued.

DEMOCRATIC COOPERATION WITH ADMINISTRATION

Democrats in Congress have maintained a responsible, constructive opposition to the Eisenhower administration, supporting and strengthening Administration proposals which we believed in the public interest and opposing those measures which benefit the privileged few at the expense of the welfare of all. I did not approve of resorting to blind and irresponsible opposition simply for political reasons. I voted with or against the administration solely on the merit of the question under consideration.

A summary of the administration's legislative record through June 1955 shows that Democrats supplied the margin of victory for the President on all 18 House rollcalls where his program was successful. Democrats in both House and Senate supported the President's foreign policy to a greater extent than did members of his own party. House Democrats supported his foreign policy on 69 percent of the votes cast while Republicans compiled only a 49 percent record of support.

My own voting record through June 1955 shows that I supported the President on 52 percent of all rollcall votes and opposed his position on 48 percent. On foreign policy votes I supported his position 70 percent of the time.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

The 84th Congress took some important strides forward but the progress was not what should have been made to successfully meet the challenge of automation, abundance and surpluses.

The average citizen did not properly share in the prosperity created by increased production, scientific and technical advances.

Those of us who wanted to channel some of this prosperity to aged, retired, disabled and handicapped citizens were in a minority. We wanted to aid these people through the enactment of legislation to expand and improve social security and retirement programs. We urged improved service in Federal regulatory and inspection activities to protect the consumers and the public. In part we were successful. But in numerous cases monopoly restrictions were weakened or removed and had the effect of aiding monopoly interests at the expense of the average citizen. Small business also suffered because of the advantages won by monopoly interests. I joined with other liberal members in an effort to aid wage earners, small farmers and white collar folks but we were in a minority because a number of southern Democrats joined with administration leaders to defeat our proposals.

This conservative coalition controlled the 84th Congress and watered down or blocked numerous progressive measures which liberal Members considered essential for the well-being and prosperity of the average citizen and his family. Listed below are some of the important proposals acted upon by the 84th Congress:

Taxes: I favored the proposal for an increase in income-tax exemption. As a compromise the House voted a $20 per person tax reduction. While passed by the House, administration opposition in the Senate killed the effort for tax relief for low-income groups.

Social security: I voted for improvements in the social-security law to reduce the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 years of age and to permit disabled workers to draw benefits at age 50 instead of age 65. Coverage was also extended to most professions. I introduced legislation calling for even more liberal social-security amendments. The bill which passed the House is stalled until next session due to administration opposition in the Senate.

Housing: I supported legislation to provide a program of slum clearance and urban redevelopment and decent public housing and housing assistance for aged persons. The House rejected the public and aged housing provisions and an inadequate program was finally approved in the final version of the bill. It authorized 45,000 public housing units in the next year, eliminating the aged housing provisions.

Trade program: The President proposed an extension of the trade program to help expand our foreign trade, create new markets for our manufactured goods, and stimulate employment opportunities. The bill was enacted by the Congress and had overwhelming Democratic support.

Farm price supports: The House passed a bill to restore high, rigid price supports for basic farm commodities. I voted against the bill because I was convinced that a majority of Berks County farmers were in favor of the flexible support system. The Senate did not act on the measure during this session. In my opinion the real solution to declining farm income lies in an expanding, full-employment economy which will benefit all Americans.

Railroad retirement: A bill to liberalize the benefits to railmen's wives and widows was enacted. It will also place staff positions on the Railroad Retirement Board under civil service. I voted for the bill. I made a number of proposals to improve the law, some of which were adopted.

Antitrust law penalties: A bill was passed increasing penalties under the Sherman antitrust law from $5,000 to $50,000. I gave it my support in the hope that this will help small business and discourage the monopoly trend in this country.

Debt limit: The administration's request to increase the limit of the national debt was approved. In protest against deceptive promises to balance the budget and decrease the national debt, I joined the minority in voting against lifting the debt ceiling. Furthermore, I objected to some of the fiscal policies which put an added burden on the average citizen and which increased the national debt.

Highways: The administration's bond financing proposal was defeated because it would have cost over $11 billion in interest rates alone. No agreement could be reached on a highway bill this session. Everyone seems to want better roads but no one wants to pay for them. The pay-as-you-go bill seemed to be a practical approach, but many Members thought the financial end of the program should be handled by experts on the House Ways and Means Committee. A highway program is most essential and Congress will most likely pass some legislation to meet the problem in the next session.

School construction: Action on much-needed Federal aid for school construction was delayed until next year. A good bill was reported by the committee after the administration's bond-financing bill was rejected. Action will be taken on this important issue next session.

Natural gas: The bill to exempt producers of natural gas from Federal regulation, despite a decision of the Supreme Court to the contrary, was passed by the House by a narrow margin. If enacted into law, this bill will cost the American consuming public an estimated $800 million a year in higher gas rates, about $41 million of which would come out of the

pockets of Pennsylvanians. I thought this was another example of how this Congress was neglecting the interest of the average citizen and I opposed the bill.

GIVEAWAY PROGRAMS

Administration opponents opposed what they called a wholesale giveawey program which started in the 83d Congress. The watchful eyes of Congress have now been turned to flagrant abuses of the public trust in various departments and agencies of our Government.

House and Senate investigating committees have focused public attention on a number of examples of activities in behalf of the special interests at the expense of the public welfare. Administration opponents in this Congress have succeeded in blocking the so-called "giveaway" trend started in the 83d Congress with tidelands oil, atomic energy, public power, and priceless natural resources rightfully belonging to the people.

DIXON-YATES

The infamous Dixon-Yates deal, still under investigation by a congressional committee, was canceled after nationwide public protests and congressional revelations. Cancellation was made only after disclosures in the case implicated the President's own White House assistant.

Had the Dixon-Yates deal succeeded, it would have struck a death blow at the Tennessee Valley Authority which played such an important role in providing the power necessary to forge the tools of victory in World War II. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER led the successful fight against the administration's Dixon-Yates deal. He charged that power monopolies make no secret of their desire to eliminate TVA, thus abolishing the yardstick of power rates which have kept rates reasonable.

HOOVER COMMISSION

Under the guise of promoting efficiency in Government the Commission headed by former President Herbert Hoover has recommended sweeping cutbacks in programs and services provided in New and Fair Deals reform legislation. The Commission has urged crippling reductions in the Veterans' Administration program for needy and disabled veterans, and has recommended proposals to weaken the civil-service merit system. It has proposed cutbacks in Government lending activities for small business, in home loans and farm loans and has urged elimination of public power projects.

I have opposed waste and inefficiency in Government but I have also opposed efforts of Mr. Hoover to destroy essential legislation under the guise of economy.

REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Presidential appointments to the various regulatory Commissions have shown a shocking disregard of the public interest. These Commissions have the duty to protect the American people against exorbitant utility rates, fraudulent stocks, false advertising, monopolistic practices, and render other similar important services.

A disturbing pattern of appointments has developed. Individuals who have come out of the ranks of the businesses regulated under the law have been named to regulatory commissions. One lawyer who spent his life arguing cases before a commission in behalf of large companies was named as chairman of the very same commission. Officials with long records of devoted service in safeguarding the public interest have been quietly shown the door.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Many of us in Congress have expressed great concern over the appointment of so many men to key positions in executive departments where they could exercise policymaking authority affecting companies and businesses with which they had formerly been associated. Use of official position for private gain cannot be condoned, whatever the particular circumstances.

Examples of a conflict of interest have revealed the cases of so-called dollar-a-year men from private industry on loan to the Government actually negotiating defense contracts with their own companies.

Still another case has revealed that a Pentagon official making important oil policy decisions has been receiving two salaries—one from the Government and one from an oil company where he is a vice president.

SALK VACCINE

I have been deeply concerned about the manner and attitude of department heads in the handling of the Salk polio vaccine program. Millions of Americans hailed the discovery of the Salk vaccine as the long-awaited preventative to the crippling polio disease. The confusion, delay, and lack of proper vaccine-testing procedures was most unfortunate. Secretary Hobby had to face the responsibility because her opposition to Government-sponsored wholesale vaccination of all children. Those of us who favored a strong Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were concerned because of Secretary Hobby's general attitude toward health, education, and welfare programs. Her last act before resigning her Cabinet post was to ask a Senate committee to delay action in improving the social security law. Although she was highly praised by the President, she was most influential in preventing favorable action this year on a social security bill which many of us consider most essential.

MILITARY MEN IN CIVILIAN POSTS

I have become increasingly alarmed at the great number of retired generals and admirals who have been appointed to key positions in the Eisenhower administration, positions which have historically been occupied by civilians. Many other top military men have recently been named to top executive posts in companies having extensive defense contract business with the Government. This is a dangerous trend. Ours is a Government of civilian authority; the military must always remain in a strictly subordinate position if our historic concepts of government are to be maintained.

SMALL BUSINESS

The administration has been conspicuous in ignoring the needs and problems of small businesses, while removing restrictions on big monopolies. Consistently underbid in defense contracts, small businesses have felt the pinch of monopolistic competition, aggravated by high taxes and reduced purchasing power among great segments of our population.

NEWS CENSORSHIP

Members of Congress as well as newspaper editors and writers have become alarmed over the recent trend in the administration to suppress legitimate news stories concerning vital subjects of interest to the American people. While conceding that security reasons are not involved, administration leaders have repeatedly withheld information which they felt might prove embarrassing if made known to the public. A congressional investigating subcommittee will soon begin hearings on this police-state method of news censorship which is so alien to our system of Government.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

Much yet remains to be done in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. Such issues as social security and retirement legislation, aid and opportunity for handicapped persons, public housing, school construction, highway legislation and other important legislation requires further action.

The real challenge of the future is the challenge of abundance. A way must be found to channel our productive genius in the fields of manufactured goods and farm commodities into the hands of the millions of Americans now existing on meager pensions, substandard diets, in dilapidated slum housing, the children attending inadequate schools, growing up amid poverty and disease on a standard of living which is shameful in this great land of abundance.

We must initiate policies to establish a full employment, expanding economy to provide more jobs at decent wages. We must have increased purchasing power in the hands of our neglected, low-income families and our old folks so that they can afford to buy the manufactured goods and farm surpluses which bulge from our warehouses and storage bins.

Despite the fact that production and profits are at an all time high, many millions of our citizens are in want for the basic necessities of life. Unemployment in many areas continues at unnecessarily high levels. The cost of living remains high and continues to be a hardship on unemployed workers, their families, and the millions of our retired senior citizens who struggle to exist on inadequate pensions or social-security benefits.

We must break the grip of monopoly which feeds on scarcity. We must drive the fear of abundance from our land. Abundance for all citizens need not mean lower profits for our industries. On the contrary it could mean even greater expansion and greater prosperity in which all would share.

There were other important issues before the Congress. Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, which I supported, was rejected. I opposed the sale of Government-owned rubber plants for a small fraction of their real worth.

In a brief report it is not possible to completely tell the full story of this session of Congress. I will therefore make myself available, without expense, to any group in Berks County which desires me to speak, answer questions or debate on issues of national importance.

Contact my Reading or Washington office with any such requests or on any matter in which you may be interested.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address by the Honorable Robert H. Montgomery at Faneuil Hall, Boston, on June 13, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, this address by Mr. Montgomery is an outstanding contribution to the many arguments that have been made in support of the Bricker amendment, now pending in this Congress.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(An address by Robert H. Montgomery, Faneuil Hall, Boston, June 13, 1955)

The subject for our discussion tonight is the Bricker amendment.

This is an appropriate place for that discussion. Long ago Wendell Phillips, speaking from this platform, said: "When liberty is in danger Faneuil Hall has the right, it is her duty, to strike the keynote for these United States."

I do not claim that I am the most appropriate person to strike that keynote. One qualification I do have. I am old enough to remember when in this country liberty and the rights of men were not in danger. The America I knew in 1910, when I came of age, was still the America described by Carl Schurz, a refugee from European tyranny, who wrote in 1853:

"Here in America you can see daily how little a people needs to be governed. There are governments, but no masters; there are governors, but they are only commissioners, agents. What there is here of great institutions of learning of, churches, of great commercial institutions, lines of communication, etc., almost always owes it existence, not to official authority, but to the spontaneous cooperation of private citizens. Here you witness the productiveness of freedom. * * * We learn here how superfluous is the action of governments concerning a multitude of things in which in Europe it is deemed absolutely indispensable, and how the freedom to do something awakens the desire to do it."

That was the America I and many of you knew—a land of individual opportunity and individual responsibility, where God-fearing men and women lived and worked and worshiped in freedom—a land to live in, a land to live for, a land to die for—an America that is now in deadly peril.

Our subject has to do with the Constitution of the United States. You will have to listen to some lawyer talk, but it is not a dry, legalistic subject. The argument that I make is not a dry, legalistic one. It is a logical argument; it is a sound argument, but it is no less sound because for you and for me it is touched with deep human emotions, with love of country, with love of liberty, with devotion to religion.

This is the only place on earth where an individual can force his government to respect his rights.

This is the only place on earth where the powers of government are limited by a constitution that means something.

Other countries have what are called constitutions. Everyone has heard of the British Constitution, which is not a constitution at all, but the negation of one—a jumble of traditions, maxims, slogans, and a "thick husk of legal fictions" that are supposed to restrain Parliament in its legislation. They do not impose an enforceable limitation on its power. Parliament is supreme. Parliament need not respect the rights of an individual. It may do so in reliance on the unwritten constitution, but there is nothing the individual can do about it if it fails to do so.

The Joyce case is an example. During World War II, Joyce broadcast from Germany utterances that in the mouth of a British citizen were treason. The British called him Lord Haw Haw. After the war they brought him to trial for treason. At the time of his alleged crime it was the law that he could not be convicted except by the testimony of at least two witnesses to an overt act of treason. One witness would not do. It developed that the broadcast upon which the case depended was heard by only one witness who could identify the voice. Parliament then acted. It abolished the rule about the necessity of two witnesses and made one witness enough. British lawyers, regardless of their feeling about his guilt, were shocked by this violation of the British Constitution, but the court had to accept the act as the law, and Joyce was convicted and hanged. This happened under the British Constitution. It could not have happened under ours, because our Congress cannot validly enact what is known as an ex post facto law. That means that Congress could not have changed the rules of evidence in this case after the alleged crime had been committed. If Congress had attempted to make the change, the court would have declared the attempt void because unconstitutional, and Joyce would not have been convicted. He as an individual would have been able to force his government to respect his rights.

I say that this could not happen here. What I mean is that it could not happen here by an act of Congress or at all as we understood the Constitution until lately. It could happen here under the treaty power as now interpreted by the Supreme Court. The President, by an interchange of letters with another country, could have changed this rule and deprived the defendant of a constitutional right which would have saved his life, or any other constitutional right that he had.

That is why we need the Bricker amendment.

Our Constitution was drafted by men who had lived under absolute governments. They had experienced the tyranny of an absolute government. They had fought a revolution to overthrow tyranny and establish liberty—they had risked their lives and their fortunes and pledged their sacred honor in the cause of that revolution. They saw to it that the philosophy, the wisdom, the commonsense, and the religious faith of the Revolution became incarnate in the Constitution. The French Revolution was soon to slip into atheism, despotism, and despair. Our Revolution put its ideals down on paper and built a scheme of government that could preserve them—a government free from impractical utopianism on the one hand and mass robbery and murder on the other—formed with political good sense and in the fear of God.

There are men who scoff at the Founding Fathers and find them faintly amusing. These men are also tender of traitors and contemptuous of patriotism. They are ashamed of America. They do not put America's interests first as point I instead of point V. For them it is considered a devastating appraisal of Senator Taft to say that he had the best mind of the 18th century. Of course, that was a tremendous compliment. In the fields of government and statecraft the 18th century mind was the greatest mind of all the centuries and our Founding Fathers who met to draft the Constitution had the greatest minds of that century. Benjamin Franklin was one of them. The 250th anniversary of his birth will be celebrated January 17 next. He was only one of the great men who assembled to draft our Constitution, but he understood it as well as any of them. When the drafting was completed, someone asked him, "What have you given us?" He answered, "A republic, if you can keep it." Have we kept it? We have almost lost it. We are fighting a rear guard action. The Bricker amendment is the last stand.

The Constitution which Gladstone called "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man" came from many sources—from England, from Scotland, from Ireland, from Holland, from France, from the classics, from Blackstone, from the Bible, and from the American Genius itself. It came from the lang thoughts of hard-working lonely pioneers who cherished freedom above all earthly gifts—above security, above peace. Theirs were the "giant hands who from the womb of the world tore the Republic."

The central, unifying, illuminating principle of the Revolution and the Constitution is religious. That is why Marxism which must destroy religion must first destroy the Constitution. William Penn said: "Those people who will not be governed by God will be governed by tyrants." He could have said: "Those people who will be governed by God will not be governed by tyrants." The Communists and the fascists know that. Mussolini said that he came to power because the people were tired of liberty. Communism, which is the essence of tryanny, cannot exist in a free land—a free land can only exist when it is governed by God. In the Bible you will find this text: "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Our Revolution recognized that men are the children of God, not mechanical-chemical compounds, not robots. It recognized that the God who created man endowed him with certain inalienable rights, amongst them life and liberty. It recognized that government is made to protect those gifts which God has given to man. No unlimited government can do that. That is why we had the Constitution. That is why we need to save it. That is why we need the Bricker amendment.

The problem presented to the Founding Fathers was not easy. It was necessary to create a central government of adequate powers. It was even more necessary to limit the powers of that government. Many centuries ago Plato and Aristole said the powers of government must be limited if men are to be free. This has been repeated throughout the centuries. One of the best statementss of it was by Woodrow Wilson, who said: "The history of liberty is a history of limitations of government power, not the increase of it."

It is worth our while to examine our Constitution and study with care the limitations on the powers of government whereby a republic conceived in liberty was brought fourth.

The Constitution created what was intended to be an indestructible Union of indestructible States. The States remained sovereign States. It was Hamilton's idea that we should have a unitary Nation in which the States would be administrative agencies only. That idea did not prevail. The fourth article of our own Massachusetts Constitution defined the position of our Commonwealth in the constitutional system in words which are now only rhetoric:

"The people of this Commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves, as a free, sovereign, and independent State; and do, and forever hereafter shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not, or may not hereafter, be by them (expressly) delegated to the United States of America in Congress assembled."

We fought a war to prove that the Union was indestructible, but we have permitted the States to be destroyed with hardly a murmur of revolt.

How was the destruction of the States accomplished? The first and most important step was the adoption of the income-tax amendment, effective in 1913, giving Congress the power to tax incomes, which has been interpreted to extend also to the taxation of capital gains, gifts, and inheritances. No State can long continue as a free and sovereign State when there is a superior sovereign who can, by taxation, destroy all property and income and can even destroy the income and property of State officers and State judges.

The second step in the destruction of the States was the extension by the Supreme Court of the United States of the concept of interstate and foreign commerce. It was necessary for the Federal Government to be given the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, and the States readily conceded that; otherwise, intolerable, situations would have arisen. It was not necessary and it was not intended that the Federal power should extend to every part of our economic activity and would regulate all manufacturing, agriculture, insurance, banks, local communications, labor relations, wages, and prices—all in the name of commerce.

The Supreme Court has held that an elevator operator who was born in New York, had never taken his elevator anywhere except up and down, certainly had never taken it across the State line, was in interstate commerce so that his wages and hours of labor could be regulated by the Federal Government. The reason given was that one of the tenants in the building was engaged in manufacturing pants that were sold across the State line in New Jersey.

The Supreme Court also decided that a farmer in Ohio who raised wheat to be consumed on his own farm by his own hogs who were also consumed on his own farm by his own family was in interstate commerce and could be restrained from growing more wheat than was permitted to him by a quota imposed by a Federal agency.

How free is this country when a landowner cannot grow his own food except with the permission of a Federal bureaucrat?

The third revolution in the Constitution came from another extension of the power of taxation. As written, Congress had the power to levy taxes for the common defense and the general welfare. As now interpreted, the words general welfare mean anything that Congress decides is for the welfare of the country. From this broadened concept Congress has the power to tax you and me for the building of houses and schools in Alabama and grain elevators in Pakistan, the payment of old-age pensions to persons who are neither veterans nor public employees, the publishing of newspapers in Germany, the financing of socialism in England, and practically anything that an imaginative do-gooder can think of. By the exercise of this power, Congress can take from the citizens of Massachusetts an unlimited percentage of their incomes and property and use the proceeds for other States or for other countries.

The fourth step in the destruction of the States was the interpretation by the Supreme Court whereby the first 10 amendment to the Federal Constitution were applied to the States. These first 10 amendments were adopted as limitations on the power of the Federal Government and are often called the Federal Bill of Rights. There were several liberty-loving States that were wise enough to fear the tryranny of a central government and would not ratify the Constitution until they were assured in writing that the fundamental liberties of the State and the individual would be protected. No one until recently ever supposed that these amendments would restrict the States themselves. They are not worded that way. They are worded to prevent Federal action. The Supreme Court has now, however, decided that by the adoption of the 14th amendment after the Civil War the first 10 amendments were made applicable to the States. It is because of this decision that the States are now deprived of their powers in the fields of education, religion, and personal rights that everyone supposed they had.

Some people interpret what has happened to the States and to our Constitution as part of a plan or plot to prepare the country for international socialism—a world state with a Marxist constitution. Let us be content to call it a series of coincidences.

This series of coincidences had a great deal to do with a man named Karl Marx. Karl Marx is not my favorite character. He was a hater. He hated all mankind. In particular, he hated Jews, despised Negroes, and held all Christians in contempt. He preached class hatred and advocated murder and violence. He did not reason well or honestly. He did not understand what men live by. He did not understand what are the enduring values and the everlasting verities. No Marxist does; nothing infuriates him so much as an argument that in any system of government or economics the best as well as the worst of human nature must be reckoned with.

In 1848 Karl Marx issued the Communist Manifesto. This contains 10 points regarded as preliminary objectives to be accomplished before the governments of the world are overthrown by force and violence and the dictatorship of the proletariat is established.

Not one of these preliminary objectives could have been accomplished in the United States under the Constitution as it stood in 1848 or in 1910. Now every one of them can be accomplished by legislation or by treaty. Some of them have already been accomplished completely; the others are well along.

There is probably a difference of opinion among you as to the desirability of some of the economic points of the Marxian program. I think they are all evil. However that may be, there can be no argument about the tenth point, which concerns personal rights and liberty and does not involve economic considerations.

The tenth point sounds very innocent indeed. It reads: "Free education for all children in public schools."

Now, no one is going to say that we should not have public schools or that they should not be free. The catch to this point is the requirement that all children should be educated in public schools. Remember, it is intended that those schools will be godless and will provide education barren of every spiritual value and of patriotism. Prof. Allan Nevins of Columbia has given this show away. He wants to take what he calls the poision out of thte public school textbooks. What is the poison? Anything that glorifies America, patriotism, or nationalism.

In America we once had no doubt that if we sent all of our children to school for a sufficient time they would be good, useful and loyal citizens. Now our faith is shaken by delinquent youth, foolish voters, and disloyal eggheads. Was there something the matter with our theory or is the matter with what we call education? Some will think the latter is true. You will recall Kipling's Lama who wrote that "Education, if of the best sort, is the greatest blessing; otherwise no earthly good."

In the early days of the Republic, education was, with negligible exception, an individual, family, or church responsibility Presbyterian and Puritan children who learned their letters at a dame school or at home were expected to know their catechism, to be familiar with their Bible, to keep the Sabbath, to fear God, to keep a good conscience, with industry and economy to be independent, and at last to die Christianly. Similar standards applied everywhere and in all denominations.

For secondary education, groups of neighbors combined and employed schoolmasters. In many places, church schools, classical academies, and sectarian colleges were founded and supported with private funds. In every case the instruction was designed primarily to promote piety, religion, and morality.

It was never supposed that the Federal Government should have anything to say about the education of the child. It was never supposed that a State could not permit religion to be taught. As Dean Manion has demonstrated, the constitutions of all the States were rooted in religion. Harvard College was Christian in its origin and its original objectives. In the language of our Massachusetts constitution which created the corporation of Harvard College, the arts and sciences and all good literature were encouraged because such encouragement tended to the honor of God, the advantage of the Christian religion, and the qualification of students for public employment in the church as well as in the State.

State control of education and religion presented a serious problem for the Marxists, who to succeed in their plan for world domination must destroy religion. This necessarily implies the destruction of church schools as well as churches, and explains why all children must be educated in public schools and why all public schools must be godless.

It would not do for the Marxists to deal with 48 States. That would be slow. Dealing with the Federal Government was much simpler and quicker.

But how could the Federal Government get into the fields of education and religion, which under the Constitution belonged exclusively to the States without any prohibition or limitation?

This is how it was done.

The first amendment reads in part as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The 10th amendment:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Nothing could be plainer than this. The States had not delegated anything to the United States about religion and about the education of their inhabitants. Nothing had been prohibited to the States on these subjects. They could establish a religion, they could favor one religion over another, they could prohibit the free exercise of religion. So of education—they could have public schools, no schools, private schools, no private schools, segregated schools, desegregated schools, religion in schools, no religion in schools, just as they wanted. It was up to them and to their constitutions because they were sovereign States who had reserved all their powers in these fields.

Now came one of the coincidences. Someone with this particular ax to grind discovered the 14th amendment, which contains this language:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of

law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

"Ha," said that someone, "here is a way to destroy religious instruction in all the public schools. All we need do is to get the courts to decide that the 14th amendment makes the first amendment applicable to the States and that teaching religion is the establishment of a religion." And so they did, and it wasn't very hard, for the courts have been extremely sympathetic throughout the past 20 years.

Out in Illinois there was a statute permitting the teaching of religion an hour a week in the public schools. The system was a voluntary one and no child could attend the classes without the consent of his parents. There were separate classes for different religions. The Catholic children were taught by a priest, the Jewish children by a rabbi, and the protestant children by a protestant minister. The Supreme Court of the United States said that this was something that the State could not do. It was a law respecting an establishment of religion. Therefore, they said, since Congress could not have passed such a law under the first amendment and since the first amendment now applies to the States, the State could not do so.

They really did that—eight of them. One dissenter wondered how the majority could justify a chapel at West Point or a chaplain in the Navy. Isn't it clear that the chapel and the chaplain are doomed? I wonder how a State can be permitted under this decision to grant tax exemptions to privately operated schools that teach religion or to churches? Withdrawal of tax exemption would result in the destruction of many church schools of many denominations. Remember, compelling everyone to be educated in secularized public schools is still the objective. A State could do it. I do not see how Congress can. It can be accomplished by use of the treaty power.

With these revolutions in the Constitution, the sovereign States were destroyed and what is left is a unitary Nation that Hamilton wanted with all governmental power concentrated in Washington.

What we had left was a Nation, not a union of States. Is it still the Nation conceived in liberty that we bargained for in the Constitutional Convention? We have seen that it has taken over almost all the powers that were retained by the States so that it is now for all practical purposes a sovereignty of full and plenary jurisdiction.

With the division of powers and with the limitations on the legislative power contained in the Constitution and the Federal Bill of Rights, tyranny was made impossible. Or so we thought.

As time went on, it appeared that many reforms and expenditures which many men thought desirable could not be accomplished or made under the system of the Constitution. It is another coincidence that these reforms happened to coincide with the 10 preliminary objectives, the 10 points, of the Communist manifesto. No one of them could have been accomplished under the original Constitution.

Moreover, our type of government, with the division of powers between the Nation and the States and among the departments and the limitation of all powers, was entirely unsuited for a totalitarian state which would own all the land, railroads, telephone companies, coal mines, steamships, steel mills, etc., and operate all the businesses of the country. Our type of government was entirely unsuited even for the sort of show we are running now. You can't regulate prices, wages, working conditions, rents, hours of labor, polio vaccine, railways, utilities, stock markets, education, medicine, agriculture; you can't be the biggest landowner, the biggest house builder, the biggest employer, the biggest banker, the biggest insurance company, the biggest power producer, the biggest munition manufacturer, the biggest grain dealer, the biggest shipowner, the biggest printer, the biggest borrower, the biggest taxer, the biggest spender, the biggest defaulter, the biggest meddler, the biggest sucker in history without making a million executive decisions every day. You can't wait for legislative action; you can't debate; you can't have two parties; you can't stand investigation or criticism; you can't let your courts determine whether your action is constitutional; you must act and you must have in the Executive all the powers of Government, all the powers of the States, all the powers of the Congress and you must have a supine Supreme Court. You must have the powers of a dictator.

The Executive, by usurpation, the Supreme Court, by interpretation, and the Congress by surrender have nearly done the Constitution in. But it and the State constitutions are still a nuisance to the internationalist socialists in some way. That is where the treaty power comes in. Under the treaty power as now interpreted, the President and a handful of Senators can amend the Constitution and the State constitutions and legislate for the Nation and for every State, enacting laws that neither the Congress nor the States could lawfully enact. This sounds incredible—it is all too true.

That puts us back where we were when the shooting began in 1775—victims of unlimited arbitrary government with no rights or liberty that our Government must respect, with no recourse if we are deprived of life, liberty, property, religious freedom, free speech. The President and another nation (Argentina or Russia would be a good choice) could by an exchange of letters deprive us of the right of meeting here to discuss the Bricker Amendment and we would have no lawful recourse.

In fact we are worse off than we were in 1775, because then our tyranny was a Parliament which had to act openly and with debate and where our petitions could be heard. Even now in Great Britain and Canada a treaty is not internal law until Parliament makes it so. With us it is law right away and we may not know for years what has happened to us.

Worse than all this, under the treaty power we can, without any action or debate by Congress as a whole or by the States or the people, surrender our state, national and popular sovereignty to a superstate making ourselves a subordinate state, perhaps a mere administrative division, in a government of the world. This, the most important decision we could possibly make, the most momentous in all history, is in the power of one man and a handful of Senators.

A treaty is a contract with a foreign government. The treaty power is the power to make contracts with foreign governments. This is a necessary power. Under our system of divided sovereignty, the Federal Government has the treaty power exclusively. The States are expressly forbidden to enter into treaties. No one supporting the Bricker Amendment wishes to destroy the treaty power or take it away from the Federal Government. That would be absurd and unwise. No one wishes to take away from the President his constitutional functions in the treaty-making process. Someone must negotiate the contract. The executive department is best organized for that and should be the best informed.

The Constitution says:

"(The President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Here is a check, a balance. The President can act only with the advice and consent of the Senate and the treaty must have the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present. This insures publicity, debate, and hearings on important treaties. This kept us out of the League of Nations because the Senate refused, after much deliberation and debate, to give the necessary concurrence.

All this sounds very sensible and in harmony with the American way of doing things. What has happened to make it necessary to amend the treaty provisions in the Constitution? What has happened is that we now have a Government that believes that the treaty power can override the Constitution and cut across all the rights of the States and the people, and is acting accordingly. The Supreme Court has given aid and comfort to this arrogation of power and confirmed it by its interpretation of the following words in the Constitution:

"The Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

I have neither the learning nor the time to compare the older concept of the treaty power with what it is now. There is no question of what it is now. It is all powerful and it does not make much difference what Hamilton or Jefferson or Calhoun thought. It is what Mr. Dulles thinks or thought in 1952 that counts now, because that is what the Supreme Court thinks. This is his language:

"The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional bill of rights."

So there you are. Here is a power vested in the President and a few Senators that can override the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and every State constitution. Should it be limited? Do we need the Bricker amendment?

But that is not the worst of it. This absolute power can be exercised in many cases by the President alone without the Senate. It can be done in secret and no man may know for years what the law is. That is the doctrine of the executive agreement. That is the Pink case, where the Supreme Court held that an executive agreement made by the President alone, without the approval of the Senate is, like a treaty, the supreme law of the land and overrides the due process clause of the fifth amendment as well as the law of New York. In that case all there was was an exchange of letters between the President and Litvinov, and property which under the laws of New York belonged to certain private persons was given to the Soviet Government. They could just as well have taken your house and given it to me. I don't think this administration would give me anything or if I had a house, give it to you, but it could if it wanted to by finding a correspondent down in Guatemala to swap notes with.

Perhaps you think I am an alarmist. All right, I will tell you what the law is now under existing treaties or executive agreements. Just a few examples.

The President can declare war without any declaration by the Congress. That power is claimed by the President under a treaty—the treaty creating the United Nations. Think that over. Under the Constitution only the Congress could declare war. Now, if war comes between Russia and Poland, the Presi-

dent, acting alone, can put us in it on either side.

NATO can merge our political and economic resources with other nations without any reference to the Congress.

An international body called the International Materials Conference, set up without congressional authority, can and did impose a system of international allocations of raw materials.

Great Britain has a continuing veto over our diplomatic and military policies insofar as the use of atomic weapons is concerned. We can't use the bomb in our defense unless Great Britain permits.

The treaty power can and did take away the constitutional rights of our soldiers accused of crime in foreign lands and turned them over to trial by foreign courts. Two homesick GI's in France named Dick Keefe and Tony Scaletti, got drunk, stole a taxicab, and went to Paris. Stealing a taxicab by drunken soldiers on a spree is a crime and should be punished. Before the treaty Dick and Tony would have been tried by our military court and punished in accordance with our ideas of the seriousness of the offense. At the trial the constitutional rights of the accused would have been protected. Under a NATO treaty called the Status of Forces Agreement, they were turned over to a French court for trial and sentenced to 5 years of solitary confinement in French cells 4 feet wide and 7½ feet long. The Army took from Dick's wife the basic allowance for quarters and the French do not allow her to communicate with her husband.

Dick and Tony were lucky that they did not steal a chicken in a Moslem country, for then their hands would have been chopped off.

An Air Force captain named William Powell, in Bermuda, violated a law he did not know existed—he drove an automobile without having third-party insurance. He got 2 months' imprisonment and this automatically meant that he must be court-martialed, and may go home discharged and disgraced with no retirement benefits.

The Pentagon gets a report of these cases every 6 months. There are hundreds of them—you and I cannot see those reports, neither can Senator BRICKER. They are top secret.

What other things can be done under the treaty power as now interpreted?

Anything you can think of. I will mention only those things which have been seriously proposed.

Our immigration laws can be set aside and everyone in the world given the right to come here. The do-gooders in the U. N. phrase their desire for this action: "Everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries freedom from persecution." Thus will come the fifth column. Thus will come the weak, the depraved, and the criminal.

Crimes like this can become the law of every State:

Causing mental harm to members of a racial or religious group—you won't be able to criticize any race or religion.

Criticizing foreign governments may be made a crime. In such cases there will be no trial by jury and no appeal if the U. N. people have their way.

No private employment agencies, no private collective-bargaining—government do it all.

Right to censor news in peace as well as war . .

Religious freedom to be guaranteed, subject to limitations prescribed by law. Ditto of freedom of speech. Ditto of meetings like this—peaceful assemblies to talk things over. This is a back-handed way of giving law the right to limit those freedoms.

Conscriptions for an international military power, which could be garrisoned all over the world. Think that over. How useful will an international army be when the time comes to overthrow our Government by force and violence?

Legalize mixed marriages in States that prohibit them. This has already happened.

International taxes.

Regulate ownership of land, overrule alien land laws of States. This has already happened. A State, the Federal Government cannot prevent aliens buying strategic land anywhere in the country.

Distribution of our gold supply.

Regulation of world resources, communications, industries, defense, currencies, tariffs, tidelands.

A world church.

And so on. Nothing however fantastic is impossible. All the things I have mentioned have already been enacted or have been seriously suggested as subjects of treaties.

It is not too much to say that we are now in an international state with plenary legislative power vested in the President of the United States, a handful of Senators, and the State Department of a foreign country.

Now what is the Bricker amendment? It is very short. I will read it:

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement.

"SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

What are its objects?

1. To prevent any treaty or executive agreement in conflict with the Constitution from being of any force or effect.

2. To prevent any treaty or executive agreement from being effective as internal law except through valid legislation.

3. To prevent treaties from being approved by a mere handful of Senators present and voting. Voting by "yeas and nays" would assure that at least a majority of the Senate (now 49) would be present to act on the treaty.

It is incredible that this amendment should be opposed by any American. Yet the administration is against it and is fighting it with every sort of pressure. Secretary Dulles has switched and now indulges himself in quibbles about language. Republican Senators have forgotten this plank that was in the Republican piaform:

"We (the Republican Party) shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution."

Not only the Daily Worker but also the New York Times, the New York Herald-Tribune, and the Washington Post are against it.

What semblance of reason do they advance?

With characteristic dishonesty some left-wingers have told the public that a treaty will require ratification by the 48 States. That is absurd as well as dishonest. All the amendment does in that respect is to provide that a treaty does not become internal law in a State unless the State acts and acts constitutionally. The treaty as a treaty (an agreement between nations) will need no more ratification than it now does (two-thirds of the Senators present) and an executive agreement will stand just as it does now if it conforms to the Constitution. It will not, however, be the internal law of any State unless that State acts and acts constitutionally.

Another argument is that the amendment is unnecessary because the people can trust the executive department, who really do not want to do anything unconstitutional or forfeit any of our liberties.

This is not a debate to be settled by an appraisal of personalities. It makes no difference what we think about any particular President, any particular Secretary of State, any particular group of presidential advisors. I would say what I have said if George Washington were President, and so would he.

No man or group of men should ask to retain this absolute power. An all-wise, all-powerful, benevolent autocrat who would live forever would be the ideal government. That is not a bad definition of God Himself. It is a bad definition of any man who ever lived.

On this subject and many others Jefferson is worth hearing. He said: "In questions of power, let no more be heard of confidence in man but bind him down from mischief by chains of the Constitution."

No President, no Secretary of State, has the time to study all the details of all executive agreements or treaties, to detect the hidden traps laid by traitors at the conference table, by double-talkers who can always find good names for evil things and incorporate in documents ambiguities for interpretation by complaisant courts. No President can legislate for 48 States and take into account 48 varying conditions, constitutions, and local histories. No President should be allowed to legislate for anyone. Legislation should be a deliberative matter; there shoud be debate; there should be hearings; there should be publicity; there should be a chance for public opinion; there should be votes of representatives of the people.

A President cannot always be alert. President Roosevelt blamed himself for Yalta. Shortly before his death he told Pat Hurley, our loyal Ambassador to China, that on the last day at the Yalta Conference, in a state of utter exhaustion, he had signed the shameful document.

"Go ahead," he told his friend, "ameliorate it or set it aside and return to the fundamental principles that you have been fighting for, because they are mine."

Yalta has a lesson for us in this discussion. The damage done by a badly conceived treaty would be minimized by the Bricker amendment which would make it void if it was unconstitutional and in any event keep any part of it from becoming internal law until legislation adopted it.

Now, what are we going to do about it? Edmund Burke once said, "When bad men combine, good men must associate." We must find some way of associating ourselves effectively to make our numbers felt.

Then, we must understand the peril that we are in. Many men of good will do not understand it. They see values in international socialism—a world government with Marxism its constitution. They see peace and social justice. They think that a world government will keep the peace and that socialism will work if it spreads all over the world.

Some of you may want to be just a "lettle" socialistic. That is Fabianism; that is the welfare state. Beware. Someone has said: "Fabianism is socialism with intent to commit communism." And it won't work. England found that she could support the welfare state (the cradle to the grave plan) only at the expense of the capitalism of the United States or her own capitalism and tried to stop short when she found that further nationalization would be ruinous. As Max Eastman, an ex-socialist, recently said, England's socialistic dream became a nightmare. She learned Adam Smith the hard way and still has some lessons to learn. It would be marvelous if we could learn from her but we won't. Russia supports her welfare state by enslaving her own people, rob-

bing other countries, and importing slaves from China. China supports her welfare state by murdering 100 million of her people and exiling 5 million to Siberia.

Stephen Leacock had it right: Socialism will work only in heaven where they don't want it or in hell where they have it already.

If I had time I could demonstrate to you by the inexorable logic of double entry bookkeeping why the socialist economy in its mildest form cannot possibly protect your economic security—inflation won't let it.

But however you may feel about that and however wrong I may be about it, I am everlastingly right when I tell you that no measure of peace, security, or economic welfare is worth the liberty you will pay for it.

The notion of a world government at this stage in history is fantastic. It would be suicidal for us to be in it with only 6 percent of the votes. It would not work. After a generation of slavery it would fall to pieces like the Roman Empire. I hope that we would be the first to rebel with a Declaration of Independence we could copy almost word for word from the old one.

Over the past dozen years this country has negotiated many treaties with the criminal gang who have announced their intention to rule the world and to root out liberty and religion everywhere. No good has come of these treaties. Even when our representatives were able and loyal they could get only worthless promises while they gave away the last hope of liberation for millions of the enslaved people of the world and the last hope of life and freedom for other millions.

What did these treaties do to us? What will other treaties do in the future? Every syllable of every treaty, every syllable of every executive agreement is now the internal law of the land and of every state. Congress does not have to act, the State legislatures do not have to act. The constitutions have been overridden, not amended. With treaty power as now interpreted there is now no place on earth where the individual can force his government to respect his rights.

We need the Bricker amendment now. I pray it is not too late.

Small Town Employees and Employers—Local Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a letter received recently from a small-town employer emphasizes a long-existing trend which may ultimately bar industrial plants from all except a very few large communities. This employer writes:

Our company, although not in any way a part of the automotive industry, is being hard pressed to meet the union demands granted in the recent Ford and General Motors contracts.

Recently our employees' union dues were raised from $2.50 per month to $7.50 per month (UAW–CIO). The purpose of this dues increase, of course, was to establish a $25 million strike fund, completely controlled by the officials of the UAW. This is big money, much bigger than a company the size of ours (whose total sales are less than $5 million per year) can combat.

Organized labor has, obviously, taken complete control of interstate commerce. This fact is well established in the Kohler situation.

Even more disturbing is the further fact that our union locals have lost their power to arrive at contractual agreements with their employers, due to the fact that the international holds veto power over any arrangements which we may make with our own men.

General Motors, Ford, Steel, and a few other employers, joining with the UAW–CIO and other nationally powerful labor unions, have created and now maintain a monopoly of the labor supply. They have destroyed the independence of the employee. His right to bargain for his own services. They have placed him in the same category with raw material. They have made him just a cog in an industrial machine, to be bought or sold when a labor dispute is on.

No longer can the individual worker seek, hold a job which he considers desirable. Using special privileges and benefits given by labor legislation and employing violence, intimidation, a disregard of all law and authority, unions now successfully insist that an individual shall not hold a job unless he joins the union, pays dues and the arbitrary assessments levied by union officials.

The right of a local union to bargain collectively no longer exists, because the international, with the approval of General Motors, Ford, Steel, and others, insists local workers shall not make an agreement with the employer unless the contract is approved by the international.

This arbitrary, tyrannical practice exists because of monopolistic agreements between big employers and labor unions. It is implemented through strikes, where violence and illegal interference with interstate and foreign trade are usual. Coupled with the present-day advancement in automatic production, this practice will undoubtedly drive the small employer out of business. It will deprive millions of independent, homeowning workers, living in smaller communities, of their jobs.

Because of the millions—in 1 or 2 instances, the billions—of dollars at the command of industrial employers, they are now able to purchase labor-saving machinery of latest design, to produce with fewer employees, and using less production hours, and at less cost, many times the former output.

The result has been higher profits, higher wages—both desirable; little, if any, lessening in the cost to consumer, and a form of competition which smaller employers cannot meet if compelled to submit to the demands of international union officers. Smaller employers might be able to continue their operations if they were permitted to bargain collectively with local employees, but this the international unions will not permit.

Employees outside the big cities have certain advantages. They are not required to live in small, uncomfortable apartments, penned in like some animal, restricted in their comings and their goings, crowded, elbowed, and pushed around by their neighbors, many of whom they do not know; dependent upon the supermarket or the corner store for opportunity to purchase their daily sustenance.

The worker in the smaller community, though earning a less wage, usually owns his own home; has his own plot of grass or garden, his own automobile; sends his children to a neighborhood school; attends his own church; is within easy reach of a pleasant countryside, river, or lake. He is an independent, self-supporting, thrifty citizen—interested in and participating in local affairs—social, municipal, educational, and religious.

Unless not only employees, but citizens generally in smaller communities, and I refer now to cities of less than 250,000 inhabitants, awaken to and realize the meaning of the present situation and trend, industrial employment in their cities will certainly diminish if it does not cease.

Local workers should not only be given, but they should exercise, the right to bargain collectively through their own union with local employers.

Absentee domination is just as unsound and harmful in labor unions as it is in corporations.

A greedy, self-seeking, politically ambitious labor boss is just a bad as is his prototype in the industrial world.

Thou Shalt Show Us Wonderful Things in Thy Righteousness, O God of Our Salvation; Thou That Art the Hope of All the Ends of the Earth and of Them That Remain in the Broad Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission approved by the House, I am including a very fine address delivered at the regular Thursday morning prayer breakfast meeting 2 weeks ago by our colleague, the Honorable CLIFF YOUNG, of Nevada. In order that other Members of Congress, who did not have a chance to hear Mr. YOUNG, may read the statement, I am including his remarks herewith. I am sure the Members will find his statement interesting.

REMARKS OF HON. CLIFF YOUNG, OF NEVADA, AT THE PRAYER BREAKFAST, JULY 14, 1955

When BILLY MATTHEWS, our president, asked me to speak here today, I felt somewhat like the young housemaid who, while seeking employment, was interviewed by a prospective employer. "Do you have any religious views?" was the question. The maid hesitated briefly and with an understanding look replied, "No, but I have some good pictures of Niagara Falls and the Great Lakes."

And, as this morning of accounting or day of judgment approached, I reflected on the truly superb religious messages and fine inspirational talks it has been my privilege to hear at these breakfast meetings; it made me feel even more inadequate. There came to mind the story of two members of a small country church who were discussing the virtues of their new minister with obvious approval. Said the first, "Say, can't he pray?"

"Yes," rejoined the second, "why he asks the Lord for things that that other preacher didn't even know He had." I might say that

in the fullness of supplication, his prayers bear some resemblance to letters received from several of my constituents in the past few months.

I should like to take as my text today the 65th chapter of Psalms, fifth verse: "Thou shall show us wonderful things in Thy righteousness, O God of our salvation; Thou that are the hope of all the ends of the earth and of them that remain in the broad sea."

It has not been many years since George Bernard Shaw said he was sure that our world is the one to which other planets in the universe send their insane. And I might add, parenthetically, there are doubtless many of our constituents who would add that when these deluded individuals arrive on earth, they usually end up in Washington, D. C.

If there were an observer on another planet watching that which has transpired and is occurring today here on earth, he would have ample reason to wonder at our strange conduct. In a generation there have been two world wars and millions have perished as a result of man's inhumanity to man. Still these struggles have not shocked man into a realization of the gravity of our international problems and the urgent need for a peaceful solution before it is too late. The armament business is the biggest business in the world except perhaps for the current manufacture and sale of Davy Crockett toys. Everywhere throughout the universe men are looking into radar screens watching, watching, watching. The commonwealth of fear is universal.

Recently there appeared in the Washington Post Outlook a challenging, although I hope not too prophetic, article entitled "Death of Earth, Seen from A. D. 45000." It purported to be a review written of a singularly important set of volumes which was the report of a select exploratory mission from another planet. The volumes were entitled "The Rise and Annihilation of Earth Life."

For years there had apparently been some doubt on this other planet as to what had occurred on earth. This mission determined once and for all how death came but admitted that it was at an utter loss to discover why the destructive event was allowed to happen. What was this event? According to the mission, it was 240 simultaneous or near-simultaneous giant nuclear reactions.

Fortunately, the mission discovered a time capsule which gave much information about mankind. With regard to man's physical structure and appearance, they thought it rather bizarre. It was their conclusion, however, that he was equipped with a superb brain. Psychically, according to the mission, man stood apart. He was possessed of a nobility of aspiration, a cosmic as well as inner awareness, a respect for life, a feeling for beauty, and in his honoring of God and good, he was utterly unmatched, let alone surpassed elsewhere in the planetary system.

All the people of the earth save for some few harmless anachronisms in out-of-the-way places were roughly similar. Values cherished differed more in formal trappings than in their essence. They hoped the same hopes, were animated by the same basic forces and drives. Although many spoke different languages, interpretation was universal, and their knowledge of each other far exceeded the areas in which there was substantial lack of information.

According to the mission, the planet shrank and apparently man's mastery of nuclear energy meant that economic scarcity, which had been a cause of countless conflicts, was no longer a major factor. The mission said that the reason for self-destruction defied speculation and that its imagination was not equal to the difficulty of postulating an issue over which people so far advanced would exterminate themselves.

The war when it came must have been quickly finished. Carnage at the blast site was immense, but man survived long enough to let fly a total of 240 nuclear weapons which the mission totaled in its inspection of the planet. Said the report, "On the site of one large city the ruins included a huge fallen obelisk and indicated it had been an important seat of government." And it continued, "The ruins of a capitol were found far inland on earth's largest continent." Thus apparently did the report allude to the once great capital cities of Washington, D. C., and Moscow, U. S. S. R.

Though hundreds of millions were killed outright, the majority, approximately 2 billion, died in the next few weeks or days as the heavily poisoned atmosphere was carried by wind and currents around the globe.

The volumes told how man had apparently made slow but steadiy progress against the elements and then concluded by saying, "But in one incredible moment he renounced his goal, mocked the flowering promise ahead of him, considered the ooze he had worked a billion or 2 years to escape, and embraced it."

When Winston Churchill was awarded the Nobel prize for literature, he wrote, "Since Alfred Nobel died in 1896, we have entered an age of storm and tragedy. The power of man has grown in every sphere except over himself. Never in the field of action have events seemed so harshly to dwarf personalities.

"The fearful question confronts us: Have our problems got beyond our control? Undoubtedly, we are passing through a phase where this may be so. Well may we humble ourselves and seek for guidance and mercy."

It is to avoid such a cataclysm as was described in the report of the select exploratory mission—to preserve mankind from extinction—that in my opinion represents the greatest challenge Christian civilization has ever faced. It seems appropriate this morning to take a few minutes to discuss this problem for several reasons. First, it was 10 years ago this week that man terrified himself by winning a monumental scientific victory. In our race with the Nazi scientists, fortunately the United States came in first. For 5 years we had exclusive possession. But atoms bear no imprint "Made in America," and no one expected this mastery of atomic power to remain solely ours. Thus it was not unexpected when Russia eventually announced it too had atom bombs but there was an element of surprise in the speed Soviet scientists exhibited in narrowing our lead.

Secondly, this last week Bertrand Russel, the British philosopher and mathematician, released a statement signed by Albert Einstein and several other prominent scientists in which they asked that mankind abolish war or face the risk of extinction by slow torture from radioactive dust and rain.

We are now in the year 10 of the atomic age, and great progress has been made in devising ingenious engines of destruction. For several years after the first atomic device was exploded, there was some doubt about the development of any great variety of these weapons. But time has wrought vast changes in our thinking on this subject. Nuclear fission explosions ranging from a few kilotons to perhaps as many as a hundred kilotons have been detonated at the proving ground in my own State, according to newspaper reports. At Eniwetok proving grounds in the Pacific presumably even larger detonations have occurred. These, of course, are the mere conventional fission explosions—little things measured against the H-bomb, which has been said by one grim jokester, to come in three sizes—big, bigger, and where is everybody.

Preliminary tests of the 1952 thermonuclear weapon using a device much smaller than the 1954 weapon, resulted in the virtual obliteration of an island of the Bikini atoll leaving a crater a mile wide and 175 feet deep in the ocean. But it was the 1954 test with its potential for raining down lethal radioactive fallout on 7,000 square miles which cause the greatest concern and has helped bring this problem into focus.

Leo Szilard of the University of Chicago and one of the principal architects of the atomic bomb, has estimated, according to one newspaper reporter, that 400 one-ton deuterium-cobalt bomb would release enough radioactivity to extinguish all life on earth. Bertrand Russell said there is credible authority to the effect that we can produce bombs 2,500 times as powerful as that which created the baleful light over Hiroshima.

In talking about the cobalt bomb, nuclear scientists sometimes quote an entry in the Journal of the Goncourt Brothers of April 7, 1869, exactly 86 years ago. The entry describes a conversation between leading scientists of the day in which they predicted that in a hundred years "Men would know of what the atom is constituted and would be able to create life (synthetically) in competition with God."

"We have a feeling," the Goncourt Journal states, "that when that time comes to science, God with His white beard will come down to earth swinging a bunch of keys and will say to humanity what they say at 5 o'clock in the saloon: 'Closing time, gentlemen'."

It used to be a favorite device of clergymen to conjure up a vivid picture of the tortures and horrors of hell awaiting the sinner and the fallen for unworthy conduct here on earth. With the development of nuclear power, it no longer requires the eloquence and fervor of a Dante to portray a tale of woe and horror. A brief statement of scientifically accepted facts will suffice as well—and we need not wait till the hereafter for proof of what is said.

The question that comes to our mind is this: Is there anything that can be done to prevent this holocaust or is it the inexorable will of God?

In my opinion, there is much that can be done and herein lies the greatest challenge that we, as Christians, have ever faced.

I do not think that God has placed us here on earth to have us wiped out in one hideous moment. The Bible tells us that He so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son to the end that all that believe in him should not perish but have everlasting life.

Nor do I think that our future is determined only by chance. As one famous scientist said, "Our God is not a dice-playing God." I do not subscribe to the thoughts of the poet who said, "All nature is but art unknown to thee. All chance, direction, which thou canst not see."

I believe "There is a divinity that shapes our ends roughhew them how we will." Christianity with its exalting of the individual, with its emphasis on his dignity and development and promise of immortality contains more to it, in my opinion, than that we must play some part here on earth in a predetermined script.

Life is a challenge; we should accept it willingly and gladly, treating the obstacles not as barriers but as steppingstones to ever-greater achievement. Not long ago I read in the paper where a Mrs. Fugal, a grandmother from Utah, was selected as mother of the year. Her life had not been easy. Hardship and work were her constant companions. She said, however, that she didn't want to live without troubles and problems because they make us strong. The problems and conflicts of life can have a similar effect on us as nations and peoples.

In this weary, atom-blessed world, what is the nature of the problem that presents this supreme challenge? With typical Amer-

ican tendency for oversimplification, may I suggest that the problem is twofold, consisting first of technology and, secondly, totalitarianism with a new face called communism. Either, taken alone, would present an enormous problem; but taken together they offer a challenge of the highest magnitude and one which we dare not ignore if we hope to survive.

Next comes the question: What can we, as a Christian nation, do? One possibility would be to engage in a preventive war to destroy the latter threat with the hope we could then control the former. This, however, is repugnant to Christian concepts. I am confidient we will never debase ourselves as a nation to achieve this end—an end which would certainly prove to be highly elusive.

Secondly, there is the possibility of following a policy of pacifism. This is consistent with many of our Christian concepts and principles but, in my opinion, Christian doctrine does not inflexibly require its adoption. To do so would inevitably result in our domination by an ideology and godless outlawry that has neither sympathy nor respect for Christian principles and peoples. Christianity would doubtless survive this ordeal but, understandably, there is little likelihood of popular support for such a policy even with the grim prospects of the atomic age.

Thirdly, we can maintain a posture of strength while we work with diligence and energy to promote Christianity both at home and abroad. The Bible reminds us, "When a strong man armed keepeth his court, those things are in peace which he possesseth." My 6-year-old son occasionally sings a verse from the ballad about Davy Crockett's gun Betsy which goes:

> "The only time I draw my gun,
> Believe me it is not in fun,
> I shoot it for defending me,
> I shoot for life and liberty."

It seems to me that we, as a nation, can do likewise without violating essential precepts of Christian living. This, to me, is the most realistic approach because it offers real hope and is capable of receiving widespread public support which is so necessary in our form of government.

In my opinion, the easiest problem to overcome will be that of communism. In the ideological conflict which now rages between Christianity and the doctrines of Marx, Christianity is bound to prevail. To build a country on Communist doctrine is to be like the foolish man in the Bible who built his house upon the sand, and the rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon the house, and it fell and great was the fall of it. As the old hymn tells us, "Crowns and thrones may perish, kingdoms rise and wane, but the Church of Jesus constant will remain."

A far more difficult problem, to my way of thinking, than emerging triumphant in our contest with communism will be that of bringing about an understanding and trust among the nations of the world that will permit eventual disarmament with effective controls. Those who recall the Kellogg peace renunciation will perhaps feel little reason for optimism. So often it seems that those who least intend to keep such a pact are the first to favor its adoption. Perhaps the grim specter of what can happen to us in a nuclear war will soften the prejudices, the antipathies, and the antagonisms. War can be declared; peace cannot. It must emerge from causes which give rise to its development. Peace is not found in conferences or laboratories but in the hearts of men. Perhaps out of the good will of the future will come enlightenment and intelligence which will create the restraints which are necessary to our existence in an atomic age.

As a nation, we, of course, are not fully responsible for what other countries and peoples do but we cannot avoid our obligations as a nation of convincing people of the world of our sincere good will and desire for peace. I believe it was Van Dyke who once said with regard to a man, "Four things a man must do if he would keep his record true: Learn to think without confusion clearly. Act from honest motive purely. Love his fellowmen sincerely. Trust in heaven and God securely." If we could do the same thing as a nation and convince others of it, we would have made great progress toward our end of convincing other people of our sincere desire for peace.

Our past record as a nation is not without blemish although we have in recent years demonstrated a generosity without parallel in the history of the world and during a time when our military strength was supreme.

We must show the world we are genuinely concerned about the welfare of others; we must back this up with deeds, as well as words. And in a world where mass communications are so highly developed and our enemies resort to every device to deceive and distort, it is essential that we make our position clearly understood. As the Bible tells us, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

We have been derelict in our responsibility to missionary services abroad. It has been reported that when General MacArthur was in Japan, he asked for several thousand missionaries. We sent him instead a few hundred. Our United States Information Agency has done an excellent job in many respects but its staff is limited and appropriations inadequate. Its work should be broadened and accelerated to the end that the lies and distortions of our enemies may be unmasked and that our good work and intentions are clearly presented to peoples throughout the world who are looking for leadership, friendship, and good will.

Emerson once said that peace can only come if there is a triumph of principles. It is also true that no one can live in peace longer than his neighbors permit. It is essential, therefore, in our dealing with other countries that we endeavor to understand their problems, their aspirations and goals. We should not be like Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones, who lived next to each other. One day Mr. Jones sent a note to Mr. Smith which went somewhat as follows: "Mr. Jones sends his compliments and requests that Mr. Smith poison his dog because it barks at night and keeps the Jones family awake." Next day there came a note from Mr. Smith to Mr. Jones which went somewhat as follows: "Mr. Smith is delighted to return Mr. Jones' compliments and beg to inform him that he will be glad to poison his dog if Mr. Jones will shoot his daughter and destroy her piano."

There is a Mexican legend which illustrates the importance of a good neighbor. It concerns one San Ysito who was plowing in his field when an angel of the Lord appeared and requested that San Ysito accompany him back to the Lord. San Ysito refused. The second time the angel spoke, "If you do not come, the Lord will send you a sandstorm and a drought." San Ysito persisted in his refusal and said that he had withstood sandstorms before and when a drought came, he had obtained water from the river. Again the angel came and said, "If you do not return with me this time, the Lord will send you a bad neighbor." San Ysito put down his plow and said, "I will go with you. I can stand anything except a bad neighbor."

Our individual conduct is also extremely important in showing that we are a Christian nation and dedicated to the realization of the goals of the man who gave us the Sermon on the Mount. According to one observer, as Christians, our attitude toward our country should be like that of a good wife to her husband. She will do anything for him except stop criticizing and trying to improve him.

We must bear in mind that God works His will to some extent through us as His instruments. As a poet expressed it, "Christ has no hands but our hands to do His work today. He has no feet but our feet to lead men in His Way. He has no tongue but our tongues to tell men how He died. He has no help but our help to bring men to His side."

Small deeds and individual action have had profound effects on the history of our country. One of the great Baptist leaders of England during the last century was Charles Spurgeon. He was motivated to take up the life of a religious leader by the remarks of an itinerant minister. The transient preacher almost decided not to speak that night because of the smallness of the crowd. He never again saw Charles Spurgeon and never knew that his evening's work had kindled an outstanding religious career.

Several weeks ago when I was in Nevada delivering a commencement address in my hometown, I was talking to my aunt, who is a devoted Christian. She showed me a page from the Christian Advocate which, as I recall, was either written by or was about our colleague CHARLES BENNETT. She was quite impressed with its contents and the story of CHARLIE'S life. I told her that we, too, were impressed with his life and good work, and I proceeded to amplify the story from my recollections of remarks he made as a discussion leader here a year or so ago.

Thus we never know just how far will be the effect of something we may do. As a poet expressed it, "Do a deed of simple kindness, though its end you may not see; it may reach like widening ripples down a long eternity."

And, of course, in this field, as in many others, actions always speak louder than words. I recall a verse written by Edgar Guest: "I'd rather see a sermon than hear one any day; I'd rather one should walk with me than merely tell the way; the eye's a better pupil and more willing than the ear; fine counsel is confusing but examples always clear; and the best of all the preachers are the men who live their creeds; for to see good put in action is what everybody needs."

And in this period of peril and uncertainty it is important that we, as Christians, pray wholeheartedly for guidance and strength, not only for ourselves but also for our leaders and the leaders of other countries in the world. In some respects we are like the little boy who was of the habit of going to sleep each night with the lights on. At last his father thought the time had come for him to turn off the lights when he went to bed, and he made this suggestion to the little boy. The little fellow replied that, if such were the case, he wanted to get up and say his prayers again because he had left out several words. Perhaps we are in somewhat the same position as this little boy. Unfortunately, too many people do not realize the gravity of the situation we face. For if they did, they, too, might say their prayers again. In the words of Churchill, "Well may we humble ourselves and seek for guidance and mercy."

In the year 451 the most fearful of all barbarians threatened to swallow up the dying Roman empire. The Huns were marching on Rome, ravishing and destroying everything in their path. They were led by Attila, king of the Huns, a short, squat, swarthy man known as the Scourge of God, who inspired his savage followers with such enthusiasm that it enflamed their natural lust for destroying, burnishing, and ravishing.

In the terrible battle he was repulsed but did not give up his plans for conquering the world. The very next spring he set out again, ravishing and destroying. Everywhere people fled.

While the Romans trained a second army for defense, Leo the aged Bishop of Rome, trusting only in God, put on his stateliest robes and went forth to meet the wolf who threatened the precious flock. Harmless in his simplicity, venerable in his gray hair, he stood before the grim Hun and pleaded so bravely for mercy that Attila, deeply impressed, withdrew his hoard from Italy without attacking Rome. This was his last attempt at conquering the world.

Attila the Hun is dead but there are other Attilas the Hun, two of which I have referred to this morning. The one is in the form of military technological progress which, if not controlled, endangers our very existence. The other appears as totalitarianism in the form of communism, which also threatens to engulf civilization.

Our best and perhaps our last hope for salvation and triumph over these threats lies in following the principles of the wisest of men who died that we might live and spreading them throughout the globe. And then in the words of our text today, "Thou shall show us wonderful things in Thy righteousness O God of our salvation, Thou that art the hope of all the ends of the earth and them that remain in the broad sea."

In the discussion group which followed, BROOKS HAYS contributed the following quotations from Lincoln which I feel are quite appropriate to the situation we now face, and I am taking the liberty of including them:

"Lincoln felt that the dangers of disunity had to be presented factually to his people. He put it in eloquent language: 'The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our task is new, we must think anew, and we must act anew. The dogmas of the quiet past are not adequate for the stormy present. The fiery trial through which we pass will weigh us down with honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We may meanly lose or nobly save the last best hope of earth.'

"In another mood, Lincoln spoke of this process of using faith and good will and love. It is beautifully stated in the address at his second inauguration: 'With malice toward none, with charity for all, and with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we have begun, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who has borne the battle, his widow and his orphan, and to do all things that will achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all the nations of the earth.'"

Washington Calvacade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered in Minnesota by the distinguished news analyst, Mr. Bill Costello, on July 20, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALVACADE

This is hardly an enviable time to be making a speech, considering the fact that the leading statesmen of the world met 2 days ago in Geneva and considering the probability that both American policy and world history may be decided, or at any rate massively influenced, by what is said there this week at the summit.

The situation remind me of a Washington social "gimmick" which was invented some months ago by a high administration official. At dinner parties after he was seated he used to hand the ladies on either side a card which read: "My mind is made up—don't bother me with facts." I feel today a great sense of envy of that man—and rather like the author of a movie cliffhanger—trying to discuss the National Government and its policies at a moment when one either has to make up his mind without reference to facts, or else put one's mind into suspended animation until next week. My hope is that I can tell you enough about the general climate of political feeling to help you judge the facts when they do become known.

The notable feature of the 1955 political landscape—not only in Washington but in London and Paris, in Moscow, and in fact throughout the world—is that mankind has rather suddenly, rather mysteriously grown afraid of too much violence. We have reached one of those occasional moments when the world seems in a state of equilibrium. That equilibrium may be precarious, it may be only temporary, but for the moment at least, the nations and the states have called a truce. Whether the great mushroom cloud on the horizon embodying the threat of nuclear destruction is going to make this truce permanent is something that no one can yet foretell.

What is more impressive to an old hand in Washington is that moderation tends to express itself in almost every aspect of our political life. President Eisenhower, in what may be perhaps a keynote of Washington's new mood, first suggested that the country wants to be governed by progressive moderates. Later, as if to emphasize the need for new definitions of tolerance, he suggested a better phrase might be "dynamic conservatism." In a sense, either phrase might be considered a notable advance. As recently as the 1952 campaign progressive was almost a subversive word. So far as dynamism goes, it has had to contend violently throughout this administration with retrenchment, and if the President has finally decided in favor of a dynamic policy, he is probably fairly well in tune with national attitudes. By and large, there seems to be a fairly deliberate effort to obliterate the more painful memories of the 1952 campaign. The whole inflammatory technique of Government by slogan is finally getting a bad reputation. There is less and less temptation to win arguments by charges of appeasement. There are fewer and fewer accusations that all opponents are soft on communism or outright subversives. In official circles they have stopped talking about their plans for a positive, dynamic foreign policy and about the master blueprint that was supposed to give us a permanent initiative in world affairs. Responsible politicians no longer discuss the liberation of the satellites or the rollback of the Iron Curtain.

The Republicans have grown wary, have stopped chanting those magic formulas that were supposed to take the place of hard work and taxes, and perpetual vigilance. The political hucksters, the supermerchandisers, who invaded Washington in the early months of 1953, have either been discarded or reeducated. They are no longer talking about "gimmicks" in the tricky formulation of national policy. They no longer regard nations and whole populations as piles of poker chips easily subject to devious manipulation. They are seriously intent now on seeing every problem in its true historical depth and proportion.

Even in domestic affairs there is a tendency to shy away from phrases like "sound money" and "creeping socialism" and "balancing the budget." The Republican official who in 1953 wanted to achieve a total posture of the entire Government is delighted in 1955 to be able to strike any kind of posture that suggests a modicum of dignity.

The point is: Slogans have lost respectability. Extremism is losing ground. Prosperity makes it easier to govern. Peace encourages the lion and the lamb to lie down together. Politically, the best sign of normalcy is that the ins are worried about staying in and the outs are licking their chops. The quipsters make the most of this situation. They said, for example, when Republicans promised plenty of Easter eggs for the annual Easter egg rolling on the White House lawn. "There ought to be plenty; the Republicans have spent 2 years laying them." When the Republican Party appoints a new public relations chief, they say: "It is his job to convince the country that the difference between Republicans and people has been greatly exaggerated." When the President urges a new addition to the White House offices, they say: "Republicans are so worried about the dangers of big government they need more room to do their worrying in."

One story that went the rounds some months ago told of a visit to the White House by Republican National Chairman Hall, whose report to the President was anything but cheerful. Judge Hall groaned over reversals in the election, over defeats in the President's legislative program, over fluctuations in the Gallop-poll ratings, and over the schism between left- and right-wing Republicans. In his eyes, the Republicans had every reason to "run scared." Well, the President, so the story goes, listened patiently to this melancholy recital, but when Judge Hall finished there was a twinkle in Ike's eye. He leaned over to his political adviser and asked, solemnly, "Tell me, Len, do you think I ought to put the White House in Mamie's name?"

It's worth asking how President Eisenhower fits into the whole Washington picture. He is by no means a static quality. Quite the contrary, in fact: He is about as mercurial as any President we have ever had. His enemies say he has been on both sides of every subject that has arisen during his administration. The public conception of President Eisenhower fluctuates a little, but not with any extremes of feeling. In 1953, when the honeymoon was on, the Gallup poll rated his popularity at 76 percent. Last winter, the monthly survey rated him 57 percent—down 19 points. Recently the rating climbed into the middle sixties. This can be taken to mean most voters think he is doing a reasonably good job, but that like all his predecessors, he is not a miracle man; he is not immune from criticism.

Naturally, being a conspicuous personage—fond of golf, fishing, and travel—he's the butt of a great many jokes. The other day someone remarked: "The Washington tourist season must be reaching its peak. Even President Eisenhower is in town." All Presidents do a fair amount of traveling, but Eisenhower is more restless than any recent predecessor; and that of course is one of the most frequent topics of comment. Apropos of his usual weekend trips to his Gettysburg farm, someone remarked: "If they had known Ike was going to be the next occupant when they remodeled the White House, they would have made it into a trailer."

The politicians, including some in the Republican Party, have taken a fairly

jaundiced view of Mr. Eisenhower's capabilities. He has offended a considerable number of Senators by failing to consult them or notify them about impending appointments in their States, and the resulting frictions have sometimes been inflammatory. Perhaps that's what gave rise to one product of the Washington jokesmiths, a little more savage than most. It might even have been a Democrat who observed: "Before the 1952 elections, there was alarm at the idea of having a professional military man in the White House. Now look at us—with an amateur civilian."

If you are looking for a residual grain of truth in a field as controversial as this, my advice is: don't underestimate the President's political talents. He has a high degree of flexibility. He has a genius for finding protective coloration. In his desire to be all things to all people, he shows extraordinary adroitness at finding common ground, and at avoiding entrapment in dogmatic positions. His enemies say he lacks dedication to principles; but his friends counter by quoting the cynic who once observed that genius is the capacity to rise above one's principles. Certainly, the President is not a fanatic, as Sir Winston Churchill once described a fanatic: "A man who can't change his mind, and won't change the subject."

Seriously, President Eisenhower has undergone a considerable transfiguration during his 2½ years in office. It was Walter Lippmann, I think, who pointed out some weeks ago, that when Mr. Eisenhower entered the White House, he was still a theorist in politics. In the Army, he had relied on civilian advisers to deal with civilian affairs; his West Point education had given him only the most primitive kind of background in social and economic affairs, and he had no practical experience to assist him in making national policy in literally dozens of fields.

Somehow, in the period before he became a candidate, General Eisenhower had been sold on the idea that the Federal Government had become some kind of monstrous juggernaut—something alien, and wicked, and far too big and powerful for the good of the country. For that reason, he campaigned in 1952 on the platform that Government had to be decentralized. He ignored the fundamental reasons for bigness—such factors as the population pressures of the 20th century (our own as well as others); and I think he cherished a kind of vague, idealistic conception of America governing itself like one vast New England town meeting house.

He had a similar conception of the Presidency itself. Perhaps in an excess of modesty, he began with an attempt to undercut the power of his own office. He created a whole series of informal new institutions attached to the White House—institutions that seemed designed to relieve the President not only of some drudgery, but also of some responsibilities and prerogatives. The Monday morning meeting with congressional leaders became a solemn ritual, especially during the 83d Congress, even though it produced about equal parts of legislation and frustration. The Cabinet was more and more tightly organized, and finally given a secretariat to coordinate its work. The National Security Council became a top policy-making body; and the President formed a Council on Foreign Economic Policy to handle all the tiresome paper work involved in the support of our overseas alliances. In general, Mr. Eisenhower showed a distaste for making individual decisions, a preference for well-organized staff work and group decisions. His chief reliance from the beginning was on the military staff system, the pyramidal chain of command. His tendency was to use his personal power sparingly, unlike Harry Truman who used to have a sign on his desk saying, "The buck stops here."

In Eisenhower's mind, at least in the beginning, even a President could pass the buck; he seemed to believe that irrevocable decisions of great national or international importance should not be made by a single individual, no matter how highly placed. When he first opposed a high-level Big Four meeting, it was because he is not the man for grandiose adventures in personal diplomacy; he felt that even a President is not entitled to embrace judgments of worldwide gravity.

In 2½ years, the cares of office have brought about a radical transfiguration of the President's theories. He has learned some new facts of life. One is that, under the Constitution the President possesses ultimate responsibility; and there is no device or informally created institution that will enable him to shirk that duty. Another is that the American Government is big because the Congress and the people have made it that way—and no President can unmake it.

Mr. Eisenhower in 1953, in the first flush of Republican victory, created two commissions that were supposed to whittle down the Federal bureaucracy and enhance State powers. The Hoover Commission undertook a review of Federal functions. This year it published a series of reports that no one in either Congress or the administration could find it in his heart to consider seriously. Essentially they would have repealed the 20th century. In the light of our political history over the last 100 years—and the infinite pains with which our philosophy of government has been hammered out by Congress—some of the Hoover reports were fantastically archaic—and in some respects presumptuous.

The other Commission—on the relationships between the Federal, State, and local governments—had originally been conceived as a device for shifting more responsibility to the lower levels, but its final report was a triumphant vindication of statesmen who have built our present national institutions; the report agreed the States lacked power today because they had not modernized their institutions, had not grown with the times, had not built a system of personnel or organizations capable of assuming greater government authority. Only minor changes were considered desirable. The result of these two Republican-sponsored investigations was to indorse the present structure of Government, and to repudiate all thought of revolutionary overhaul.

In terms of Presidential thinking, the practical effect of these advisory studies has been to persuade President Eisenhower that he cannot wage a successful war against the reforms of the New Deal-Fair Deal era; and he has called off that vendetta against the Democrats. The change became noticeable in his 1955 message on the state of the Union. Two years earlier, he had sprinkled his message liberally with the merchandising slogans that had been coined for him in the election campaign—with superficial concepts like dynamic initiative, psychological warfare, clandestine nonmilitary operations that would roll back the Communist empire, and all the rest. This year, Mr. Eisenhower abandoned all reliance on amateur sloganeers, and made it his aim in foreign affairs to find a modus vivendi or a means of coexistence that might give promise of stabilizing what had obviously become a world stalemate.

Likewise in domestic affairs, the emphasis in this year's message was no longer as it was last year on balancing the budget, but on balancing the national economy. In references to welfare legislation, whose necessity he conceded reluctantly in 1953, Mr. Eisenhower this year was cordial and even enthusiastic in urging liberal extensions of the present system.

The President recognized in effect that modern political, economic and social concepts are not a private, monopolistic possession of the Democratic Party, but a global aspect of twentieth-century progress. He is under the same compulsion as politicians in other countries: all are expected to join in making rules by which we can parcel out a decent living for everybody. The President has simply acknowledged political reality. His administration has adjusted its aims, its methods, and its scope. In this respect, it has been vastly more successful than the Republican Party as a whole.

In Harry Truman's day, it was the Democrats who were suicidally split and perpetually quarreling among themselves. Today, the Democrats have buried the old hatchets, at least in shallow graves, and have achieved a degree of unity which is probably without parallel in this century.

Not so with the Republicans. The pro-Eisenhower, internationalist wing of the party has been challenged again and again by an old guard faction favoring isolation in foreign affairs and big money at home. The strength of Eisenhower's position has been in its consistency in favoring collective security and in its ability to attract Democratic support. The weakness of his Republican enemies lies in the fact that their policies have lacked both consistency and leadership. The old guard, for example, has wanted no Government interference with the economy, but a strong mobilization base in preparation for eventual war with communism; has wanted a reduction in military spending, but intervention in Asian wars against communism; has favored a tough line with the Kremlin on the satellite issue, but the recall of American troops overseas. In general, the isolationists would revert to high tariffs and a defense system based on the Hoover concept of "fortress America," but along with that they want an authoritarian world peace imposed by some mysterious American edict.

To achieve this best of all possible worlds, the rightwingers thought for a time that they had found a leader in McCARTHY, because he seemed to have a political "gimmick" that would win elections. After McCARTHY's eclipse—I might almost say obliteration—the tendency was for the Old Guard to coalesce around Senator KNOWLAND, but even his loyalties have been equivocal.

Last fall the relative strength of the 2 feuding Republican factions was pretty well dramatized in the vote on censuring Senator McCARTHY; in that case, you may recall, 22 Republican Senators joined in condemning the Wisconsin Senator, and 24 voted in favor of McCARTHY. From that, it appeared for a time that the party leadership hung in the balance. This summer the question was resolved; and, of course, entirely to the advantage of the President. When McCARTHY last month made another attempt to dictate foreign policy to the President only three Republicans voted with McCARTHY in the showdown. That's why people nowadays don't even bother to smile when they remark that McCarthyism is no longer an "ism" but a "wasm." Some weeks ago, in a classic bit of understatement, GOP Chairman Hall summed up the party's position by advising one group of State leaders: "The Republican Party has got to remake itself in the image of President Eisenhower's thinking. In my travels I find that the party is not popular."

An honest assessment of the Democratic Party boils down to this: Its successes in dealing with the Eisenhower administration have been based on its frequent ability to unite, either in support or in opposition. Its failures have resulted uniformly from disunity. Now, with a Presidential election in the offing, the Democrats find themselves in a horrendous predicament.

Their dilemma is this: In order to establish a reputation with the voters as the party of responsibility, the Democrats at the legislative level have to handle every Eisenhower

recommendation strictly on its merits. That's the LYNDON JOHNSON strategy. They also have to treat the President himself with courtesy because, as one Senator told me last week at luncheon, "Eisenhower is a good man, a decent man, and we're not going to vilify him the way the Republicans hated and vilified Roosevelt and Truman." But, in doing that, it's hard to make a case for electing more Democrats to Congress or for putting a Democrat in the White House.

Some Democratic Senators are warning their colleagues that their present strategy is self-defeating. They say, if the Democrats have no program of their own, they may have trouble finding a strong presidential candidate in 1956; and if Eisenhower runs against only nominal opposition, he may win in a landslide—in which case he may carry the Republican Party along to a victory in both Houses of Congress. About a dozen Democratic leaders have concluded that the whole party has got to run against Ike, starting right now, if it expects to keep control of the lawmaking machinery in 1957.

Many Democrats say privately that Mr. Eisenhower plays too much golf, has too many rich friends, makes too many bad appointments, and altogether is not a good President. Publicly, only a handful of these critics have spoken out, and it was your own Senator HUMPHREY who put their case in a nutshell when he said: "President Eisenhower is directly responsible for the deeds, misdeeds, and lack of deeds in his Republican administration." It remains to be seen, of course, whether this view—and, believe me, HUMPHREY'S views are studied closely by his Senate colleagues—will overcome the reluctance of the southern standpatters who secretly sympathize with certain conservative aspects of republicanism.

For the time being, the Democrats are coasting, pretending they can take-it-or-leave-it-alone. In the back of their minds is an uneasy awareness that defeat for the party would deprive them of their powerful committee chairmanships. Sooner or later that fear may rouse them to do battle. It may be, however, that the swift march of events will force them into a more vigorous political posture. One of the cohesive forces in the Democratic Party—in fact the essential ingredient in bipartisanship—has been the threat of Communist aggression; if there should now be an agreement on coexistence with communism, the Democrats would naturally find their partisan center of gravity shifting from foreign to domestic affairs. It has been possible for the Democrats to cooperate actively with the President on many subjects because their views on collective security were identical. If conditions now change drastically, this alignment may be ruptured. If peace is assured, the paramount issue may become prosperity. Attention may focus sharply on the national economy—and on that sector of the political front, the danger signals are already flying.

There is a fundamental difference in the economic philosophy of the Republican and Democratic Parties, making some allowances for dissenting minority factions. The orthodox Republican attitude is that the economy should regulate itself automatically with a minimum of Government manipulation. The orthodox Democratic view is that the economic health of the Nation requires a balanced growth in the economy and a total growth exceeding 3 percent a year. The Democrats say competitive forces alone will not guarantee a healthy rate of expansion, and that national security requires a certain amount of Federal encourgement and guidance to produce an expanding economy. The Republicans say competitive forces, stimulated by the normal factors of population growth, will provide the necessary incentive.

Actually, neither party is able to practice in any literal sense what it preaches. The public rejects some of the controls that liberal Democrats would favor, and the same public insists upon some of the Federal activities that orthodox Republicans would reject.

A notable case in point is the present administration's fiscal policy. In the spring of 1953, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey undertook to carry out Republican hard money promises by launching a tight credit policy. The program was frankly deflationary. That policy lasted all of 6 months. At the first sign of a recession, there was a nationwide howl of protest, and the Treasury itself saw with alarm that a deflationary policy would reduce Federal revenues so drastically as to offset administrative economies and practically guarantee a bigger defiicit than before. Since the fall of 1953 the administration has consistently followed a policy of easy credit; in fact, the present policy has been described as the loosest credit structure in our history—an essential element in an expanding economy. Since this policy creates all the outward appearances of prosperity, no one in either party offers serious objection. There is reason to believe, however, that the seeds of future trouble have already been planted. For more than 2 years the cost of living has remained virtually stable despite the administration's easy money policy. In part this has been a result of tax reductions, in part the result of falling production costs in industry, in part a result of postponing certain costs which some day the Federal Government will have to meet.

What I am trying to say is this: Today's appearance of stability in the economy is partly illusory. An easy-money policy is fundamentally inflationary, and the Eisenhower policy is, therefore, inflationary. Sooner or later that inflation wil make itself visible.

This year the dikes have been greatly threatened by a rising spiral of wages and prices. The President has acquiesced and perhaps even encouraged this trend by approving pay raises for almost everyone in the employ of the Government. Having done that, he could hardly oppose union demands for higher pay; and having acquiesced thus in the demands of labor, he could hardly discriminate against business and industry by limiting their access to credit. One step along the road to inflation leads inevitably to another and another. The history of this administration is in keeping with everything we know about the history of the last 2,000 years—an almost unbroken story of piecemeal inflation.

However realistic this policy may be in the eyes of the President and in the eyes of the Democratic Party, it still remains to be seen whether it will be tolerated by the more orthodox wing of the Republican Party.

Cynics are, nevertheless, convinced that the hope of another Republican victory in 1956 will prevail in the end over any reservations that conservative Republicans may have. Treasury Secretary Humphrey and his associates may gag at the political necessities of their position, but they are no less expert in the technics of controlling inflation than their predecessors in the Truman administration. There may be minor quibbles next year over the character and scope of tax reductions, but the practical politicians see only two big question marks on the immediate economic horizon—whether automobile production and building construction will continue at the present luxuriant and unprecedented pace until the 1956 elections are safely out of the way.

Assuming that Eisenhower will run—and almost everyone does—and assuming that there will be nothing resembling an economic recession or collapse, the Republicans are likely to go into the 1956 campaign with the slogan every politician dreams of: "Peace and Prosperity."

Other issues are problematical. The Eisenhower administration has adopted almost in its entirety the Truman-Acheson foreign policy of building coalitions and distributing foreign aid, and there is no controversy to speak of in that regard. Since the administration has stopped trying to repeal the domestic reforms of the New Deal-Fair Deal era, there are only scattered targets for Democratic opposition. One of these is public power, as exemplified by the Dixon-Yates attempt to subvert TVA; another is the dissipation of natural resources by executive and administrative subterfuge; another may be discrimination against the farmer, and favoritism toward Big Business and Big Money. The Democrats feel they are sure to get some mileage out of the unprecedented succession of mergers in many branches of industry and finance; the trend is definitely toward monopoly. The Democrats are viewing this trend querulously, and they are prepared to leap on it venomously at the first sign of trouble or corruption. Similarly, there will be no reluctance in Democratic ranks to becoming the champions of agriculture if it appears that predatory financial interests are victimizing the small farmer. No one yet knows how potent these issues will be, but there are enough independent voters in these and related areas in the national economy to riddle anybody's election calculations.

So much for the crystal-ball department.

These are by no means unprofitable speculations, but they should not be overemphasized. What must not be forgotten is that, in any overall review of American Governmnet attitudes today, the menace of Communist Russia is still paramount. No matter what happens this week at Geneva, the problem of dealing with the Red conspiracy is Washington's major preoccupation, and is likely to remain so for a long time. Since the enunciation of the Truman doctrine in 1947, and especially since the Lisbon meeting of the NATO Council in 1952, every responsible American official has agreed that Communist ambitions are insatiable, Communist intentions are implacable, Communist capabilities are being accelerated every year.

I would urgently remind you—notwithstanding the wave of optimism now sweeping the world—that communism is a revolutionary conspiracy which has long boasted of its contempt for western ethics. Dictator Stalin once observed: "Since diplomacy is no more possible than dry water—or iron wood." When the Reds talks about cooperation—as they do from time to time—they consider efforts at harmony a temporary tactic, not a moral commitment. Lenin told a party congress in 1919: "We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. A series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

A thoroughly indoctrinated Communist does not forget such a warning; in fact, the idea has been endlessly elaborated since Lenin's time. In 1928, the Comintern said in a resolution: "The proletariat in the Soviet Union harbors no illusions as to the possibility of a durable peace with the imperialists. The proletariat knows that the imperialist attack against the Soviet Union is inevitable." In 1946, a Soviet navy publication assured party members: "The Soviet Union, building communism in conditions of capitalist encirclement, is not guaranteed against the danger of attack from outside and against attempts to restore capitalism."

To rationalize their imperialism, the Reds have concocted a wholly ruthless set of ethical principles. They say: "We must resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers, illegal methods, evasions and subterfuges."

"There can be no breathing space in ideological warfare." They say: "The strictest loyalty to the ideas of communism must be combined with the ability to make all the necessary compromises, to tack; to make agreements, zigzags, retreats, and so on, in order to accelerate the coming into power of the Communists." As recently as 1950, Moscow radio said: "From the point of view of Communist morality, only those acts are moral which contribute to the building up of a new Communist society."

There is a tremendous Communist literature, all of which has been subject to careful study and analysis in the postwar period. Everything Communist leaders have said is part of the same consistent pattern; no one can possibly have any illusions about their intentions. Lenin said in 1917: "The task of a truly revolutionary party is not to renounce compromises once and for all, but to be able throughout all compromises, when they are unavoidable, to remain true to its principles, to its class, to its revolutionary purpose, to its task of preparing the way for revolution and of educating the masses for victory in the revolution." In 1952, Stalin's last testament was a theoretical work called The Economic Problems of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. It outlined two possible policies for the Soviet Union. If the allied coalition held the democracies together under American leadership, Stalin recommended a policy of economic penetration and subversion. If the western allies fell apart, he proposed an intensification of military preparations and pressures.

Well, look around the world today and what do you see! You see the free enterprise system creating a level of prosperity and well-being that has never been matched in all the centuries before us. You see the western allies, with American support, tightening the bonds of mutual understanding, acknowledging their interdependence, creating new mechanisms for consultation and cooperation. You see the threat of Communist aggression resulting in a tremendous consolidation of anti-Communist power.

Last year my news director sent me on a survey trip through Asia, the weakest part of the free-world coalition, and what I saw there was a revelation. Recognizing the existence of continuing poverty, spotty dissatisfaction, and some insecurity, it is, nevertheless, a fact that the outlook in Asia today is more encouraging than at any time in history. With a rising standard of living and with greater political stability, the fear of war has receded. Even where communism threatened the anti-Communists have become more sure of themselves than formerly. There is an awareness that communism can be beaten. Nowhere does one find now a sense of panic or demoralization; everywhere it is possible to see evidences of greater stability.

Asia's progress has been multiplied many times in Europe. On both continents it is well to remember that order was achieved in the face of violent Communist efforts to create chaos and disorder. In short, 8 years of cold war has succeeded in creating a degree of political equilibrium in the world; has had the effect of containing militant, aggressive communism.

What remains now is to find another system of containment—this time for the containment of economic aggression. The postwar rehabilitation period is over. Now comes the period of fundamental development, of lifting the entire economic plateau of the backward countries to a higher level. The race between the United States and the Soviet Union is to invent a formula, a principle, an assembly line that will produce a good living for anyone, anywhere, provided he is willing to work. The challenge is to rally our know-how in a massive assault on poverty; and the penalty for failure would be to see the Soviet Union take the leadership and friendship of large parts of Europe and Asia.

Today we stand on the threshold of compromise with the Communist world—their version of compromise, which makes illusory concessions while remaining true to their revolutionary principles. It is no exaggeration to say we have forced the Reds to negotiate, and I ask you these questions: Is it wrong to suspect Soviet motives? Is it wrong to question Soviet good faith?

My answer is that neither Bulganin nor Khrushchev nor anyone else in the Kremlin has repudiated one syllable of the doctrines preached by Marx, Lenin, or Stalin. No Communist leader has promised the free world that there will be a cessation of the struggle tactic which has poisoned world relations since the day of the Bolshevik revolution. No responsible spokesman has even so much as hinted at a repudiation of the doctrine of world revolution. The closest anyone in the Kremlin has come to an acceptable definition of coexistence is Bulganin's invitation to live in peaceful competition, but no one knows whether his definition of "peaceful" includes the continued use of communism's international conspiratorial apparatus.

I say the Government of the United States has a right to suspect Soviet intentions until the Kremlin publicly rejects Lenin and Stalin as spokesmen for the Communist movement. When the Russians abandon the struggle tactic then we can have real peace, and general disarmament. It is all very well to talk about the horrows of atomic warfare, and the possible destruction of the human race, but it is a mistake to imagine that nothing worse could happen. I can shudder even more picturesquely at the prospect of barbarism and death under the Communist heel.

In Washington they say there are two kinds of diplomats—those who think you can deal with the Russians and those who have tried. I think there is more skepticism in this country toward the Reds than there is in Europe, and the absence of a healthy skepticism in Europe may ultimately prove to be one of our greatest hazards. The yearning for peace is profound and the fear of atomic disaster is spreading. This feeling almost certainly points toward some kind of accommodation between communism and the West. No one has any ground for objecting to an accommodation, but no agreement with the Communists should be taken for anything more than an accommodation. It should not be some an excuse to relax our vigilance. It should not become a broad causeway for the introduction of a revolutionary Trojan horse. It is just as true today as it has been since the onset of the cold war and, in fact, since the Bolshevik revolution; we must never let down our guard.

More than that, if the struggle against revolutionary communism is going to have to be waged in the political and economic arena, there is going to have to be a realinement of American policy. A new emphasis is needed on partnership—on keeping alive the kind of trade relationships and political kinships that will assure the United States of strong, friendly allies. In the backward regions we can well afford to review our foreign-aid philosophy. The time for charity handouts is nearly over.

An American diplomat last year warned me in Asia that military aid and point 4 have just about exhausted their usefulness as instruments of national policy. What we need now is a program of major capital improvement: New trunk highways, railroads, better waterways, multipurpose dams for the creation of integrated agricultural-industrial areas, new harbors, and modern communications systems. The need is to promote impressive projects expressing faith in the long-range future—an earnest of our belief that communism is not going to seize these improvements, and a tacit warning to the Reds that we would be ready to defend what we help build.

Besides this species of logic, there are two other cogent arguments being brought to bear on the administration's high policy-makers. One is the fact that, if the Soviet Union undertakes a program of economic penetration, the competition will be based on State subsidies; and we are either going to have to match their subsidies or lose by default.

The other argument is that the laissez-faire policy of the Republican Party did not win the 1954 congressional elections. In fact, the policy came within a ace of causing a depression before it was modified. And if the Republicans have any hopes for 1956, in a period of arms reduction and savage competition, they are going to have to find markets for our enormous industrial output—in Europe and Asia if that's where the markets are, and by subsidies if that's what it takes to keep them out of Communist hands.

Amending the Classification Act of 1949

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, support H. R. 3255 which will correct a serious injustice to our loyal civil servants. So many of my constituents were the victims of downgrading in their civil-service positions that I was prompted to introduce similar legislation early this year. My bill, H. R. 5887 is very similar to the one introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] which the House considered favorably last week. The only difference is that my measure included those persons who had held their jobs for 1 year while H. R. 3255 pertains to those employees with not less than 2 years of service.

I commend my colleague from Michigan for the excellent presentation of this legislation. Every employee, whether in the Government or in private industry, can do a much better job when he has a feeling of security in his position. On the other hand, an employer—in this case the Federal Government—has an obligation to its employees.

I have been impressed with the number of letters I have received from my constituents on this subject. In many cases, they have held a certain grade for 4 or 5 years, or even longer. A classification survey occurs and a decision is reached that their duties no longer warrant the grade they are holding. Or, after several years in a position of a certain grade, the employee is informed that the agency had improperly placed his position in a higher grade. Assuming this contention is accurate, it is difficult to understand how the failure of the agency to properly classify the position should be borne by the employee. If the agency has failed to apply the classification standards developed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the employee should not be made to suffer a monetary loss.

Very recently, Congress approved a much needed salary increase for Federal classified workers. In those instances where jobs have been downgraded in the past several months, the effect of the salary increase has been nullified in whole or in part by the loss of pay resulting from the reduction in grade. I am most gratified that the House has passed H. R. 3255 to correct this situation this year.

Anniversary of Swiss Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on the night of August 1, fires glow in the Alps in celebration of the anniversary of Swiss independence. They shine through the night like the spirit of Swiss democracy which has stood through the centuries as a beacon to guide mankind toward freedom and democracy. Today, Swiss independence serves as a flaming symbol of man's struggle toward freedom and democracy. It illuminates the political night which has fallen upon the many nations that have lost their independence.

Nearly 7 centuries ago, on August 1, 1291, Switzerland threw off the oppressive yoke of monarchist tyranny, gladdening the hearts of all who yearned for liberty much as our own people did on our first July 4.

Throughout the centuries that followed, the Swiss nation broadened the base of its liberties, developed education, science, the arts, and crafts. And its people, of German, French, and Italian ancestry learned, as did the American people, to live in peace and harmony together, solving their problems in the open forum that only democracy provides.

It is no wonder, then, that so many of the far-seeing projects of our time have been originated or make their homes in Switzerland such as the Red Cross, the League of Nations, and the World Health Organization. Perhaps the greatest tribute to Switzerland is the fact that through the decades, other nations so often call upon the Swiss to provide the site for great international conferences. It is tribute to the impartiality and justice which characterize the country.

The Swiss have addressed themselves equally successfully to more material matters. Like America, they have a prosperous, clean, and healthy land with a standard of living with few equals in the world. In a mutuality of trade, both of our economies have prospered, each supplying the other with those goods insuring comfort and well-being for our peoples. America and Switzerland have proved throughout their history that industrious men have nothing to fear from competition, but are only stimulated by it toward new and greater accomplishments.

But last summer, a blemish developed to mar this fine record. For it was then, on July 27, that the administration approved a 50-percent increase in the Swiss watch tariff. This shortsighted development was brought about by a small group of fearful men, trying to protect us from free competition. Let us hope that our President will soon be reminded of his fine statement "the free world alliance will be most firmly cemented when its association is based on flourishing mutual trade," and that the United States once more assumes the role of champion of increasing international trade.

Economic Control of Communists in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Victor Riesel appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express newspaper of July 28.

In this article, Mr. Riesel verifies the facts and the statements made during the Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood debate relative to communistic influence in Hawaii.

HARRY BRIDGES CONTROLS THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII

(By Victor Riesel)

HONOLULU.—The surf, the sand, the catamaran sailing, the stars, and soft music at the Royal Hawaiian at Waikiki lull into forgetting—until you stand on the sunken hull of the U. S. S. *Arizona* and realize that there are still 1,100 skeletons of American fighting men sealed beneath the twisted bombed deck of the battle wagon destroyed by the Japs one Sunday morning.

There still are machine gun bullet pockmarks on some Hickman Field barrack walls where Nipponese fliers sent many of our boys from here to eternity.

Suddenly you realize that the unified military, naval, Marine, submarine and Air Force command here is second in importance and power only to the Pentagon itself.

And a sickening feeling hits you because you know that an arrogant man by the name of Harry Bridges really controls the economy of this island outpost and knows virtually every detail of what transpires here.

This is the same Harry Bridges ousted from the CIO for following the Commie line. The same man who all through the Korean war sneered at our efforts to stop Communist aggression. The same man who worked with the Soviets' International Federation of Sailors and Dockers Unions, affiliated wtih the viciously anti-United States World Federation of Trade Unions controlled by Moscow.

Yet Bridges is the labor boss of the islands on which Adm. Felix Stump runs the headquarters of all our Pacific forces.

On a hill above Pearl Harbor the admiral directs a command which stretches to Formosa, Japan, and Asia, and the down-under countries.

Through these Army forts, docks, sub bases, navy yards, and airfields move our men and war machines to the only real vital front—Asia.

Yet Harry and his aide, Jack Hall, and a couple of lawyers growing wealthy out of their handling of cases of the native workers, are the bullying, terrorizing, cocky, behind-the-scenes powers here.

Does no one care on the mainland?

These men so frequently charged in congressional hearings with being Communists are political powers wooed by some politicos, feared by others because they control some 22,300 workers. These are members of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. There are another 2,000 in the United Public Workers, also kicked out of CIO for pro-Communist activity. These two unions operate out of the same headquarters over on Atkinson Drive—and have the same telephone number.

These 24,300 workers and their families cast a good part of the 80,000 votes turned out in elections here. So few politicians will publicly antagonize these unions.

Furthermore, neither the AFL nor CIO national headquarters back home are putting any real money into a campaign to compete with Bridges here. Instead, he is moving in on the AFL and CIO territory. George Meany and Walter Reuther might like to know.

In fact, the Bridges people have told the teamsters' representative here to stop organizing. Bridges and Hall want it all. The Bridges union is being hit by automation. Plantations are mechanizing and laying off members of his union. So Bridges is unionizing mattress workers, butcher shops, a bakery, hotels, anything he can put his hands on.

Bridges and his boys want continued power on these island gateways to Asia, and they talk rough, these leftwingers. When Jack Hall, Bridges' right-hand man here, was being tried under the Smith Act, Hall met the Government prosecuting attorney in the Federal Building elevator. Hall turned to the United States official and snarled that "Bridges will come in here and tear the building down brick by brick if we are convicted."

They were convicted. But they are up on appeal and move around the islands in style and live well. The anti-Communists do not have it so well. There is a Jack H. Kawano, a former Commie who was high in Bridges' union. Kawano broke and told all. Today he is a night watchman at the Kamahehe School. Nobody seems to care.

I've been with labor leaders across the world at international anti-Communist conferences and have heard them make strong speeches.

A little action here would help make those speeches mean a little more.

Government Clinics—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom every other year, during adjournment to hold Government clinics in each of the 38 county seat towns in my district. These meetings are not political, but merely question and answer periods to give folks an opportunity to visit with their Representative, ask questions, and to render a report of my stewardship in Congress.

The first hour is devoted to school studens, entitled "Youth Wants to Know."

The last hour is for adults who may attend. Following is the schedule of clinics for the period from October 10 through October 20:

Monday, October 10: North Platte, 2 to 4 p. m., gas company building; Tryon, 7 to 9 p. m.

Tuesday, October 11: Stapleton, 2 to 4 p. m.; Thedford, 7 to 9 p. m.

Wednesday, October 12: Mullen, 2 to 4 p. m.; Arthur, 7 to 9 p. m.

Thursday, October 13: Chappel, 2 to 4 p. m.; Oshkosh, 7 to 9 p. m.

Friday, October 14: Grant, 10 to 12 a. m.; Ogallala, 2 to 4 p. m.

Monday, October 17: Brewster, 2 to 4 p. m.; Broken Bow, 7 to 9 p. m.

Tuesday, October 18: Lexington, 2 to 4 p. m.; Kearney, 7 to 9 p. m.

Wednesday, October 19: Burwell, 2 to 4 p. m.; Ord, 7 to 9 p. m.

Thursday, October 20: Loup City, 2 to 4 p. m.; Grand Island, 7 to 9 p. m.

Note: All meetings will be held in the county courthouse unless otherwise indicated. The public is invited.

The Farm Program in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there appeared in the RECORD of July 29, several remarks of the Senators from Missouri that I can construe only as political ones. Not being completely aware of the situation that exists in that State, but being cognizant that what they complain of now was accepted as proper during the New Deal days, I appealed to a Congressman from that State for an appraisal of the complaints. His remarks were very concisely put, in my opinion, in a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD for the edification of those who might be intrigued with the arguments offered by the Democrats of Missouri.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1955, from pages 10519 to 10529 there appears with the heading "Political Manipulation in the Farm Program in Missouri" a series of statements by Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS, both from Missouri, along with insert of letters and other material. Mr. HUMPHREY, a Senator from Minnesota, enters the discussion and among other things he states: "I wish to assure the Senator from Missouri that it is my intention, as chairman of the subcommittee, to come into his area. I shall notify the respective Senators and the other Members of the congressional delegation, and I shall hold whatever hearings may be necessary."

Now, I know it has been your intention, Mr. Secretary, to so run the Department of Agriculture that partisan politics would be kept out of the administration. It is your belief, as it is my belief, that the best politics is to run a good and efficient organization. It is also your belief, as I understand it, and again it is mine, that there are basic policy decisions to be made in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress and in running any department. These policy decisions in many instances properly give rise to honest political differences which may and should be openly discussed, not by those who are employees of your Department, but by those who are the people's representatives and, indeed, by the people themselves.

Now, almost from the time that the Eisenhower administration took office the two Senators from Missouri, Senator SYMINGTON and Senator HENNINGS, have been making general charges of political manipulation of the farm program in Missouri. Congressman PAUL JONES also has been making general charges, in the beginning on the floor of the House, but I am happy to state not on the floor of the House since I challenged him to either back up his charges with details or desist. Most of the charges made have been ex parte in political speeches and in releases to the newspapers. Seldom have the charges been made on the floor of the House or the Senate where they were subject to rebuttal. The statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1955, were essentially insertions in the RECORD and not matters openly expressed upon the floor of the Senate. It is a well recognized device and all too frequently used by Senators and Congressmen to insert material in the RECORD as if it had been presented orally on the floor. The only proper technique to use when attacking a program, or a policy, or a man, or a group of men is to notify ahead of time those you know take a contrary position to yours, that you intend to take the floor at such and such a time, and discuss the matter. I have many times used this technique in launching an attack on something I thought was wrong or improper. The failure of any Senator or Congressman to employ this technique leaves open to question by fair minded people the sincerity and accuracy of their charges.

There are no Republican Senators from Missouri who could have taken the floor to challenge Messrs. SYMINGTON's and HENINGS' charges; however, there are many Senators who would have undertaken to defend the Missouri situation had the two Missouri Senators notified anyone that they planned to make such an attack. It is obvious, from the reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that Mr. HUMPHREY, the Senator from Minnesota, a fellow partisan of Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS, was notified and well prepared to participate in this discussion.

Under the rules of the Congress, I, as a Member of the House, am not permitted to challenge the statements of Members of the Senate on the floor of the House. Accordingly, I have to resort to other means to challenge their statements, as I do. One means I intend to use is to publicize this letter I am writing to you. Another means I intend to use is to publicly challenge either Senator SYMINGTON or Senator HENNINGS, or both together, to appear in public debate on these issues at any time or place in Missouri of their choosing.

Just last year and the year before, Missouri, along with other parts of the Nation, was in the grip of a devastating drought. The two Senators from Missouri—SYMINGTON and HENNINGS—went up and down the State making untrue and unsubstantiated charges about the administration of the drought-relief program. Time and again I publicly challenged the statements of both these men and offered to appear in public debate to refute what I felt were their unfounded charges. By good luck, twice I was able to appear on the same program with Senator SYMINGTON. The first time in St. Louis County, in October 1953, at the Creve Coeur Farm Bureau meeting. I spoke first and challenged him to answer a series of specific questions about the Federal drought-relief program which he had been castigating around the State. Mr. SYMINGTON's reply in essence was he had not expected to have to debate the matter and had left his notes at home. He answered none of the questions. The second time was in 1954 in Jefferson City, before the Missouri Farm Bureau State meeting. Mr. SYMINGTON requested to speak first, and did speak first. Before he spoke he asked me whether I intended to take issue with him on the Federal drought-relief program. I stated I certainly did intend to, and stated that he still had not answered the questions I posed to him at the Creve Coeur meeting. I further stated, and still state, that he and Senator HENNINGS deliberately misrepresented the Federal drought-relief program, repeated unsubstantiated charges which reflected on the integrity of certain individuals, and thereby were guilty of trying to use the terrible drought disaster for partisan purposes.

Now, to get at the issue at hand, the alleged political manipulation in the farm program in Missouri. The charges to date and the RECORD of July 29, 1955, reflect the type and nature of these charges, follows exactly the same pattern as the general charges directed by Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS against the administration of the Federal drought-relief program in Missouri.

If you will refer to the July 29, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will notice that with very few exceptions each charge made "begs the question"; in other words, it merely states the charge sought to be proved, that there has been political manipulation in the farm program in Missouri. I shall take up a little later the few instances of specific details alleged and discuss them. Of course, it is specific detail alone that can substantiate a general charge and the absence of specific detail in itself demonstrates the falseness of the general charges.

However, I want to point out one very obvious general fact. If Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS were truly anxious to keep the Missouri farm program in Missouri out of politics why have they resorted to the press and political speeches to try to correct errors they thought existed before they referred the alleged instances of improper administration to the Department of Agriculture for correction? For 2½ years now the tactics have been the same, make public charges first, then, if at all, refer the matter to the Department. Furthermore, even when the specific charges have been proven false, Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS have never cleared the record by admitting their information was false. Quite the contrary, by back reference they try to capitalize on the publicity given the original charge knowing that newspapers tend to prominently print charges (and people remember charges) and rather inconspicuously print the retraction.

Furthermore, I think it is important to point out the strangeness of the claim for lack of bias in all the letters and statements of Missourians placed in the RECORD by Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS, which alleged political manipulation in the farm program. Why were these letters and statements written or made to Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS instead of the Department of Agriculture if the purpose and intent of the authors was to get and keep the farm program out of partisan politics?

Indeed, why weren't letters of allegations of improprieties written to me or DEWEY SHORT or the other two Republican Congressmen from Missouri (in the 83d Cong.), complaining about the situation—if the purpose was really to try to correct it? To date I have received no letter of complaint from any Democrat or Republican.

I believe, at least I certainly hope, I have a reputation for fairness and a desire to see

partisan politics kept out of any Federal programs. Why was not my assistance sought if there were really a concern about the allegations that the Eisenhower administration had put the farm program in Missouri into politics?

The answer is quite clear to me. Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS aren't interested in getting the farm program out of politics, they want to put it into politics. For twenty-odd years it was difficult, if not impossible, for a person who happened to be a Republican to either be federally employed in Missouri in the first instance or be promoted because of merit. My Democrat friends have become so accustomed to this situation that they call it politics when the present administration states that it is no longer policy that a Republican is a pariah.

Let's take one of the specific cases referred to by Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS, that of Callaway County. What was one of the basic issues in the removal of the county committee? A statement by the committee that the only county manager they would employ would be a Democrat. At least they were frank about it and to support their position they pointed out, rightly, that Callaway County was 10 to 1 Democrat politically. The issue was, however, if the best qualified applicant for county manager happened to be a Republican, then he should be appointed. In a 10-to-1 Democrat county it would seem that the odds would also be 10 to 1 that the best qualified man would be a Democrat, but that was no justification under proper administration to rule out the 1-in-10 chance for a Republican or an Independent.

Senator SYMINGTON starts his accusations against Republican administration by referring to a letter (which he inserts in toto) by the Republican State chairman Perry Compton to all Republican county chairmen in which he urges the Republican county chairmen to look for and encourage qualified Republicans to apply for these agricultural jobs. Frankly, I think that was a fine letter and one that should improve the agricultural program. Why? Because it would increase the number of applicants for particular jobs and so give a wider choice to the administration.

The first test of good and proper employment practices is whether or not the best qualified person is selected. I only hope both Democrat and Republican Parties will compete on the basis of trying to beat the other out on a job by putting up a better qualified candidate.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Since the Republicans have taken over in Missouri 70 percent of the county managers have bachelor of science degrees in agriculture. This is probably a higher percentage of quality along that particular line than any other State in the Union and certainly it is a tremendous change from what existed under the Democrat rule in Missouri.

The next test of good and proper employment practices is whether the person selected tends to his knitting and applies his qualifications to getting a good job done without regard to partisanship. On this score the Missouri administration obviously rates high because not one of the complaints registered by the Missouri Senators even imply that the men appointed as county managers are not doing a good job or have carried out their jobs in a partisan fashion.

No, the charges seem to be centered around (1) removal of committee and county managers; (2) insistence upon getting the best qualified man as county manager; (3) upon the Republican Party making a real campaign to get the people of Republican faith who are highly qualified to apply for the jobs.

Let's examine the first charge—removal of county committees and county managers. Murray Colbert, the chairman of the Missouri State committee, stated to me, when I asked him at a meeting on July 15, 1955, of many heads of the Department of Agriculture and some lower official specifically charged with the Missouri program, that there was no instance of any removal or suspension of a committee or county manager for political reasons; that in all instances they were suspended or removed for cause. He asked if anyone in the room cared to challenge that statement and no one did. The person or persons whom Senator HUMPHREY refers to when he says (p. 10525): "I have discussed the situation with representatives from the Department of Agriculture, and believe the testimony to date will reveal that they recognize the fact that there is a very unfortunate, or I might use a more blunt word and say incredible situation in the ASA program in the State of Missouri," must have been at the July 15 meeting. Evidently Senator HUMPHREY has misunderstood their position.

The occasion for this July 15 meeting was to discuss certain complaints which had been made in regard to the suspension of the Mississippi county committee. I had been asked by the Republican State chairman to check into the allegations of politics in this suspension which he, the State chairman, stated were false. The evidence indicated that the suspensions were entirely based upon cause and had nothing whatsoever to do with politics. The Mississippi committee had been forced by the State ASC committee to remove a totally incompetent county manager a few months before. I trust that if this is the pressure the State committee exerts on the county committee that this kind of pressure along with that to get highly qualified county managers continues. The county committee then connived with their former employee to falsify his sick-leave payments after his removal. Among pending detailed charges against the Mississippi county committee which seem substantiated by records one involves possible criminal culpability.

Now, Mr. Secretary, let me refer to the 10 pages of allegations of political manipulation in the farm program in Missouri set forth by Senators SYMINGTON, HENNINGS, and HUMPHREY, to see what specific allegations there may be to support these serious general charges. First, I properly eliminate all restatement of the general charges as begging the question.

It is alleged (1) "In many counties, where the farmers did not elect ASC committees willing to take dictatorship from the State committee, the State committee moved in with suspension and dismissals."

Alleged proof: (a) "Texas County ASC chairman and then the entire committee were summarily dismissed." Answer, the word "summarily" begs the question. The records clearly show the removal was for cause. Do Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS want to debate the details of this removal?

(b) "In Greene County, the county ASC chairman was dismissed." Answer: Well so what? Is it charged that the dismissal was not for proper cause? Do Senator SYMINGTON and HENNINGS want to debate the details of this removal?

(c) "In Callaway County, the entire ASC committee was dismissed." An editorial in the Springfield News Leader is then set out as proof, I suppose, of improper dismissal. (Springfield is in Greene County 100 miles away from Callaway County.) One aspect of the Callaway County committee's dismissal has already been pointed out. The committee insisted on the right to appoint a Democrat county manager. This, of course, was not their right. Indeed, it was highly improper and really goes to show how brazen the Democrats in certain sections of Missouri had become.

The Springfield News Leader editorial deals mostly in generalities. It is in error in implying that State ASC Chairman Colbert fired these men "for noncooperating. Just that and nothing more." Even though Colbert may have been correctly quoted as saying that, the records clearly show that there was a great deal more to it.

(d) The "unhung picture" case. This is trivia on its face and yet it too reveals the arrogance of certain Democrat politicians in Missouri who refused to recognize that the Eisenhower administration meant what it said about "cleaning up the mess" and getting partisan politics out of the farm program. Imagine, a fight over hanging the picture of the President of the United States in an office of a Federal agency. This same county committee had had the picture of President Truman in its office when he was President and this point is conveniently forgotten by the partisan Senators from Missouri. Instead of trying to blow this case up an an example of Republican politics in Missouri, I would think they would have written the county committee and said, "For heaven's sake, how far do you want to let partisan politics go." I might add that if I had been the State committee I would have made no issue of the matter, knowing full well that men with such narrow and small minds as they had exhibited by not putting the picture of the President of the United States in the office, would be guilty of similar small mindedness particularly in carrying out their duties as committee members. However, I notice in spite of the picture episode the committee was not fired.

It is alleged (2) for 2½ years the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary have been repeatedly requested to take the necessary steps to correct the abuses in the ASC program in Missouri.

Answer and query: What abuses? This begs the question. The issue is, Were there abuses? Then just what documentation have Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS to substantiate their charges that repeated requests were made? It would be interesting to see what letters were written by them to the Department of Agriculture, and what details, if any, were set out in the letters. The repeated requests referred to probably were no more than newspaper statements setting forth unsubstantiated generalities such as appear in the July 29, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A letter of January 4, 1954, by Mr. R. D. Cummins, chairman of Newton County, Mo., PMA, to Senator SYMINGTON is set forth as an example of the Department of Agriculture not taking action on complaints. First, I would comment that the letter of Mr. Cummins does not contain specific charges of anything. Second, it was written to Senator SYMINGTON, not the Department of Agriculture. On the face of it, it appears that the State ASC committee were within their rights in discharging Mr. Cummins for making unsubstantiated charges against the ASC administration, when the gentleman, upon request, refused and failed to back up his charges by supplying details. Furthermore, Mr. Cummins himself was obviously guilty of interjecting partisan politics into the matter by referring his complaint to a United States Senator rather than the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Cummins' affidavit itself makes it clear that he was neither willing nor ready to carry out policy properly decided by the Department of Agriculture in Washington. His charges of "politics being played" remain solely in the realm of unproven generalities, and the tone of his letters and statements indicate that he is intent upon "playing politics."

Senator SYMINGTON states that the case of Mr. Cummins is not an isolated case. I wonder if all his other cases are likewise matters of unproven generalities. The real questions are, Does Newton County have a

qualified county manager? Was the most qualified applicant selected? Is the program being administered properly? Furthermore, Mr. Cummins himself is alleged to have admitted that some of the charges in his letter to Senator SYMINGTON were false, and he even refused to retract the statements that he admitted to be false.

The case of Benton County is referred to as follows: "In Benton County several qualified applicants for office manager were turned down because the State ASC committee insisted on a local mechanic." The whole issue is one of qualifications and it helps nothing for Senator SYMINGTON to simply state the applicants were qualified without setting forth some detail. Furthermore, being a local mechanic does not of itself either qualify or disqualify a man.

I have previously commented upon the Callaway County situation. Senator SYMINGTON'S statement of general conclusions does not jibe with the detailed facts in the case. He supplies no details so it is difficult to reach any conclusions.

The charges in regard to Franklin County are mere generalities with no indication whatever of who made the charges or how the charges could be substantiated. The charges are false. The Franklin County committee has not been removed. The position of office manager is vacant. The allegations in regard to Greene County have already been discussed. The chairman was removed for making political speeches.

The statement in regard to Howard County is false. The county committee fired the county manager for cause. The position of county manager is open. The allegation in regard to Lewis County is false. The audit was a bad audit, not a good audit as Senator SYMINGTON alleges. The audit is available for anyone to see. It contained false statements and the office manager resigned voluntarily rather than appear before the State committee to explain the basis for his false reports.

The Madison County case is rather apparent on the face of it. Getting into further details will demonstrate that the employee fired had not limited her campaigning to driving a car to work with a Democrat campaign sticker on it.

The charges in regard to Saline County are false. The employee was discharged for loafing on the job over a period of time and bragging about the fact that because of his influence with the vice chairman he didn't have to work if he didn't want to. The vice chairman tried to hold him in his job. These facts can be readily ascertained.

The Barton County case referred to in Senator HENNINGS' remarks becomes quite apparent just reading the case that Senator HENNINGS presents. The committee just didn't want an office manager that would carry out the policy set by the Department of Agriculture in Washington and I understand there are still difficulties in Barton County.

I am happy to note that the Senators no longer are complaining about the situation in Iron County where the chairman of the county committee who was removed has now been sentenced to the penitentiary by the Federal district court.

I personally have checked the detailed charges involved in the removal of the committee in the Mississippi County case, and if their removal is an example of what Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS regard as politics, I can unequivocally state they are in error. I would be happy to debate this or any of the cases publicly with the Senators.

The character assassination referred to by Senator SYMINGTON is most interesting in view of the fact that the Senator is the one who is dragging all this matter out in the press. Men could be removed from office without embarrassment to themselves if each time there was a removal Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS, without any knowledge of the facts, did not run to the press with charges of politics.

Indeed, the proper way to proceed—and the two Senators know it—is to ask the Department of Agriculture for information concerning the removal of any person. Then, if the files reveal there was not proper grounds for removal, some public oratory would not be out of line. I do not believe in any instance, the two Senators have followed this course. They were perfectly willing to further embarrass an incompetent committee member or manager by crying politics and calling the public's attention to the matter, only later to learn that there were ample and good grounds for the removal.

Nothing can possibly be served by having a subcommittee of the Senate headed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] come to Missouri unless he changes his approach. Senator HUMPHREY has already disqualified himself as an impartial observer by stating his conclusions ahead of time, based upon half-baked generalities advanced ex parte.

Mr. HUMPHREY'S remarks, including page 10527, "I do not trust the Secretary of Agriculture," obviously mark him as prejudiced and partisan. It is difficult to perceive how any hearing or investigation he conducted would be objective.

Senator HENNINGS' charges consist of several letters written to him by Missouri people. Senator HENNINGS is presently engaged in doing a subcommittee study of the dangers existing in the country to our civil liberties. He is an attorney, and he has many times expressed his interest in proper procedures to protect our citizens from false and unsupported accusations. Yet he is perfectly willing to set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters which make serious but unsubstantiated charges against those in charge of the Missouri ASC program. Is this his idea of correct and fair procedure? Wasn't he interested in obtaining the statements from the other parties involved? Senator HENNINGS states, "My files are replete with irate letters from Missouri farmers." I wonder if the few he plucked out to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are typical? I wonder what he has done to try to test the accuracy of the charges of the irate farmers?

Furthermore, I wonder if Senator HENNINGS approves the procedure of writing up these general charges and merely inserting the material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without subjecting himself to cross-examination or rebuttal. I wonder if he will not agree with me that the correct procedure on matters of this nature, which is observed by many Senators and Congressmen, to notify those who might disagree with him that he plans to take the floor to set forth certain charges. Furthermore, what has Senator HENNINGS done in the Department of Agriculture or with representatives of the Eisenhower administration to stop the practice he alleges exists other than to publicize charges he apparently has never investigated or verified?

Now, I am contacting my Republican colleagues in the Senate to do what I can to assure that any investigation or hearing conducted in Missouri on this subject be conducted in a fair and nonpartisan manner. A fair, impartial investigation is welcome and is needed to separate slander from facts.

If there is any basis to the general charges made by Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS, we want to get to the bottom of them and correct the situation. To date there have been little details set forth upon which to investigate the accuracy of the general charges. In the few instances where details are given it becomes quite apparent that they are incomplete and untrue.

To conclude and restate the case, Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS' charges that there is political manipulation in the farm program in Missouri, are general, unchecked, unsubstantiated by detail and made without reference to specific denials by those against whom the charges are directed. There has been no real attempt to present these charges to the Department of Agriculture for substantiation and correction. The primary efforts seem to be devoted to conducting a political publicity campaign, and having, as it does, a subject involving other men's integrity, a "smear campaign."

The fact remains that no charges have been made that the county managers are not administering a good program without partisanship. No charges, except the one of Benton County, which is unsubstantiated, have been made that the best applicant for county manager was not chosen. In contrast we have an encouraging picture of 70 percent of the county managers being appointed holding bachelor of science degrees in agriculture.

The extent of the charges center around removals of county committees and office managers. The State ASC chairman has made the challenge that there has been no removal in Missouri for other than cause. The files are available to be checked. In consideration of the people removed the checking should be done quietly and without publicity. I would be happy to go over any case in detail with Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS to check whether, indeed, in their opinions, the removal was not in the best interests of good administration. If the matter is one in which there is real disagreement, then the matter should be publicized (regrettable for the individual), but necessarily in order for the public to exercise their judgment of whether the procedures followed have been fair and just.

And now, Mr. Secretary, I wish to state that I am making this letter public. I want everyone in Missouri who has heard the general charges of political manipulation in the farm program being made to understand the matter, and understand that these charges are denied, that they are unproven, and in the opinion of the State ASC committee cannot be proved because they are untrue. If any person can throw light on any specific case I would be happy to have their name and statement. I want no partisanship interfering with our Missouri farm program, whether it be in administration of the program or in making false accusations against its administration.

Let Senators SYMINGTON and HENNINGS agree to resolve this issue. Let's have the charges and countercharges investigated by a group of impartial Missouri citizens or a congressional committee that comes in to review the situation without bias and prejudice.

My interest, I might add, comes from several sources: As a Missouri citizen, as one of the two Republican Congressmen from Missouri (and I might add my colleague, Congressman SHORT, has asked me to undertake the chore for both of us) and by specific request of the Republican State chairman and, finally, as one who believes in honesty and fairness in political matters.

I have great faith in your integrity and abilities, sir. I think the Department of Agriculture under your administration has been excellent. I feel certain that the administration of your Department in Missouri merits your complete confidence. I want the matter fully and impartially investigated. I want partisan politics out of the administration of the agriculture programs. There is plenty of room to draw up political sides on the policy questions without resorting to mudslinging.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

REMARKS OF THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 2, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the July 29, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 10519–10529, there appear certain charges that there has been political manipulation in the farm program in Missouri. Under the rules of the House which do not permit criticism to be directed against Members of the other body, it is awkward to refute the charges in detail on the floor of the House. However, it is proper to state that any charges that there has been political manipulation by the Eisenhower administration in the farm program in Missouri are incapable of proof because they are untrue. I have written a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, which I have made public, setting forth in detail a refutation of the charges made with comment as to what the situation actually is.

Certain charges were also made about the large increase in expenses in the ASC program, exclusive of CCC grain storage structures. The following statement shows conclusively that expenses in the ASC county officers have decreased with respect to programs where the workload is the same or has declined and has increased only in those cases where there has been additional workload. It demonstrates that the total increases in county expenses is attributable in its entirety to workload rather than the method of operation.

The statement which follows shows the program breakdown of ASC county committee expenses for the State of Missouri and in total for all States for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954:

ASC county committee expenses

Program	Fiscal year		Increase (+), decrease (−), 1954 over 1953
	1953	1954	
I. STATE OF MISSOURI			
Agricultural conservation and farmland restoration	$829,760	$718,435	−$111,325
Agricultural adjustment programs	190,202	950,214	+760,012
Loans and purchase agreements	131,622	134,054	+2,432
Crop insurance	44,208	14,913	−29,295
CCC (other than grain storage structures)	105,566	824,000	+718,434
Reimbursements	16,516	15,338	−1,178
Total	1,317,874	2,656,954	+1,339,080
II. TOTAL ASC COUNTY COMMITTEES FOR ALL STATES			
Agricultural conservation and farmland restoration	20,977,502	18,156,348	−2,821,154
Agricultural adjustment programs	8,627,680	33,869,387	+25,241,707
Sugar	285,000	318,108	+33,108
Loans and purchase agreements	4,298,236	5,505,107	+1,206,871
Crop insurance	1,992,075	545,988	−1,446,087
CCC (other than grain storage structures)	7,606,404	10,019,297	+2,412,893
Reimbursements	493,660	549,129	+55,469
Total	44,280,557	68,963,364	+24,682,807

Analysis of these figures indicates that for the only program where the workload was relatively stable, agricultural conservation, the expenditures decreased in 1954.

The increase in expenses for the agricultural-adjustment programs was due to the imposition of acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat, cotton, and corn in 1954, which were not in effect for 1953.

The increase in expenses for the sugar program was caused by the imposition in 1954 of proportionate shares on sugarcane.

An increase in the number and amount of CCC loans in 1954 accounts for increased expenses in that year.

The decrease in crop insurance expenses in 1954 reflects primarily the decrease in workload.

The emergency feed program, which was particularly heavy in Missouri, accounts for the increase in CCC programs other than grain storage structures.

The wide fluctuations of workloads makes it extremely difficult to segregate savings due to changes of methods of operations, but the agricultural-conservation program, the only program with a relatively stable workload, does show a significant decrease.

Analysis of expenditures for county committeemen, office manager, and chief clerks' salaries in the fiscal years 1953 and 1954 indicated (1) that about $1,200,000 was saved in 1954 over 1953 in the 10 States which had no office managers in 1953, and (2) that about $1,300,000 was saved in county committee salaries in 1954 over 1953, although the agricultural adjustment programs required nearly 400 man-years of additional work.

A comparison of 1954 expenses with those for 1953 in a State where there was no change in the method of operations proves conclusively that increased expenses in 1954 were due primarily to increases in workload chiefly the agricultural-production programs and the drought emergency programs. This is evident in the statement for Oregon, shown below. It should be noted that expenses for the agricultural-conservation program increased in 1954 and that there was no drought emergency program in Oregon in that year:

Oregon ASC county committee expenses

Program	Fiscal year		Increase (+) decrease (−) 1954 over 1953
	1953	1954	
Agricultural conservation	$213,619	$230,390	+$16,771
Agricultural adjustment programs	52,991	157,380	+104,389
Sugar	5,513	4,936	−577
Loans and purchase agreements	87,641	76,343	−11,298
Crop insurance	19,098	8,610	−10,488
CCC (other than grain storage structures)	93,688	68,717	−24,971
Reimbursements	4,911	6,324	+1,413
Total	477,461	552,700	+75,239

There was further criticism on the change in the farmer committee system and the establishment of country office managers. The following, I believe, is a statement that accurately presents the Department of Agriculture's position on this matter and the reasons for the changes.

Early in this administration, it became apparent from the department's studies that several changes were needed to strengthen the farmer committee system. The Department was aware of the splendid contribution these committees had made in the past, and determined to make the best possible use of their services in administering farm programs. This committee structure, composed of community and county committees elected by farmers, and the State committees appointed by the Secretary, is responsible for the local administration of the agricultural conservation, acreage allotment and marketing quota, price support, and sugar programs. Formerly known as production and marketing administration committees, these committees are now known as agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to conform with internal reorganizations made in the Department.

The first changes were made in March 1953. These were for the purpose of increasing efficiency, promoting economy, and attracting more competent farmers to serve in committee positions. The principal change made at that time was to separate the policymaking and policy-executing functions of State and county offices. The policy-forming functions were assigned to farmer committees. The committees now operate in much the same manner as a board of directors. They make the policies of the office and hire trained employees appointed by and responsible to them to carry out the committee's decisions and to be responsible for the day-to-day operation of the office. This method of operation has enabled both the farmer committeemen and their hired employees to perform the functions which each is best qualified to undertake. A second change was to employ committeemen on a part-time and when-actually-needed basis, rather than full time. This change not only reduced costs, but enabled the Department of Agriculture to attract many capable and interested farmers to serve in these positions who otherwise would have been unwilling or unable to serve.

These first two changes affected primarily the Midwest States. Most of the other States were already operating on this basis. The good experience gained from the operation in most of the States, convinced the Department that this system should be used nationwide.

Third, a rotation system was established for State committees under which a member is replaced each year. This has brought fresh and wider viewpoints to bear on farm problems in the State, and at the same time insured stability and continuity of policy by retaining experienced members of the committees from one year to the next.

Early in the Eisenhower administration it was determined that county committees should continue to choose their own personnel. It was felt that the local farmers had generally done a good job in selecting employees, and that an important part of the new grassroots approach should be to keep these committees functioning with a maximum of local responsibility. However, in order to attract capable people, the Department published minimum standards which employees were required to meet. The enforcement of these national standards, or such higher standards for the State as the State ASC committee elected to use, was delegated to the State committee. It was emphasized that these standards were to be used to get qualified employees and not to substitute the judgment of the State committee for that of the county committee where the employee selected by the county committee met the qualification standards. The Department also established for the first time a national scale of salaries for these employees which provides flexibility to meet varied situations in different States and counties.

Last year the Department made additional changes in the committee system, all designed to strengthen and improve it, and necessary to supplement the several improvement actions taken previously. These changes place the election machinery in the hands of an independent group of farmers to

insure fairness in the conduct of committee elections, tighten eligibility requirements for committeemen to exclude persons with conflicting interests, and simplify the election procedure. One of the most frequent criticisms of the farmer committee system in the past has been that some committees were using the election machinery to perpetuate themselves in office. This is not a valid criticism under today's operations because the Department has moved to make committeemen as representative as possible of the farmers they are selected to serve.

It has been, and continues to be, the Department's policy to free the farmer committee system of partisan politics. The Department has stated on many occasions that these committees can serve their cause and their country best in an atmosphere which is as devoid as humanly possible from partisan considerations.

Only Significant Difference Was in Quantity of Work, and Impaired Workers Rated Higher—Experience of Atomic Energy Commission in Employing Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of several congressional investigations into the problems of the physically handicapped, and as sponsor of legislation to encourage the hiring of the handicapped, I have repeatedly been struck by the fact that all impartial and objective studies of the value of these employees as compared to unimpaired workers always show the handicapped ranking very high for any work they are capable of performing.

Adm. Louis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, confirms this experience of mine in a report just issued which analyzes the experience of the AEC employing the physically handicapped. Admiral Strauss reported that a study of the performance of 300 handicapped persons in one AEC laboratory revealed there was no significant difference in job performance between the impaired and unimpaired.

When comparing the two groups in ability, adaptability, attendance, attitude, dependability, quantity of work—

And so forth. He wrote in the July issue of the monthly publication Performance issued by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped—

The only significant difference was found in the factor, quantity of work. On this point the impaired workers were rated higher. The impaired group also had a better safety record than the unimpaired group. From janitorial activities to the design of new nuclear reactors, this group of handicapped employees has more than carried its assigned workload.

The AEC Chairman said that use of physically handicapped persons in atomic-energy work has added needed scientists to the labor force, helping to fill a serious shortage of qualified people.

The press release issued July 29 by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, which reported on the study by the Atomic Energy Commission, is as follows:

AEC HEAD SAYS HIRE-THE-HANDICAPPED PROGRAM ADDS SCIENTISTS TO LABOR FORCE

The policy of employing physically handicapped individuals in the Atomic Energy Commission materially increases the number of scientists in the labor force, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission states in the July issue of Performance, monthly publication of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

"One of our atomic-energy research laboratories," he said, "has employed several hundred persons whose physical disabilities cover practically every conceivable type of handicap. An analysis of the performance of 300 handicapped workers revealed that there was no significant difference in job performance between the impaired group and a similar group of unimpaired employees. The two groups scored almost identically in ratings by supervisors.

"When comparing the two groups in ability, adaptability, attendance, attitude, dependability, quantity of work, etc., the only significant difference was found in the factor, quantity of work. On this point the impaired workers were rated higher. The impaired group also had a better safety record than the unimpaired group. From janitorial activities to the design of new nuclear reactors, this group of handicapped employees has more than carried its assigned workload.

"Of particular interest to the Atomic Energy Commission is the fact that such programs increase the number of scientists and engineers in the labor force.

"As one example, one laboratory employed a design engineer who had atrophy of the right leg and paralysis of both legs since the age of 6 months. Using a basic form of remote-control equipment in his crutches, he designs mechanical arms and hands that can operate through protecting walls and manipulate radioactive materials.

"The ever-increasing needs of American industry makes it imperative, therefore, that no physically handicapped individual possessing usable skills be denied employment in a job for which his skills qualify him. Ability rather than disability must be the watchword of any individual who is responsible for employee selection and placement."

"Atomic energy research," Admiral Strauss said, "has placed new tools in the hands of medical scientists that will materially assist in the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals."

"These tools," he said, "will enable us to gain a better understanding of what makes the human body behave as it does and to assist in the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals, thus making more of them capable of gainful employment."

Always More To Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial by Mr. Belmont Dennis, editor and publisher of the Conyers News. Mr. Dennis is also editor and publisher of the Covington News, and is a resident of Covington, Newton County, Ga. It was with pleasure that I read the editorial which follows, and I hope that it will be of interest to others who shall read it:

ALWAYS MORE TO LEARN

Learning is the common denominator of democracy. The higher the level of learning in this country, the higher will be the level of our form of government. Freedom to pursue knowledge is the birthright of Americans, and this means each individual is privileged to advance and learn with limitations set only by his own ambition and capabilities.

Public education and compulsory school attendance have raised the literacy level higher in this country than anywhere else in the world. With that rise also have risen our standards of ethics, our social and political institutions.

Mere literacy, however, is only a stepping-stone to learning. And learning is only the raw material of thinking. Because of our broad base of education, we Americans have become leaders in the sciences, the arts, and in human relations.

These thoughts are generated by the recent award of large cash prizes by the publishers of the New York Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedia and of the Unicorn Book of the Year to the winners of two nationwide information contests.

The prizes awarded by the publishers of these excellent research and reference works are of interest primarily to the winners. The public has a much more profound interest in the contests. Thousands of contestants, of all ages and walks of life, of all degrees of formal education, have been stimulated to scholarship, research, and a thirst for knowledge.

We feel that this publishing firm has performed a noteworthy service in demonstrating that intelligent curiosity need not end in the classroom—that the home, the foundation of our free way of life, can be an important place of learning through ownership and use of family reference libraries. They have taught us that study can be a rewarding and pleasurable hobby which helps bind the family ties.

Richard B. Vail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked beyond measure when I heard of the passing of my good friend Richard B. Vail. He was possessed of great character and integrity. During the years he was in Congress he served his country, his State, and his district with distinction.

I know every Member of Congress who was privileged to serve with Dick Vail, will remember his many courtesies and acts of kindness.

I join with all his many friends in expressing my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

The Nation's Medical and Scientific Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced 3 bills dealing with the medical and scientific needs of the country. These measures are the result of prolonged study and many conferences.

In essence, the 3 bills would:

One. Provide $250,000 to cover the cost of preparation, publication, and distribution of science teaching text and laboratory manual supplements for public, elementary, and secondary schools which would be prepared by qualified private science teaching groups.

Two. Institute a national program of 10 college scholarships per State each year for needy students who qualify in a nationwide mental examination.

Three. (a) Provide $20 million of Federal funds for use on a matching basis to aid the States in the construction of psychiatric hospitals and psychiatric rehabilitation centers; and (b) Provide $5 million of United States funds for aid to the States on a matching basis for use in building narcotic addicts hospitals and narcotic addicts treatment and rehabilitation clinics.

It is my firm conviction that our national medical and scientific research activities are in need of great augmentation. However, it is recognized that before any large-scale expansion can be undertaken, many more thousands of trained scientific personnel are needed. Yet, while this need is clear, American schools graduate fewer and fewer trained personnel each year. The gravity of the situation is well demonstrated in an excellent article which appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times this past Sunday. The author of that article is Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation. He has stated the case with great directness and clarity. Dr. Waterman cited these startling statistics in his presentation:

Engineering graduates

	1950	1954
Soviet Russia	28,000	54,000
United States	52,000	22,000

He said, "The fact is that there are not going to be enough teachers and experienced research investigators to train the coming generation of scientists and engineers when the youngsters resulting from the high birthrates of the forties enter college in a few years."

This shortage is apparent today on the elementary and secondary school level.

Dr. Waterman set forth four basic steps to help reverse this shocking trend by "increasing the broad base of our educated population from which scientists and leaders in other fields must come; locating and attracting into the sciences youngsters with special aptitudes in that direction; improving the quality of instruction in the secondary schools; developing an appreciation of pure research as the foundation of our strength in science. Above all, we must strive for a climate of opinion that will be favorable to our intellectual as well as creative activities," he said.

I believe that two of the bills which I have introduced will help to meet the needs outlined by Dr. Waterman.

The first would provide funds to enable private groups to prepare, publish, and distribute, without charge, supplementary science teaching text and laboratory manuals to public elementary and secondary schools throughout the country.

Such manuals would fill the long gap which exists between publication of regular editions of grade- and high-school text and laboratory books. It has been found that revisions of such standard works are not economically feasible more frequently than every 7 to 10 years. As a result, classroom work can be seriously retarded, particularly when science courses in our crowded schools have to be taught by substitute teachers, not especially trained in the sciences.

These manuals would include text material to the extent that new topics come up that are deemed of interest to students and have not been treated in the textbooks that are available. Similarly, they would include laboratory exercises that involve subject matter and skills so recently developed that they are not included in the current laboratory books. The material would be distributed through national science-teaching societies and organizations. The established publishing houses could produce such manuals on a straight contract or other reimbursement basis. As is the case with the traditional preparation of manuscripts, science teachers and professors in teacher-training universities would produce the materials. Coordination of topics could be accomplished through a national science-teachers organization such as the Future Scientists of America Foundation of the National Science Teachers Association. Such an organization, a division of the National Education Association, would be eminently qualified to conduct the entire program and could be authorized to do so under my bill.

The cost of such a program is modest indeed when compared with the benefits to be derived. A typical booklet could be produced and a copy sent to each of the Nation's 28,000 high schools for approximately $5,000. To place 1 copy in the hands of each of the Nation's 365,000 physics students would cost 10 or 12 times that sum. There are in the United States approximately 70,000 teachers who have assignments involving one or more sciences. A worthwhile manual could be prepared for them at a cost of only about $1 per teacher, including the cost of development, production, and distribution.

The second bill which I introduced would carry on the training process at the college and graduate-school levels. In 1950, according to Dr. Waterman, we had 59,000 graduates in the natural sciences. Four years later, in 1954, we had only 29,000. He pointed out that the record total of graduates in 1950 was largely due to the GI bill of rights. He said:

> It shows what we can do. The substantially lower figures for the years that follow represent a serious handicap to the full development of our national strength.

My bill would increase college enrollments, principally at the land-grant colleges, by about 500 students each year. They would be eligible for both undergraduate and graduate work.

In February of this year, the Health Resources Advisory Committee under the able chairmanship of Dr. Howard A. Rusk, reported on the serious and increasing national shortage of trained health personnel. This report dealt essentially with physicians, dentists, and nurses but is a clear indication of the situation regarding all our scientific personnel. Dr. Rusk reported:

> We have a tight supply situation in the three major health professions—medicine, dentistry, and nursing. The supply both of physicians and dentists has not increased as fast as the population, in the period since the beginning of World War II. * * * There is little prospect for improvement in the total situation in this decade.

This report went on to point out the serious shortage of faculty members on the staffs of medical schools and that at least 30 million Americans live in areas without organized health departments. The report concluded that a civilian disaster of the magnitude possible today could put an incredible load on civilian health personnel.

Last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House reported that—

> An adequate number of well-trained scientists is the most important single factor in determining whether or not progress is made over the years to come in the fight against disease. Money and facilities are needed urgently, but they will not of themselves produce the knowledge we need so urgently. The crucial factor is the intelligence of adequately trained dedicated men and women who will, if given the oportunity, explore new avenues of science and thus bring us to our desired goal.

The bill I propose would give that opportunity to hundreds of Americans. It would give that opportunity to individuals capable of contributing to and strengthening our Nation. It would utilize the talents and intelligence of those who, through lack of encouragement or lack of funds, have been unable to contribute to our general well-being in the fashion they would like or to the full extent of their capabilities.

The third measure which I have introduced would expand the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to include psychiatric hospital and rehabilitation facilities and narcotic addict hospitals and treatment and rehabilitation clinics. The most critical health problem confronting the Nation today is in the field of mental health. Dr. Jonas E. Salk pointed this out immediately after the announcement of his success in culminating the conquest of poliomyelitis.

Today there is an estimated shortage of 5.3 hospital beds per thousand population in all categories of hospitals. This is a shortage of about 500,000 beds. Among the categories of hospitals,

need—as measured by additional beds required to meet minimum standards—is most acute in the mental-care field. The rate of additional beds needed per 1,000 population for mental care is 2.2; for general hospital care, 1.2; for chronic illness, 1.7; and for tuberculosis, 0.13.

At the present rate of illness, 1 out of every 12 children born will spend some time in a mental hospital. The number of patients in institutions for the care of the mentally ill is increasing steadily at the rate of approximately 10,000 per year. In addition, the number of noninstitutionalized cases have been estimated at 9 million people. That is almost 6 percent of the total United States population. Only 10 percent of these are thought to need hospital care. Thus, the urgent need for psychiatric hospitals and psychiatric rehabilitation facilities for ambulatory patients is clear. Advances in treatment have made it possible to provide increased care for the mentally ill outside of hospitals. It has become increasingly apparent that psychiatric clinics—usually defined as having a psychiatrist in attendance at regularly scheduled hours—can be of great assistance in relieving overcrowded mental hospitals. They serve as the center for the often neglected but urgently necessary followup care or rehabilitation of patients who have been hospitalized and have recovered sufficiently to return to their homes. Several States have already instituted outpatient clinics and rehabilitation facilities for the care of mental patients. I have been told that the average cost of treating a patient in one of the clinics now in operation in Michigan costs about $39 per adult as compared with $1,124 for a patient in a traditional State institution.

Despite the excellent advances which have been made under the Mental Health Act of 1946, it has been estimated that there is at present a need for more than 800 additional psychiatric clinics.

The need for similar facilities for narcotic addicts is even greater today. There are virtually no narcotic addict rehabilitation facilities in the country. In essence all of our efforts have been concentrated upon the two Federal hospitals for addicts located at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. There have been a very few State projects such as the Riverside Hospital in New York City. Dr. Isidor Chein of the Research Center for Human Relations at New York University, Dr. Solomon Kobrin of the Chicago Area Project, the Provident Hospital and Training School in Chicago, and Dr. Ralph W. Fisher of the Los Angeles Youth Committee have been virtually alone in their activities with narcotic addict rehabilitation and treatment clinics.

In view of the apparent inability of the Federal narcotic agents to stem the tide of habit-forming drugs which is flooding the country, the only solution to this virtually insoluble problem of dope addiction must lie in the cure of addicts and their rehabilitation and restoration to a useful place in society. A fully integrated program of hospital treatment and postcustodial care at rehabilitation clinics must be established at once. One example of the growing curse of addiction, and many, many more could be given, is the fact that in New York City in 1954, more boys and girls under the age of 21 were arrested for narcotic violations than the total of all narcotic arrests of adults and teenagers combined in 1946.

There is at present a waiting list of over 500 persons seeking voluntary admission to the Lexington and Fort Worth hospitals. Based upon the operating record established at these two institutions, it will take approximately 40 more years to treat the present estimate of 60,000 addicts in the United States. In addition, adequate and extensive rehabilitation facilities would serve to greatly reduce the large number of repeat admissions which prevail today as a result of back-sliding addicts.

Increased hospital custodial treatment and a sound nationwide program of rehabilitation and postcustodial care is essential.

Mr. Speaker, I offer these three bills now in the hope that during the recess the appropriate administrative agencies and professional groups may be able to study my proposals and that when the Congress reconvenes we may be able to hold public hearings promptly and enact some helpful remedial legislation. I do not claim these measures as the final word, but offer them as my own thought on the subject, in the hope that discussion and study may produce additional proposals and professional suggestions which may be adopted to help alleviate the critical conditions which exist in these scientific fields.

With your permission, I would like to include here with my remarks analyses of the three bills which I have introduced:

ANALYSIS OF THE DAVIDSON BILL TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN FINANCING PUBLICATION OF SCIENCE TEACHING MANUALS FOR USE IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

SCIENCE TEACHING MANUALS

1. Purpose: To promote science education by providing Federal assistance to the Nation's elementary and secondary schools through grants to finance the development, publication, and free distribution of science teaching manuals to supplement standard textbooks and laboratory manuals.

2. Appropriation: Not more than $250,000 in any fiscal year.

3. The United States Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to finance the preparation, publication, and distribution of such manuals for use in elementary and secondary schools.

4. Grants shall be made only to nonprofit private agencies selected by the Commissioner on the basis of experience in science teaching in the elementary and secondary schools.

5. Grants shall be made under agreements between the Commissioner and such agency providing that the agency will distribute the manuals free (except for distribution costs) to United States elementary and secondary schools which request them.

(a) Manuals in excess of those used to fill such requests may be sold, with proceeds of such sale being divided between the United States and the agency on basis of their respective contribution to cost of manuals.

(b) All such funds paid into the Treasury shall be kept in a separate account available for making additional grants.

(c) The agency shall account to the Commissioner regarding all expenditures.

6. The Government is specifically prohibited from exercising any direction, supervision, or control over the selection of authors or materials or over the personnel, curriculum, or program of any school or school system.

7. Elementary or secondary schools are defined in the bill as those providing such education at public expense and under public supervision and direction.

ANALYSIS OF COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM PROPOSED BY CONGRESSMAN IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

The purpose of this act is to promote interest in higher education and give an opportunity to needy qualified highschool graduates to attend college and graduate schools.

1. Provision is made for the awarding of the following annual scholarships:

(a) Ten to residents of each State.

(b) Five to residents of Hawaii, 5 to residents of Alaska, and 5 to residents of Puerto Rico.

(c) Two to residents of the Canal Zone and 2 to residents of the Virgin Islands.

2. Holders of scholarships shall either attend a land-grant college within their State or such other accredited college or university as the United States Commissioner of Education may designate.

3. The initial award of such a scholarship shall be based upon: (1) The results of annual competitive examinations to be held throughout the United States; (2) financial need as determined by such evidence as the Commissioner may require.

4. Examinations shall be conducted by the educational testing service of Princeton, N. J. (college boards) pursuant to arrangements with the Commissioner of Education. Any individual who has completed his or her secondary education, or who will do so within 1 year, and who has not commenced education at the college level is eligible to take the examination.

5. Initially, scholarships under this program may only be awarded for first year study at institutions of higher education. However, such scholarships may thereafter be renewed from year to year if the student's progress is satisfactory to the institution he is attending and to the Commissioner, and the student remains at least in the upper quarter of his class.

6. The Commissioner may continue to provide scholarship assistance to students who complete 4 years of undergraduate work under the program, and who he determines are outstandingly qualified to continue their education at the graduate level in the students' major field of study. The Commissioner may authorize all students to attend institutions of higher education other than those initially designated when such institution does not provide an adequate course of study in the field the individual desires to follow or when continued attendance at such institution is impracticable for other reason.

7. No scholarships may be awarded under this act or renewed under it, if the individual is receiving benefits under the educational provisions of the so-called GI bills or certain other scholarship aid.

8. Payment of scholarship assistance shall be made directly to each individual to meet in part the expenses of such individual's subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment while holding a scholarship and actually enrolled at school.

9. The allowances provided are as follows:

(a) Each scholarship student, no dependents, $110 per month;

(b) Each scholarship student, one dependent, $135 per month;

(c) Each scholarship student, more than one dependent, $160 per month.

10. Holders of such scholarships who are otherwise subject to military service require-

ments shall be deferred during satisfactory attendance under the program. However, upon completion of studies under the program all former recipients of assistance shall automatically become subject to general military requirements unless, while attending college they pursue a full 4-year Army ROTC, Naval ROTC, or Air Force ROTC program and accepted a commission in one of the services.

11. The United States Commissioner of Education shall administer the program and shall make regular studies, investigations, and reports concerning the scholarship program and shall report annually to the Congress through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He may employ specialists, experts, and consultants when deemed necessary.

12. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall consult with the heads of other executive departments and Federal agencies with the aim of coordipating all scholarship programs administered by the Federal Government.

13. No Federal department, agency, officer, or employee may exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of any educational institution or over its administration or personnel.

14. Scholarships shall be awarded without regard to sex, creed, race, color, religion or national origin.

ANALYSIS OF CONGRESSMAN IRWIN D. DAVIDSON'S BILL TO ASSIST THE STATES ON A PARTNERSHIP BASIS IN BUILDING MUCH-NEEDED NONPROFIT PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL AND REHABILITATION FACILITIES AND NARCOTIC ADDICTS HOSPITALS AND TREATMENT CLINICS

PSYCHIATRIC AND NARCOTIC ADDICTS HOSPITALS AND REHABILITATION FACILITIES

Title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 291) is amended by adding new parts H, I, and J which would assist the States in surveying their needs and in constructing:

A. Psychiatric facilities

1. Five hundred thousand dollars is authorized to assist the States to inventory their existing psychiatric facilities, survey the need for additional facilities, and develop programs for the construction of such facilities. The Surgeon General is authorized to use this fund to make payments of not more than 50 percent of the cost of such survey to States applying for assistance; no such allotment to any State may be less than $25,000.

2. Twenty million dollars is appropriated to aid the States in the construction of nonprofit psychiatric hospitals, rehabilitation, and treatment facilities. No allotment made to any State under this section may be less than $100,000.

3. The following types of nonprofit facilities are defined as proper for assistance under this portion of the bill:

(a) Psychiatric hospitals: These are hospitals for the intensive treatment and care of the mentally ill and those afflicted with psychiatric ailments, but not hospitals devoted essentially to providing long-term custodial care;

(b) Psychiatric treatment clinics and rehabilitation facilities: Such facilities are defined as those providing for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of ambulatory patients afflicted with psychiatric ailments, through an integrated program of medical, psychological, social, and vocational evaluation and service which is either operated in connection with a hospital or in which patient care is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice psychiatry in the State.

B. Narcotic addicts facilities

4. $250,000 is authorized for use in assisting the States to inventory their drug addicts facilities, survey the need for such facilities, and develop programs for the construction of such medical facilities.

5. $5 million is appropriated to aid the States in the construction of the following types of nonprofit facilities:

(a) Narcotic hospitals to provide suitable custodial care and treatment of narcotic addicts.

(b) Treatment clinics and rehabilitation facilities for the care and treatment of ambulatory patients overcoming narcotic addiction and not in need of custodial care.

Appropriate integrated treatment by competent professional personnel in medical, psychological, social, and vocational fields would be provided at such facilities which are either connected with a hospital or in which the patient care is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice medicine in the State.

6. The States may submit applications for survey and construction funds for both psychiatric hospitals, rehabilitation facilities and narcotic addicts hospitals, treatment centers and rehabilitation clinics as provided in the original Hill-Burton Act.

The act provides for:

(a) A single responsible State agency to administer the States program;

(b) A State medical facilities advisory council which includes representatives of nongovernmental groups or provides for consultation with such groups.

(c) State reports to the Surgeon General supplying such information as he shall require, including relative need for such facilities determined in accordance with the Surgeon General's regulations.

(d) State plans for construction of facilities eligible for assistance.

(e) Review of State plans and modification of them from time to time as is necessary.

7. Allotments under both the psychiatric and narcotic addicts portions of the bill are to be made to the States on the same basis as was provided in the 1954 amendments to the Hill-Burton Act, except that the Surgeon General may consider special facts relating to the incidence of narcotic addiction within the States in allotting funds for drug addict medical facilities construction and surveys.

8. The Federal share of the cost of all projects is to be determined in the same fashion as is provided under existing law in the case of projects covered by the 1954 amendments to title VI. There are three alternatives:

(a) Special standards may be established under the State plan which is approved by the Surgeon General;

(b) In the absence of such standards, an amount to be determined, but not less than one-third nor more than two-thirds of the State's allotment percentage; or

(c) Fifty percent of the cost of construction, if the State so elects.

9. A State may, subject to the approval of the Surgeon General, request that a specified portion of an allotment to it be transferred and added to the corresponding allotment of another State in order to meet a portion of the Federal share of the construction in such other state of psychiatric or narcotic addicts facilities.

10. No application for diagnostic or treatment centers or psychiatric treatment and rehabilitation facilities may be approved unless the applicant is either:

(a) A State, political subdivision, or public agency;

(b) Corporation or association which owns and operates a nonprofit hospital; or

(c) A corporation, association, fund, trust, or foundation organized and operated exclusively for either charitable or educational purposes as described in section 170 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

11. The recapture provisions of existing law are extended to the new act and definitions of "psychiatric hospitals" and "psychiatric treatment and rehabilitation facilities" are added.

Small Business and the United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of Wallace J. Campbell, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business concerning the report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Wallace J. Campbell. I am director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. The league is a federation of consumer, purchasing, and services cooperatives across the Nation with a direct membership of over 2 million families, both rural and urban. In addition, we have in associate membership an additional 9 million members affiliated through the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the Credit Union National Association.

The cooperative league is very much interested in the report of the Attorney General's committee, both in terms of its specific reference to cooperatives, and in terms of our more general concern with the protection of a free, independent, and competitive economy. The cooperatives are based on the premise of a democratic economy, one which is free from unnecessary controls on the part of the Government and also one free from control and domination by any single business or business organizations. We feel that it has been and must continue to be in the interest of all of the people of the United States to maintain our antitrust laws and to enforce them adequately.

We had hoped that the Attorney General's committee would take as its major task the review and strengthening of the antitrust laws. We are greatly disappointed in the results of the study.

It is a sad commentary on the committee itself that the press and the public breathed a deep sigh of relief when the report recommended continuation of the existing antitrust laws. This should have been the point from which the committee started rather than the point at which it arrived after long study. Unfortunately, in our judgment, the report opens the way for the weakening of the antitrust laws to such an extent that the actual effectiveness of the Government's antitrust procedure may be destroyed from within.

We would like to devote our attention first to our organization's point of specific interest, the section on agricultural cooperatives, pages 306–313.

While the report makes no recommendation for a change in the existing laws, the text itself falls into the trap set by the enemies of cooperatives who have been trying to make the public believe that cooperatives are exempt from prosecution under the antitrust laws. A layman reading the report might very well feel that some special privilege had been given to cooperatives under the Clayton Act or the Capper-Volstead Act or the Cooperative Marketing Act. None of these acts exempt the cooperatives from prosecution if they in any way violate the antitrust laws of the United States. No co-

operative organization and no cooperative official whom we know have ever asked for such an exemption.

The law is clear and the courts have always sustained the following position. The Clayton and Capper-Volstead Acts provide that the fact of the organization of a cooperative and its normal operation shall not be construed as combination in restraint of trade. The Congress felt that for the protection of the cooperatives themselves, the law should set forth plainly the fact that cooperatives, by their nature, provide the economic machinery through which people work together in their common interest. In many communities it is necessary for a cooperative, if it is to serve its members effectively, to handle the bulk of, or sometimes all of, the commodities produced or the items purchased. The law actually established the fact that this could and is being done in the interests of the members of the cooperative, and that such action does not in itself constitute a restraint of trade. If a cooperative, by its action, engages in practices which are unlawful there is nothing in the law, and never has been anything in the law, which frees the cooperatives from the same responsibility which falls on any other business enterprise.

In the conclusions and recommendations on this section, the report says, "Some members would add that the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture over two decades to institute a single proceeding against an agricultural cooperative at least suggests that enforcement responsibility be put elsewhere." The implication of the statement is obvious, and we feel, completely unwarranted.

A little earlier the report questions the growth of centrally controlled cooperatives, or federated cooperatives. These organizations are essential to the interests of the farmers and consumers of America, and are as completely a part of the pattern of American cooperation as is the small marketing cooperative or the farm supply co-op. These central organizations have no way of escaping antitrust prosecutions either, and are proud to stand up as part of the established business community, assuming their full rights and responsibilities.

It is extremely significant, as Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN pointed out in his review of the report, that the committee in all of its recommendations except one, leaned toward a relaxation of the antitrust laws affecting big business organizations. "As to small business, labor, and farmers," Congressman PATMAN says, "the recommendations are to make these groups open targets for the abuses of monopoly power and to enlarge the antitrust laws against the organized efforts of two of the groups—labor and farmers—by which these segments of our population have in the past sought, in some measure, protection from the abuses of the big corporations."

The Attorney General's Committee, as erudite and well informed as we assume it should have been, should know that America's cooperatives are a yardstick factor in the economy; that they have restored competition in areas where competition was in danger of being obliterated; that they are in themselves a factor in preventing monopoly; and, in the words of Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, "The cooperatives are about the highest type of private industry" and "one of the strongest bulwarks against vesting too much power in Government." The committee might have better devoted its time to finding a way of strengthening cooperatives rather than implying that they may be guilty of monopoly practices.

Your committee is having presented to it rather comprehensive analyses of other sections of the report. Since I am not an attorney, I would like to give you a layman's appraisal of some of the features of the report which we feel are dangerous.

The most important loophole which the Attorney General's Committee would drive into the antitrust laws is the recommendation that greater attention be given to the rule of reason in the settlement of antitrust cases. This attractive, slick slogan—for slogan it is—may well be used to cover a drive to eliminate the rule of law in antitrust enforcement.

The Sherman Act, as you know, made "every contract, combination in the form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade of commerce * * * illegal." The hopes which small business had at that time were dashed badly when the Supreme Court wrote the rule of reason into the Sherman Act. The net effect was that the Sherman Act was made so weak that it was necessary for the Congress to pass the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to prevent further abuses. If the formation of a monopoly or the destruction of competitive business through price discrimination, exclusive dealing, quantity discounts, brokerage fees to purchasers, combinations and mergers, are unlawful, it is a destruction of the law to say that such practices are legal if they are carried on in good faith.

In recent years the good faith defense for illegal action has made it possible for huge business enterprises to excuse their discriminatory prices and other predatory actions by saying that they acted in good faith, fearing that some other large competitor would offer the same discriminatory prices. The result is that thousands of small businesses can be, and in some cases are, destroyed with the guilty party escaping by saying that his act was in good faith.

The Kefauver and Patman bills, S. 11 and H. R. 11, are designed to strengthen the antitrust laws by eliminating the possibility that businesses may hide behind the good faith defense.

You may be interested in a layman's interpretation of how you can most easily destroy your competitor. The practice is one of price discrimination. It is possible for a firm with many units, such as the A. & P. which was indicted for this practice, or other large organizations, to secure competitive economic advantage by forcing a supplier to give it a discriminatory price because of its economic power. The huge business may then cut its prices in an area where it wishes to destroy a competitor. Those prices can be at or below cost, forcing a competitor to carry on his business with a destructive loss until he is eliminated completely. The cost of this operation on the part of the chain organization is recouped by charging slightly higher prices in its other units around the country. The consumers actually, by this process, are paying for the destruction of a competitive factor in the economy.

The Robinson-Patman Act was designed to prevent discriminatory pricing. The enforcement of that act should be strengthened rather than weakened as the Attorney General's committee report would indicate.

The Attorney General's committee has successfully led the public to believe that it was on the side of the consumer because it advocates the repeal of the so-called fair trade laws. Such a repeal might turn out to be a temporary gain for the consumer if at the same time the Robinson-Patman Act and the Clayton Act were so weakened that thousands of small businesses were destroyed and the genuine competitive factors in the economy were eliminated.

The one point where the committee has urged a strengthening of the antitrust laws has been in the penalties advocated for violation of the Sherman Act, recommending the lifting of the maximum penalty from $5,000 to $10,000. The House of Representatives, not waiting for the committee, had already boosted the maximum penalty from $5,000 to $50,000. The doubling of the penalty recommended by the committee may sound "tough" until you realize that if you merely accounted for a change in price level in the 60 years since that ceiling was written into the act, an adjustment of economic penalty would be many times the size of the fine recommended by the committee.

True to the pattern of the report itself, this small increase in the penalty would be hard on genuine small business and would have no significance whatever to the multimillion-dollar corporations which are the chief targets of the antitrust laws.

Fortunately, the report itself contains some able and effective dissents. At many points throughout the report the minority have revealed about 30 places where the committee would weaken the antitrust laws. These dissents, like the famous dissents of Justice Brandeis, Justice Cardoza, Justice Holmes, and others, are actually the interpretation of the public interest. The Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, in keeping with its tradition and philosophy, will find these dissents more important and more valid for a basis of legislative action than the majority opinion set forth in the report. We commend these dissents to your serious attention.

Relations With Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Red Chinese Gesture," published today in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED CHINESE GESTURE

Inevitably, the first reaction to Peiping's announcement that 11 American aviators who have been imprisoned in Red China for about 2½ years are now to be set free in a feeling of relief and satisfaction. We are happy that these men can come back to their own world. We are especially happy on behalf of their families, who have been kept in cruel alternation between hope and despair for so long.

Likewise, there ought to be a feeling of gratitude to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, for the earnest efforts he made to obtain the release of these men. He pursued that objective unremittingly from the time that he felt that the obligation had been properly imposed upon him.

These sentiments of gratitude and satisfaction over the personal aspects of the case cannot, however, shut out some of the questions that must be asked. What does this gesture on the part of Communist China mean in the larger picture? Why was it timed precisely for the opening of the Geneva conversations? What is Red China angling for, and what does Red China expect to gain?

There is reason for skepticism. These men should have been released long ago. They could have been sent home at Panmunjom. They could have been set free when Mr. Hammarskjold made this trip to Peiping last December. They could have been freed to give an even sweeter aroma to the Bandung conference.

Instead, they are suddenly freed at the moment of the opening of this latest diplomatic meeting. More than that, they are twice stigmatized in Peiping's announcement as the 11 criminals. There is, therefore, no admission that the Red Chinese had ever acted badly, or even that they are now acting belatedly. Instead, the Communists have suddenly discovered that the behavior of these criminals was fairly good and that they can now be deported. That Peiping should expect to get worldwide credit for a new humaneness through this grudging and insultingly phrased gesture is impudent.

It was quite apparent in the summit conference that the Communists had decided that honey was a better bait than vinegar. Apparently the directive has now gone out to Peiping as well and Mao, Chou, and their underlings seem ready to give us a taste of the same, the sweetness and light treatment. Insofar as this means life instead of death for imprisoned Americans we are grateful. If it also means life instead of death for civilization, if the drive is really for peace, we can rejoice. But we need more certainty.

What does Red China want out of the Geneva talks? The immediate major objectives are already clear. First of all, the Communists hope to create further fissures on the question of Formosa. They want to make the Nationalists uneasy about the continuance of our support and to make us uneasy about giving it. They hope to raise, once again, the question of United Nations membership and United States recognition. And most of all, as they have repeatedly said, they want to relieve tensions by getting the United States out of the Pacific; lock, stock, and commitments.

As a start on this program they announce as a humanitarian gesture what they should have done years ago. It remains to be seen if their next gesture will be the promise not to do again what they had no business doing in the first place. Perhaps the next move will be to free some of the civilian hostages in China, who should never have been imprisoned, and we will be expected to receive that also in humble thankfulness.

Each of the gestures, of course, does make its contribution to a lessening of the tenseness that has gripped us all. The Russian smiles at Geneva were part of that. The Red Chinese are obviously taking the same line. Naturally, we welcome this relief, yet it would be folly to allow a lessening of tenseness to mean a lessening of caution and logic. The release of these 11 aviators may well be a good augury for a pleasanter atmosphere in Geneva. We hope so. But Red China still must prove that she wants a just peace.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Annual Convention Baquet of the AMVETS, Department of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered at the annual banquet of the AMVETS, Department of Pennsylvania, at Uniontown, Pa., on Saturday, July 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled in a community enriched in history.

Here in Uniontown we are close to many historic shrines which are constant reminders of the courage and valor of the pioneers of American freedom.

In colonial days this region was the scene of many campaigns against the French and Indians which finally establish British supremacy on the North American Continent. Battles fought here shaped the course of our history and the destiny of two great European empires.

Fort Necessity, where George Washington first commanded troops under fire, is only 10 miles east of here. Washington knew this entire country. As a young soldier, on his first important military mission, he recognized the strategic value of the point, in the present city of Pittsburgh, where the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers meet to form the Ohio.

Route 40, over which some of you traveled to this convention, has a place of great importance in our history. It recalls the romantic days of our Nation's westward expansion.

First designated as the Cumberland Road, it became known as the National Pike. It was the first road built by the Federal Government. A little more than a century ago it was the principal highway between the East and the West.

Soldiers, statesmen, merchants, educators, preachers, farmers, explorers, and adventurers passed along the National Pike. They traveled on foot, on horseback, and in vehicles of every description. The road was used daily by fast stage coaches and long streams of Conestoga wagon trains. Cattle, sheep, and hogs by the thousands were driven over it to eastern markets.

The road was dotted with inns and taverns to care for the drivers, teams and stock. It was travelled by General Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, Henry Clay, Sam Houston, Davey Crockett and many other celebrities of those days. In 1824 General Lafayette passed over it on his triumphal tour of the United States.

Part of the National Pike was cut through the mountain wilderness by General Braddock on his ill-fated advance on Fort Duquesne. The moving of Braddock's forces over the the mountains from Cumberland, Md., was a tremendous military operation.

About 15 miles from here, at New Geneva, is Friendship Hill, the home built by Albert Gallatin, a great Secretary of the Treasury, in 1789.

I mention these memorials of our historic past because they are part of our tradition and our way of life. Every Pennsylvania county has its shrines of great interest. They should revered and studied because the record of the past reveals the real meaning of Americanism.

You are members of a great patriotic organization. You are sincere Americans who have served our country in time of national peril. You are loyal to the one great ideal which is the strong foundation of our system of government.

Let us briefly consider that ideal and what it has accomplished.

In less than 200 years an uncharted wilderness has been transformed into the greatest Nation of all history—a country possessing the most extensive diversity of industry, the most outstanding agricultural production, the finest cultural standards and the highest spiritual level ever attained by any nation.

Many countries of the world possess more abundant natural resources than the United States. Many have soil just as rich as ours. They have people who are willing to work just as hard. They have places of historic pride. They have highly developed culture. They have deep religious beliefs.

Why is it then that we have made such great progress? Why is it that in such a short period of time we have surpassed other nations until we now have the duty of leading the free nations of the world?

The answer can be found in the ideal of freedom upon which the Founding Fathers established the American system of government.

They planned a constitutional Republic—not a democracy. For the first time in world history they proclaimed the doctrine of self-government by the people through their elected representatives. Their concept of freedom made the people the master of the government and not the servant.

The whole ideal of our individual freedom is embraced in the sacred words of the Declaration of Independence. The courageous signers of that noble document loved liberty above life itself. They were the first group brave enough to proclaim that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are Divine endowments, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the Universe.

We must never forget those brave patriots who met in Independence Hall in the summer of 1776.

They proclaimed the great truth that in the sight of God all men are created equal, with equal opportunity to develop the gifts or talents they may possess. These include the will to work, to be tolerant, to be considerate of the rights of others, to be humble, and to be upright.

The Declaration of Independence meant that every individual is important and that the purpose of government is to give every man an equal opportunity to succeed. Also that every man in America has a right to be rewarded for his industry, thrift, hard work, tolerance, and decency.

After the American Colonies gained their independence our forefathers adopted the world's greatest charter of freedom, the Constitution of the United States.

They framed a Bill of Rights to protect individual freedom from our own folly and to safeguard the citizen against oppression by an all-powerful Central Government.

They established the principle that government has no power over the individual beyond that specifically granted by the people themselves.

The Constitution guarantees human rights and dignity but it also protects the right of every American to acquire and own property.

The right to enjoy the rewards of one's labor and industry is one of the greatest of all human rights. It is the basis of the American system of free competitive private enterprise. It made possible the miracle of American progress and prosperity.

Yes, on this firm foundation of freedom and opportunity our Republic has grown in strength and vigor unparalleled in the history of mankind.

But we must remember the warning sounded by students of history that great republics and democracies of the past have been undermined and destroyed by certain evil conditions.

Among these are moral decay among the people, failure to understand the nature of their government, and emotionalism, generated by false leaders.

Government is weakened when demagogs play upon the emotions of the people, stirring up demands for great variety of functions, services, and payments at public expense. The demagogs cause the people to forget that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people.

In order for a republic or a democracy to survive there must be constant teaching of what it means. The people must under-

stand that they are the government. They must understand that while we have great rights we also have equal obligations to defend those rights.

They must understand that everything the government gives in the way of grants, aids, or projects must be paid for by the people in direct or hidden taxes.

Hidden taxes are very dangerous. Debt is also dangerous. More nations have fallen as a result of confiscatory taxes and burdensome debt than from invading armies. Public and private debt in America is more than $600 billion. Even with inflation, it is more than our total wealth.

The greatest responsibilty of patriotic American citizenship is to protect our free Government. You men as soldiers fought to defend the ideals of our Republic.

Every soldier, in taking the oath to support the Constitution, assumes an obligation to do everything he can to become a better member of his organization.

After we have served in the uniform we have an equal obligation for faithful and earnest service to see that our Nation may progress and become stronger.

We should all take part in Government because it is our Government. Our forefathers, when they signed the Declaration of Independence, pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. We must do the same thing.

There are enemies abroad and there are enemies within who would destroy our sacred ideals of freedom and independence. To preserve those freedoms, we must be vigilant. Our duty is to be as vigilant as civilians as we were on guard during the war.

At a critical time in the Revolution, General Washington ordered: "Place none but Americans on guard tonight." Real Americans, like yourselves, must be constantly on guard.

America became great as a land of opportunity. To keep it that way, we must have deep patriotism. Let freedom always ring. Let us always associate ourselves with true patriots Let us fight to preserve this as a land of individual freedom and opportunity.

How can it be done? Everyone must stand up for American ideals.

It has been suggested that true observance of the Golden Rule, that time honored and accepted way of life, would save the ideals of this Republic.

"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

This would mean less arrogance; it would mean obedience to the law; it would mean leaving out of good society men who do questionable things within the bounds of law; it would mean humility and repentance; and it would mean that everyone of us would strive to make this a better country.

There must be no question about the loyalty of an American. You were loyal to your service unit. Let us give equal loyalty to the township, borough, and city in which we live. Let us take great pride in our counties and in our States.

This will build a stronger America. It will preserve for future generations the great blessing of freedom—freedom of the individual and freedom of opportunity.

Schoolteacher Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by one of my constituents, Mrs. Oscar A. Ahlgren of Whiting, Ind., which was published in the July 3, 1955 issue of Grit, a family newspaper widely distributed in the small towns and rural areas of this Nation.

Mrs. Ahlgren is a member of President Eisenhower's Committee for the White House Conference on Education. This presidential program seeks to improve education throughout the United States. The plan calls for the holding of statewide meetings on educational problems in the 48 States, and similar conferences on education in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These conferences will then culminate in the White House Conference at Washington November 28–December 1, 1955.

Mrs. Ahlgren's article discusses the schoolteacher shortage in the Nation, one of the six major subjects under study by the Presidential Committee and scheduled for the agenda of the national conference. Mrs. Ahlgren states in her article that:

Good teachers mean good pupils, and good students mean good citizens in peace or war. The end result of good teaching and good teachers is a society of individuals trained to accept the responsibilities of freedom.

I concur with her statement wholeheartedly. Her article is a timely one and reaches to the heart of the teacher shortage problem and the importance of its impact on the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOLTEACHER SHORTAGE SEEN CHALLENGING TO NATION

(By Mrs. Oscar A. Ahlgren)

(Mrs. Oscar A. Ahlgren is a member of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education and a past president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.)

Do you want your child to become a schoolteacher?

The teen-age daughter of my neighbor bluntly told her mother: "Why should I become a teacher? There's no future in marrying someone who makes $60 to $75 a week. I want a job where I can meet fellows who have a chance to get ahead. Teaching is a dead-end street."

Her attitude startled me, so I decided to do some research. I discovered train baggagemen, bartenders, paperhangers, and truck drivers earn more than the average schoolteacher.

NO FUTURE IN IT

I talked to teachers, principals, businessmen, and civil leaders in more than 200 cities. I asked them about teaching school. "No future in it," too many of them replied.

I have a friend in Chicago, a good teacher, who is distressed by the low salaries and unwarranted criticism that teachers get and by a lack of cooperation and understanding in parents. I asked him why he did not give up teaching.

"My whole life is wrapped up in it," he replied. "I would be miserable doing anything else."

MORE TEACHERS NEEDED

There are upward to 1,278,000 teachers at the elementary and high-school level. By 1960 this country will need about 500,000 more teachers in this bracket. In addition, 50,000 new teachers are needed annually to fill gaps left by deaths, retirements, and those who quit teaching for better paying jobs elsewhere.

Yet lowered teacher prestige, inadequate salaries, and the consequent insecure future discourage mosts college students from entering the profession.

"Something must be done about it," we hear on all sides.

NATIONAL STUDIES MADE

Something is being done about it. President Eisenhower and Congress have set up a White House conference on education November 28 to December 1 this year. How we can get enough good teachers and keep them is 1 of the 6 major subjects listed for study.

Meanwhile, conferences are being planned in virtually every State to get all the facts on educational ills. Attending the conferences will be educators, businessmen, religious leaders, and representatives of labor, agriculture, publishing, and women's groups.

It will help if every American asks himself this question:

"What do good public schoolteachers mean to me?"

My own answer is that good teachers mean good pupils, and good students mean good citizens in peace or war. The end result of good teaching and good teachers is a society of individuals trained to accept the responsibilities of freedom.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the various units of the National Guard of the United States are now performing their field service. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Go," published in the United States National Guard News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GO

Technically, the militia back in the 1830's embraced virtually every adult male; the active field forces needed in any emergency were made up of militiamen who volunteered for active service.

Thus it was when 23-year-old Abraham Lincoln, of New Salem, and 72 other men from his region, answered the Illinois governor's call for 30-day volunteers to pacific the Sacs and Foxes. And, by the custom of the times, the company elected its officers. Young Abe and another, untutored as he in the military arts, stood aside; the men voted by taking their places behind the candidate of their choice. By a vote of about 3 to 1, Lincoln became the captain.

In the month that followed, Abe's company did a lot of marching, scouting, and going hungry, but no real fighting. Their time up, most of the men went home. Without a company, Lincoln unhesitatingly took a bust and enlisted as a private for another 20 days in an independent company on detached scouting service. When that was over, he signed up for another hitch as a scout in still another company. His comrades told of the gawky young citizen-soldier's constant readiness for duty, and his ready response: "Let's go," whenever the call came for volunteers for a patrol.

Today, a tighter-knit, better-organized, better-trained, better-equipped force by far than the militia of the Black Hawk War,

the National Guard that has evolved from the old militia still preserves the volunteer spirit and the push that was exemplified by young Abraham Lincoln's characteristic reply: "Let's go."

Anticrime Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following communications from Kansas City, Mo., and San Francisco, Calif. They address themselves in part to the question of protecting the sources of information of the approximate 25 privately financed and operated anticrime commissions located throughout the United States, as well as to the information contained in the intelligence files of the department of justice of California. Both of these communications are from organizations which have performed excellent work in fighting crime and should be of value to the Congress when considering Senate Resolution 91.

In this connection, I particularly desire to call attention to State senate bill No. 1342, introduced by Senator Cunningham in the State senate of California, which embodies the essence of some of the recommendations made by our Crime Committee in 1951, as well as legislation that has been introduced by me and other Members of Congress since that time. I commend it to the Congress, and sincerely hope that other States may emulate California's worthy initiative in proposing this much needed vital legislation.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
San Francisco, April 25, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Thank you for forwarding a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18. Page 3826 thereof indicates that you introduced Senate Resolution 91 to explore the extent to which offices of anticrime civic organizations may be required to divulge confidential sources of information. This matter is particularly timely and interesting.

It has been my experience that the files of a crime commission are built up primarily from information received either on the basis of personal friendship or with the assurance that the information would not be divulged. I believe that any attempt to permit information so received to be used publicly would seriously hamper the spirit of confidential interchange under which crime commissions operate.

In the bill for the establishment of criminal intelligence files in California or, as I refer to it, a "California Hoods Who," this factor was anticipated, and the language of the bill was amended to include the following:

"Intelligence information contained in the files of the Department of Justice pursuant to this section shall be confidential, not open to public inspection, and shall not be admissible in evidence in any legal proceedings."

It is at once obvious that the revised language will give the Department "the right of refusal" in those instances where the information cannot properly be made available. It would also insulate against any attempts to reach the confidential files by means of subpena.

A copy of the bill as it now stands is attached, and the hearings are scheduled for May 11, 1955.

As you will note, the first part of the bill providing for a survey of law enforcement agencies has been stricken principally because of the opposition by the peace-officer organizations. It was deemed advisable to leave this function at least for the present on a voluntary basis as it is now performed rather than provide that it be done pursuant to legislative directive.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

H. G. ROBINSON,
Deputy Director, Department of Justice.

Senate Bill No. 1342

An act to add section 11010 to the penal code, relating to the establishment of organized crime intelligence files

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 11010 is added to the penal code, to read:

"11010. The attorney general shall establish and maintain with the department of justice a criminal intelligence operation to compile, coordinate and disseminate intelligence information concerning those individuals engaged in organized crime to build up complete dossiers regarding the activities and alliances of all the assorted people who go to make up the field of organized crime in California, to coordinate activities with local law enforcement agencies, crime commissions, State and Federal officials and agencies, and to keep such officials and agencies fully informed concerning the activities of reported criminals, racketeers, and their associates. For the purpose of this section, organized crime is deemed to include among others individuals responsible for the unlawful use, sale, possession, or distribution of narcotics throughout the country and particularly in the State of California. Intelligence information contained in the files of the department of justice pursuant to this section shall be confidential, not open to public inspection and shall not be admissible in evidence in any legal proceedings.

KANSAS CITY CRIME COMMISSION,
Kansas City, Mo., April 29, 1955.

Senate Resolution 91

On April 18, 1955, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennesee, introduced a resolution in the United States Senate which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas there are now in active operation throughout the Nation about 25 privately financed and operated anticrime civic organizations, devoted to the gathering of information, statistics, data, and evidence relating to law enforcement; and to reporting to the public and appropriate public officials any indications of lax or inefficient law enforcement; and

"Whereas these anticrime civic organizations are generally composed of responsible and reputable citizens motivated by patriotic efforts in behalf of clean Government and civic decency, who voluntarily dedicate their time and money to this commendable public cause, and who usually employ capable and well-qualified directors of investigations who are often former FBI agents; and

"Whereas these anticrime civic organizations are endeavoring on their own volition and resources to further the objectives outlined and recommended in the 1951 Senate Crime Investigation Committee report for citizen participation in, and public insistence for, high standards of community law enforcement; and

"Whereas the national public interest and welfare critically require the continuing and active support of all respectable and law-abiding citizens throughout the Nation, if the rising menace of crime is to be suppressed and kept under control: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Federal Government should encourage, and aid by all reasonable and proper means, the continued active cooperation of citizens and functioning of civic anticrime committees; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senate Judiciary Committee, or an appropriate subcommittee thereof, is hereby directed to conduct an immediate study and report promptly to the Senate body as to the extent to which the officers and directors of such anticrime civic organizations should or should not be required to divulge confidential sources of information, except in cases involving treason, where such confidential information was obtained by agreement that its source would be kept confidential, but wherein the substance of such information has been duly reported to an appropriate public official."

This resolution, which has the unqualified support of the Kansas City crime commission, was doubtless prompted by recent proceedings instituted by county and parish prosecutors in New York City and New Orleans, La., respectively, against crime commission representatives in those cities for failure to disclose their confidential sources of information in certain cases.

The Kansas City crime commission is not in possession of the facts which allegedly caused the district attorney of New York City, N. Y., and the prosecutor at New Orleans to institute court proceedings to force Mr. William J. Keating of the New York City anticrime committee, and Mr. Aaron M. Kohn of the metropolitan crime commission of New Orleans, respectively, to disclose their sources of information; but we are familiar with, as Mr. Dan Sullivan of the crime commission of greater Miami so aptly puts it, "the old dodge" used by officials unfriendly to crime commissions to punish private citizens and citizens' organizations rather than to prosecute the malefactors who commit crime.

There is one important fact that is apparently being overlooked by prosecutors who insist on harassing crime commissions and their officials by contempt proceedings instead of vigorously prosecuting those charged with crime and corruption, and that is, with a few exceptions, the privately financed and operated crime commissions presently in existence in cities throughout the United States came into being after the Kefauver committee of the Senate in 1950 and 1951 exposed the hookup between organized crime and public officials at the National, State, and municipal levels. These groups of public-spirited citizens were encouraged to organize in anticrime groups to further the objectives of the Kefauver committee, outlined in its 1951 report, for better law enforcement in the United States.

The crime commissions today are simply endeavoring to carry out the recommendations of this fearless congressional committee. They have no axes to grind; they are not trying to displace or compete with any law-enforcement organization, Federal or State; they are set up for the purpose of seeing to it that the organized crime element which was so powerful in the United States prior to 1950 does not again thumb its nose at those charged with maintaining law and order in the country. Crime

commission members and staff operatives throughout the United States have no political ambitions; all they are interested in is seeing to it that those charged with the responsibility of law enforcement do their job.

So, we are heartily in favor of the Kefauver resolution, and hope that it is favorably acted upon by the Senate, and that it proves as great a boon to law enforcement throughout the country as the historical Kefauver committee hearings did. One of the outstanding accomplishments of the Kefauver committee in its investigation of organized crime was to focus the attention of the public on the extent of the activities of the big-time criminal and gambling racketeers throughout the country. True, the Kefauver committee put few people in jail, but it did cause the public to sit up and take notice of the extent to which the underworld was operating and the effect of its activities upon government.

Speaking for Kansas City and Jackson County, Mo., we know that law-enforcement conditions in this area are much better in 1955 than they were in 1950.

Services by DAV to Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, seeing the full-page advertisement in the April 18, 1955, issue of Life magazine, featuring the Skrambelgram puzzle contest—including objects to be identified by words formed out of sets of scrambled letters and inserting admissible words, of high letter-point value, into the interconnecting horizontal and vertical letter paths of the puzzle pattern—I am impelled to state that, during the last some 10 years, I have served as one of the 13 trustees of the sponsor of this intriguing puzzle contest, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, which, incidentally, has its offices at 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Judging by my own observations during the past 7 years, I am sure that these annual puzzle contests are conducted by the DAV Service Foundation with complete fairness. Several hundreds of contestants have, during that time, been awarded prizes by the DAV Service Foundation totaling $568,333.38. The top winner in the current Skrambelgram contest may win as much as $28,600.

The primary purpose of conducting these annual puzzle contests is to acquire substantial net income therefrom, to be held in trust, for subsequent appropriation to the beneficiary of its trust, the 36-year old service-giving congressionally chartered Disabled American Veterans, to which the DAV Service Foundation has so appropriated the aggregate sum of $2,490,000 during the last 6 years. Such sum has been used by the DAV toward the maintenance of its nationwide service activities—of great benefit each year to scores of thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Because I have so firmly believed that America owes a primary obligation to its disabled defenders, and their dependents—to enable them to live in the American way, for which they sacrificed so much of their bodies or their health—I have long been associated as a life member of the DAV. Moreover, I am a member of all of the other veteran organizations to which I am eligible, and am also associated with many other fraternal, patriotic, and civic organizations.

Only through their support of various private organizations can American citizens help to mobilize their mutual desires, abilities, and objectives for various constructive purposes. Every American ought to be a member of at least one or more of our Nation's many social, fraternal, patriotic, political, and civic organizations. Moreover, every veteran who has served our country in its Armed Forces, in peacetime or in wartime, ought to be actively affiliated with at least one of the national veteran organizations which contribute so much to this country, locally and nationally.

Every war-wounded and disabled veteran ought first to be a member of the only congressionally chartered veteran organization composed exclusively of those Americans who were either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war—namely, the Disabled American Veterans. In addition to his membership in the DAV, he ought also to be an active member of at least one other congressionally chartered veteran organization, to give his support to its broader activities and objectives.

The DAV is a patriotic, noncompetitive, service-giving veteran organization, dedicated to the important objective of extending much-needed service to, for, and by America's disabled defenders. To that end, it has, during most of the 36 years of its existence, maintained a larger staff of full-time national service officers in the district, central, and regional offices of the Veterans' Administration than any other veteran organization.

The DAV specializes in service to distressed disabled veterans, and their dependents. The DAV is a one-purpose organization—to protect and to promote the welfare of America's disabled war veterans, and their dependents.

The DAV is presently headed up by a badly wounded veteran of World War II, Judge Alfred L. English, of Shelbyville, Tenn. Its national adjutant—who has served the outfit for more than 27 years—is a wounded marine of World War I, Mr. Vivian D. Corbly, who maintains his offices at the DAV national headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati 13, Ohio.

The DAV's chief fund-raising project—sending out miniature automobile license tags to automobile owners—comes under the overall supervision of its national adjutant. By reason of this nationwide key insurance, some 115,000 sets of lost keys are each year returned to their owners, without regard to whether the owners may previously have made any contribution for their Idento Tags.

Only about 20 percent, unfortunately, of the recipients of such key insurance Idento Tags send back donations to the DAV. Those who have done so have enabled the DAV to maintain some 300 to 600 employees, mostly disabled veterans and their dependents, and to have a very substantial net income each year, which is used by the DAV in the maintenance of its nationwide setup of full-time national service officers. The DAV itself owns and operates this Idento-Tag project.

If every recipient of a DAV Idento Tag were to respond with a $1 donation, its net income from its serviceable Idento-Tag project would then enable the DAV to employ additional very much needed full-time national service officers in all of the some 166 hospitals maintained by the Veterans' Administration throughout the country, to advise, counsel, and assist their patients, first, to establish, technically, their entitlement to those governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled; second, to guide them toward physical restoration and vocational rehabilitation; and third, to assist them toward self-sustainment as self-respecting American citizens, through useful, suitable employment which utilizes their remaining abilities.

Some Americans, if not most of them, have the erroneous idea that governmental benefits to disabled veterans are automatically awarded. Such an assumption is entirely wrong.

More claims are denied by the Veterans' Administration than are allowed. It is more difficult, ordinarily, for a disabled veteran to prove factual and technical entitlement to the benefits to which he may be equitably entitled, than is the case as to an able-bodied veteran who may be entitled to some benefits under the so-called GI bill of rights, by reason of having actively served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the period of World War II or in the Korean war.

Official records too frequently fail to substantiate the disabled veteran's claim that his disability originated in military service, whereupon he must positively prove that contention, by detailed specific fact-giving affidavit evidence. Too frequently, that becomes exceedingly difficult if not impossible to do, because of loss of memories with the passage of time, inability to get in touch with former buddies, inexperience in preparing specific factual affidavits which actually do set forth all of the pertinent facts, and so forth. Too many equitable claims are ruined because of inadequate careless preparation of the substantiating evidence.

The average disabled veteran claimant needs the expert advice of an experienced service officer, one who knows what is required by the Veterans' Administration, to justify favorable adjudication of the claim, if the facts which would substantiate it, can be brought to light, by

digging into the memories of those who originally observed the pertinent facts, and then persuading them to set forth such facts convincingly and in sufficient detail.

This is the task which cannot be properly performed by an employee of the United States Veterans' Administration, which, in the final analysis, must act as the judge and jury and, as defendant, must pay the damages to the claimant, in the form of disability compensation, vocational training, medical treatment, and so forth, if the claim is awarded.

More than a thousand laws are being administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to disabled veterans and their dependents, many of them complicated and technical, making it even more advisable for a disabled veteran to have the helping-hand advice of an expert national service officer than for a businessman to employ an expert in the preparation of his Federal income tax report.

Because the average disabled veteran does not bother to try to avail himself of the laws which have been passed for his protection until driven by economic necessity to do so, claims of disabled veterans will continue to come up for consideration for many years in the future, probably following the pattern as to World War I veterans, for whom service-connections of disability were still being legally established by the DAV, more than 35 years following their active military service.

It will therefore undoubtedly be necessary for the DAV to continue to maintain a large staff of full-time national service officers for many years into the future. Adequate provisions for the disabled of America's wars is a must, not only from a humanitarian standpoint, but to equalize the burdens that would otherwise have to be assumed by relatives and friends, and by local communities.

Even more important it is that America's possible future veterans will have been impressed by the fact that our country does not permit the disabled veterans to become mere forgotten heroes—to be relegated to the economic scrap pile. The future welfare of our country is inevitably linked with the welfare of its disabled war veterans.

Americans who help to extend the opportunity for security to America's disabled defenders thereby help to fortify the future of our beloved country.

The nationwide service officer setup of the DAV is supervised by the DAV's national director of claims, Capt. Cicero F. Hogan, who maintains his offices in the DAV's national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. Some 200 full-time national service officers serve under him.

Also located at the national service headquarters is the DAV's national director of legislation, Maj. Omer W. Clark, former Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and his able assistant, Col. Charles Foster.

A very important aspect of the services rendered by the DAV comes under the jurisdiction of its national director of employment, John W. Burris, who is also the organization's national civil service officer.

A complete account of all of the DAV's activities, including a detailed audited statement of its receipts and disbursements, appears in the proceedings of the DAV's annual conventions, which are reported to the United States Congress and then printed as a separate House document by the United States Government Printing Office. Also included in such document is the annual report of the DAV's incorporated trustee, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

The foundation's activities are under the supervision of its 13 trustees, 10 of whom each serve for 5-year periods, with 2 expiring each succeeding year, whereas the remaining 3 consist of the incumbent national commander and chairman of the national finance committee of the DAV and one other elected for a 1-year term.

The foundation's president is Miles H. Draper, Esq., a prominent attorney and friend of mine, from Tampa, Fla., with John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a past national commander of the DAV, as vice chairman, and with Mr. Lewis L. Clarke, former president of the American Exchange National Bank of New York City, trustee of the Bowery Savings Bank, as chairman of the foundation's finance and budget committee. Serving with him on such committee are Arthur W. Procter, Esq., a New York attorney, and Maple T. Harl, Director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, D. C.

The president of the American Security & Trust Co. in Washington, D. C., Mr. Daniel W. Bell, is the chairman of the foundation's trust fund investment committee. Serving with him on such committee are Maple T. Harl and Boniface R. Maile, a past national commander of the DAV and a prominent attorney in Detroit, Mich., and Mr. Lewis L. Clarke.

Other trustees include Gen. Charles Hines, who succeeded his older brother, Gen. Frank T. Hines, former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; Gen. George C. Kenny, United States Army, retired; James L. Monnahan, DAV past national commander and presently the national service officer and department adjutant of the DAV at Fort Snelling, Minn.; Mr. Thomas Savage, of Rome, N. Y., as chairman of the DAV national finance committee; and Judge Alfred L. English, as DAV national commander; I, myself, constitute the 13th member. It has been my pleasure to so serve during the last 10 years.

What is the purpose, one might ask, of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, as a separately incorporated trustee for the congressionally chartered DAV? The foundation was incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio on May 16, 1931, with the specific prior authorization and subsequent approval of national conventions of the DAV, primarily thus, through the overlapping terms of the trustees, to be able to extend assurance to potential donors of a continuity of policy as to the conservation and investment of donated funds and as to their judicious subsequent appropriation to the DAV toward the end of helping it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup.

The DAV Service Foundation has also raised money for the DAV. Under the terms of the foundation's charter and its trust agreement with the DAV, these funds can be appropriated by the trustees for the rehabilitation program of the DAV and for its work on behalf of disabled veterans, their widows and orphans.

One of the most successful fund-raising efforts of the foundation was a series of puzzle contests. These were conducted with the utmost scrupulousness, and a board of nationally well-known scholars and experts was secured to pass on questions as to the propriety of the words used in the contest. Following the success of the first contest, other organizations tried the same methods of fund raising, and the foundation ran into the law of diminishing returns.

There have also been other fund-raising projects, which taken all together, have brought in several million dollars for the charitable purposes of the foundation. This has enabled the foundation to appropriate to the DAV during the last 6 years the sum of $2,490,000 in addition to smaller amounts appropriated to State departments and DAV chapters which had made their contributions to some of the fund-raising efforts. The foundation still has over a million dollars in cash and Government securities on hand.

But for these appropriations from the foundation, it would have been impossible for the DAV to maintain its most valuable work in which its members take the greatest pride, namely, its national service officers program.

These service officers are maintained in many of the Veterans' Administration offices and hospitals where the Government furnishes them with desk space. They have been specially trained for this work. Many are graduates of a special course arranged for by the DAV at American University, where their schooling was largely paid for from educational benefits available under the GI bill of rights, or similar benefits for disabled veterans. The cost of maintaining this skilled group of approximately 200 service officers throughout the United States is in the vicinity of a million dollars a year.

Designations in insurance policies, assignments of stock and bonds and other property to the DAV Service Foundation, by disabled veterans, and by social-minded Americans, are greatly needed and highly justifiable, and will be reflected in continuance of valuable service each year to scores of thousands of distressed disabled veterans.

Special trust funds, designed to contribute toward the solution of some phase of the problems of disabled veterans, are particularly desirable, but would be feasible only on the part of other foundations or wealthy individuals. The foundation has one special trust fund, for example, the Irving J. Phillipson Rehabilitation Fund, which has been earmarked toward the support of activities sponsored by the Disabled Veterans Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

During the last several years, such special trust fund has paid for the expense of printing some 350,000 attractive calendar cards, which each year have been distributed among the Nation of the Veterans' Employment Service, its State veterans' employment representatives, and the cooperating local officers of the respective State employment services throughout the country. Employers, and others, interested in the employment of the physically handicapped, might well wish to make contributions toward this special trust fund, toward the perpetuation of such special activities in future years.

Many other types of special trust funds might well be established by large donors or bequests: First, maintenance of full-time DAV national service officers in certain States or in certain hospitals; second, maintenance of all or a part of the national service staff of the DAV in Washington, D. C.; third, special travel allowances for DAV national service officers to enable them to visit disabled veterans in local communities; fourth, maintenance of secretarial staff of DAV national service officers; fifth, establishment and maintenance of part-time and/or full-time DAV national service officers in all or some of the 166 hospitals of the Veterans' Administration; sixth, expenses for special surveys pertaining to various phases of problems of disabled veterans in this country, and/or in other countries, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who are grateful for the sacrifices made by America's disabled defenders, of parts of their bodies or of their health, by reason of their special services to our country in time of war, will generously support the vitally important service activities maintained by the DAV and sponsored by the DAV Service Foundation.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was unanmiously adopted by the 42d convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C., recently.

The resolutions committee, of which I served as chairman, consisted of one delegate from each State, Territory, island possession, and the District of Columbia. The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them, suggested numerous changes in the draft of the resolutions presented to them, and reached unanimous agreement thereon. An additional resolution was offered from the floor of the convention and was adopted without objection.

This convention was attended by 346 registered delegates from 44 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, as well as many others who failed to register, guests, visitors, and so forth. These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations, and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several million.

We believe this unanimous expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 42D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, JUNE 1, 1955

FOREWORD

Proper development and appropriate conservation of our soil and water resources affect the welfare and happiness of all of our people to no lesser degree than the adequate defense of our Nation; the delivery of our mail; our health, education, and welfare; protection of our persons; and other functions of Government historically dedicated to the general welfare.

These truths were apparent to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress when it was founded more than a half century ago. They are even more apparent today. In keeping with the trend of the times the demands on our resources are increasingly greater and therefore impetus must be given to their development and conservation. In this respect this Congress is ready and willing to fulfill its obligation to assist in sponsoring and accelerating those developments which are necessary for our economy.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGES

Many aspects of President Eisenhower's state of the Union message on January 6 were encouraging. The transition to a peacetime economy mentioned as being largely behind us is but one of the promising factors he finds contributing to the position from which to carry forward our economic growth. Furthermore he includes our land and water resources among our resources making up the foundation of our economic growth and encourages their development, wise use, and conservation. Here we are in complete agreement.

The President emphasizes the need to follow the historic pattern of developing these resources by private citizens, under fair provisions of law and with proper provisions for conservation and also the need to treat resource development as a partnership in which the participation of private citizens and State and local government is as necessary as is Federal participation. The latter emphasis is qualified later to provide that the Federal Government is obligated to undertake projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. Here we repeat with emphasis that the development of our resources will continue to require the overall financial and administrative assistance of the Federal Government.

The President's budget message of January 17 states that the fiscal year 1956 budget makes provisions for the Bureau of Reclamation to start construction on 5 new irrigation and water-supply projects, and for the Corps of Engineers to begin work on 10 local protections, 2 larger flood-control projects, 8 for beach erosion control, and 14 navigation projects. Provision is made for resumptions of projects and for the selection of a number of small projects by the Secretary of the Army. These new starts and resumptions indicate a desire to reduce the backlog of worthy projects and this trend lends encouragement to those of us interested in the development of our resources. However, with the public works program, as reflected by the backlog of approximately $8 billion of authorized active and unstarted projects, running 20 years behind schedule, we believe that the general welfare of this country would be better served by substantially increasing the civil functions budget each year until this tremendous backlog of authorized projects is eliminated.

WATER RESOURCES STUDIES

We await with interest the findings of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, the Hoover Commission Report on Water Resources and Power, and the report of the Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. These commissions are composed of individuals of wide experience in the field of natural resources and their talents no doubt will result in some recommendations conducive to the proper conservation and development of our resources. These we will give our wholehearted support. There will, however, no doubt be some recommendations which will not be in the best interest of sound resource development and consistent with the rights of our people. Such recommendations must and will be emphatically opposed by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and it behooves those who are not associated with us to take cognizance of any such detrimental proposals and voice their objections.

Specifically we will oppose any attempts to disturb the present status of the Corps of Engineers with respect to its civil functions; and any attempt to place a larger burden on local interests in the form of contributions toward flood protection when the national responsibility would dictate less.

CIRCULAR A-47, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

It is apparent to us that the conflict between congressional resources policy, established by law, and executive formulas promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget is having a detrimental effect on orderly resource development and the morals of those who depend on such development for protection of life and their economy. Formulas promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget in December 1952 through its circular A-47 set patterns for determining benefits to cost ratios that are reported to be restrictive to the extent that qualified projects under previous procedure are now curtailed. It is alarming to note that a contemplated revision of A-47 will be more restrictive as to which projects can be constructed. We urge immediate action by the Federal Congress to elliminate this stalemate to progress.

APPROPRIATIONS

Adequate appropriations for resource development are in effect investments in the capital assets of our Nation in peacetime and requirements for a national war effort. These appropriations must first be adequate to provide for the proper study and design of projects preparatory to requests for construction. The two phases must remain in balance if we are to continue orderly progress. The amounts appropriated should admittedly be in phase with the national economy and by the same token should not be subordinated to those for similar purposes destined to promote the economy of other nations.

The Chief of Engineers has estimated that the development of our resources contemplated by the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers alone should proceed at a rate of not less than $650 million per year. The record of the Corps and our confidence in

that organization and our knowledge of the requirements prompts us to urge the Appropriations Committees of the Congress to accept that estimate and make such amounts available. Moreover, we urge adequate appropriations for all the other important phases of resource development, including construction of Federal reclamation projects for which the Commissioner of Reclamation estimates that a minimum of $250 million annually is required.

WATERWAYS

The historic development of our waterways for commerce by the Federal Government has paid ample dividends through their contribution to our economy in peacetime and our security in times of international conflicts. As our country continues to develop and our population to increase, so will the need for additional improvements to our waterways increase. Furthermore, the existing improved waterways should be maintained to authorized depths if they are to continue to serve the useful purpose for which they were constructed. We accordingly urge the United States Congress to provide ample funds for that purpose.

TOLLS ON WATERWAYS

This Congress submits that the imposition of tolls or user charges on our inland waterways is incompatible with the historic free use of these waterways for the flow of commerce by which an extensive economy on, along, and off them has been developed. Moreover, the complexities of any equitable imposition of such charges on waterways improved over a period of a century are aggravated by the varying amounts of local contributions heretofore made. Tolls or user charges in lieu of some form of non-Federal participation in projects will have an adverse effect on water transportation perhaps to the extent of eliminating a number of carriers, increasing rate structures for the remainder, and even the elimination of important links in this vast transportation network. The Nation cannot afford such deterioration of a valuable asset by experiment. We cannot remain idle and permit it to take place.

We are pleased to note that the President's Cabinet Committee on Transport Policy and Organization found from its exhaustive study of the subject that tolls on waterways would be an unjust experiment and eliminated them from consideration in its final report.

HURRICANE PROTECTION

This Congress is cognizant of the toll in death and destruction wrought by hurricanes along the Atlantic seaboard and particularly in the New England area. The protection of these areas from such damages in the future presents a problem of such magnitude as to preclude appropriate action by local and regional authorities. The impact of such damages on the economy of the area and the Nation makes it a matter of national concern. Accordingly we urge the United States Congress to enact immediately appropriate legislation and appropriate funds which will permit a thorough study to be undertaken with a view to determining what protective measures are required for the coastal areas subject to hurricane damage. Furthermore, in view of its experience and knowledge in the fields of navigation, flood control, and beach erosion, we recommend that the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, be the agency selected to make such a study.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

This Congress notes with apprehension the growing tendency on the part of sportsmen and other fish and wildlife enthusiasts to look with disfavor on many worthy projects constructed or authorized primarily for flood control and drainage, irrigation and navigation. Their condemnation of these projects in their organizations and in the press ignore benefits to wildlife that should be apparent. We submit that there is an obligation on the part of every citizen to protect and provide habitat for this valuable resource to the greatest extent practicable. We must, however, remind those who live in flood-free humid areas that there are some substantial citizens who are not so fortunate and must attempt a livlihood under threat of flood and drought. These latter citizens include many who also realize the obligation of all citizens to contribute to our economic growth through the conservation of all of our resources including fish and wildlife. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior has the dual obligation to protect and develop our wildlife resources and conversely to assist other agencies in protecting our citizens by discouraging condemnation of projects approved by the President for land and water resource development. This becomes all the more important in the face of the prediction that our present population of 165 million humans will soon increase to 200 million and will require products from the land far in excess of our ability to provide them from areas now available.

MERCHANT MARINE

We share the definite apprehension of America's shipbuilders and operators as to the future of our American merchant marine. Many ships of our active and inactive fleet are rapidly approaching obsolescence. Some constructed under the somewhat frantic conditions of World War II are already obsolete. American shipping and its related industry, shipbuilding and repair, represent two important components of our peacetime economy and our national security, and must not be allowed to deteriorate either. To the end that this not happen we support with vigor the efforts of the Maritime Administration in its vigorous prosecution of a Government and private shipbuilding program to insure orderly replacement of those vessels which threaten the American merchant marine with obsolescence.

"THEY INHERIT THE EARTH"

In its 41st annual convention the National Rivers and Harbors Congress adopted a resolution entitled "They Inherit the Earth," in which it expressed opposition to S. 3111 of the 83d Congress, a bill which later died in committee without action. Its counterpart in the 84th Congress is S. 951, which would extend into the field of bulk transportation on inland waterways the devitalizing influence of Government regulation. Among the more than 1,000 contract carriers now serving the public on all of our inland waters except the Great Lakes, the bill's effects would be to restrict competition and to prevent them from bidding effectively for the new traffic steadily growing on our waterways.

The bill would benefit a handful of prosperous major barge lines holding unlimited commodity rights and extensive territorial rights as common carriers under present regulation.

This special-interest legislation, however, would be to the great disadvantage of the shippers of bulk commodities who would be called upon to pay increased rates, to the public in general who would be expected to absorb these higher costs in the prices of consumer goods, and to the more than 99 percent of the carriers who deliver more than 90 percent of the traffic on our inland waterways.

We urge Congress to reject such legislation and to remember that the benefits of our public waterways improved at public expense should redound to the many and not to the few.

TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1955

S. 1920, H. R. 6141, and H. R. 6142 are identical bills introduced by request to implement the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Transportation Policy and Organization. They are entitled "The Transportation Amendments Act of 1955, and, according to the basic document, would modify the existing obsolete national transportation policy and the established scope and methods of regulation so as to place increased reliance on competitive forces in transportation pricing under a system of dynamic competition and to reduce economic regulation of transportation to a minimum consistent with the public interest. Where our national transportation policy of 1940 now recognizes and would preserve the inherent advantages of each means of transportation and foster sound economic conditions among the several carriers, the new policy would be to encourage and promote full competition between modes of transportation subject only to certain vague provisions intended to prevent the charging of rates less than cost.

The existing system of economic regulation of railroads was designed for the purpose of restraining their practices of selective rate cutting which in the past have been so successful in stifling competition by water carriers. Inland water for-hire transportation owes its very existence and its encouraging curent growth to the fact that this system of regulation has at last become partially effective. Our present national transportation policy is based upon the judgment that it is in the public interest to protect small carriers who render efficient services from the destructive rate practices of large carriers who, by virtue of their size alone and regardless of efficiency, have historically been capable of putting their small competitors out of business unless a proper restraint is exerted by Government.

These transportation amendments, while purporting to reduce economic regulation of transportation, would do so only for the railroads and with respect to water transportation would actually increase the scope of regulation in such a way as to impede its flexibility and efficiency. Ninety-three percent of inland-water traffic consists of bulk commodities not subject to regulation under present law. Shippers and carriers alike are well satisfied with the vigorous competition now existing among carriers of these basic materials of commerce under a system of free enterprise beneficial to all. To place artificial restrictions upon water carriers while relaxing the restraints upon rail carriers will ultimately assign inland water transportation to the field of private carriage where its benefits are limited to only those shippers large enough to afford their own fleets.

We are sympathetic with the need for developing an efficient and sound railroad system in the United States, but we are convinced that the sensible approach to this objective is to improve the outworn administrative and operating practices of the railroads and not to cripple their small competitors. Let Congress continue the policy of survival of the fittest in transportation and not be tempted to substitute survival of the biggest.

GREAT LAKES LEVELS

The present and recent high levels of the Great Lakes is a matter of grave concern to the citizens of eight States, such condition accelerating shore erosion and placing in jeopardy both human life and property at numerous points on the Great Lakes.

Such higher lake levels are, in essence, the accumulation of floodwaters on the total watershed of the Great Lakes.

The present National Flood Control Act does not adequately recognize the necessity of dealing with such accumulated floodwaters in the Great Lakes, nor for providing for the protection of life and property therefrom.

The Corps of Engineers has developed plans and made recommendations for various crit-

ically needed projects along the shores of the several lakes, for which funds have not been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget on the basis that they are not presently authorized in the existing National Flood Control Act.

The Congress of the United States of America is respectfully petitioned to amend the existing National Flood Control Act to include the authorization of projects, in cooperation with the several States and their subdivisions, for the protection of life and property which are now or may be placed in jeopardy by reason of accumulated floodwaters in the Great Lakes.

MAINTENANCE OF PORTS AND WATERWAYS

Adequate port and waterway facilities are indispensable to the economic welfare of the Nation and the national defense.

Commercial shipping and the use being made of the country's ports and waterways has greatly increased during the past decade, mounting to nearly 1 billion tons in 1953.

The size of vessels being placed in service is increasing, requiring deeper and wider channels for efficient and safe navigation.

Additional and more frequently dredging is necessary to maintain the ports and waterways adequately.

Many of the breakwaters, jetties, and other harbor protective structures are in immediate need of repair and restoration.

The federally improved harbors and waterways are not being maintained to the authorized depths and widths.

The maintenance of shallow-draft harbors have generally been neglected in recent years due to insufficient appropriations for maintenance.

The Congress in authorizing and appropriating funds for the improvement of the Nation's ports and waterways has also accepted the responsibility for their maintenance to properly accommodate existing shipping.

We strongly urge that the responsible Federal agencies request and that the Congress of the United States appropriate adequate sums of money necessary to restore and fully maintain our ports and waterways in order that the increased needs of commerce and vessel traffic may be adequately served.

We join with the American Association of Port Authorities, other national associations, and regional and local organizations concerned, in a united effort to support before the responsible Federal agencies and congressional committees the annual appropriations required to carry out an adequate national program of maintenance of the Nation's ports and waterways.

SHORE PROTECTION

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress support H. R. 4470, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946. (Offered from the floor of the convention by Mr. Lynn F. Baldwin, vice chairman of the Michigan Water Resources Commission, and adopted without objection.)

No Place To Hide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services has held a number of hearings on the problem of civil defense. Other hearings should be held, particularly in view of the results of the test that was conducted throughout the country. A very thoughtful editorial on this subject appeared in a recent issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PLACE TO HIDE?

A Senate Armed Forces Subcommittee finds, after some scratching around, that the country's civil defense plans are "inadequate."

At best, that's an understatement. "Nonexistent" would come closer to the facts.

There's been plenty of big talk, and millions spent for sirens, test alerts, and emergency stockpiles. But no city dweller yet knows with any confidence just what he should do if the bombers really were on the way.

Evacuation, the latest catchword, is deceptively misleading. It's an invitation to traffic chaos, not a ticket to safety.

The net effect of all the warnings, all the ballyhoo, all the TV drama from Yucca Flat, largely has been to persuade people of the futility of trying to do anything to protect themselves.

The Senate group criticizes an absence of leadership. That's right.

If there are some practical answers, they should be sorted out from all the loose and confusing talk and passed along.

If there aren't, the leadership should have the courage to say so, frankly and candidly. Then people will know where they stand. That's far better than lulling them into the comfortable but dangerous notion that there really may be some quick way to get out of the range of a hydrogen bomb.

Tribute to Michael F. Higgins by Senator Johnson of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, paking through Sports Illustrated a few days ago, I came across a familiar name and a familiar face—Michael Franklin "Pinky" Higgins, manager of the Boston Red Sox.

The article was of deep interest to me because his brother, the late C. L. "Ox" Higgins was one of the best friends I ever had. It was through "Ox" Higgins—a boyhood pal—that I first met "Pinky."

"Ox" Higgins was one of the finest and most honorable Americans I have ever known. He exemplified all of the qualities that have made America strong—integrity, aggressiveness, honor and fair play.

His brother "Pinky" inherited an equal share of these attributes.

Like every Texan, I am proud of the eminence that "Pinky" Higgins has attained in the great American sport of baseball. I believe he has reached his position not just because of skill but because of the imagination, daring and sense of fair play that means preeminence in any field.

As long as such men have a firm hold on the hearts of American youth, our future as a great nation is assured.

I ask unanimous consent that this article on "Pinky" Higgins be included in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PINKY IN THE RED SOX BOOT

(By Al Hirshberg)

For several years, there has been no more uncomfortable seat in baseball than the one currently occupied by Michael Franklin Higgins, a large, blue-eyed Texan who sometimes answers to the incongruous nickname of Pinky. Manager since last fall of the Boston Red Sox, Higgins is the fifth man in 9 years to tackle the touchy job. The betting is that he will keep it for a long time.

Ever since Joe Cronin escaped in 1947 from the bench to the front office, where the brickbats land with a thud instead of a crash, the Red Sox managers have lived a life of triple jeopardy. Saddled by what are generally conceded to be the worst press relations in the league, they have had to face, usually alone, one of the most prolific, exacting, and competitive presses in the land. But if they have had troubles from these sources, they are as nothing compared with the going over they have had from the rabid, baseballwise following of a million self-appointed assistant managers. When things went wrong at Fenway Park—and they did often in those trying years—the fans exploded with a clatter that suggested time bombs had been thoughtfully provided by the management under each seat. And the wrath of the fans landed with a loud, resounding smack on the head of the man who at the moment was thoughtless enough to answer to the name of manager. The trick was not so much to manage. It was to survive.

Why Pinky Higgins should want the job, much less think he could succeeed at it, is still somewhat of a mystery among sound baseball men. Yet the fact remains that for the past 8 years the low-pressure Irish Methodist has surely and steadily stalked his way to Fenway Park.

When he quit as a major league player after the 1946 World Series, Higgins could have become manager of the Class AAA Toronto club of the International League. He turned the chance down in favor of the same job with Roanoke in the Class B Piedmont League. The difference was that Roanoke was in the Red Sox farm system, while Boston had only a lose working agreement with Toronto. "At Toronto I would have had only 2 or 3 Red Sox men," Higgins commented recently. "At Roanoke I had a whole ball club of 'em."

Higgins has had whole ball clubs of Red Sox ever since. But there was a time last fall when it seemed as if all the training might go for naught. He had just finished his most successful season, winning the Little World Series with the Louisville Colonels of the American Association, when he was offered the managership of the Philadelphia Phillies. Higgins told the Boston management about it, and they decided to pay off Lou Boudreau, whose contract as manager still had a year to run. Boston wasn't allowing Higgins to escape.

JUMP FOR GENIUS

This week, as the Red Sox continue to show surprising strength in chasing the American League pennant, the Boston management's quick decision to grab hold of Higgins has the aura of genius about it.

Boston's brain trust could look bad, though, if the team should go into the kind of tailspin it suffered beginning in the second month of the season, when nothing Higgins did went right. The return of Ted Williams is credited with adding much of the lift, and undoubtedly his presence in the lineup has been a boost to morale. But other Boston managers have foundered with Williams on the roster. Those who are counting on Higgins to keep the team in high fettle are depending rather on qualities not often sought after nor found in a new manager: sound knowledge of his players and their wholehearted respect. Of the 44 men who were on the roster at spring training headquarters in Sarasota, Fla., this March, 23 had played for Higgins somewhere along the line and all 23 swore by him.

What it is exactly that Higgins has is hard to lay a finger on. Patient, colorless, plain, slow of speech and manner and action, he is a living bromide, the still water that runs deep, the honesty that is the best policy, the virtue that is its own reward. He is a good, kind, unspectacular man, rugged and simple and given to uttering such homely phrases as "rules are made to be broken" and "a happy team is a winning team."

Even these phrases do not come readily. Higgins speaks in a deep drawl and his voice is so low that a visitor has to pay close attention to catch everything. He rarely answers a question without turning it over for inspection several times first. Sometimes he ponders so long that he appears to have forgotten the question. His easy ways give him the disarming manner of a country boy and strangers often mistake him for a ready mark in the big city. But they soon discover that underneath he is as shrewd as a banker and a sharp man in a corner.

In one sense Higgins is fortunate in taking over the Red Sox this year. The many woes that once beset his worthy predecessors have for the most part vanished. The press, and even at times the public, chastened by the near-certain knowledge that their antics were in some part responsible for the repatriation of the Braves in Milwaukee, are acting with a restraint that proper Bostonians find comforting.

Many other things are different. The policy of buying up established stars and installing at their head a manager who had recently won a pennant was buried under an avalanche of raw youths brought in 2 years ago by Boudreau when he combed Red Sox farms for new talent. Boudreau's players are maturing.

So is Williams, a national hero today. Ted was always something of a problem child in earlier days. Charming one minute and gloomily uncooperative the next. Williams was bigger than any manager, a law unto himself. He did as he pleased, and no manager dared try to cross him. Joe McCarthy, a martinet when he won eight pennants with the New York Yankees, was willing to forego one of his strictest regulations in Boston. A stickler for formality in dress, he appeared without a necktie on his first day of spring training in Florida so that Williams, who flatly refused to wear one, would not be embarrassed. Big Steve O'Neill treated Williams with stout deference, and Boudreau and Williams maintained a mutual silence. The long shadow of the great slugger was always darkening the manager's door.

Not so Pinky Higgins. He and Williams have been friends since 1946, when both were on the only Boston team ever to bring a pennant home to millionaire owner Tom Yawkey. When Higgins was appointed manager, Williams was quoted as saying, "Mike is a nice guy," a grudging compliment from anybody else perhaps, but from Williams, who is not given to paying unsolicited tributes, high praise.

Throughout the spring, when rumors over Williams' intentions were meeting each other coming and going, Higgins maintained an attitude of impassive indifference. The slugger had announced his retirement at the beginning of the 1954 season, but few believed that he meant it, and almost everyone but Higgins had an opinion on the subject.

THE WILLIAMS ENIGMA

"I'd like to have him," Higgins said, "but I don't know what his plans are. I haven't heard a thing. In the meantime, Throneberry's my left fielder. He'll do all right."

Faye Throneberry, a taciturn 24-year-old youth fresh out of the Army and happy to be a big-league ballplayer, is typical of the new Red Sox. He and his teammates of several years' standing offer the last and possibly the sternest contrast with Red Sox teams of the past. In 1950, the year after the club had missed winning 2 successive pennants on the very last day of the season, there were 11 Cadillacs in the players' parking lot behind Fenway Park. Those Red Sox were big-business men ballplayers, not loafers, but not hungry men either. They could, with some equanimity, shrug off defeat as part of the game, then blithely drive their Cadillacs home to wait for the next season to roll around.

The current team is completely unspoiled. The men are lean, hungry, determined, and eager, and their salaries are commensurate with salaries of other ball clubs. Prima donnas and big-business men lurk in the shadows of remembrance and the Cadillacs are confined mostly to a few players' futures.

This is the kind of team Higgins wants. Indeed, it's the team he virtually grew up with. There is the 23-year-old Tom Brewer, whose 3-hit shutout over the Indians last Sunday is typical of the good ball Higgins is getting from his young men. There is the 22-year-old Gene Stephens who, when things were going badly for him in Boston in 1953, said, "Send me back to Louisville with Mike." There is 25-year-old Ike Delock who made the same request at just about the same time. There are others who have asked to be sent back from Louisville to Birmingham "so I can be with Mike again," just as boys in the Red Sox farm system 7 years ago asked to be sent from Birmingham to Roanoke "with Mike."

"Higgins is the greatest judge of human nature I have ever known," says Charley Wagner, a Higgins teammate on the 1946 Boston team and now assistant farm director of the Red Sox. "He knows instinctively how to get the most out of young ballplayers."

Players like Al Curtis, George Susce, Pete Daley, Frank Malzone, Don Buddin, Marty Keough, Norm Zauchin and Al Van Alstyne, some of whom are with the Red Sox now and some of whom are on the way, can testify to that. So can veterans like Milt Bolling, who was with Higgins at Louisville, and Leo Kiely and Willard Nixon, who pitched for him at Birmingham.

The late Harry Agganis, for whom Higgins had high hopes as a player before he died as a result of pneumonia this summer, got typical Higgins treatment at Louisville in 1953. Fresh out of Boston University, where he had been an outstanding football star, he got off to a terrific start, then suddenly went into a terrible nosedive. He suffered in silence for weeks, and finally went to Higgins with the plea, "Mike, what am I doing wrong?"

Higgins pointed out a few minor flaws and Agganis promptly pulled out of the slump.

Why didn't he tell him sooner?

"An independent guy like Agganis would have resented me butting in," Higgins explained. "He always figured he was man enough to solve his own problems. I wanted him to want help before I said anything."

But when Gene Stephens ran into the same trouble at Louisville last year, Higgins began working with him right off. Stephens eventually got back into the groove, but it took him longer.

"You'd go to a kid like Stephens," Higgins said. "You couldn't wait for him to come to you. He was scared and nervous and he needed confidence. You had to coax him into believing in himself. That takes time."

In his playing days, Higgins was a steady, solid third baseman who occasionally hit spectacular heights. In 1938, his second year with the Red Sox, he established a major league record of 12 straight hits which still stands, although it has been tied by Walter Dropo. Higgins twice hit 3 home runs in 1 ball game, and he played on 2 American League All-Star teams and in 2 world series during his 15-year career. He started with the Philadelphia Athletics, then went to the Red Sox, on to Detroit, and finally, in 1946, back to the Red Sox. After winning the pennant that year, they lost the world series to the St. Louis Cardinals. Higgins, then 37, played through all 7 games, being replaced only once, and that by a pinch-runner in the ninth inning of the first game.

Higgins was noted in his day for a peculiar batting stance, in which he stood stiff-armed, holding his bat high over the plate and almost perpendicular to the ground. His lifetime average of .292 was well ahead of that of the average third baseman. Generally known as a "ballplayer's ballplayer," he was a valuable team man, who could hit in the clutch and whose record did not quite do justice to his true ability.

He spends a good deal of his off-season time now hunting and fishing, which he loves. He lives in Dallas during the winter with his attractive brunette wife, Hazen, and his two school-age daughters, Diane and Elizabeth, otherwise known as Bootsie. The rest of the year they rent a house in Newton, Mass., not too far from the Fenway. The girls and their mother are all musical, a circumstance which Mike accepts with placid good nature. Sometimes, if the noise gets too loud, he quietly goes to his room and closes the door.

His name, a source of embarrassment to him for years, came from the fact that he had a rosy complexion as a small boy. A sister nicknamed him Pinky, and he carried it with him through school, college, and the big leagues. Given his choice, he'd prefer to be called Mike.

"I don't suppose it makes a hell of a lot of difference," he says, "because I'm more interested in what people think of me than what they call me. But, honestly now, don't I look more like a Mike than a Pinky?"

Before the season began, Higgins minced few words in showing more confidence in his young ball club than the baseball experts, many of whom picked the Red Sox to finish no better than fifth this year. He told reporters the club would definitely be in the thick of the pennant race.

"I wouldn't want to predict that we can win," he said, "but I think we'll take more games than last year's team did." Boudreau's 1954 club won 69 games, finished fourth, 42 games behind the league-leading Cleveland Indians.

At 46, Higgins knows exactly what he wants and where he's going. When he talks baseball, he expresses himself with quiet confidence. He punctuates his remarks with pithy phrases, along with the aforementioned maxims which he likes to assemble in simple battle array, the better to score his points. Here are some typical volleys:

"Baseball doesn't change much. What changes is the personnel."

"Percentage baseball must be good. If it weren't, it wouldn't work so often."

"It's easy to see what a fellow is doing wrong. The big job is to make the proper corrections."

"Each man must be treated as an individual. No two do things alike."

"Every manager has his own way of dealing with problems."

"I don't consider handling ballplayers a problem. It's a pleasure."

"Discipline never reforms a bad actor. I'd rather get rid of a man than fine or suspend him."

"The golden rule is old, but it still works pretty well."

The phrases may not make any notable additions to Bartlett's Quotations. As exemplified by Pinky Higgins, however, they do apparently shape ball games.

Housing Amendments of 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2126) to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, probably the issues have pretty much narrowed in this bill, as usual, to the question of public housing. It was advisable that a rule be granted in order that the House solve once and for all again this question of public housing. So it was necessary that the Committee on Rules make in order, if they reported out any rule, the Senate bill. The Senate bill was before the House committee and the Senate—I should, in this respect, say the other body did a deplorable job on the housing bill. We have had housing legislation before us to my knowledge since 1937. I never saw a worse mess than what came to us from the other body. I am quick to add that the great House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which we are usually very proud, at least I am, did not do a much better job. Neither the Senate bill nor the House amendments to the Senate bill constitute the President's program on housing—anything to the contrary notwithstanding. So it was thought advisable in an attempt to salvage something of the housing program that we start almost from scratch again and see what could be done. So at the suggestion of the administration I prepared and introduced a bill, the bill H. R. 7473, but minus any public housing provisions. The provisions contained in the Senate language, the provisions contained in the House language do not reflect the wishes of the President in respect to public housing. The only similarity, even the much touted House committee language, is that it just happened by coincidence, perhaps, that both the President's recommendation and the action taken by the House committee provide for 35,000 units—and there the similarity ends.

The bill, H. R. 7473, which is introduced, will be offered as a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendments after the first section is read. It is a streamlined, stripped-down bill, but it contains all the essentials—every one of the essentials necessary to continue the housing program. It provides that title I, in respect to modernization loans, be continued until July 1, 1956.

It provides in effect and in substance and in fact for a continuance of the FHA financing, and provides for additional insurance authorization sufficient to carry the FHA program throughout this fiscal year 1956. It increases the authorization for that purpose by $3,400,000,000. It is estimated that something less than that will be necessary to carry the program at the rate it is now going for the balance of this fiscal year. It provides for some military housing under the so-called Wherry Act, title VIII of the act, not as broad or as comprehensive as the House language provides for, nor as specific as the Senate language. But nevertheless, at the suggestion of the administration, Wherry financing is continued, but only for those projects which have already been certified by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 4 of the bill makes some technical changes which we can pass over.

Section 5 of the substitute provides an additional $500 million for capital grant authorization for the urban renewal programs. That section also increases the amount of the capital grant authorization which could be used in any one State from $35 million to $70 million. All of the other provisions are controversial provisions, many of which, most of which, have not been parts of, and never have been included in any housing bill which we have enacted.

It is unnecessary to enlarge the concepts of the housing program, for the reason that as of this moment we are building at an annual rate of 1,320,000 units, the greatest number which has ever been built in any 1 year. I may be in error. There might have been 1 calendar year when we got up to 1,400,000.

So it is not necessary to take up all of these controversial matters. If you want the program continued at the same rate that we are building housing units at the present time all we need to continue at that rate is this additional insurance authority.

I hope we take into consideration the potentialities of the actions which we might take and be realistic about this situation. If my substitute is adopted, it will continue the program about as is for another year.

If it is adopted and passed by the House the matter will go to conference, and I do not know of anything that is not in the Senate bill; I cannot conceive of anything in respect to housing that is not in the Senate bill, so almost anything that you can imagine will be before the conference, including public housing.

This House, as the gentleman from Virginia has so rightly said, has denounced and refused to approve public housing on 4 or 5 occasions.

May I take just a moment to clear up in your minds my understanding of the President's position on public housing? We must go back a year to the time when we were considering the Housing Act of 1954. You will recall that somebody had contended that the President wanted 140,000 housing units over a 4-year period. We had conferences with the President. The President, I believe, announced publicly, but surely privately, that his concern was only that we have enough authority to build sufficient public housing units to house the people who were to be displaced by slum-clearance project, urban-renewal projects, or because of other action taken by the Government; in other words, if by Government action a person's shelter is taken away from him, then it is the duty of the Government to make available safe, sanitary shelter.

That was his purpose, and that is all we should provide for, and that is all we did provide for. We provided ample units, because it was at the President's suggestion that we wrote into the act these standards under which we have worked all this last year. Although we gave him an authorization of 35,000, and they have been working under standards which the President himself set up, they found in 51 weeks there was necessity for building only 142 of the 35,000 units; in other words, replacements of safe, sanitary housing was found for all but 142 families who were displaced.

That is all the President wants; that is all he asked us to give him, and my bill does it.

Status of Forces Treaties

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, some of us are very strongly opposed to the status of forces treaties and other secret agreements that are being made, under which American servicemen and their dependents may be tried in the civil courts of foreign countries and incarcerated in foreign prisons.

I should like to read an item appearing in one of last Sunday's newspapers. It is from the leased wire of the New York Times and the dateline is London.

An American airman lost the right to drive in Britain for 12 months, and paid a $14 fine, for an act that would have won him commendation in most American courts.

Thomas Eugene Rogers, 25, told a South End magistrate that he knew he had had too much to drink the other night, so he climbed into the back of his car to sleep it off. A friend removed the ignition key.

But British law says you're "in charge" of a car if it isn't in the garage. A bobby pulled Rogers out of the back seat and took him to a police station, where a doctor certified he was unfit to be "in charge."

Rogers pleaded strenuously that he had done just what American police would have advised, and couldn't possibly have started the car without the keys.

Eighty-fourth Congress and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 84th Congress nears adjournment, we may look back on the past 7 months in an effort to sum up and evaluate what has been accomplished in the Congress.

In this connection, I ask consent to have reproduced in the RECORD an analysis of the work of this session of the Congress as reported in the New York Times of yesterday. This report follows:

THE 84TH AND THE PRESIDENT

Anxious and turbulent were the words for President Eisenhower's first 2 years in the White House. He was beset by great problems—the worsening situation in Indochina, the long delay over West German rearmament, the recession at home. He was bedeviled by the right wing of his own party. The "Asia Firsters" kept pressuring for a "tougher line." Senator MCCARTHY kept up a barrage of challenges. At one point the President somewhat plaintively remarked on the peculiar situation of a President of the United States—not only did he have to make decisions for the good of the country, he also had to be head of a political party.

Confident and amiable are the words for the past 7 months. The problems of the cold war remain, but the tension has eased. The Nation has moved into a period of great prosperity. Senator MCCARTHY has become a voice muted and ignored. The right wing led by Senator KNOWLAND has been largely silenced as public opinion, thoroughly aroused to the meaning of thermonuclear war, has strengthened the President's determination to seek and pursue peace. In defiance of all precedent, the nature of politics and the nature of man, the President has enjoyed almost unexampled good relations with a Democratic Congress. A few weeks ago, when asked how he liked his job, he replied: "Anyone who finds himself in a position of authority * * * to work toward a * * * peaceful world, of course it is a fascinating business. * * * There are in this office * * * unique opportunities to meet especially interesting people."

DEMOCRATS ON OFFENSIVE

The Democrats, of course, know a mote when they see it and have been quick to pluck it—Mrs. Hobby's handling of the Salk vaccine, the Dixon-Yates contract, the Talbott affair. But they have given the President full support on his foreign program—as they were duty-bound to, considering its lineage. On the domestic side, some of the President's measures have come through nearly intact, several have been modified, and a good many—which ran foul of the conservative-liberal split in the Democratic Party—have not been acted on.

All last week both Houses were driving to meet the adjournment deadline, which had been set for July 30—yesterday. As always when the cry "Home ho" goes up, Congress disposed of several measures which the President had marked "urgent" by throwing them overboard. Last night, as the session was drawing to a close, this is how the President's program stood:

FOREIGN AND DEFENSE

Treaties: Senate ratified the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Chinese Nationalist regime; the Paris pacts on West German sovereignty and membership in NATO; the Austrian State Treaty.

Formosa: Congress supported the President's request for a free hand in the defense of Formosa and the offshore islands.

Foreign trade: The administration bill for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act and authority to lower tariffs by 5 percent a year was passed.

Foreign aid: The President asked for $3,266,000,000. The final conference figure agreed on last week was $2,703,000,000—a cut of $563 million. A good part of this will be made up, however, because the Pentagon found some $302 million of former appropriations not obligated, which had become lost in bookkeeping. Congress gave the Defense Department permission to use the money which would otherwise have been returned to the Treasury.

Defense appropriations: A request for $31.9 billion was granted without major change.

Military reserves: To make up for manpower cuts under the New Look program, the President proposed increasing the Ready Reserve from 800,000 to 2.9 million by (1) requiring all men entering the services since the 1953 Korean armistice to serve a combined total of 8 years of active and reserve duty; (2) setting up a training program for up to 250,000 men a year aged 17–19, who would take 6 months of active duty and seven and a half years reserve. Congress finally passed a bill which (1) limits compulsory reserve duty to those entering on active service after the bill is signed, but offers incentives to those now on active duty to take reserve training; (2) sets the term of combined service at 6 years, the last year in the Standby Reserve, requiring no training; (3) permits youths 17 to 18½ to volunteer for 3 to 6 months' active training to begin when they graduate from high school, leave school, or reach 20, followed by reserve duty for a total of 8 years.

DOMESTIC

Appropriations: Regular departmental appropriation bills went through without drastic cuts.

Taxes: Congress supported the President on postponing scheduled cuts in corporate and excise taxes, and finally rejected a $20 personal income tax cut sponsored by House Democrats and opposed by the President.

Highways: The President proposed a 10-year, $39.1 billion, Federal-State road program, of which $21 billion for an interstate system would be raised by bonds not figuring in the national debt. The House Democrats sponsored a 13-year, $50.3 billion program, of which $24 billion for the interstate system would be raised by increased user taxes. Last week the House killed both the administration and Democratic bills. Democratic leaders charged their bill had been lobbied to death by the trucking industry.

Minimum wages: The President asked an increase from 75 cents to 90 cents an hour; Congress voted for $1, and the President will accept it.

School construction: The President wanted a 3-year program of $200 million in outright grants to the States, plus authority to buy up to $750 million of low-interest bonds issued by local school districts. A House committee increased the grants to $1.6 billion over 4 years. Largely because southerners feared an antisegregation rider would be attached to the bill, the measure was not acted on.

TROUBLE ON HEALTH

Health: The President's broad health program with a proposal to encourage extension of private health insurance through Federal reinsurance against loss never got out of committee. Conservative legislators feared the reinsurance proposal would be an entering wedge for socialized medicine; New Deal Democrats thought it vague and inadequate.

Housing: The President asked 70,000 low-cost units over 2 years. The Senate passed a bill providing a total of 380,000 over an indefinite period, with a minimum of 85,000 and a maximum of 200,000 a year, plus 50,000 over 5 years for elderly couples. The House knocked out all public housing. Last evening the conference committee was still seeking a compromise.

Atom showboat: Both Houses rejected the the President's plan for a nuclear-powered merchant ship to serve as a world-girdling exhibit on atoms for peace. Majority felt funds should be devoted to developing atom-powered marine engines.

Hawaii: No action on the President's statehood request.

Immigration: No action on his request for liberalization of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Casting over this record for its campaign potential, politicians of both parties are pretty well agreed—privately, of course—that:

There is not much here which the Democrats can use to cut down the President's popularity.

There is not much here which the Republicans can use to enhance the popularity of the party.

In 1956 the Democrats have only 15 Senate seats at stake, 8 of them safe. They hold only 31 House seats won by less than 55 percent of the vote, as against 63 Republican marginal seats.

Therefore the feeling is growing in Washington that if the President runs and unless the Republicans gain considerably in public esteem, the Nation may well witness that unprecedented phenomenon—a President who failed to carry his party into Congress.

Company Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of commonsense to the within editorial, "Company Coming," that appeared in the Boston Traveler of July 29, 1955:

COMPANY COMING

We might as well get out the little old date book and make a note of the fact that the Moscow Happiness Boys are heading this way—date undetermined.

That possibility became almost a certainty Wednesday in the British House of Commons. A formal communique was read, announcing that Khrushchev and Bulganin had accepted Anthonk Eden's invitation to visit England in the spring. And the Britons responded with a roar of cheers.

So where does that leave us? We're being boxed. If the Merry Men of Moscow can go down to Kew in lilac time, sooner or later they'll be in Washington to see the cherry blossoms. Otherwise, what price stuffiness?

Even before the British announcement arrived, you could see this thing taking shape at the White House. At his Wednesday news conference, the President was asked if he'd discussed at Geneva the possibility of visiting back and forth with the rambling Reds.

In his reply, he said the matter had been talked about "a very great deal"—that no proposals had been made but "opportunities were discussed in a general way in arranging, let us say, throughout the whole echelons of government and everything else."

Stripped down, that means—sure, next question.

Well, we are indeed a strange people. No wonder the rest of the world finds it hard to understand us when most of the time we can't even understand ourselves. It seems only yesterday that we were hurling violent purple warnings in one direction at Chou En-lai and in the opposite direction at the Russian Rover Boys. Now we share the dry martini at Geneva, and soften up the home folks for unexpected company.

In Commons on Wednesday, Laborite Herbert Morrison said Eden's optimism frightened him.

"It did remind me, with something of a shiver," he said, "of the return of Mr. Neville Chamberlain from Munich with his little piece of paper which, he said, meant peace but which, as it turned out, did not."

Took the words right out of our mouth, Mr. Morrison.

Objection to H. R. 5205, a Bill To Extend to Uniformed Members of the Armed Forces the Same Protection Against Bodily Attack as Is Now Granted to Personnel of the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5205 is entitled "A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard."

That language would seem to make the bill highly desirable. However, such is not the case.

This proposal has been pending before Congress for a good many years. It has been considered in the Committee on Armed Services and in the former Committee on Military Affairs a number of times, and has in each instance been rejected. On at least one occasion it was considered on the floor of the House and rejected.

Members of the Coast Guard occupy a dual status. They are members of the armed services. In addition, they are charged with the duty of enforcing the customs laws. In this latter category, they are Federal peace officers similar to United States marshals, border patrolmen, or customs agents. As Federal peace officers, they are entitled to, and have, the same protection against bodily attack in the discharge of their duties as is granted to all other Federal peace officers. The law has long provided that protection.

Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps have no duties as peace officers. In a democracy such as ours, they should have no duties as peace officers. Their duties are, and must remain, strictly military duties.

Should the provisions of this bill become law, every affray or fist fight in which a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps is a participant could be cognizable in the Federal court. This is highly undesirable. The proposal is a mischiefmaker. This bill appeared on the Consent Calendar, a portion of which was called on July 30. Should it be called on the Consent Calendar, or unanimous consent for its passage be requested, I shall object.

What I have stated with reference to H. R. 5205, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], applies also to the similar bills for the same purpose, being H. R. 5279, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]; H. R. 5309, by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]; and H. R. 5399, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Annual Chiropractic Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues in Congress to a very special observance that will occur in America next month. For in September, the chiropractic profession—the Nation's second largest profession of healing—will observe its annual Chiropractic Day.

On that day—September 18, 1955—more than 25,000 chiropractors throughout the United States, Canada, and many foreign countries, will celebrate the 60th anniversary of the discovery of chiropractic by the late Dr. Daniel David Palmer.

It is not my purpose here to enter into controversy over any method of practice of the healing art, nor to endorse or to condemn any school of healing. But I do want to submit for the RECORD the following statement by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, director of public relations, National Chiropractic Association, Washington, D. C.:

On September 18, chiropractors will look back to survey more than a half-century of progress wherein the chiropractic profession has been raised to a firm basis of professional skill and ethical standards, and to the point where chiropractic today enjoys the prestige, standing, and material rewards of other professions.

Chiropractic is the second largest healing profession in America. It is classified as 1 of the 4 major healing professions, along with medicine, dentristry and osteopathy, by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.

Recognizing the goals already reached by this prominent profession, and the confidence of 33 million people who have received chiropractic treatment in the United States and Canada, it is indeed proper that we all should pause for a moment to consider the basic principles which form the foundations for this growing profession in our Nation today.

A fresh concept in the art of healing based upon the physical and mechanical approach, rather than the chemical, was given to the world 60 years ago. For it was in 1895 that Dr. Palmer brought to the modern world the benefits of chiropractic principles.

These principles were actually in use many years B. C. with the healers of Greece. Hippocrates himself, the father of healing, said "look well to the spine for cause of disease." And from the Greek words meaning "efficient hand" came "chiropractic," the modern term for this science, art, and practice.

And it was Plato, the great Greek philosopher, who broke the bonds of "hidebound," custom-restricted thinking and noted, along with many other early Greeks and Romans, that what we call "nerve energy" and other principles of spinal health are basic to the healing of the ills of mankind.

After exhaustive research, Dr. Palmer in 1895 reintroduced to our world these principles which have been carried on by chiropractors who are devoted to the prevention and treatment of disease and to the promotion of public health and welfare.

The specific function by which the chiropractor is distinguished from other modes of healing is his adjustment by manipulation of the structures of the body, especially those of the spinal column, to restore normal nerve function. Such adjustment is frequently supplemented by any or all of the modern tools of physical therapy.

The remarkable effectiveness of chiropractic methods in treating disease has won for chiropractic a permanent place in the family of health sciences, and in the hearts and homes of suffering humanity.

This rapid acceptance of this science of healing in the past 60 years leads us to inquire of the standards in use today. And extremely exacting standards they are found to be.

Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hours in a standard 4-year course to obtain accredited ratings from the committee on educational standards of the National Chiropractic Association. A basic course of 4,400 hours is recommended.

Up to 2 years of professional (college) education is required by State chiropractic laws of licensure. A large percentage of students entering apprroved chiropractic colleges today have college degrees.

The following typical or basic curriculum for approved chiropractic colleges is based on the National Chiropractic Association code for a minimum of 4,000 hours in a 4-year course:

	Hours
Anatomy, including embryology and histology	740
Physiology	240
Biochemistry	180
Pathology and bacteriology	520
Public health, sanitation, hygiene	160
Practice of chiropractic principles and technique, neurology and psychiatry, pediatrics, dermatology and syphilology, urology, ophthalmology, otolaryngology, first aid and minor surgery, roentgenology	1,960
Obstetrics and gynecology	200
Total	4,000

The average graduate of an accredited chiropractic college is as well qualified to practice chiropractic as the average graduate of an accredited medical college is to practice medicine, and often must pass the same board examination in the basic sciences to gain a license.

An appreciation of these high standards has been expressed by the 33 million people—1 out of 5 Americans—who have found this way to restored or improved health. This marks a great contribution by chiropractic to the general health and well-being of the people.

Chiropractors everywhere will join in the observance of September 18, 1955, as Chiropractic Day with a full appreciation of the freedom of the Western World, where, in three score years a new profession can gain public acceptance on its merits.

Assuring Fair Division of the Benefits of the Sugar Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following material from Agriculture Information Bulletin, No. 111, dated July 1953, and published by the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture:

ASSURING FAIR DIVISION OF THE BENEFITS OF THE SUGAR PROGRAM

The principal way in which the domestic industry derives benefits from the sugar program is through the stabilization of raw and refined sugar prices at reasonably profitable levels. But the framers of the Jones-Costigan Act did not leave solely to competitive forces the carrying of these benefits through retailers, wholesalers, refiners, and importers, to beet and raw-cane processors, growers, and farm workers. They provided in that act for a system of grower payments to assure that this sharing would take place. This system was carried forward in succeeding legislation though, as pointed out earlier, handled in a different manner. Under the present act these payments are called conditional payments.

Conditional payments are financed out of the general funds of the Treasury. However, a tax on sugar provides funds for the Treasury which more than offset the total of all conditional payments plus the costs incurred by the Department of Agriculture in administering the Sugar Act. This tax is in the amount of one-half cent a pound, raw value, on all sugar processed and imported for direct consumption. It is imposed on domestic processors, principally beet processors and refiners, and importers of direct-consumption sugar by the Sugar Act, through an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code.

As indicated in the section on proportionate shares, conditional payments act as an incentive to growers to adjust their production to the quota and carryover needs. But this payment system also has three other objectives. These other objectives are: (1) To help provide adequate incomes to growers; (2) to assure growers and field workers a fair sharing of returns to the industry; and (3) to prevent the employment of child labor in field work.

The first objective is accomplished by augmenting grower income through conditional payments. The second and third objectives are achieved by requiring growers to observe certain conditions in order to receive conditional payments. These conditions are in addition to the requirement that growers comply with their proportionate share determination. They are as follows:

1. Growers, who are also processors, are required to pay fair prices for cane or beets purchased from other growers in order to receive conditional payments. Fair prices are determined annually by the Secretary for each domestic area after public hearings and after investigation on the economic position of growers and processors. The fair price determinations fix the level of prices paid to growers by processors who are growers. In addition, they affect the level of prices paid to growers by processors who are not growers. Processors who are not growers pay about the same prices as grower-processors.

2. Growers must pay fieldworkers in full for work performed on cane or beets and at rates not less than those determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be fair and reasonable. Each year the Secretary determines fair and reasonable wages for fieldworkers in each domestic area. These wages are established after investigation and public hearings at which all interested parties may testify.

3. Growers must not employ children under the age of 14 years or permit them to work on the farm. Adolescents between the ages of 14 and 16 may not be employed or permitted to work for more than 8 hours a day. The children of growers who own at least 40 percent of the crop they are cultivating are exempted from this condition. If this condition is not observed by a grower he is penalized by a deduction of $10 from his payment for each child and for each day or part of a day during which such child was employed or permitted to work.

The rates of conditional payments vary with the volume of sugar, raw value, produced from the cane or beets grown on a farm and are graduated downward from the small to the large producer. The basic rate of 80 cents a hundred pounds of sugar, raw value, is paid on the first 350 short tons produced on a farm. This rate is reduced progressively to a minimum of 30 cents a hundred pounds on all sugar produced in excess of 30,000 short tons on a farm. From 1942 to 1950 the average rate of payment was 67 cents a hundred pounds, ranging from 46 cents in Hawaii where most of the production is on large farms to 79 cents in the beet area. Payments in the mainland cane area, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands averaged 68, 67, and 72 cents a hundred pounds, respectively, during the same period.

It is noted that the average payment per pound for all domestic areas exceeds the tax per pound—an apparent paradox in view of the fact that total tax receipts exceed the cost of the program. However, this is because the tax is imposed on all sugar (foreign and domestic) processed or imported for direct consumption and payments are made on domestic production only.

To summarize, the conditional payment provisions of the act help to assure that the benefits of the sugar program are shared equitably by growers and farm workers, by (1) making conditional payments to growers; (2) fixing a fair division of the returns from sugar between growers and processors; (3) fixing a fair and reasonable wage for workers engaged in producing, cultivating, and harvesting cane and beets; and (4) eliminating the employment of child labor.

The Late John Roland Kinzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of my very good friend, and our former colleague, John Roland Kinzer, who died last Monday at the age of 81 in Lancaster, Pa. Our State has lost one of its finest citizens.

Mr. Kinzer served in Congress from 1930 until his retirement in 1947. He was an honest, conscientious, and loyal legislator. His work in the House of Representatives was useful and constructive and his ambition was to preserve the principles and ideals of our great Nation.

He was a humble and kindly man and one whom you admired as a companion and a friend. He was always considerate of everybody and the kind of man who added much to our daily lives, with a kind word for everyone.

Today it is with a feeling of sadness that we record his passing, and remember him for the many little acts of kindness that marked his friendship and good will toward all of us who knew him.

Highway to the Arctic Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I take especial pleasure in presenting here an article entitled "Highway to the Arctic Ocean" written by Col. G. L. Curtis, USAF, which appeared in the National Defense Transportation Journal for July-August 1955. The article tells of a revolutionary development which took place in transportation last winter in transporting supplies and fuels for the "Dew Line" radar screen:

In a pioneering adventure which made transportation history, a common carrier has driven its regular highway trucks from Fairbanks, Alaska, to the shores of the Arctic Ocean, carrying supplies and fuel for construction of the United States-Canadian "Dew Line" radar screen. Making the feat more impressive is the fact that the private trucking concern blazed its own more-than-four-hundred-mile highway through the Arctic in only 39 days, smashing through a virtually unknown and uncharted area of snow and ice.

Original plans for the project called for truck and trailer delivery to a specified point. From there, a specially designed giant tractor-propelled snow train would haul the freight overland to designated spots.

This project began in the latter part of 1954, when Alfred Ghezzi, Jr., President of Alaska Freight Lines, Inc., made an unusual proposal to the Western Electric Corp., prime contractor in charge of building the "Dew Line" radar screen across the Arctic perimeter between Alaska and Greenland. Mr. Ghezzi proposed that Alaska Freight Lines load an initial block of 500 tons of freight at Fairbanks and make delivery to specified sites in the Arctic. Alaska Freight Lines would build its own highway through the Arctic; would provide its own equipment; would guarantee delivery; and would fly the freight in if the road proved unsuccessful. Alaska Freight Lines would use its own funds for the entire project, and would not be paid for the freight haulage until final delivery.

Sensing the possibilities of a complete new concept in Arctic military supply, the Departments of the Air Force and Army, gave their approval to Mr. Ghezzi's proposal. United States and Canadian authorities realized that if Alaska Freight Lines could build a highway to the Arctic Ocean and make overland delivery of the supplies and equipment needed to build the radar screen, the high cost of airlifting the same supplies could be greatly reduced, and transportation schedules could be maintained despite the tricky Arctic weather.

Even before receiving the official go ahead from the Departments of the Air Force and Army, Alaska Freight Lines ordered new Caterpillar D–8 tractors from Peoria, Ill., and a huge Snowtrain from LeTourneau's Texas plant.

Mr. Ghezzi set up headquarters in Fairbanks, and began assembling the crew of Alaskans whom he knew could lick the Arctic.

WANNIGANS USED

Alaska Freight built its own Wannigans (sled-mounted cabins for use as sleeping and cooking quarters for the crews), and the first units headed north from Fairbanks just a month and 2 days from the day the project was given the green light.

Although a summer road exists between Fairbanks and a small unidentified community way station located on the Arctic Circle, this road has always been impassable during the bitter Arctic winters. Alaska Freight Lines' lead "cat" train blasted through to this intermediate point over terrain previously considered impassable in exactly 8 days. The "cat" train crossed the frozen Yukon River and headed north for the Arctic Ocean. Ahead of the lead unit, an Alaskan guide from Big Delta and an Alaskan Indian guide from Fort Yukon went forward on snowshoes, working in constant liaison with Alaska Freight Lines' own scouting plane. Red flags dropped from the plane were spotted along the most passable routes for the lead "cat" to follow. Constant radiotelephone communication was maintained between the scouts, the plane, and all units of the following trains.

Two weeks after the original "cat" train left Fairbanks, a second train followed. This unit was charged with the actual building of the Arctic Highway, a road 25 feet in width, across the roughest, coldest, least-known territory in the Northern Hemisphere, to the Arctic Ocean, more than 400 miles away. Following in the wake of the "cats" was a convoy of 32 line-haul diesel truck and trailer units, designed for paved highways but never for Arctic transportation.

Day and night the "cats" kept punching into the north, with the big diesel truck-trailers right behind. Temperatures hit 68° below zero, and engines had to be kept running 24 hours per day to prevent freezing. Drifts 50 to 75 feet high were commonplace, and at times the "cats" worked in layers of 2 and 3.

Behind the train of roadbuilding "cats" and diesel trucks rolled the LeTourneau Snowtrain, each of its 24 wheels individually powered, its 5 trailer units loaded with 150 tons of supplies. The wheels of the Snowtrain were 7 feet 4 inches high, and the trailer beds stood 9 feet off the ground, enabling the train to roll securely over the roughest terrain.

Alaska Freight Lines' original plans called for the diesel trucks and trailers to go only to the dividing line between the sub-Arctic and actual Arctic. There the cargo would be transferred to the Snowtrain for final delivery to the Dew Line radar network along the rim of the Arctic Ocean. However, the diesel trucks and trailers surpassed all expectation and kept rolling north as if they had been intended all along for Arctic operation.

The lead "cats" of the trail-blazing section were the first vehicles ever to be driven north to the Arctic Ocean, and their "cat skinners" had accomplished the impossible by blazing a more than 400-mile highway through the Arctic, over a route considered by many experts to be impassable, and in the face of conditions designed by nature to test to the limit both men and machine.

While waiting for the arrival of the main highway construction train, this same unit built an airstrip at destination. They completed a runway 7,500 feet long in less than 1 week's time.

Early this year, Alaska Freight Lines' Snowtrain, as well as Alaska Freight's 32 line-haul trucks and trailers, reached their Arctic shore destination with 500 tons of freight for the Dew Line.

MAY CHANGE PROGRAM

This achievement of the Alaska Freight Lines in pioneering a land route to the Arctic has opened up an entire new concept in logistic support of Arctic sites.

This new concept may reverse the original resupply program of the Dew Line from the summer open-water season to the winter frozen-tundra season. Supplies may be fanned out to individual sites from strategic inland staging points, such as Fairbanks, in this first winter's operation or ships may move supplies into 3 or 4 central locations on the Dew Line during the summer open-water season for lateral movement to individual sites during the winter season. In addition to possible savings in actual transportation costs, this new concept developed by the Alaska Freight Lines provides a valuable alternate mode of transportation in the event supplies cannot be moved to the sites via the sea lanes.

The Department of the Air Force is studying this entire area in the light of this recent development.

Tribute to Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 11, 1955, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, a distinguished Representative from Connecticut, made what many of us thought was an eloquent address entitled "How High Is the Summit?" This speech of Congressman DODD was not only eloquently delivered but contained sound and courageous advice to our Nation.

Shortly after July 27, Congressman DODD received a letter from former President Harry S. Truman, which I hereinafter set forth. Former President Truman certainly has paid Congressman DODD an unusual tribute. It is typical of the gallant and courageous Harry S. Truman that despite his retirement from the high office of President, he nevertheless follows the affairs of our Nation and reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is with pleasure that I include the President's letter in the RECORD, not only as a tribute to Congressman DODD, but also as a reminder to all that Harry S. Truman's service to the Nation has not ended and that is something for which the Nation should be grateful.

The letter follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *July 27, 1955.*

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DODD: I have just received a copy of the RECORD for July 11 which contains your speech, the subject of which is How High Is the Summit?

It is one of the best statements on the subject I have ever read, and I am certainly glad you were thoughtful enough to put it into the RECORD. I congratulate you heartily on it.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Highway Legislation a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following timely editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 29, 1955:

ROAD MAP NEEDED

Americans aware of the serious gap between supply and demand in our road system will support President Eisenhower thoroughly in his appeal to Congress to reconsider road legislation.

The House defeated the administration highway plan by 224 to 193 and then defeated a Democratic substitute by the even greater margin of 292 to 123. As a result, Mr. Eisenhower said he was "deeply disappointed." He added:

"The Nation badly needs good roads. The good of our people, of our economy, and of our defense, requires that construction of these highways be undertaken at once."

Nobody, including all the Congressmen who voted against highway legislation, can deny this. And if these Congressmen are as interested as the President in getting action on a road program, they will take advantage of his offer of a compromise. For Mr. Eisenhower said that contention over the method of paying for the roads should not deny the Nation the roads.

His program, first offered Congress, suggested a special Federal corporation to issue road bonds outside the Federal debt limit. The House substitute proposed a penny increase in the 2-cents-a-gallon Federal gas tax and increased levies on trucks, tires, and tubes. There was little difference between the two plans as to the roads to be built or total expenditures.

Many Congressmen opposed the administration plan because special bonds would be costly and devious in terms of increasing the national debt without seeming to increase it. And as it turned out, the powerful truckers' lobby fought the House substitute because of the increased taxes proposed. House Democratic Leader MCCORMACK observed, "The answer is, everybody wants a road bill and no one wants to pay for it."

The answer to that is, the Nation needs a road bill and cannot have it without paying for it. Bonds will only postpone and increase the payment. But if major tax increases are not politically possible, then Congress has to find a program which it feels the public will support.

That program might lie somewhere between the defeated plans, or in a scaled down version of them. If Congress will not accept a 10- or 12-year proposal for 38 to 42 billions in expenditures, it might settle on a somewhat less ambitious 5-year plan such as the Gore bill which the Senate approved. And if Congress cannot approve either special bonds or sharp tax increases, it might agree to regular Treasury bonds plus a limited tax increase.

Highway legislation is must legislation, both to the President and, we think, to millions of motorists and the American people. It should not be put off until an election

year, when politics could crack all the proposed payment.

What is needed now is a legislative beginning that will get the highway expansion underway. Obviously the only way this Congress can begin is to compromise. President Eisenhower has given the legislators a good road map in the right direction.

Federal Home Loan Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the titles to the homes of many thousands of California families, including many of my own constituents, have been clouded and reclouded, and bounced in and out of courts for the last several years, as a result of two major factors:

First. A Federal agency, the then Home Loan Bank Commissioner, acted in a vindictive and capricious manner. Such conduct resulted in very grave and irreparable injury to citizens of California.

Second. The courts failed in their function to grant protection to citizens who had been the victims of the bank commissioner's diabolical scheme.

The bank commissioner's capricious scheme was made possible through the abuse and misapplication of powers granted Federal agencies under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the Home Owners' Loan Act.

Under the claimed authority of these acts, the then bank commissioner seized, without trial, notice, or hearing, two solvent and prosperous financial institutions. The lack of merit and capriciousness of such seizures were conclusively brought to light in two subsequent congressional hearings, by the sworn testimony of a host of witnesses and documentary evidence.

The United States district court has however, thus far been precluded from trying the charges of fraud against the seizing Government officials, by a series of United States circuit appellate court decisions. These appellate court decisions are based upon purely technical grounds, denying the United States courts jurisdiction to hear the complaints and claims of injury of our victimized citizens.

Congress enacted these laws as a protection for its citizens and to aid in stabilizing our national economy at a time when it was sorely needed. Under these enactments, over $28 billion savings deposits have been built up by over 16 million people.

When the congressional enactments were abused by the home loan bank officials, the circuit court blamed Congress by holding the United States district court without jurisdiction, and said:

> The simplest kind of an amendment [by Congress] would have achieved such a result.

It should have been obvious Congress never intended these abuses, and certainly did not intend to deprive its citizens of the protection of the courts. To make its intention crystal clear, Congress did correct the law by enacting the 1954 Housing Act.

By such act, Congress wiped out the excuses of the United States circuit appellate court for its failure to properly function. Such court had previously held the following:

First. Home Loan Bank Board was not sueable.

Second. That exhaustion of administrative remedies was a prerequisite for citizens to judicially regain their property seized from them by force and duress.

Third. Lack of jurisdiction in the United States courts of the "subject matter," of the claims of the citizens.

Fourth. Absence of Government defendants from the jurisdiction of the United States district court precluded the courts from functioning.

None of these appellate court excuses went to the merits of the injustices perpetrated upon our citizens.

Congress in its 1954 Housing Act was plain and forceful in its language and intent when it repudiated the United States Circuit Appellate Court's contention by adopting a law which: (a) Made the Home Loan Bank Board a sueable entity; (b) authorized direct jurisdiction by the local United States district court to hear and grant relief to its citizens, without the prior necessity of administrative process; (c) committed to the local United States district court jurisdiction to review all acts of the Home Loan Bank Board embracing the whole gamut of the subject matter of such board's functions; (d) provided a definite and specific manner of serving process on the Home Loan Bank Board and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; (e) after consideration of the specific litigation pending—for example, Long Beach Federal Savings cases—Congress refused to limit its enactments to future matters. All of its citizens are entitled to equal protection against fraud and corruption of Government officials.

Notwithstanding the plain intent of Congress, evidenced by the legislative history as well as the clear and concise wording of the act, the United States Circuit Appellate Court, by its ruling in July 1955, still precludes the United States district court from exercising the jurisdiction specifically granted by Congress.

There has been no prior trial on the merits of the issues. There can be no res judicata of something never tried. The Congressional enactments are procedural and remedial. Such a conflict of the United States Circuit Appellate Court rulings and congressional enactments, are unwarranted and unjustified. with the heavy and burdensome workload of Congress, it should not be subjected to criticism which follows as a result of the failure of our courts to protect its citizens against capricious acts and abuse of power of Government officials.

These United States circuit appellate courts are experimental creatures of Congress, intended to serve a useful purpose. However, if the experiment proves a burden rather than an asset, Congress has the responsibility of correcting the evil in the courts, as well as in the agencies.

In such United States circuit court's latest decision, it nullifies a California State law granting our citizens a right "to quiet titles" to their homes against allegedly false and fraudulent claims of people and agencies with whom they have had no dealings. Such nullification and encroachment into State law was necessary, to sustain the appellate court's erroneous rulings which are in conflict with the congressional act.

What ultimate damage to Government and citizens alike will result as a consequence of the United States appellate courts flaunting of congressional enactment, is impossible to estimate. The damages thus far reaches into many millions, in addition to the unwarranted heartaches and hardships already thrust upon thousands of our citizens.

Congress has the responsibility to correct abuse of its enactments, or face a growing host of injured citizens, who have been deprived of their homes and property, without trial, hearing, or right of redress, because of the failure of the courts to properly function.

Harvey Plans Courthouse Visits With Indiana Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to be of service to the citizens of the 10th District of Indiana, I plan to tour the 10-county area during the period of October 3 to October 14, inclusive. With the cooperation of local officials at county-seat cities, I have been assured courthouse space in which to confer with individuals and groups who feel they have matters to discuss with their Representative in Congress.

It is sincerely hoped constituents will feel free to call on me during the time allotted their community. Whether they wish to discuss personal problems or national affairs, I shall welcome the opportunity to face them.

No appointments will be necessary for those wishing to spend a few minutes with their Congressman. It will be my intent, aided by staff members, to give attention to all callers.

My itinerary, with the daily conference periods to run from 10 a. m. to 4 p. m., local time, is as follows:

October 3, Monday: Greensburg, Decatur County.

October 4, Tuesday: Winchester, Randolph County.

October 5, Wednesday: Shelbyville, Shelby County.

October 6, Thursday: New Castle, Henry County.

October 7, Friday: Muncie, Delaware County.

October 10, Monday: Greenfield, Hancock County.

October 11, Tuesday: Connersville, Fayette County.

October 12, Wednesday: Liberty, Union County.

October 13, Thursday: Rushville, Rush County.

October 14, Friday: Richmond, Wayne County.

Eisenhower's Statesmanship at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the world this side of the Iron Curtain has applauded the sincere and brilliant leadership of President Eisenhower at the conference at Geneva. The President's personal triumph is a victory for our Nation and free men everywhere—opening the way for the ending of the decade-long cold war through the exertion of a quality of statesmanship long absent in our time.

I wish to commend to the House of Representatives the excellent analysis of the President's contribution to the Geneva Conference which appeared in the Times-Recorder of Zanesville, Ohio, on Monday, August 1:

ENCIRCLING MOVEMENT

The ponderous, long-heralded summit conference, from which the world expected little and hoped for much, will go down in history as the scene of the "Eisenhower Challenge"—probably the greatest stroke of statesmanship in our time.

As Western newsmen struggled desperately to send home reports of progress and optimism, when the key issues of German reunification and European defense had both been kicked under the table for resurrection at the foreign minister level at some later date, when Russia's Bulganin had once more repeated the threadbare Soviet formula for disarmament—of other nations, when the meeting seemed hopelessly fouled up and rapidly disintegrating * * * President Eisenhower let the peace-loving Russians have it.

In the same simple, friendly, but deadly earnest manner of his earlier addresses in Geneva, he called upon the masters of the Soviet to exchange with the United States complete blueprints of each other's military establishment. Further, he invited them to take all the aerial photographs they wished over the United States—extending the same privilege to American fliers over the U. S. S. R. in return. He emphasized that the exchange of military installation blueprints was to cover the United States from end to end and to extend likewise across the vastness of the Soviet Union.

The jolt that turned the tables and placed President Eisenhower in command of the situation was received by the Russians in stony silence. Premier Bulganin, as chairman, adjourned the meeting.

Such a proposal is obviously not to the Reds' liking. But will they dare to reject it? If they turn it down their protestations for peace and amity and understanding are forever gone with the wind that generated them. If they turn it down they can never again charge us with warmongering. And if they should accept the President's challenge the Iron Curtain comes crashing down. The secret fastnesses of the Urals, the slave camps of Siberia, the wretchedness and poverty of the Russian people and the Soviet satellites will be revealed to all the world. The days of the Kremlin hierarchy will be numbered. And if they accept we suspect there is little about our Military Establishment for them to add to the intelligence data they already have.

Either way, General Eisenhower has taken the summit.

How an Industrial Payroll Stimulates the Economic Life of a Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article dramatizing the purchasing power of an industrial payroll. It is probably a typical example of how payroll earnings are spent not only in a typical New Hampshire town, but small towns anywhere in this country so I thought it might be of interest to my colleagues and readers throughout the country. An economic survey by Paul Weiner of the department of economics, University of New Hampshire, How an Industrial Payroll Stimulates the Economic Life of a Community, follows:

HOW AN INDUSTRIAL PAYROLL STIMULATES THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF A COMMUNITY

(By Paul Weiner)

When the International Packings Corp. of Bristol, N. H., paid its employees 11,803 silver dollars on May 27, 1955, an opportunity was provided for the community to determine the flow of money in and around its shopping area.

Among the questions Bristol businessmen were interested in were how much money stays in town and how much goes to surrounding communities; what percentage of wages is spent on food, clothing, notions, services, etc., to what extent does a dollar multiply its purchases.

This survey, based on an economic study of questionnaires filled out by 37 Bristol merchants and interviews with bank officials in and around the area, will try to answer these questions and show how the community may realize the maximum benefit from its major industrial payroll.

Of the 11,803 silver dollars paid out to employees of the International Packings Corp., approximately 6,060 silver dollars were accounted for after the first full week of business. There were 5,743 silver dollars unaccounted for. The First National Bank of Bristol held 4,165 silver dollars and the various merchants in town were left with 400 silver dollars at the end of the week. The interesting statistic is that the neighboring banks in Plymouth, Laconia, and Franklin had collected 1,495 silver dollars, which may turn out to be a modest early figure. A breakdown of these banks found the Franklin bank holding 900 silver dollars, the Plymouth bank holding 367 silver dollars, and the Laconia bank holding 196 silver dollars. The latter figure is expected to be much larger after this week.

The important thing, as will be indicated later, is that once a dollar is spent outside of Bristol, the chances seem slim that it will be respent in Bristol. This means that the town and merchants lose the important benefit of induced spendings or having this money spent over and over again in the town. This severely limits the possibility of economic expansion. The one important principle is that the initial expenditures must be encouraged to be made in Bristol.

Of the silver dollars traced down after the first week of business, 25 percent were found outside of Bristol. If this same percentage holds true for the silver dollars not yet located, then eventually 8,852 of them should be located in Bristol. However, I feel that this figure is somewhat high and I think that the Bristol bank will probably have closer to 7,000 silver dollars.

However, far more important than the dollars handled during the week and accounted for at the end of the week is this question: How much more business will be induced and created in Bristol as a result of this payroll? A normal rate of savings and an estimated leakage of silver dollars to other areas based on the various bank's figures will have to be taken into account. Eventually, as pointed out above, the Bristol bank will probably take in the area of 7,000 silver dollars and most of this money will be respent partly in Bristol and partly outside of Bristol. On the basis of earlier figures, I feel that eventually some $23,000 worth of economic activity will be created in Bristol as a result of 1 payroll. It takes a great deal of time for one payroll to work itself out, but this may approximate the added weekly lift to the town of Bristol.

Let's take a look and see what may happen to silver dollars when an employee of the International Packings Corp. spends them. After deductions, employee A receives 50 silver dollars and it is his practice to save $5 and spend $45. He buys various items such as food, clothing, services, entertainment, and pays his rent. The merchants and the landlord now have an extra $45 that employee A has spent, and they as a group also save part of this money and respend part of it (by far the larger part). Let's keep the same percentage of savings (10 percent) so that they as a group save $4.50. They also spend as a group $40.50 to pay for food, services, entertainment, and rent. This process keeps on occurring with a percentage of leakage to other areas and has a multiplied effect so that the employee who was paid 50 silver dollars and spends 45 can create around $450 worth of economic activity. An industrial payroll of $11,803 can induce over $100,000 worth of extra economic activity. Some of this will be spent in Bristol, some in surrounding areas, some in Concord, Manchester, Boston, New York, and so forth. The more money that is initially spent in Bristol, the more in extra sales and added economic activity for Bristol.

Thirty-seven merchants of Bristol handled around 4,000 silver dollars during the first week of business. Of this amount, 45 percent was handled by food, grocery, and beverage lines; 20 percent was handled by gas stations and auto repair shops; 11 percent was handled by clothing establishments; 6 percent for restaurants; 6 percent for gifts, drugs, and newspapers. Another 5 percent was handled by services such as cleaning, laundry, barbers, etc. The remaining 5 percent can be put in the miscellaneous category.

The full impact of an industrial payroll cannot be measured, but it is clear that any

industry entering a community will have a powerful economic impact on that community, and for the whole area as well. A vigorous, progressive community that rapidly and effectively adjusts to a new industry can manage to keep a larger share of the payroll and induced spendings within its boundaries. Although, I have not had the opportunity to make a personal study of the retailing practices in Bristol, some principles developed from similar areas may be of help. It should perhaps be borne in mind that there is a decided difference between storekeeping and being a merchant. The storekeeper's concepts and methods of yesterday cannot meet the needs of today's markets and those of the future. As one economist pointed out, "The continued expansion of trading areas, increasing competition, better informed and discriminating consumers, and the rapid tempo of economic and social changes have made the management tasks of even the smaller retail establishments complex, difficult, and risky."

The day is past when anyone can keep store when basic business and merchandising principles can be ignored and when retail management can fail to assume the economic and social responsibilities rightfully expected of the retail industry. If there be a loss of more business than what is expected to other areas or not enough business, then much of the difficulty can be traced to faulty management. Attractive window displays, sales promotions, a proper stock balance, advertising, public relations, merchandise control, and store layout all play an important role. The advantage of holding on to an industry and attracting new industries extend far beyond a single payroll. It is up to the merchants of Bristol to maximize this advantage.

Cooperative Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of August 2, 1955:

COOPERATIVE CONGRESS

The most notable fact about the first session of the 84th Congress is that President Eisenhower's fears of a cold war between the White House and Capitol Hill did not materialize. The President's remark was made, of course, in the heat of the 1954 campaign, and he himself later acknowledged that his choice of words had been unfortunate. Actually there has been a large degree of cooperation between the Republican President and the Democratic Congress. On a number of issues, especially in the field of foreign policy, the Democratic majorities have given the President more support than members of his own party.

On such vital questions as the Formosa Resolution, the Paris Treaties and the Austrian Treaty party differences were not discernible. Both parties were also firmly behind the President's efforts at Geneva. While his foreign-aid program was trimmed, it came through with a large part of what he had requested. Authority was also given to enter into reciprocal-trade agreements for 3 more years. According to the Congressional Quarterly, majorities of both parties in the Senate stood with the President on 31 of the 33 issues on which votes were taken.

Credit for this sensible and constructive policy of working together for the national interest goes in considerable measure to four men. President Eisenhower consulted with the leaders of both parties and in general kept partisanship in the background. Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, played a role similar to that of Arthur H. Vandenberg in the Truman administration. His wise counsel and initiative helped to keep the administration looking forward in foreign affairs. And Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who missed the last month of the session because of a heart attack, consistently placed the national interest ahead of party interests in marshaling his forces. In large measure, the same can be said of Speaker RAYBURN.

In the field of domestic policy, the President was less successful in getting his program enacted. Congress defeated his highways bill as well as the Democratic substitute. The aid-to-education bill and statehood for Alaska bogged down in controversy. Also postponed were revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Refugee Act, and the Walter-McCarran Act. The Colorado River bill was put aside in the House to avert defeat. On the other hand, Congress passed a military reserves bill that had at one time appeared to be doomed, extended the draft for 4 years, and renewed the Defense Production Act. It raised the minimum wage to $1 an hour, and the President is likely to accept this despite the fact that it exceeds his recommendation. It increased the pay of its own Members as well as that of judges and executive personnel.

Congress corrected the investigative excesses of the previous session, but it effected no general reform of the procedures of investigating committees. The improvement was largely in the shift of control to more responsible committee chairmen. Senate investigations led to cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract and put Secretary of the Air Force Talbott on the spot, but otherwise they have made little impression on administration policy. Congress sensibly turned over the loyalty problem to a Commission on Government Security.

Although they control both Houses of Congress, the Democrats did not offer a formal legislative program. In the House there was a drive for a $20 income tax cut, for restoration of farm-price supports at 90 percent of parity, and for further liberalization of social-security benefits. These measures were clearly aimed at establishing a record for the 1956 campaigns, but they were killed or put aside in the Senate. The Congress as a whole is entitled to generous thanks for keeping partisan considerations at a minimum. It has notably minimized the fear of divided control over the White House and Congress and has shown that men of good will under separate banners can work together when public-spirited leaders point the way.

Congressman Jerry Ford's Schedule for His Mobile Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have a very strong contention that each Member of this great deliberative body, the Congress of the United States, should make every effort within his power and ability to bring Government closer to the people he represents in our Nation's Capital. In an effort to do just that, Mr. Speaker, I plan to tour my district this fall with a mobile office. I am doing this because I hope that my meeting face-to-face more of the people I represent, I will be not only better qualified to represent their interests but will also help to extend the knowledge that our great Government has a personal concern in the welfare of each citizen.

I am planning to locate this "mobile office" in the nature of a house trailer in 26 communities of Ottawa and Kent Counties, Mich. Members of my staff and I will be in the office from 2: 30 until 8 on the afternoon and evening of the day indicated.

Congressman JERRY FORD's schedule for his "mobile office," 2:30–8 p. m., on day indicated: Friday, September 16, Hudsonville; Monday, September 19, Zeeland; Tuesday, September 20, West Olive; Wednesday, September 21, Allendale; Thursday, September 22, Robinson Township; Friday, September 23, Ferrysburg; Monday, September 26, Nunica; Tuesday, September 27, Coopersville; Wednesday, September 28, Conklin; Monday, October 3, Marne; Tuesday, October 4, Sparta; Wednesday, October 5, Kent City; Thursday, October 6, Sand Lake; Monday, October 10, Cedar Springs; Tuesday, October 11, Rockford; Wednesday, October 12, Belmont; Thursday, October 13, Harvard; Friday, October 14, Grattan; Monday, October 17, Cannonsburg; Wednesday, October 19, Alton; Thursday, October 20, Lowell; Monday, October 24, Cascade; Thursday, October 27, Bowne Center and Alto; Friday, October 28, Caledonia; Monday, October 31, Byron Center; Tuesday, November 1, Jamestown.

Dollar-a-Year Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'I'm Merely Serving the Govment,' Says Executive on Leave," written by Albert M. Colegrove, and published in the Indianapolis Times of Tuesday, July 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I'M MERELY SERVING THE GOVERNMENT," SAYS EXECUTIVE ON LEAVE—$1-A-YEAR MAN BORROWED FROM AUTO INDUSTRY TELLS OF NEW CAREER

(Congress is spotlighting business executives who take leaves of absence to work for the Government without Federal pay. Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, opened a House subcommittee's hearings yesterday by saying his group will look

for "abuses" where such businessmen may have "feathered their own nests." What sort of men are these fledgling bureaucrats? Here's the story of a typical "WOC.")

(By Albert M. Colegrove)

WASHINGTON, July 26.—Joe Eskridge has just returned to the job in Detroit after a Florida vacation last February when he had a phone call from his boss, S. G. Baits, a vice president of American Motors (Hudson and Nash cars).

"Joe," said Mr. Bates, "George Romney wants you to go to Washington and work for the Government."

Three weeks later, Joseph W. Eskridge was sitting behind a walnut desk on the fourth floor of the Commerce Department here.

The sign on his door said, "Director, Automotive Division, Business and Defense Services Administration."

Joe Eskridge now was what his fellow businessmen call a bureaucrat. To the Government, he was a w. o. c., meaning he was working for Uncle Sam "without compensation."

"What a change," 52-year-old Joe Eskridge said today. "If anybody had told me 6 months ago that I'd be working in Washington soon, I'd have said he was crazy."

Still, after the first jolt, Mr. Eskridge hadn't greatly minded the idea. "It was a challenge," he recalled. "I'm a production man and an engineer. This was something really different."

After the phone call, Mr. Baits had given the pitch to Joe in person. The Commerce Department, he had explained, needed a motor executive with savvy to handle a tough job.

A key part of the job would be to act as a sort of man-in-the-middle with Government and motor-industry representatives in drawing up a complete set of national defense "standby orders."

These orders would stipulate how many cars, trucks, etc., a manufacturer could make for civilian use during the first months of a national emergency.

Each of the auto and truck companies, Mr. Baits explained, was going to lend a man to the Government, one at a time, for a 6-month "tour of duty." They would contribute in alphabetical order—which meant American would send the first man.

George Romney, American Motors president, had suggested Joe—provided he was willing.

Mr. Eskridge would, of course, be on leave with full pay from his post as vice president in charge of manufacturing for the Hudson Special Products Division.

Joe decided to go.

He was sworn in April 7 and took over his desk in the Commerce Department, where he supervised 11 Government employees instead of 3,000 Hudson workers.

Mr. and Mrs. Eskridge, and their 18-year-old daughter, closed down their spacious home at Grosse Point Farms, outside Detroit. They got a two-bedroom apartment here.

"Under the terms arranged," Mr. Eskridge explained, "I could have sort of commuted between here and Detroit. But I figured that if I were going to do the job, I ought to do it full-time.

"I think we've made progress. We've sweated over those standby orders and have a couple ready to go.

"I was pretty green at first, but the people here have been really fine about helping me get started."

Mr. Eskeridge was on the job 2 weeks before he discovered that, although he wasn't being paid by the Government, he was entitled to $15 a day living expenses. "A happy surprise," he said.

He works from 8:30 a. m. to 5 p. m., 5 days a week. On weekends, he goes sightseeing—and sometimes reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to see what Congressmen are saying about people like him. "I get a sardonic pleasure out of that," he said, wryly.

But his face turns dead serious when he's asked about the fears of some Congressmen that the Government unpaid businessmen might feather their own nests.

"Some people," said Joe Eskridge, "seem to think patriotism only blossoms in wartime. That's rather shallow thinking, seem to me."

It's clear that Joe Eskridge would just as soon be back home, enjoying the prerogatives of a well-paid motor executive. It's equally clear that nest-feathering remarks disturb him.

"When Mr. Baits said goodbye to me in Detroit," he recalled, "he said, 'remember, Joe, you're going down there to serve the Government.' He stressed the words 'serve' and 'government.'

"I've been doing just that."

The Junior Order of United Mechanics Is a Patriotic Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we have in our great country many fraternal organizations, most and probably all, of which are patriotic and law abiding. There is one fraternal organization that specializes on advancing patriotism and Americanism. I refer to the Junior Order of United American Mechanics. This organization has councils in many sections of the country and has a large membership.

Just recently, on the 22d of June, the national council of this fraternal organization met in its biennial session in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio. While in session this council adopted a number of resolutions of public importance. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Be it resolved by the national council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc., in session assembled in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, this the 22d day of June 1955, That we highly approve and endorse Senate bill 251, providing penalties for membership in, or participation in, the revolutionary activity of the Communist Party, or any other organization furthering revolutionary conspiracy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate, the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, the author of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the national council office have this resolution reproduced and a copy mailed to each council in the country asking them to contact their Members of Congress and express their opinion of this bill.

RESOLUTION ON THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas the members of the national council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, and the individual councils throughout the United States, feel that the House Un-American Activities Committee of the Congress has performed an outstanding job in the field of anticommunism, and that it should be encouraged and supported in its further work along this line: Therefore be it

Resolved by the national council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc., in session assembled in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, this the 22d day of June 1955, That we urge that the powers, functions, and duties of the House Un-American Activities Committee be not curtailed but encouraged by sufficient appropriations to carry on; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Whereas there has been going on in the United States a vigorous campaign to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act which became a law of the United States on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act is the result of almost 4 years of study of the immigration system and is well suited to the present conditions and situations in our country; and

Whereas the act was passed by an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives, and when it was vetoed by the then President of the United States it was enacted into law over President Truman's veto: Therefore be it

Resolved by the national council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc., in session assembled in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, this the 22d day of June 1955, That we call upon Members of Congress to keep the McCarran-Walter Act on the statute books of this Nation in order to ward off attempts to weaken or modify the act, and to continue to screen carefully all aliens who apply for admission; and to keep the present immigration quotas.

Migrant Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article from the New York Herald Tribune for Friday, July 29, 1955, on the subject of Migrant Labor. The problem of the migrant laborer and his family is one of deep concern to me, as it is to every Member representing an agricultural area.

It is gratifying to know that a pilot project is being successfully conducted in Huntington, Long Island, N. Y. This program is being conducted by a group of public-spirited citizens, representing 12 local churches, and headed by Mrs. C. Arnold Smith, of Greenlawn. Mrs. Smith, under the able guidance of Rev. Austin H. Armitstead, chairman of the Suffolk County Migrants' Committee, is

doing a magnificent job. The pattern for this project could well be used in other areas of our country.

The article follows:

HUNTINGTON AIDS FARM MIGRANTS—CHURCH SERVICE GROUP AT WORK

(By Emma Bugbee)

HUNTINGTON, LONG ISLAND, July 28.—Five hundred migrant workers, here for the bean and potato picking on Suffolk County's level acres, are benefiting this year from a communitywide service organization unparalleled on the east coast.

Usually ignored by the townspeople in farming areas, these workers travel from the South in trucks, settle in run-down buildings, linger a few weeks until the crops are harvested, then move on to the next picking. Their children get little or no schooling.

All this has been a concern of the National Council of Churches and civic organizations for several years. Many communities have long been aware that "something ought to be done."

JOB FELL TO HUNTINGTON

It remained for Huntington Township to set machinery going at a pace which veteran workers in this field say is unequalled.

Mrs. C. Arnold Smith, of Greenlawn, a village bordering on Huntington, is chairman of the Huntington Township Migrant Committee of the Suffolk County Council of the Churches. Here motto is, "We never close shop and we never bother about red tape."

Women of twelve churches cooperate in cooking and serving a hot lunch to thirty children, who attend a daily vacation Bible school in the Presbyterian Church at Greenlawn. A car pool takes the children to and from school. Teen-agers wash the dishes. Sometimes there's a slipup in the organization. A teen-ager forgets that washing the dishes isn't enough. Some of the pans must be transported to the women who are to fill them with tomorrow's lunch. So it is Mrs. Smith who brings the pans back to her own home, and it is the Rev. Isaac Henderson, chaplain of the project, who totes them from there to tomorrow's cocks. It's all part of the job.

GRADUATE OF SEMINARY

Mr. Henderson is a Jamaican, a minister of the Disciples of Christ, and a graduate of Hartford Seminary. He taught school in his early days and has an easy way with children. He has served the migratory workers for 8 years in camps in Florida, North Carolina and Virginia.

It was due primarily to Mrs. Smith's energy that the Huntington Township committee was able to obtain Mr. Henderson's services this year. She attended a church women's meeting a year ago at which the Rev. Austin H. Armitstead, chairman of the Suffolk County Migrants' Committee, told about their problems: Mrs. Smith got busy on the telephone and raised $700 from the townspeople to guarantee the salary of a full-time chaplain for 4 months this year. The other necessary committees were soon organized. The churches, the police, the health authorities, the public schools, and townspeople of varying occupations volunteered to help.

SERVICES ARE NEEDED

"It seems to us that the migrants are American citizens and just as important as any other citizens," Mrs. Smith explained this afternoon, after sending Mr. Henderson off with the baking pans. "We realize they need education, welfare services, and religious inspiration just as much as anybody else does."

Mrs. Smith said that a registered trained nurse was giving her services four days a week to migrant families. A young woman about to have a baby was helped by the welfare agency to enter the local hospital. A young lawyer has aided the migrants with legal advice.

Mr. Henderson conducts religious services whenever and wherever he can collect a group of workers. Usually this is under the trees at a "camp" where a dozen or more families are within walking distance.

Asked which feature of the Huntington Township project he regarded as most valuable, Mr. Henderson replied that more important than any single service to the migrants themselves was community cooperation. It was, he said, a "pilot project" which might have far-reaching effects up and down the Atlantic Coast.

Operation Brave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be associated with my distinguished colleagues in this statement commending Mr. George W. Brazier, Jr., on the proposal he has so appropriately called Operation Brave.

At a time when a real hope for a just peace is being cautiously murtured by thinking men around the free world, it is good to know that individual citizens like Mr. Brazier are giving of their personal efforts to so noble and unselfish a cause.

It is significant, I think, that the President reserved his greatest optimism in his report to the people on the meeting at Geneva for the hope that a better understanding between nations can be achieved by closer contacts between people.

He said:

But the subject that took most of our attention in this regard was the possibility of increased visits by the citizens of one country into the territory of another, doing this in such a way as to give the fullest possible opportunity to learn about the people of the other nation. In this particular subject there was the greatest possible degree of agreement. As a matter of fact, it was agreement often repeated enthusiastically and supported by the words of the Members of each side.

I can think of no better group of American citizens to explain the desire of the President and the Nation to achieve this understanding than the men who fought in Korea. They best exemplify our deepest aspirations for a just peace and our firm determination that it shall be an honorable peace in which justice and freedom are the essential ingredients.

The men who held the line of freedom in Korea know that the ideal of human freedom is not cheaply held. In the truest sense, they represent the spirit that has made our country great and I think Mr. Brazier has made a happy choice in calling his proposal Operation Brave.

Courage is universally admired among freemen and the bond of comradeship steeled on the shell-torn hills of Korea can yet be a real force for peace. There is no firmer respect than that born out of common suffering for a just cause and this is surely a good foundation for cooperation between freemen. We are the strongest of the free nations and the task of leadership has fallen to us. It is fitting, therefore, that in an effort like this we should again take the first step in keeping alive the great potential for futual understaning that began in Korea.

Sending 22 American veterans to visit their comrades in 22 nations is surely no grandiose stunt or pompous propaganda maneuver; it is a simple and modest effort to renew an area of understanding between men who already shore an unforgettable experience in the never-ending struggle to preserve freedom.

It is especially noteworthy that this is the idea of a private citizen who is determined that every step shall be taken to avoid the necessity of other citizens again fighting that kind of war. He is asking the veterans of that struggle to make the same sacrifice for peace in their own countries, to take up different weapons to preserve the same ideals.

The American veterans would again assure their comrades that the effort is not unnecessary or meaningless but that our military strength is a symbol of our firm purpose to preserve the freedom which is at once our real strength and our hope for other men.

I also want to join in personally commending Mr. Brazier for his unselfish contribution of time and talents to a cause in which he believes so firmly.

Let Us Not Be Taken In by Communist Smiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks, our newspapers and other mediums of communication have been filled with accounts of the new friendly attitude of the Communist leaders.

Our people have seen numerous photographs of smiling Red dignitaries attending various parties, visiting western factories and farms, and sitting down at a conference table with our Chief Executive and with other leaders of the free world to discuss world problems. They have been reminded of the alleged friendship between the Soviet army chief and our President.

It seems to me that this publicity campaign has given many people the impression that world tensions are easing, that the Communists may be ready to negotiate peaceful solutions to various world problems, and that the era of peaceful coexistence may be just around the corner.

In my opinion, there is absolutely no justification for such optimism at the

present time. We must face reality. We must realize that Communist policies have not changed, even though a few Communist leaders have decided to smile at photographers. We must remember that the cold war is not over, but that it is still raging with intense fury in many parts of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, the Reds had consented to come to Geneva, to a highly-publicized but very uneventful conference. The Soviets came, advanced a few proposals, and listened to others suggested by the leaders of the free world. They did not negotiate any issues, and they made no concessions. On the contrary, it appears that the commies may have received some concessions from our side of the conference table.

The fact that we have agreed to negotiate with Red China is in one sense, a victory for the Soviet leaders who have persistently championed the cause of the recognition of the Mao Tse-tung government. and worked for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. It further appears that we are getting ready to expand free world trade with the Communists, and perhaps send some of our exports to Soviet Russia to bail them out of their economic difficulties. These considerations may at least partially account for the smiles on the faces of Communist leaders.

If we look at the other side of the ledger, we will find no evidence of any change of heart on the part of the Communists.

In Europe, there has been no easing of the Soviet grip on the Communist-dominated nations behind the Iron Curtain. As a matter of fact, fresh Soviet troops are moving into East Germany and the people there have been told openly that German unification can only be accomplished at the price of German withdrawal from NATO.

In the Far East, the situation is even graver: the desire to terminate hostilities as promptly as possible, and to seek world peace, has resulted in concessions to the Reds in Korea, in Indochina, and in the Formosa Straits. These Communist gains are now being solidified and extended.

In northern Korea, Red military power is being amassed in direct violation of the truce terms.

In Indochina, truce terms are being repeatedly and continuously violated by the steady accumulation of Communist military strength in North Vietnam, and by the aggressive Red campaign in Laos.

In the Formosa Straits, the Chinese Communists continue to bombard the coastal islands held by Chiang Kai-shek, and are concentrating great fighting power within striking distance of Formosa.

In Indonesia, the Communists are fomenting internal strife and appear to be gaining strength.

In Malaya, the Communists have stepped up guerrilla warfare against British and have paralyzed Singapore with riots, strikes, and bloodshed.

Similar developments are taking place in other parts of the world, where the Communists are fomenting strikes and disorders, engaging in subversion, and endeavoring to take over local and national governments.

Do these actions resemble the behavior of peace-loving men?

Let us not delude ourselves, the Communists have not relented and they have not to date changed their policies. The cold war goes on, while the Soviet leaders are trying to charm us with their friendly smiles.

As another instance, I would like to recall last week's shooting down of an unarmed Israeli passenger plane, which strayed off its course and crossed the Iron Curtain. Fifty-eight persons, including 12 Americans, perished in that tragic disaster, caused willfully by trigger-happy Communist border guards in Bulgaria.

In the thought that it may prove of interest to my colleagues, I would like at this point to insert an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of July 28, entitled "Red Smiles and Cold Murder":

RED SMILES AND COLD MURDER

The 58 victims who were shot down in flames in the Israeli airliner give the lie to the smile of friendship that world communism has turned to non-Communist nations.

Here is a new example of what Lloyd George used to call the "brutality of barbarians." Here is new proof, if any is needed, that the Communist world still lives by the law of bandits rather than by the law of the family of civilized nations. If any change is coming, it isn't here yet.

In a civilized nation a plane off its course is ignored, unless it is in need of help—in which case help is given. But the Bulgarian Communists, like headhunters lying in wait on a jungle trail, consider it fair game for murder.

This was no military plane. It was a passenger airliner. It was no plane of one of the Western nations that Communists say they fear. It was a plane of little Israel, a threat to no Communist nation. It was a plane largely passengered by persons seeking refuge in Israel—persons to whom the heart of the civilized world goes out in support of their desire for a land of their own.

Whether it was flying off a course well inside Bulgaria, as the Bulgarians claim, or just inside the border, as Greek observers claim, isn't important. That's no excuse for coldly shooting down a passenger plane to start with.

This is not the first victim of Communists treating planes like targets. The only thing different here is that Bulgaria admitted the shooting quickly, said it is "sorry" and will investigate. But in every other respect it is typical Communist barbarism—and that means a barbarism that has been promulgated from the Kremlin.

The wreckage of that Israeli plane and the charred bodies of its passengers speak more loudly to the world of Communist philosophy than any smiles and soft words, any cocktail parties, and assurances of friendly intentions by a Khrushchev or a Bulganin. For the world, it wipes the smile from the Kremlin face.

Until these brutal tactics end, and the U. S. S. R. and Soviet-controlled countries act like peaceful and civilized nations, no honeyed words mean anything.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that world tensions will be truly relaxed, and that we may make some true progress toward the attainment of world peace. It is my earnest belief, however, that we cannot afford to consider those goals as being even partially attained until the Communists demonstrate, through concrete actions and policies, their readiness and willingness to act like peaceful and civilized nations.

Until that stage is reached, let us not be deceived by empty smiles or by clever doubletalk. The security of our Nation, of the entire Christian civilization, may well depend on our ability to look reality straight into the face, and to meet it unflinchingly. This is no time for daydreaming, or for wishful thinking.

Recognition of Red Chinese by United States Feared by American Allies in Asia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been warning the Members of Congress and the American people of what I believe to be a well-organized plan to bring about recognition of the criminal Communist Chinese Government by the United States and the admission of the same Red Chinese Government to the United Nations.

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, August 1, there is an excellent article written by Earnest Hoberecht, United Press vice president for Asia. Every American should read this article which follows:

TOKYO, July 31.—The United States is moving closer to the recognition of Communist China.

This is the conclusion reached, reluctantly, by many of America's anti-Communist allies in Asia.

It is a trend which many Asians, who are being urged by the United States to resist communism, cannot understand.

The talks between the United States and the Chinese Communists which open Monday in Geneva is one piece of evidence which leads many Asians to believe the United States is moving steadily down the road to eventual recognition of the Peiping regime.

These Geneva talks already are being discussed as a signpost pointing to possible United States-Red China talks at a foreign ministers level.

The Chinese Nationalists and the South Koreans, both of whom have put armies in the field against Communist forces, cannot understand why the United States is willing to negotiate with the Chinese Reds.

FILIPINO RAISES ISSUE

An important Filipino leader today raised this question in a private conversation on the matter: "Is the principle of negotiation and compromise—or coexistence by any other name—more important than the principle of right and wrong?"

There is increased suspicion in many Asian quarters that the United States is dealing with the Reds while urging others to refrain from the same type of action.

There are more than 10 million overseas Chinese, and many countries in Asia fear what might happen within their own borders if the United States joins those nations which already have recognized Communist China.

In Singapore, a well-informed student on Chinese affairs described the situation as follows:

"If the United States recognizes Communist China or if Communist China is admitted to the United Nations, you can be sure the Chinese will take over all the small countries which thus far have enjoyed freedom and independence. The large Chinese populations in the various countries of southeast Asia will have increased prestige, backing, and confidence. The tide of Chinese expansion—directed from Peiping and Moscow—will be impossible to halt."

REGARDED AS BAD SIGN

The mere fact that the United States is sitting down in Geneva with the Chinese Reds is considered by many anti-Communists in Asia as a bad sign for at least two reasons:

1. It tends to give the Peiping government status and importance equal to that of Soviet Russia with whom the United States, France, and England recently conferred.

2. It revives memories of the Indochina conference in Geneva which was a big defeat for the free world.

Many Asians see the Geneva talks as another successful move by the Chinese Communists to gain recognition and respectability. Some insist it shows how the United States gradually has moved, step by step, and issue by issue, closer to the big problems of recognition and U. N. membership for the Communist regime.

With these things in mind, free Asians will be watching to see how the United States handles the talks in Geneva.

IMPORTANCE REALIZED

Some American diplomats in Asia realize the importance of these Geneva talks on future American relations in other areas throughout Asia. Some say privately they hope American public pressure for the release of Americans now in Communist China will not force the United States to make concessions which would undermine the confidence of America's faithful anti-Communist allies in Asia.

"Perhaps the Americans are convinced that the Communists have put aside their plans for aggression in Europe," a Thailand source told United Press. "If so, good. But we out here still are not sure the Communists have abandoned their Asian dreams of expansion. So far the only aggression in Asia in recent years has been Communist aggression, and the Reds out here have not withdrawn any of their announced plans for adding to the territory they already control."

Public Works Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in years of yesterday, not long gone by, we heard and read much about confusion along the Potomac. This was part and parcel of the mammoth program to defeat the Democrats by whatever means or methods required. Miraculously, or calculatedly, this great roar died to a faint whisper as the new administration assumed the stately functions of public enterprise. It was fitting, although hardly so completely necessary, that criticism be withheld until the new administration got its feet on the public path in view of the inexperienced nature of its top personnel in matters public. However, at some reasonable point in time, this desire toward charity must yield to necessary examination. By now surely time enough has passed for the new team to become adjusted to the public business they requested the opportunity and duty to administer.

In a spirit of constructive criticism, I hope, I am constrained to object to a current instance of consorting with confusion because it deals with a matter vital to the West and to Colorado in particular. I refer to a recent administrative pronouncement and its actions as they effected reclamation and reclamation development.

On July 15, a press release from the White House carried the news that the President had "with great reluctance" approved the bill making appropriations for the AEC, the TVA, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior—in ordinary language, reclamation—and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army—in ordinary language, flood control, rivers, and harbors—for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

This "great reluctance," the press release said, stemmed from two major considerations. The first of these was the apparent cut in funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, yet simple examination would have revealed to the administration that these self-same funds were already included in the upcoming supplemental appropriations bill. This was clearly pointed out on the floor of the House during debate on the above civil works bill. That should have been confusion enough for one day.

However, not to leave well enough alone, this Executive message went on to point out a second factor in the "great reluctance." This was, and I quote:

> The large increase in the number of new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. * * * In all, 107 unbudgeted projects were added by Congress. We can only guess what their total cost to the taxpayers will ultimately be. * * * The best guess that can be made at the present time is upward of $1.5 billion, but when planning is completed, this guess, in the light of past experience, may well prove to be far too low.

Then came the real joker and again I quote from the message:

> As a consequence of these considerations, initiation of the added projects cannot be undertaken until the detailed engineering plans have been completed and we have a sound basis for cost estimates.

Now if ever there was a thinly or transparently veiled threat to freeze money appropriated by the Congress, this clearly is it. There was a natural and an immediate reaction from the Congress to whom the Constitution gives the right and duty of providing both policy and appropriations which are to be "faithfully" executed by the President. It was a bit too much coming on top of a similar announcement that funds for maintaining the Marine Corps were to be impounded. Also, we cannot forget a previous message where the President saw fit to take the Congress to task for what he called an infringement upon executive rights in the Defense appropriation bill. By July 18, a hasty supplemental release from the Bureau of the Budget attempted to redress this error in part by saying that of course there was no intention of impounding these legally appropriated funds. The heat generated by this administration confusion had gotten home somewhere along the administrative ladder.

However, that problem, and the problem of the Corps of Engineers is more in the interest of other areas. On the other hand, Reclamation is important to the West—so important as a matter of fact that on July 15th, the very day that the Presidential message announced the Executive's reluctant approval of the money for the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal 1956, the Commissioner of Reclamation was out in Denver reporting in glowing terms the Bureau's program as "one of the largest and most important in recent years." This is what he reported to the Secretary of Interior after a big pow-wow in Denver and then released as information to the press. I realize that it is real handy for the left hand to conceal its activity from the right, especially where different areas with different interests are involved, but it makes life a bit confusing.

It is obvious that one cannot be doing two opposite things at the same time, or for that matter attempting to do such a thing, without someone suggesting that a pedal extremity is filling some mouth that should have been left closed. I am aware that this blooper will be passed over as lightly as possible in most quarters, but we of the West can hardly stand this pliant political trafficking in our vital programs. Either the program is good and worthy of support, or it should not be praised only where it is known to be popular and discounted elsewhere.

I should like to remind the executive department that the sum appropriated for Reclamation construction and rehabilitation for fiscal 1956 is the sum requested in the President's budget—to the exact penny. Now, I will be generous and also point out that to achieve this inestimable station, it was necessary to reduce funds for 3 other projects in order to initiate 3 more new ones. Yes; three whole already authorized construction projects were given funds which were not included in the budget. Add that amount to the seven new starts in the budget, and even these are the only new ones since the Korean emergency, and you have this terrible thing about which the President apprised the Congress of his great reluctance. I cannot conceive of criticism with less factual base or less useful purpose.

The reclamation program can hardly be called substantial at best. In fiscal 1946, as we began to emerge from World War II, appropriations for construction and rehabilitation rose from a wartime $20 million to a peacetime $109 million. They reached a postwar peak in 1950 of $335 million and then went steadily down, due at first to the "no new starts" rule of the Korean emergency. Such rule, however, cannot explain the 1954 fiscal year appropriation of a meager $116 million. That came in the initial effort,

still unsuccessful, of the new administration to balance the budget and before it occurred to them that a reclamation program was not only valuable but necessary. Thus, for 1956 some new starts are proposed and the appropriation recommended is advanced clear up to $146 million, 10 whole percent over last year's limping program. It may indeed be the largest and most important in recent years, but one must be very careful about the particular years considered. The recommended appropriation still looks a bit sickly compared to the once-achieved $335 million.

This more careful examination of the general problem and the record which is referred to or ignored as ambition dictates, leaves 100 plus of the unbudgeted new starts, which the President dislikes, completely outside of the reclamation field. His blanket criticism of water resource projects and his careless lumping of reclamation and flood-control programs as deserving the same criticism is unwarranted and unfair. One might conclude that he is just about 2-percent accurate.

I am pleased, as no doubt virtually all westerners are, with the small but significant advance in the reclamation program. It is my hope that the White House in the future can keep its different arms better informed as to the actions of the day.

Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of August 5 of the U. S. News & World Report appears a statement which is untrue and which if not corrected will certainly be misleading. The magazine in question occupies a very high position as to its quality and veracity among readers throughout the Nation and in fact all over the world; it is for this reason that the statement should not be permitted to go unchallenged. On page 9 near the center of the page appears the following statement which I quote:

> Farmers aren't doing so well, it's true. Farm owners, however, have only 11 billions out of a national income of 320 billions. That's under 4 percent, so that if farm income goes down 25 percent for owners, barely 1 percent of national income is involved. Planners in Government are not so concerned about troubles on the farm as they were in the past.

The farm income—gross—in 1954 was near 34 billion and the figure of 11 billion must have been the estimated net farm income which is quite different. Historically there has been a direct relationship between farm and total national income of about 1 to 7. At present the farm income is about 1 to 10 or 11. This does not represent a healthy condition for if the economic history continues as it has, then the total national income will come down or the farm income will go up or both will happen.

While this magazine does not state directly that their philosophy is the same as the quote it would leave the inference that they do believe the figures quoted substantiate the conclusion that farm income is of little importance to our national economy.

This is not a sound conclusion, for farmers are consumers of all the products of our factories only when their net income will permit them to be. But the total economy of our Nation can only result from the processing, distribution, and selling of the raw products of our Nation. Since the percentage of raw products from within our own boundaries is the highest of any major nation, it follows that our total income can only be a multiple of the value of our raw products. From 1929 to 1953 the proportion of raw material income to total national income was 1 to 5. Agricultural products constitute almost two-thirds of the value of all raw products fed into our economic stream. If agriculture or farm values are permitted to continue to slide, it will eventually be reflected in our total national income.

While deploring the inaccuracy of the statement, this in itself would not be so dangerous were it not for the fact that this will be accepted as a fact by the readers and the conclusion which is derived, namely, "that the farm income is of no real importance to national welfare" could have serious repercussions. Farmers are having a tougher time each year to show a profit in the price squeeze in which they find themselves; their lowering net income is reflected directly in the stores and factories of the Nation.

Unfortunately there is a tendency on the part of those who are not interested in the welfare of agriculture to minimize its importance and to conclude that we could very well do without a prosperous farm economy. Such a viewpoint was freely expressed in the late twenties. Only when the effects of a failing agriculture were felt in the whole economy was the effort made to correct the trend; but it was too late. My concern is that we may make the same mistake until we again find trouble too far reaching to correct.

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission among its surveys made one covering the field of transportation. It came, in some instances, to strange conclusions.

It was the purpose of the Hoover Commission to improve the operations, the efficiency, of the executive branch of the Government. Yet, one of its recommendations, if put into effect, would have merged the traffic management operations of the TVA into those operated at far greater cost to the taxpayer by the General Services Administration.

The report itself shows that the payroll costs for TVA traffic management are only 1 cent per ton of freight. This is the lowest cost for any governmental agency. On the other hand, the Central Traffic Management's payroll costs run to 98 cents per ton, or nearly 100 times as much.

As a matter of fact, the costs of the Central Traffic Agency are $11.39 per $100 of freight charges, which appears to me enormously high.

The Hoover Commission itself declared that the TVA has done an extremely good job of traffic management, a job beyond criticism. It is clearly faulty reasoning to turn a job which has been done so well and so cheaply over to an agency which is less efficient and far more costly.

The Georgetown University Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to participate in a panel discussion over the Georgetown University Forum which on Sunday, July 24, was devoted to the topic Need for Congressional Watchdog Over United States Information Abroad. As many Members know, this forum, conducted under the able direction of Rev. Francis J. Heyden, S. J., and Rev. Daniel E. Power, S. J., is one of the most outstanding radio and TV forums in this country and is consistently an award-winning one for its informative and analytical discussions on major issues of public interest and action.

The pointed answer to the question raised in the topic for discussion is, of course, no. All three of the panel discussants, including, in addition to myself, the Honorable Abbott Washburn, Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency, and Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, strongly agreed that the need is not for a congressional watchdog over our overseas information services and all that this misleading term implies. Instead, the pressing need is for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Overseas Information which positively and understandingly would work closely with the United States Information Agency in meeting the grave challenge that Russian Communist propaganda poses in the present contest to win the minds of people everywhere.

In a real, practical sense the need for this joint committee is more essential than that which existed prior to the formation of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. If in the

basic realm of human ideas, attitudes and sentiments we should lose this fundamental struggle for the minds and hearts of men, then even our atomic capacity would prove inadequate to withstand the direct or indirect aggressions of the Russian Communist conspiracy against the free world. Moscow understands this truth of first things first, and consequently pours heavy resources and subsidy funds into its worldwide propaganda organization and activity. Sadly enough, our efforts are pitifully meager by comparison. To rectify this dangerous discrepancy and to insure the success of our information efforts in the war of ideas, in order that the unsuspecting might not fall victim to Russian Communist adventures, to prevent an armed global conflict, the formation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Overseas Information is a prime necessity that requires speedy legislative attention.

Mr. Speaker, due to the timely importance of this subject, I include the entire transcript of the radio portion of the Georgetown University Forum in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WARREN. "Need for Congressional 'Watchdog' Over United States Information Abroad?" is the topic for the 453d consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington. The Georgetown University Forum was founded in 1946.

This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss studio, on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

The participants in today's discussion are the Honorable Abbott Washburn, Deputy Director, United States Information Agency; the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, Democrat, Member of Congress from Ohio; Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University.

Transcripts of today's broadcast are available. Send 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing, with your name and address to Georgetown University Forum, Washington 7, D. C. Please mention also the subject matter of the transcript desired.

The end of this week will mark the second birthday of the United States Information Agency. On August 1, 1953, President Eisenhower set up a separate agency to handle the task of reaching people all over the world with the truth about the United States and what we stand for as a nation. This week marks the end of the second year of operation, and provides an opportunity to examine the progress of this Agency whose mission is so vital to each and every American, and to consider the role Congress plays in these overseas information activities.

To begin our discussion, Mr. Washburn, I would like to ask you to tell us just how the United States Information Agency has gone about this assignment by the President.

Mr. WASHBURN. Fortunately, we have been given a very clear-cut directive from the President and the National Security Council. To carry out this directive, we use just about every means of communication, press, radio, TV, motion pictures, personal contact, overseas libraries. The job, roughly, breaks down into four main tasks. The first is to explain our United States foreign policies and objectives to people overseas; to counter Communist propaganda, nail down the lies they circulate about us; to show that our policies are in line with the aspirations of other peoples, that, so to speak, our goals are their goals; and to project abroad those aspects of American life and culture that will help foreigners understand us better.

We obviously can't project abroad a total picture of America; the country is simply too big and too varied to do that. What we have to do is select certain aspects of American life that will help people overseas know us and what we stand for, and give them an idea of what they can expect from us. For instance, the desegregation that is taking place in our public schools all over America today is such an example, because it shows what a deep belief we have in the fundamental equality of human beings everywhere, not just here in America.

About three-quarters of our personnel in the Information Service are stationed overseas. They man the United States Information Agency centers abroad, and the posts over there throughout the free world. We have over 200 of these information posts in 79 countries. We used to have some behind the Iron Curtain, but quite some time ago the Communists closed them up.

A good many of these posts have United States libraries attached to them. These are very popular places. For instance, our library out at Rangoon, Burma, is crowded all the time. I recall a piece in the New York Times recently to the effect that this library has made thousands of friends for the United States in a part of the world that is normally so suspicious and distrustful of our motives.

In connection with the libraries, we also have an extensive book translation program. So far, we have translated and distributed abroad, more than 18 million books by American authors. Then, there are the traveling exhibits that go out from the information posts into the rural areas and reach millions of people that way. Right now in Pakistan and in India, and also in many other countries, people are crowding in to see the United States Atoms for Peace exhibits that are traveling from town to town and from village to village.

Also, in the posts abroad, we have experienced press and publications people who see to it that the facts about the United States and our position on major issues in the world today, such as disarmament, to see that these facts are put into the hands of editors of newspapers and publishers of magazines, radio and TV, commentators. In that way, over a billion people regularly receive the truth about the United States.

Also, the agency puts out an enormous number of pamphlets and posters and booklets, as many as 150 million a year.

Then, there is a film program. Films are very important in getting the United States story overseas. In some areas, films are about the only way you can reach people. We have special trucks equipped to generate their own electricity in order to show pictures in these areas.

Finally, and perhaps the most glamorous and best known of all these activities is the Voice of America, the radio arm of the Agency. The Voice broadcasts every day in 38 languages, and reaches into 93 countries every day. One thing that is not so well understood is that three-quarters of these broadcasts go behinfd the Iron and Bamboo Curtains to the people of the Soviet Union and the satellite states of Eastern Europe and Red China.

Mr. WARREN. I presume the United States Information Agency covered the Conference at the summit at Geneva?

Mr. WASHBURN. Yes, we did. We had a team of people there covering all aspects of the United States participation. They got the material back to us very quickly so that it could be translated and sent out over the Voice.

Mr. WARREN. What consequence do you think Geneva will have for the Information program?

Mr. WASHBURN. We are hopeful as a result of Geneva some of the artificial barriers will be gradually lowered by the Soviet Government so that we will be able to get the truth through to many more of the Russian people.

Mr. WARREN. You have given us a good picture of the scope of the United States Information Agency, Mr. Washburn. I would like to ask Congressman FEIGHAN to give us the other side of the picture in this war of ideas. Congressman, I know you served on the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression in the 83d Congress. Will you tell us what you think we as a Nation are up against on this subject of Communist propaganda?

Mr. FEIGHAN. From my study of the world Communist conspiracy, I would like to make it clear at the outset that in my opinion it is a tremendous undertaking to expose and counteract Communist propaganda.

I say this because they have been at this since they got into power in Moscow in 1917. They devote a substantial part of their resources to propaganda. We know from our own sad experiences that their false propaganda has deluded many people and caused great damage throughout the world. I have seen estimates as to the expenditures annually of the Russians on propaganda. It is estimated between $1 billion and $1.5 billion. From my own observations, I am certain it is in excess of $1 billion.

The Russians do a lot of things that we are just beginning to think about. For example, they maintain a number of scientific research institutes on the use of information media. They are constantly testing the orthodox media for transmitting information, as well as developing new and unique devices for the transmission of information. In these institutes they evaluate the effectiveness of their propaganda programs.

Another thing they do, which is abhorrent to us, is that they have established ideological centers for the training of professional propagandists. Some of the products of those training schools are called "agitprops." It is obvious their duty is to agitate with Communist propaganda. Candidates for these schools are selected from every country in the world. After they get their specialized training, they go back to their native land to carry on this massive Russian propaganda for the Communists.

As an example, everyone has heard about the Marx-Engles-Lenin Institute in Moscow. That is one place where these men and women are trained for their future tasks in the Communist conspiracy. There they learn the technique of sabotage, espionage, guerrilla warfare, how to incite a riot, germ warfare, and all other conspiratorial techniques. But with all the training given the candidates, the greatest emphasis is put on propaganda. They realize that it is important for them to flood the free world with this propaganda by very subtly slipping it into the information media of the world, such as radio, television, magazines, books and newspapers.

So, to sum up the world-wide Communist propaganda effort, I would say the Russians consider propaganda to be as important as the H or A bombs, tanks and germ warfare.

As an example of my point of view on what the Russians spend for propaganda, I have some books from my own collection here. These are entitled, "Joseph Stalin." They have to do with some theoretical work of Stalin. They are all intended to advance the Communist conspiracy. One of them here is printed in Spanish. It was printed in Moscow. It was distributed in vast numbers throughout all of Latin America; inexpensive, selling for under 10 cents. Another, with the same title, is in English, printed in Moscow, by the Foreign Languages Publishing House. That is sold in the United States for 13 cents. The third volume is a

deluxe issue. That is printed in the German language, published in East Berlin, at a cost of under 25 cents. Here is another one, printed in Moscow. It is a paperbacked edition, costing 10 cents. It is obvious these deluxe editions are very heavily subscribed. I suppose the paperbacked editions are sold at cost.

An estimate was made for me as to the cost of publishing the deluxe edition in the United States, and I am told it cost $1.50. Another example is this book, "Lenin," printed in Moscow. It is sold in the United States for 79 cents. It has 774 pages. It is a very high-quality work. The lowest estimate that I have as to its publication in the United States is $1.50.

One that intrigued me was this very super deluxe propaganda piece in color, called Union Sovietica. It was printed in Moscow, in the Spanish language, for distribution to the Spanish-speaking world. I picked it up in Guatemala. It is an expensive piece. It is a straight propaganda piece to show that life under communism is a workers' paradise. I would call it, in descriptive words, Hollywood extravaganza, because it bears no reality to the facts of life under communism.

These propaganda pieces are very much like this, and are put out in major languages throughout the whole world and given wide distribution.

Another book, entitled "The Lenin-Stalin Solution to the National Question," was printed in over 40 different languages, over 80 million copies distributed in practically every country in the world.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman, from what you tell us, the Communists are spending a great deal of money in expounding their theories and ideas. What about our own budget to combat that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think it is very woefully weak. I think that we must increase our expenditures, because we are very, very far behind in what I consider is one of the biggest fights to preserve our freedom and the free way of life throughout the world.

Mr. WARREN. Dr. Dobriansky, you have been listening to both of these gentlemen. How effective do you think our program is?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. I didn't wish to evaluate the effectiveness of the program until I had certain questions answered for me by both Mr. Washburn and Congressman FEIGHAN. The excellent portrayals of American informational activity and Russian Communist propaganda activity by Mr. Washburn and Congressman FEIGHAN, respectively, bring a number of questions to mind.

The first that I would like to direct to Mr. Washburn is this: To what extent do we have participation on the part of individuals, unofficial groups, organizations in our informational activity? I raise this question, Mr. Washburn, for a number of reasons. One, not so long ago, General Sarnoff submitted a memorandum, as you know, to President Eisenhower in which he stressed this very thing, the need for more active participation on the part of the individuals and on the part of numerous American groups. Then, secondly, after having read carefully the recommendations of the former Hickenlooper subcommittee, which, as you know, made a very extensive survey on the activities of the Voice of America, one of the recommendations of that subcommittee was the need for more extensive participation on the part of these groups.

To what extent do we have this participation today?

Mr. WASHBURN. The Hickenlooper committee report was extremely valuable. Actually, it was one of the main guide lines we used in setting up the new agency 2 years ago. I think if you go down the list of its recommendations you will see that just about every one of them have been acted upon.

In this matter of private groups and organizations helping with the job, we certainly couldn't agree more. It is an enormous task. Government can't possibly do it alone. Quite a bit of progress has been made. Hundreds of projects have been developed and are underway. One, as an example, is the American Bookshelf, which is a portable library of 99 paper-backed books which have been gotten together through the cooperation of several publishers, and with the help of the CARE organization, can be sent overseas to hospitals and schools and universities at $30 a set. We find that the VFW and Rotary and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and a number of other groups, are running campaigns to buy these books and get them sent overseas in quantity. This is a wonderful thing, and is particularly helpful in combating this cheap book campaign that Congressman FEIGHAN was talking about.

Mr. WARREN. Doctor, you had a question for the Congressman.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. We have noticed in the past few months during this peace offensive on the part of Moscow quite a step-up in the cultural offensive, as they call it, of Moscow and the Communists. You have ballets that are being staged in various capitals of Western Europe, and, of course, sports activities. In other words, there is a much greater participation on the part of the citizens of the Soviet Union in the free world and in the activities of the free world. I just wondered if Congressman FEIGHAN has any view on that particular thing in terms of our combating this cultural offensive on the part of Moscow; whether he feels that anything we are doing in that respect actually is effective in combating this cultural offensive on the part of Moscow.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I might say since a couple of years ago we have participated in these trade fairs. Previously, the Communists have had a propaganda springboard, creating the false impression there was a life of plenty behind the Iron Curtain. But now that the Americans have competed, the Russians have withdrawn at Bangkok, Paris, Liege, France, Salonika, Greece, and other places. I think it is extremely important that the United States Department of Commerce, with our American manufacturers, participate in all these fairs.

I urged the President to take the initiative in forming a free world trade block in order to protect free labor and free enterprise in the United States. We should never permit our fruits of free labor to compete with slave labor. If we do, it will only lower our standard of living to the common poverty that is in existence behind the Iron Curtain.

I am certain that is one good thing that we have entered into. Another thing that is very disturbing to me is the fact that in the coming Olympics in Melbourne next year, our amateur athletes will have to compete with those professional Russians. It is my hope that the people in the United States will make every effort, along with organizations, to help to send athletes who will be able to compete with these Russian professionals.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Congressman, may I interrupt there? I understand you to say, "Russian professionals." My reading of many of the newspapers that come from Moscow, and also pamphlets, shows that they certainly don't represent themselves in that fashion. You have individuals that may be, let us say, employed at one of the installations in Baku, an oil company, and they are on the payroll there. They are certainly amateurs in the same way, I imagine, as we have our basketball team with the Phillips Oilers, who are actually employed in the concern, and yet in their free time play basketball or engage in swimming, or anything else. In other words, I can't understand you saying "professionals."

Mr. FEIGHAN. They are professionals because they are specially trained, and those to whom you refer working in various oilfields, or wherever it may be, I doubt if they are working. They are really just training. Of course, the reason for the Russians trying to win the Olympics is to try to show that life behind the Iron Curtain is a very pleasant life and the people there will become the superior people. We have to try to put up in the field individuals and teams that will compete with them. I think they really are professionals. They are not the amateurs like ours, that are usually in high school or college.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. You are definitely correct in that respect. It is a definite subterfuge. But, nevertheless, Moscow propaganda has them as amateurs.

Mr. Washburn, in connection with the USIA, are there specific projects underway now to meet this tremendous cultural offensive on the part of Moscow, and also in preparation for the Olympics next year?

Mr. WASHBURN. There has been in the past 10 months quite an effort made in this direction, Dr. Dobriansky. Under the President's fund, $5 million was appropriated by Congress, and we are getting into the trade fairs. There is no question but what the Communists have the jump on us in that. They are in 65 fairs this year, and we will be in a total of about 21. But we have been very successful in those we have been in. As Congressman FEIGHAN said, Cinerama scared them out at Bangkok. When they found out they were going to have to compete against is in Djakarta this fall they pulled out of that fair, too. It is interesting that at Djakarta, and also at New Delhi, the United States exhibit there will present television to Indonesia and India for the first time. That should be a rather interesting exhibit for the United States to have over there.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Mr. Warren, if I may also interject here another question that has certainly been burning in my mind, and at the same time I think quite disturbing is this: Reading the newspaper accounts or the articles of various commentators, there has been a crying need in the eyes of some people for a joint congressional committee on the overseas information program. I know that the Select House Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, otherwise called the Kersten committee, made that recommendation and, of course, numerous others have.

I just wonder here how Congressman FEIGHAN feels about the formation of such a committee.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think it is most necessary, if we are going to carry out our objectives of acquainting the people with what we stand for and exposing and counteracting the evils of Communist propaganda. We must prepare for a full-scale undertaking. I call it a political offensive, and a substantial part of that offensive must be assumed by the USIA. Our Kersten committee report recommended that Congress establish such a joint committee. I think that our information programs have a major bearing on the question of peace or war. I believe that it is entirely within our capabilities to prevent world war III, and at the same time to bring to the world an era of peace and freedom. But we must measure up to our full capabilities——

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Congressman, are you suggesting that this joint committee serve somewhat as a "watchdog"—which I think is an unfortunate term that many people employ, but nevertheless, you do have that term used in articles and editorials and the like?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The term "watchdog," to me connotes more or less of an overseer of expenditures. This joint committee, in my opinion, should be something entirely bigger and more effective than that. This should be a committee that will get the best brains of the entire country, to put them together in order to disseminate truth. We have to

realize that the Information Agency has to do certain things that are novel. They have to go into unchartered waters. You can't always have them be 100 percent correct. With the joint committee, we would have a joint initiative on the problems that face us in our propaganda efforts.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. As you envision it, the members of this joint committee would be concerned also with the content of information?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Absolutely.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. For example, a few days ago, George Sokolsky wrote an excellent article on nationalism. He claims that we have hardly used this weapon of nationalism, especially directed against the many non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and the like. It is my information that the term, "independence," can't even be used on the Voice of America in connection with these non-Russian nations. Would the Congressmen be concerned about that and urge something of that sort?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I certainly would. I think that the question of the independence of these nations that are enslaved by communism is the key to peace and freedom. I think that is the only way we are going to break up the Communist conspiracy which has the chains of slavery throughout the entire world behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you, gentlemen. I am sorry that our time is up for further discussion of our topic today, "Need for Congressional 'Watchdog' Over United States Information Abroad.

GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following by Mr. Herbert Solow, editor of Fortune magazine:

GSA: WASHINGTON'S MOST DURABLE MESS

(By Herbert Solow)

Three years ago the Republican Party asked a chance to "clean up the mess in Washington." One aspect of the mess was the giant General Services Administration, purchasing agent and property manager for much of the United States Government. GSA's 25,686 employees buy, sell, construct, rent, lease, maintain, design, research, mine, manufacture, transport, store, and otherwise "service" most Federal agencies outside the Pentagon (and in some respects the military, too). GSA holds almost $9 billion in land, buildings, automobiles, clerical supplies, and other physical assets ($4 billion more than General Motors' assets). Its purchases in fiscal 1954 came to $1 billion. GSA is, in effect, a vast, diversified commercial-industrial corporation in the Government, and its operations touch thousands of enterprises outside the Government. And GSA is in just as much of a mess today as it was in 1952.

The irony of this situation is not confined to the fact that the Republicans campaigned against messes. The mess that Truman left behind in GSA was especially susceptible to a businessman's cleanup, and the Eisenhower administration is full of businessmen. To enrich the irony, the very conception of GSA as a consolidated service agency was Republican in origin, for Public Law 152, which created GSA out of several older agencies in 1949, was adopted on the recommendation of the first Hoover Commission.

The GSA mess arises mainly from messy appointments. True, Truman's appointee as Administrator, Jess Larson, an Oklahoma politician, has given way to Eisenhower's, an Illinois politician named Edmund F. Mansure. But this has brought no benefit to GSA. Nor has there been any net improvement in the echelon just below the Administrator. In short, the Hoover idea of GSA has never had a fair test.

The new Administrator claims there have been improvements in GSA. Mr. Mansure personally examines travel requisitions of his Washington staff; he encourages removing clips from waste paper; to limit phone talks, he has put 3-minute egg timers on subordinates' desks. There are weightier changes, too. Among them are a promising scheme for lease-purchase of Federal office space, the contracting to private industry of some property-management services, and simplified accounting. It is, in short, hardly possible to employ 25,686 people in so diversified an operation as GSA and fail to produce islands of positive achievement.

The mainland of GSA is, nevertheless, the most durable mess in Washington. It would take a congressional investigation to light up the whole of it, but this article aims to illuminate a number of corners. The story involves great United States corporations and marginal operators; oriental swindlers and Caribbean grafters; Chicago politicians; Washington influence-peddlers and fixers; Republicans and Democrats, and, above all, time-serving bureaucrats who are neither Republicans nor Democrats, nor yet honest mavericks, but just jobholders, glowing with contempt for the United States taxpayer. Happily, the cast also includes some honest, capable, GSA employees, men harried, half underground, and hoping for better days.

If better days are to come, they will come only when the White House decides to clean up GSA. As of mid-July, the White House was quietly looking into GSA. Should it look hard enough, GSA might have a new Administrator before this article appears. In that event, this article may serve as explanation of a long overdue reform—and as a report on what a new Administrator would be up against.

AN EXPENSIVE REPUTATION

Fifty-four-year-old Ed Mansure, the first Republican Administrator of GSA, speaks of himself as a businessman. He says that he made "considerable money" in Chicago "and so I have a rather expensive reputation." Nobody has challenged his financial integrity. Superficially, Mansure seems to be a public-spirited citizen on a self-sacrificing tour of Washington duty, with plans for early return to his home State and an industrial career. But he has burned some bridges behind him. Two years before Mansure went to Washington in April 1953, he had sold his business. Soon after his appointment to GSA, he disposed of his residence in plush, placid Libertyville near Chicago, home of Adlai Stevenson and of many Republican businessmen. Mansure is in politics wholeheartedly, and, if he can manage it, permanently.

Mansure actually was as much in politics as in business even before coming to Washington. True, he did preside over a $5-million-a-year upholstery and drapery-trim manufacturing enterprise inherited from his father. But from the time he graduated from Chicago's Kent College of Law, Mansure gave much time to the gamy politics of his native Cook County. He managed several local Republican campaigns and in 1937 became the party's State treasurer. He held posts on three State boards, to one of which he was appointed by Governor Stevenson, his neighbor across the road, and he was busy in the Illinois Manufacturers Association, Red Cross, the Chicago Crime Commission, and similar bodies. He backed Stassen for the presidency in 1948 and joined Chicago's Citizens for Eisenhower before the 1952 convention.

Mansure says that he puts merit above party ties, and he has, in fact, not fired a single one of GSA's holdover bureaucrats, either for cause (which abounds in GSA) or at pleasure (and he has this option in a number of important cases). Defining practical politics as "just back-scratching," he speaks with contempt of "civic do-gooders," characterizing their code as "hypocrisy."

Among Republican Mansure's cronies are "practical politicians" of both parties, including the no-do-gooder variety. He praises Jess Larson, his Democratic predecessor as GSA boss. Larson was associated in an oil deal with the influence-peddler, Frank Nathan, one of the most memorable witnesses turned up by the King Committee investigation (1951–52) of income-tax scandals. But Mansure says that when he took GSA over, he sought out Larson for his views on personnel and operations. Soon after came the indignant resignation of GSA's Deputy Administrator Russell Forbes a nationally recognized expert in public procurement and related matters, who had helped Hoover to conceive the GSA and who, after leaving GSA, was associated with the second Hoover Commission. Only one high-echelon GSA job has been given to a Republican since Mansure came in—and that was at the instance of the White House.

"Ed Mansure," says a long-time Libertyville neighbor, whom Mansure cites as a character reference, "could easily get over his head in very shallow water." The explanation of the GSA mess is not so simple, however. For Mansure has the guidance of a highly experienced Chicago politician, the man who got him his job. This man is William J. Balmer, of Chicago. In the words of a mutual acquaintance who has discussed GSA business with both men, Balmer "has Mr. GSA in his pocket. Whenever Balmer walks in, Mr. GSA bows." Says Mansure: "Balmer is a king and holds court."

GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the continuation of an article by Herbert Solow, editor, Fortune magazine:

THE SILVER FOX

William J. Balmer, who got Mansure his job, is the boss of the 17th Ward Republican organization and vice chairman of the Cook County executive committee of the Republican Party. In political clubrooms and in the Loop's Bismarck Hotel, where he can sometimes be run to earth, 63-year-old Balmer is known, only in part because of his white hair, as the Silver Fox.

Balmer says he has been in politics "ever since I can remember." He managed "Big Bill" Thompson's second mayoralty campaign, was a commissioner in Big Bill's ad-

ministration, perhaps the most corrupt in Chicago's fabulous history. During the war Balmer was much in Washington. Mansure says that at that time Balmer had "access to the White House." One of Balmer's main activities was wangling Government orders to permit the production of civilian items barred by general regulations. Balmer says he believes in doing things for Government employees who are helpful in getting contracts and who later "look at you, thinking 'he made all that dough out of me.'" He gets them hotel reservations, he says.

Mansure calls Balmer a "business consultant." Some others call him a trouble shooter, especially for people who, under Illinois law, must argue with an elected tax assessor about how much personal-property tax they shall pay. According to Mansure, Internal Revenue has investigated Balmer, "but has never found anything." "On finances, Balmer is one of the closest-mouthed persons I ever knew," says Mansure. "He has two accountants and he doesn't let one know what the other knows." He has been sued often by individuals, by a hotel, a bank, and the telephone company, for amounts from $30 to $5,500.

Mansure and Balmer have been acquainted since the 1930's intimately acquainted since the 1950 county campaign. Mansure regards Balmer as a political genius. He once brought together Balmer and Edward Ryerson, a top Illinois businessman (Inland Steel), civic leader, and Republican stalwart. Says Mansure: "It was cat and dog." Mansure says that, for Ryerson, Balmer is a moral question. But not for Mansure. "Without reservations," he says, "I admire Bill Balmer as a friend. I wish we had a dozen Bill Balmers in Chicago." Balmer often visits Mansure in Washington. Mansure's appointments to second-level GSA jobs are mostly Chicago Republicans close to Balmer.

Even before Mansure was publicly named for his job, it was being said in Chicago that henceforth Balmer would influence GSA contracting. And Mansure admits that Balmer has talked with him about GSA contracts. Among the instances that he says he can remember is the effort of a Moline, Ill., architect to get a GSA contract for a Rock Island, Ill., project, and the effort of a Milwaukee building material manufacturer to sell his product to GSA.

Not all Balmer proteges get the deals they seek, but the Paint Products Corp., of Elgin, Ill., is one that did. Through a friend, the company got in touch with Ed Moore, who is Balmer's partner in an insurance-brokerage business. Moore is chairman of the GOP's Cook County central committee. Through Moore and Balmer, Paint Products met John Skeen, director of the Chicago regional office of GSA. In the words of A. W. Johnson, president of Paint Products, the company "really got going through Mr. Balmer and Mr. Moore." They sold paint to GSA.

GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third of a series of articles appearing in Fortune magazine, written by Herbert Solow, editor:

A BYPRODUCT

With a nice sense of timing, Balmer & Moore registered in Illinois as insurance brokers in May 1954. Mansure had just set in motion a process that was to make available a good piece of insurance brokerage. For a projected $40-million overseas construction job, there was to be chosen a subcontractor who would have to buy a workmen's compensation policy. Now, thanks to Mansure, two-thirds of the brokerage fee is to go to Balmer & Moore. The contractor, hired 90 days after Balmer & Moore became registered brokers, is Snare-Merritt, now expanding the capacity of GSA's Nicaro nickel plant in Cuba. After all premiums are paid, the Nicaro commission of Balmer & Moore will be about $44,000. (The other one-third is to go to a Cuban broker who is actually to do the technical work on the policy.)

Mansure admits that Balmer discussed Nicaro insurance with him. And Balmer sent to Mansure one Erwin Shafer, a Balmer & Moore employee, whom Mansure in turn sent to his Nicaro operating officer. Later the agent revisited Mansure, finally telling him that "things" looked "pretty good." So they were. "Insurance," Mansure says, "is a byproduct of politics."

Balmer has also been interested in Government surplus. For one set of surplus deals, a group of men including Balmer are now defendants in Federal court in Chicago in a $400,000 fraud suit. The statute of limitations has run on criminal prosecution, but a civil action was brought last December by the Justice Department. In 1946, according to the complaint, the defendants induced veterans to permit use of their names so that Balmer and the others could fraudulently purchase unused trucks and other then scarce and much-sought items. Some of the defendants' agents, according to the United States attorney, were exconvicts, one a counterfeiter. And when some of the veterans wanted to pull out of the scheme, they were threatened with violence.

A SHAME

At the moment the case is pending, and Balmer is trying to negotiate a cheap settlement. Balmer says that the alleged facts were known to the Government when the Democrats were in power. As he sees it, the Democrats' failure to act shows that the present prosecution is political. He blames Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, an old opponent, for the action begun by United States Attorney Robert Tieken. But Tieken is an Ike appointee drawn by Attorney General Brownell from a top Chicago law firm—Winston, Black & Towner.

Balmer's friend Mansure has interested himself in the case. He echoes Balmer's arguments and has asked the prosecutor not to press the suit, which he has characterized as "a shame."

Of Mansure's friend and sponsor Balmer, more later. Let us now take a look at some GSA operations with which, so far as Fortune knows, Balmer has no connection. None of these involves a spectacular sum of money. Taken together, however, they suggest the scope of the GSA mission and of the GSA mess.

FROM LARAMIE TO THAILAND

1. In march 1954, GSA began to dispose of a surplus experimental alumina plant built during the war at Laramie, Wyo., at a cost of almost $5 million. The procedure has been protracted over 16 weary months. The initial range of bidding was set inordinately low by poor business tactics. GSA at first called for bids and got three. It took none. Later, after 10 weeks of negotiating exclusively with Monolith Portland Midwest Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., GSA contemplated selling to them for $1,110,000. When GSA informed one of the other original bidders, Ideal Cement Co., of Denver, that its bid was to be rejected, Ideal raised to $1,200,000. GSA decided to take this bid. Then a congressional subcommittee under Democrat JACK BROOKS, of Texas, investigated, and last spring it asked Mansure to call for new bids. Reluctantly he did so; Ideal offered $1,373,000, and apparently will get the property. But whatever happens, it is clear that GSA can get at least $173,000 more for the plant than it was ready to take before BROOK's committee acted.

2. The Brooks committee is also looking into GSA's handling of a piece of land near Seattle, Wash., which was condemned by the Government during World War II. According to GSA, it had a verbal understanding with the former owners to sell it back to them. In June 1954 Standard Oil of California asked GSA's permission to prospect on this land for oil. GSA refused. The reason given for denying the taxpayers a possible windfall is a high point in bureaucratic willfulness: to allow oil prospecting might disturb GSA's appraisal of the land.

3. In January 1954, just before the Democrats took over the House, a Republican subcommittee issued a little noticed report about four GSA tungsten developmental contracts given to mining companies in Thailand. Written in Larson's time, three contracts were still operational under Mansure. After the market price of tungsten began a sharp decline, the Thai contractors delivered ore that they had bought from lower cost operators, rather than ore mined by themselves. This fraud ran over $1 million, and the committee headed by Representative CHARLES BROWNSON, Republican, of Indiana, condemned the improper administering and policing, as well as the ambiguous language of the contracts.

4. There was a $360,000 loss of critical stockpile material in an unsafe warehouse that burned up in May 1953. With several sets of GSA inspectors at cross-purposes, the material was destroyed just as some of the inspectors had predicted it would be. In GSA there is internal argument over the blame, but the neglect is admitted.

GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another of the articles by Herbert Solow, editor of Fortune magazine, entitled "GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess":

SLOW AND SLOPPY

Now let us consider some broad criticisms, originating in other parts of the Government.

1. Government agencies required to make certain purchases through GSA complain of slow service. In fact, the gap between GSA's receipt of an order for goods supposedly in stock and the date of delivery to the customer agency averages 2 weeks—three times what GSA calls its "norm." GSA has never got around to performing for the Veterans' Administration the procurement services that are part of its legal mission.

2. Although GSA is supposed to handle real property disposal, President Eisenhower felt compelled in December 1953 to create a special Surplus Real Property Disposal Proj-

ect, attached to the Budget Bureau, to stimulate and accelerate GSA's disposal work. But that work continues to drag. Until a few months ago, the Washington office of GSA did not even possess a full list of GSA's disposable real estate.

3. The inventory records of the critical-materials stockpile are not entrusted to GSA's Emergency Procurement Service, the stockpile operator, but to the Comptroller of the GSA. Commissioner A. J. Walsh of EPS says he has trouble getting information he needs for operating purposes. He also says that the Comptroller's recordkeeping staff is grossly inflated. In any case, nobody really knows what is in the $4.9 billion stockpile, as distinguished from what some invoices say is there, and Congress has called for a checkup.

4. Bidding procedures are often strange, as in the Laramie alumina case. At a recent House committee hearing, Representative PORTER HARDY, JR., Democrat, of Virginia, proposed studying GSA's general practice of submitting invitations for bids which are not invitations for bids, but are merely invitations to become eligible to negotiate. Others have also criticized these procedures.

5. When the second Hoover Commission and its task forces studied GSA, they praised its records-management job, but found fault with almost every other operation they examined. Here are a few Hoover complaints: "Instead of creating one centralized, coordinated traffic organization * * * GSA superimposed upon the already confused situation still another traffic agency. * * * Those regulations on real property management which have been issued by GSA are not applied by other executive agencies. * * * There has been no adequate inventory of the stockpile. * * * GSA does not provide adequate centralized direction and control in the management of Government-owned and leased real property used by executive agencies. * * * The potential economies and efficiencies have not been realized."

THE NICKEL FIASCO

Perhaps GSA's messiest single mess is Nicaro nickel. Nicaro is a United States Government-owned nickel refinery built in the Cuban jungle during World War II, and shut down in 1947. Previous Fortune articles (April and June 1952; June 1953) have told how the reactivation of the Nicaro plant was botched by GSA in Jess Larson's time. For political reasons, it may be recalled, Larson chose as manager of the plant a Dutch company, Billiton, totally inexperienced in nickel production. The purpose was to please Robert Butler, then Ambassador to Cuba, a notable Democratic fund raiser. Butler, in turn, was anxious to please some Cubans (including a notorious grafter) who wanted to elbow their way into the Nicaro project. This elbowing Billiton was willing to accept, but otherwise Billiton did so badly with Nicaro that Larson was compelled to force them out. Thereupon the National Lead Co. took control, the Cubans remaining as junior partners with increased influence.

So much for Nicaro in Larson's day. Mansure's record is no better—and he is responsible for all major decisions on Nicaro.

Production has never reached the level called for in the manager's contract with GSA. Even with nickel at a record price level, GSA—the Hoover Commission has noted—loses money at Nicaro. Efficiency, as measured by unit costs and the rate of metal recover, has lately declined. A promised by-product, cobalt, has never been produced.

What is more, the whole arrangement is probably illegal. For Congress, as GSA's general counsel, Maxwell Elliott, has told Mansure, gave GSA no authority to run a nickel plant beyond a trial period that ended more than 2 years ago. Mansure says Nicaro's legal status "is in a friendly tangle."

Despite all this, GSA began almost 3 years ago to prepare to expand Nicaro by 75 percent at a minimum cost of $40 million, thus boosting the direct investment of the Government in the risky nickel business to a total that may approach $100 million. The excuse is the severe nickel shortage.

The expansion has been wretchedly bungled. It was not undertaken directly by GSA through operating subscontractors, but by National Lead as a supervisory contractor for GSA. National Lead then let subcontracts to the operating architect-engineer and theoperating constructor. In order to super-supervise its supervisor, GSA has retained a metallurgical-engineering consultant, Singmaster & Breyer, at a monthly fee of $3,500.

GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following by Herbert Solow, editor of Fortune magazine, the fifth of a series of articles entitled "GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess":

EXPANDING THE FIASCO

The company that actually does the building is a 50–50 partnership known as Snare-Merritt Co. Mansure explains that he felt "there should be two constructors for this big job." Actually, this job is smaller than the pioneering wartime job of building Nicaro, which was well handled by a single company. That company was Frederick Snare Corp., famous in Cuba for over 50 years as an American constructor. Now it is the Snare of Snare-Merritt.

The Merritt of Snare-Merritt is Merritt-Chapman & Scott, whose previous Cuban venture, a 1952 water-supply project, ended in a lawsuit. The boss of Merritt is Louis Wolfson, antagonist of Sewell Avery and manipulator of Capital Transit. At best, Merritt was superfluous. To elbow its way in, it got the help of National Lead. National Lead's main product is paint material, and Merritt's subsidiary, Devoe & Raynolds, makes paint. National Lead pressed Merritt's cause with Mansure.

So, by the way, did Secretary of Air Harold Talbott. Says Talbott: "I met Louis Wolfson in 1948 when I was chairman of the Republican finance committee." Talbott was also a major Republican money raiser in 1952, but says he "never heard of Wolfson" in that campaign. He says that when he backed Merritt, with Mansure, it was "casual, at a dinner party."

Merritt had another avenue to Mansure. For Lewis M. Schott, Merritt's executive vice president for administration, knows Bill Balmer. Schott used Balmer—who is experienced in this sort of thing in the political field—to solicit proxies in Wolfson's unsuccessful fight for control of Montgomery Ward. Knowing that Balmer was a friend of Mansure, Schott discussed with him the contract for Nicaro. Balmer in turn discussed it with Mansure. The discussion, says Mansure, was "casual, at a dinner party."

Dining out is a well-known feature of Washington life, of course, and what with one thing and another, Mansure decided that Merritt should get 50 percent of the Nicaro deal. Snare glumly took what was left. The fee to Snare-Merritt is $1 million.

The deal has not been good for the taxpayer. Snare has staffed the top of the on-site operation with men experienced in Cuban and in Nicaro operations. But the purchasing side of Snare-Merritt has been increasingly dominated by Merritt, with the backing of National Lead and the blessing of GSA. Interestingly enough, more than $300,000 worth of material has been bought by Snare-Merritt from subsidiaries of Merritt-Chapman & Scott and of National Lead.

SLOW AND HIGH

At least one contract, for big cranes, did not go to the low bidder but to Marion Power Shovel, a Merritt-Chapman & Scott subsidiary. Marion, which bid $230,800 and offered 2-week delivery, prevailed over a Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton distributor, who offered 3-week delivery but asked only $185,000. Marion delivered 1 crane 4 weeks late by dint of using a rebuilt motor instead of a new motor as originally called for. Delivery of the second crane has been even more seriously delayed.

Delays have been heaped upon delays. It took GSA almost 5 months to name National Lead as its prime contractor. National Lead consumed 3 months in coming to its curious choice of a Snare-Merritt partnership. At first this delay was ignored by GSA, though it constituted a breach of contract; then it was forgiven. There have been other delays—in starting a program of workers' housing; in completing a construction-progress forecast; in completing engineering design (a job let out to H. K. Ferguson Co., a subsidiary of Morrison-Knudsen). After one-fourth of the 2-year contractual time period, only about one-sixteenth of Nicaro's expansion had been done, as measured by payments made. It seems impossible that the job will be finished on the date set as a target in the contract—unless the estimated cost of $40 million is grossly overrun by crash steps. Already there has been an overrun of almost $500,000 in engineering costs—25 percent.

HOW GSA GOT THAT WAY

The origins of GSA's many messes go back to the first Truman administration. In 1947 Jess Larson, later to be Truman's GSA Administrator, was General Counsel of the War Assets Administration, later to be dumped into GSA. WAA was headed by Maj. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, who had won high praise as Eisenhower's top quartermaster in the European theater. But WAA was a businessman's job, not a general's. In 1947 a congressional investigating committee, headed by Ross Rizley (since appointed to the chairmanship of the Civil Aeronautics Board by President Eisenhower), took a look at Littlejohn's WAA. Here are some of its findings:

Slow disposal, small money return, inadequate control of regional offices, "unbelievable conditions of bad organization," improper accounting, deceptive reporting, possible fraud, failure to inventory millions of dollars' worth of desirable surplus property, loss of much inventoried property, inaccurate and misleading sales figures, the loss of quantities of sales documents, countrywide violation of prescribed procedures, repeated promotions of individuals who made serious mistakes. "The amount in money," the committee concluded, "which this administrative failure has cost the taxpayer is inestimable, but it is certainly enormous." A White House aide of the period (Truman's) summed things up: "Littlejohn did a messy job."

Eventually, Litttlejohn quit and Larson took his place. The Rizley committee sent material to the Department of Justice for study of possible criminal or civil action against people involved in frauds. The Department never took any action—for reasons that will be related below—and Larson left the WAA personnel undisturbed.

GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include No. 6 of an article by Herbert Solon, editor of Fortune magazine:

WAA FOREVER

Many of the WAA bureaucrats had been the first castoffs of the war agencies in 1945–46. Yet many of them, because WAA at its birth had a problem of quick staffing, were given high grades and salaries. And in 1949 they were taken into GSA with full civil-service rights when Congress dumped WAA into the new GSA for liquidation and Truman made Larson GSA's first Administrator. Personnel of the other agencies merged into GSA remained largely on the operating level, but the WAA refugees moved into the new agency's vacuum—central staff positions and regional directorships.

Today, 7 of the 10 regional directors of GSA are ex-WAA men. So are all but 1 of GSA's 4 staff office chiefs. So are many of their top aids; a couple of second-echelon men in Public Buildings; the assistant general counsel in charge of real property management and disposal activity. So are almost all the GSA people ever involved in the Nicaro fiasco. So is Mansure's confidential secretary, who used to be Larson's confidential secretary.

So is GSA's No. 2 man, Assistant Administrator Almon E. Snyder. When Larson was Administrator, Snyder was his office assistant. He was close to influence-peddler Nathan, who testified that he brought occasional delicatessen lunches to Snyder's office. Mansure recently promoted Snyder to be his Assistant Administrator at a salary of $14,800. "When I'm away," says Mansure, "Snyder has the authority to sign documents for me; he knows my thinking."

Within GSA there has been some courageous, but on the whole ineffective, opposition to the WAA crowd controlling most of the staff and regional offices. It has come from the chiefs of GSA's four main operating divisions.

All the operating chiefs, when Mansure took over GSA, were old hands who had been legislated into GSA: Three Commissioners—A. J. Walsh (Emergency Procurement, the stockpile), W. E. Reynolds (Public Buildings), Clifton E. Mack (Federal Supply Service)—and Dr. Wayne C. Grover, the National Archivist.

NINETY-DAY REVOLT

All these men took part in an abortive revolt against the staff clique, during a strange interregnum of 90 days between the departure from the Administrator's office of Democrat Larson, in January 1953, and the arrival, with spring, of Republican Mansure. The revolt was invited by the man who served during those 90 days as Acting Administrator—Russell Forbes, the first GSA Deputy Administrator, the man who had helped the first Hoover Commission to conceive GSA, and a conscientious public servant.

When Larson left, Forbes offered the Commissioners their first opportunity to register their critiques. He set up a Committee on the cost of staff services headed by the National Archivist. The report described GSA as being in "a situation where everybody is boss, nobody can be held responsible, and our chief central office characteristics are friction, confusion, paperwork, and delay. [Operations are] continuously hampered * * *. In the field, we encourage [expensive personnel] to engage needlessly in the make-work manufacture of 'administration' to the tune of several hundred thousand dollars a year. * * * If the recommendations in this report are adopted, annual savings would run to nearly $2 million as a minimum."

Forbes did not subscribe to all expressions of the Grover committee report, finding some of them extreme. But Forbes was anxious to cut the GSA budget and economize wherever possible, and he welcomed the report's general line.

The WAA clique took alarm and leaked copies of the report—supposedly for the Washington brass only—to regional directors. One copy turned up in the Chicago regional office. At that time Mansure, with his high hopes of getting the Administrator's job, was dropping in there regularly. John Skeen, ex-WAA and the man who later was to be helpful to Balmer's friends, Paint Products Corp., of Elgin, was then, and is now, Chicago's regional director. In the Chicago office Mansure saw the Grover committee report. He also heard it denounced.

When Mansure shortly thereafter arrived in Washington to take over GSA, he addressed the agency's top-echelon men, both staff and operating. He was, he said, a personal friend of Larson. He made it clear that there would be no further encouragement of the type of criticism expressed recently by the operating chiefs. "I take full responsibility for shelving it," says Mansure of the Grover report. And he bore down on the operating chiefs and Deputy Administrator Forbes.

Mansure so chastened Dr. Grover that even today the National Archivist will not discuss the episodes of the interregnum beyond saying that some people did not view his report as constructive. If Commissioner Mack's Federal supply operation is fairly effective, the main reason is the close relationship between Mack and his field men, dating back to Treasury days. Mack manages to communicate with them out of channels, evading the regional directors, but Mansure now campaigns against evening telephone calls and similar desperate operating methods. Though Commisioner Walsh ostensibly has 700 stockpile employees under him, most of them have been put under the thumb of the staff clique in the central staff offices or in the regional offices. Commissioner of Public Buildings Reynolds took a pounding from the WAA clique, retired, and went to work for Webb & Knapp.

The successor to Reynolds as Commissioner of Public Buildings is Peter Strobel, a distinguished New York engineer who took the job on the urging of the White House and at considerable financial sacrifice. Strobel is not happy with the GSA setup. For one thing, Mansure has decentralized most of the records of the Public Buildings Service. Strobel is largely ignorant of the actions of his field men and the procedures they follow. He sometimes finds his efforts to control field operations impeded by Mansure's personal control of travel authorizations.

As for Deputy Administrator Forbes, who helped to father GSA, Mansure aimed to lift his administrative power. When Forbes, balked and disillusioned, was asked by the second Hoover Commission to serve as a consultant in November 1953 he quit GSA with pleasure.

GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the seventh and concluding article by Herbert Solow, editor of Fortune magazine entitled "GSA: Washington's Most Durable Mess":

THE QUALITY OF JUSTICE

So the old WAA people have been riding high all through Mansure's regime. Though he slurs the loyalty of his operating chiefs ("They would still like to be the XYZ Service instead of a division of GSA"), he defends and pampers the WAA clique. He poohpoohs the Rizley Committee report that condemned them so scathingly. True, the Justice Department never took action as a result of the Rizley Committee's suggestion, but when that has been said, how much has been said?

The Justice Department to which the Rizley Committee referred certain of its WAA findings, for possible criminal or civil action, was the Justice Department of Attorney General (now Supreme Court Justice) Tom Clark. Here is part of the picture of that notorious Department as painted by a congressional investigation committee in 1952–53: shockingly inefficient handling of contract fraud cases, acceptance by Department officials of favors from persons against whom they were supposed to be defending the Government's interests, improper interference with the work of a St. Louis grand jury "to an extent which merits grave censure."

Responsibility for many of the conditions and events was charged to Assistant Attorney General Caudle. But the committee concluded that much of the blame properly belonged to his superiors. Among the superiors named as responsible was one Peyton Ford. From 1947 to 1951 Ford was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the civil division, then the chief assistant attorney general, and at times in 1950–51 Acting Attorney General. Peyton Ford is today the law partner of Jess Larson, who was WAA's General Counsel when the Rizley material was sent to the department.

No suit was brought. In the Justice Department today, there is in the central files no "closing-out" memorandum as required by departmental regulations, to show why no criminal suit was brought. The papers were, as explained last month by a department spokesman, "just sent to the central files without ever being properly closed, either on a formal or informal basis." The date of the pigeonholing was sometime in 1950, when Peyton Ford was the second man in the department. And the criminal statute of limitations ran out in 1951.

For Mansure, the whole matter is closed. He says he has read only a part of the Rizley Committee report and none of the King Committee hearings. "If there are any skeletons in the GSA closet," says Mansure pleasantly, "I haven't looked for them, and you can quote me on that."

There remains the question: How did President Eisenhower ever get stuck with this Mansure? The answer goes back to the in-

fighting before the Republican national convention of 1952.

GUNNER'S REWARD

One of the many politicians, big and small, who worked for Wesley Roberts and Herbert Brownell, top Ike tacticians, was Bill Balmer of Chicago. Balmer was what Roberts called his "gunner" for the Illinois delegation, before and during the convention. It was understood that on the second ballot Balmer could help swing more than 20 Taft-pledged votes to Ike. In the event at Chicago, Ike won on the first ballot, with Illinois going 59 to 1 for Taft, but Gunner Balmer was credited with a good preparatory performance.

Right after the election, Balmer and Moore, using the letterhead of the Cook County Republican organization that they control, wrote to Brownell. In tones of familiarity, they asked for Mansure's appointment to the GSA job. The letter was eventually forwarded to Sherman Adams, Eisenhower's chief of staff. Brownell, who as Attorney General has since fully supported the Chicago fraud suit against Balmer, raised no warning flag. Adams was also the recipient of letters in Mansure's favor that were forwarded by Roberts, who had become Republican national chairman. Adams also received copies of favorable press articles, warm letters from businessmen and Congressmen, and an FBI field report that showed no blemish on the Mansure record.

In Chicago there was some opposition to Mansure, whose intimacy with Balmer had come under observation at the national convention. It is said to have been led by Edward Ryerson of Inland Steel, and R. Douglas Stuart of Quaker Oats, the latter now Ambassador to Canada. Both these men are longtime acquaintances of Mansure. But, on balance, they made little impression. As a lawyer, private enterpriser, civic leader, and party stalwart, Mansure looked all right to Roberts, to Brownell, to Adams, and to the President. And Balmer, not yet hit by the fraud suit, was thought of by top Republicans as just another ward leader and preconvention gunner—if anyone thought of him at all.

Mansure got the GSA job. He had had it, as this article went to press, for 27 months. How much longer he would have it was up to Mr. Eisenhower.

Tenth Annual National Conference on Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following news release of the Honorable Justin Miller, president of the National Conference on Citizenship, and former judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, with respect to the 10th annual national conference on citizenship:

Justin Miller, president of the National Conference on Citizenship, and former judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, has announced that the 10th annual conference will be held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., September 19–21, 1955.

The conference, formerly cosponsored by the Department of Justice and the National Education Association, now operates as an independent entity under a charter unanimously grated by the 83d Congress. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, will again be the honorary chairman.

The conference will bring together around 1,200 men, women, and youth from all of the 48 States and Territories. Approximately 800 public and private organizations and agencies with widely varied interests will be represented.

The 1955 conference theme is "The Blessings of Liberty," taken from the preamble to the Constitution. The discussions of the group sessions will center around subtopics of the theme such as whether "the blessings of liberty" are in danger by neglect, erosion, or direct attack.

Harry P. Cain, member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and former United States Senator from the State of Washington, will deliver the keynote address on the theme of the conference at the opening session. Mr. Cain has been very outspoken in defense of the constitutional rights of the individual, especially where they have been jeopardized by the loyalty security programs.

Justin Miller will formally open the conference with a welcoming message. Members of the United States Marine Corps will advance the State and Territorial flags. The American Legion national guard of honor will advance the colors. The national anthem will be rendered by the Navy Band, followed by the pledge to the flag. Tom C. Clark, Justice of the Supreme Court, and Willard E. Givens—who were the heads of the sponsoring agencies, the United States Department of Justice and the National Education Association, respectively, when the conference was initiated—will greet the delegates. David Leahy, Brooklyn, N. Y., a national winner of the American Legion high school oratorical contest, will speak. God Bless America, sung by Janice Anzulovic, Oberlin College Conservatory of Music, will close the opening session.

At the luncheon, September 19, Alexander Boyd Campbell, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and, also, an outstanding leader from the field of labor, will speak. Music will be provided by a service orchestra.

The first group session will be held in the afternoon; the second and third sessions will follow on the morning and afternoon of the 20th. The 1,200 delegates will be divided into 30-member discussion groups, in which everyone has the opportunity to express his viewpoint.

A Musical Americana—music that enriched America—will be given by the United States Army Band on the evening of the 19th.

The annual dinner, addressed by a distinguished American, will take place on Tuesday, September 20. Justice M. Chambers, Congressional Medal of Honor recipient of World War II, will introduce Purple Heart veterans now at Walter Reed Hospital and the Naval Medical Center. Purple Heart veterans from these hospitals are always honored guests at these annual dinners. David Dwight Walker, Oskaloosa High School, Iowa, 1 of the 4 national youth winners in the Voice of Democrary contest, will speak on I Speak for Democracy. A service orchestra will provide the music.

The closing session on September 21 will include a summarization of group discussions by W. Cameron Burton, past president of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia; and a speech, I Speak for Democracy, by Abron Maletzky, Nott Terrace High School, Schenectady, N. Y., another national winner of the Voice of Democracy contest. This will be followed by an impressive naturalization ceremony wherein a large class of qualified foreign-born persons will become United States citizens. This ceremony will be in charge of the chairman of the Citizenship Committee of the District of Columbia Bar Association. The Presidential Auditorium of the Statler Hotel will be transformed into a courtroom for the occasion. The naturalization hearing will be presided over by Bolitha J. Laws, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, who will address the new citizens.

The Air Force Band with the famous singing sergeants will furnish the music for the closing session. The national anthem will be sung by Maria de la Hull, soloist of the Columbia Opera Co., a naturalized citizen.

The colors will be retired by the American Legion national guard of honor.

The purposes of the National Conference on Citizenship as set forth in its constitution and bylaws are:

"To support and strengthen the efforts of the people in maintaining the blessings of freedom and justice and in protecting and perpetuating the principles and ideals upon which this Nation is founded; to develop a more thorough knowledge of citizenship rights and responsibilities; to inspire a deeper devotion to citizenship obligations; to encourage ever more effective participation in citizenship activities and to promote a spirit of cooperation on the part of all citizens—to these high purposes, the National Conference on Citizenship is dedicated."

The conference was founded in 1946, when a small group of men and women met in Philadelphia to consider how the spirit of cooperation that had bound together all citizens of the United States during World War II could be conserved for the future. They sought a means to maintan this spirit so that, in peacetime as in wartime, all citizens might dedicate themselves to upholding continuously our concept of government and the democratic way of life.

From 1946 to 1954, the United States Department of Justice and the National Education Association sponsored the conference. The two agencies lent their support until the conference could function as an independent entity. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, introduced in the Senate by the late Senator Willis Smith, of North Carolina, and in the House by Representative THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts, passed both Houses unanimously and was signed by President Eisenhower, at the summer White House, Denver, Colo., on August 13, 1953.

The conference is unique in that it brings together the most comprehensive cross section of organizations and agencies to be found in any single national meeting. Over 1,000 delegates representing hundreds of various organizations and agencies took part in the ninth annual conference in 1954.

Since 1946, more than 1,200 organizations and agencies have participated. Through their memberships and activities these touch nearly every wholesome aspect of our life and reach most of our 164 million population.

Included are all levels of government—national, State, and local; schools, colleges, and universities; major religious faiths; professional associations; veterans' and related organizations; labor, business, industry, and finance; farm and civic groups; and youth organizations.

The conference has had four honorary chairmen. The late Chief Justices of the United States, Harlan F. Stone and Charles Evans Hughes were the first two, and former Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY, the third. The present honorary chairman is the Chief Justice, Earl Warren.

The present officers and board of directors of the National Conference on Citizenship, who have been closely identified with it since its beginning, are:

Justin Miller, president; former Associate Justice, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Judicial Circuit.

Emma Mae Brotze, first vice president; principal, Marshall Junior High School, Marshall, Tex.; and chairman, National Education Association Citizenship Committee.

Leo M. Cadison, second vice president; former Assistant Director of Public Information, United States Department of Justice.

Earle T. Hawkins, third vice president; president, Maryland State Teachers College.

Maurice Bisgyer, treasurer; secretary, B'nai B'rith.

Carl B. Hyatt, executive director; former Assistant Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice.

Robert N. Anderson, general counsel: Special Assistant to the Attorney General, United States Department of Justice.

Thomas F. Clear, principal, Katherine T. Murphy School, Stamford, Conn.

Willard E. Givens, former executive secretary, National Education Association.

Richard B. Kennan, secretary, Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, National Education Association.

THOMAS J. LANE, Representative from Massachusetts, United States Congress since 1941.

Elizabeth F. Hart, secretary; publications editor, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Distinguished Americans have participated in each of the nine annual meetings. President Eisenhower and former President Truman have sent greetings to the conference on each occasion. Mr. Truman has spoken to the delegates six times. Speakers at previous conferences have included:

Henning W. Prentis, past president, National Association of Manufacturers; Ellis Arnall, former Governor of Georgia; Daniel A. Poling, District of Columbia, churchman and editor; Joseph H. Ball, former United States Senator from Minnesota; Ernest J. King, fleet admiral, former Commander in Chief and Chief of Naval Operations; Robert A. Taft, late United States Senator from Ohio; Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; William G. Carr, secretary, National Education Association; Robert G. Simmons, chief justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska; Tom C. Clark, former Attorney General of the United States; Donald R. Richberg, author and attorney; George D. Aiken, United States Senator from Vermont; Watson B. Miller, former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization; Anna Lord Strauss, president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Justin Miller, former judge, United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; Robert B. House, chancellor and vice president of the University of North Carolina; Hubert H. Humphrey, United States Senator from Minnesota; Alben W. Barkley, former Vice President of the United States; Andrew D. Hold, past president, National Education Association; J. Howard McGrath, former Attorney General of the United States; Irving M. Ives, United States Senator from New York; George Maurice Morris, past president, American Bar Association; Estes Kefauver, United States Senator from Tennessee; Wayne L. Morse, United States Senator from Oregon; Florence E. Allen, judge, United States Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit; James P. McGranery, former Attorney General of the United States; Sarah G. Caldwell, past president, National Education Association; Mrs. James B. Patton, president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; Eleanor Roosevelt, former member, Commission on Human Rights, United Nations; John C. Bell, Jr., justice, Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; William A. Early, past president, National Education Association; Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States; John J. Parker, chief judge, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit; Gertrude S. Carraway, president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; Waurine Walker, past president, National Education Association; Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States; Alvin M. Bentley, Congressman from Michigan; Kenneth A. Roberts, Congressman from Alabama; W. Cameron Burton, past president, Bar Association of the District of Columbia; and F. Dickinson Letts, judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

The future of the National Conference on Citizenship is challenging. The congressional charter empowers the conference to translate its ideals and objectives into realities. Plans for the future include both long-range and immediate projects and activities. The conference will initiate and conduct some of these activities directly. Others, it will encourage and assist organizations and agencies in States and communities to initiate and carry on. Proposed projects and activities include the following:

1. Annual meetings of the national conference at which participants will consider the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, discuss major problems facing the Nation, and ways in which the ideas inspired by the national meeting can be carried out in their home States and communities.

2. Regional, State, and local conferences on citizenship which will have purposes similar to those of the national conference, with organization and procedures adapted to State and community situations.

3. Citizenship Day observances which will commemorate the signing of the Constitution, recognize the native youth reaching voting age and the foreign-born receiving citizenship through naturalization, and afford all citizens opportunity for rededication to the ideals and principles of the Constitution.

4. A "new voter" program which, carried on through cooperating groups and other organizations and agencies, will stress responsible exercise of suffrage by all, and emphasize greater recognition of youth in civic affairs and their better preparation for the assumption of citizenship responsibilities.

5. Naturalization ceremonies in which the conference, through its participating organizations and agencies, will assist Federal and State courts with inspirational court induction ceremonies that stimulate in new citizens appreciation of American traditions and ways of living.

6. Integration of foreign-born citizens through State and local programs in which the native and foreign-born may achieve mutual understanding by working together and those of foreign birth may become more effective citizens.

7. A magazine and other publicity materials which will provide current, pertinent information for the press, radio, and television, for those carrying on projects and programs to promote good citizenship, and for those planning conferences and patriotic observances.

8. Citizenship programs in schools and colleges for which the conference, in cooperation with educational authorities, will assemble and make available information about significant developments in methods and materials for citizenship education.

9. Information on legal aspects of citizenship which will be assembled and made available to conference members and other participating organizations and agencies.

10. A clearinghouse which will collect, compile, catalog, exchange, and disseminate information and materials on matters relating to citizenship.

What Is the Latest Communist Party Line?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, to help Americans keep on guard against Red propaganda dictated from the Kremlin, International New Service brings a weekly roundup of Communist Party line aims as disclosed in official Red publications and directives. These are prepared by Mr. Jack Lotto, a staff writer.

While using every subtle device and deception to trick Americans into believing that the Communists accept and want genuinely peaceful coexistence between their bloc and the free world, the Communist Party makes clear to its members that they must not fall for their own propaganda put out to lull to sleep their intended victims. Their objective always is and must be isolation and destruction of the United States.

ON YOUR GUARD

American Communists were told bluntly this week to abandon any dangerous ideas that from now on all will be beer and skittles between the United States and Russia. They were pointedly reminded by party boss William Z. Foster that their eventual goal, despite the new era of outward Communist friendliness, still remains the destruction of the capitalist system.

Here is a summary of this important theme and other campaigns stressed in Communist propaganda organs in the United States and abroad:

Geneva: From the millions of honeyed words pouring from the Communist presses on the Geneva talks, some cold facts emerged on the continuing Red strategy. Phase two of their global peaceful coexistence program started humming almost as soon as the conference ended. Eventually, why not now was the key slogan advanced in plugging for quick ministerial-level talks and friendly relations between Red China and the United States.

The Reds called for pressure for exchange visits of delegations from both countries, recognition of Communist China, its admission to U. N. membership, opening of trade relations, and an end to what it termed the "Pentagon occupation of Formosa." Bowing to all these demands, it was claimed, would be "a logical follow-up to Geneva."

After all, editorially commented the Daily Worker, "If the cold war is to be ended * * * then it has to be ended in all parts of the world."

Foster was worried that the local comrades might be lulled into complacency by their own soft words. He wrote:

"There is the danger that would arise from any notion that the great peace fight has been already won, that * * * we can rest generally upon our oars. Such pollyanaism is nonsensical. The basic difference between the world Socialist and world capitalist systems as such will continue. * * *

"The relaxation of international tensions may also give freer and sharper expression to the natural competition among the capitalist powers."

The London Daily Worker, in a front-page editorial, put the same thoughts in much blunter language, declaring:

"Preoccupation with the cold war and the dangers of world nuclear war has tended to obscure the danger of wars in general among capitalist states themselves. Capitalism inevitably generates such wars. Only the ending of capitalism will end the inevitability of war in general."

Atheist Attempt To Deceive the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a disgraceful attempt of two members of the National Liberal League to falsely use the name of George Washington to forward their base plan of denouncing a new series of "In God We Trust" stamps.

The two individuals, John L. Manners, 44, and Walter B. Stevens, 25, both of New York City, are members of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. I am informed they are attempting to send envelopes through the mail with a red-lettered inscription which quotes George Washington as saying that "The Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion."

This is a most flagrant misquotation for evil purposes. Research I have conducted shows that the quotation did not come from George Washington at all. It first appeared in an English translation of a treaty between the United States and Tripoli, executed in 1797, and signed by John Adams. It has been accepted as authentic to this treaty for years, but in fact the statement came from nowhere but the imagination of the translator, a latter day bureaucrat named Joel Barlow, who had the position of Consul General at Algiers.

The history of the statement is rather interesting. This 1797 treaty, like the treaty with the Dey of Algiers of 1795, had been bought, and the procedure of its execution was quite unusual. The treaty was written in the Arabic language, and any original English text on which it may have been based no longer exists. The price paid for the treaty is recorded as 40,000 royal duros, 13 watches, 5 seal rings, 140 ells of cloth, and 4 garments. Another section listed the Americans as still obliged to pay such things as 25 barrels of pitch and 4 anchors. Final adjustment on this matter was not completed until April 10, 1799, when the United States paid the equivalent of $18,000.

Four documents are in the Department of State file of this treaty. The first is the original treaty in Arabic. The other three are translations, each different. One of these, the Barlow translation, is extremely erroneous, but it has stupidly been trustfully and universally accepted as the just equivalent of the Arabic, and it is printed in the Statutes at Large and in treaty collections generally. This has been done even though evidence of the erroneous character of the Barlow translation has been in the archives of the Department of State since around 1800.

The article of dispute is Barlow's No. 11, which reads:

As the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion—as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquillity of Musselmen—and as the said States never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mehomitan nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.

Now what is most extraordinary and wholly unexplained is the fact that this statement does not exist at all in the Arabic text, and therefore in the treaty. The eleventh article of the Barlow translation has no equivalent whatever in the Arabic, but apparently no one knew better at the time. In fact the Arabic text opposite that article is a letter, crude, flamboyant, and unimportant, from Hassan Pasha of Algiers to Yussuf Pasha of Tripoli.

As hostilities were begun by Tripoli in May, 1801, after threats for a year, the actual terms of the treaty became of little importance. But the fictional Barlow translation has remained to blur the record and provide atheists with a quotation to use for their ignoble purposes. The attempt of these atheists of the National Liberal League to tie this absurd quotation to the great George Washington simply demonstrates how desperate their movement has become.

At the present time Manners and Stevens are suing Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield and District of Columbia Postmaster Roy M. North because the Post Office Department has barred such foul material from the mails. I predict that their suit will get nowhere now that the mendacious nature of their quotation has been revealed. We must guard against attempts to abuse the great men of American history.

The Mexican Contract Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable misunderstanding of the policies of the Department of Labor in connection with the Mexican contract labor program, particularly since this Federal agency must draw upon State agencies for assistance in enforcing the terms of the law.

Recently an exchange of correspondence between the Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of this program and the Secretary of the United States Section, Joint United States-Mexican Trade Union Committee, has come to my attention. In my opinion, this correspondence does much to clarify the official Government policies in this matter. With the permission of the parties concerned, I am inserting this exchange of correspondence in the RECORD in the hope that it will help to remove some of the misunderstandings which exist concerning the relationship of the State agencies to the Department of Labor:

JUNE 16, 1955.

Hon. ROCCO SICILIANO,
Assistant Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. SICILIANO: The enclosed copy of Mrs. Widman's letter of June 8 to Messrs. Brockway and Burkett deals with, and supplements, the complaint concerning the establishment of wage rates in the Salinas-Pajaro area which I brought to your attention in a separate letter a few days ago.

The obvious question it immediately raises—and to which I do not request an answer at this time unless you care to comment upon it—is: What is the Labor Department doing to see that its compliance officers have a uniform understanding of departmental, congressional, and international agreement regulations pertaining to the administration of Public Law 78, and what further steps does it take to see that there is a uniform application of these rules? This question is merely rhetorical, because I realize that it involves administrative procedures which we are prepared to acknowledge should properly be left up to the Department of Labor insofar as they do not hamper the operation of the law. I ask it only to suggest that this is a matter which you might want to look into for your own information should you decide that my previous questions warrant investigation.

There is, however, a second question that occurs to us which we believe we should have an answer to if we are to fully understand the administration of this law. This is, in cases where there is a disagreement between the State officials and those representing the Department of Labor, what steps are taken to see that the Labor Department views prevail? I ask this question in this way, because it is clear that Public Law 78, and the present intent of Congress, place the responsibility on the Secretary of Labor and not the State agencies.

If the facts stated in Mrs. Widman's letter are true, it is clear that the policies of the California department of employment to which your compliance officer refers run counter to the clear intent of Public Law 78, and in such circumstances it would appear to be the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor to see that State policies of this kind do not apply insofar as the Mexican labor program is concerned. At least, through the provision of the law requiring the Secretary of Labor to make certifications, he must certify that such conditions do not exist, and there is no exception for conditions which may be brought about by policies of State agencies which differ from those of the Labor Department.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON PLUMB,
Director of Legislative Information, CIO.

JUNE 8, 1955.

GLENN BROCKWAY,
Regional Director, Bureau of Employment Security, San Francisco, Calif.

WILLIAM BURKETT,
Director, California Department of Labor, Sacramento, Calif.:

This letter is written in regard to Complaint No. 4 S–P filed by our union on May 3, 1955. We pointed up the fact in this complaint that the majority of the resident work-

ers in the Salinas-Pajaro area are kept in the 82½-cent jobs in lettuce while the 87½-cent jobs are performed by the contract nationals.

Our position is that it is obvious that resident workers are not getting the highest paid jobs in the area. Mr. J. F. Ahearn, United States-Mexican Service representative in the Salinas area takes the position that "I have reviewed it very carefully and note that it constitutes a complaint of the operational policies and procedures of the California Department of Employment here in Salinas. There is nothing in this letter which falls within the purview of Public Law 78."

But the intent of Public Law 78 was not to create a situation where resident workers were performing the lesser paying jobs while contract nationals performed the higher paying jobs. Yet this is exactly the situation in lettuce in the Salinas-Watsonville area. To state that there is nothing in this situation within the purview of Public Law 78 is to state that Public Law 78 is then not designed to protect resident workers' prior rights on higher paying jobs.

Mr. Ahern suggests that we contact Mr. L. Braun of the Salinas Farm Placement Office. We have done this in another situation regarding rights of residents as to choice of crop and job selection, and find that Mr. Ahern representing USES and Mr. Braun representing the Farm Placement Office are confusing as to what is exactly the interpretation of Public Law 78 and how it is to apply. We have filed complaints on several what we believe to be violations of residents' rights and find each time a confusion between the two local departments. We have written to Mr. Brockway and was answered by Mr. Norton that it seemed to him a simple matter to apply the little green pamphlet which spelled out the prior rights of resident workers. Yet our complaints and this letter points out the fact that it is not a very simple matter because of the differences in interpretation of the "little green pamphlet."

It is necessary that each of your departments having jurisdiction over clarifying of Public Law 78 sit down with your employees and do so immediately and advise us if our interpretation of Public Law 78 is wrong or right in regard to the rights of resident workers.

Very truly yours,

ROSALIE D. WIDMAN,
Field Representative, UPWA-CIO Field Local.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, July 12, 1955.

MR. MILTON PLUMB,
Director of Legislative Information, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PLUMB: This is in reply to your letter of June 16, with which you sent Mrs. Rosalie D. Widman's letter of June 8, to Messrs. Glenn Brockway and William Burkett.

I am very much concerned that field representatives of the Bureau of Employment Security have a full understanding of the policies, procedures, and regulations pertaining to the Mexican labor program. To this end there is continuous on-the-job training and periodic formal training for all field representatvies. Regional supervisors strive for the uniform application of policies, interpretations, and procedures in their respective regions. Our headquarters staff coordinates this activity by field visits, training conferences, and the review of reports and correspondence. We are thus constantly on the alert for deviation from the uniform and correct application of the provisions of Public Law 78 and the international agreement.

The Department of Labor does not itself have adequate facilities or funds to carry out all the administrative aspects of this program. Accordingly the Secretary has entered into agreements with the States, as authorized by Public Law 78, whereby certain State facilities and services are utilized in carrying out his responsibilities under that law. Administrative action under these agreements must of course conform to the Federal requirements and any misunderstanding or error is promptly corrected when brought to our attention.

I have instructed our Regional Director Glenn Brockway to confer with Mrs. Widman and make a thorough investigation of the complaints made in her letter. The results of this investigation will be transmitted to me and any remedial action disclosed as necessary will be taken.

Sincerely yours,

ROCCO C. SICILIANO,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Address by Philip B. Perlman to the Annual Meeting of the American Optometric Association, Milwaukee, Wis., July 9, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Philip B. Perlman to the annual meeting of the American Optometric Association, Milwaukee, Wis., July 9, 1955:

More than a quarter of a century has passed since the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Roschen* v. *Ward*, decided that the State of New York had power to prohibit the sale of eyeglasses at retail in any store, unless a duly licensed physician or optometrist were in charge and in personal attendance. The Supreme Court held that such a measure was within the proper exercise of the State's police power to safeguard the health, the safety, and the welfare of its people. The decision affected all of the 48 States. It marked one of the milestones along the road toward the goal of making available to the public the services of qualified professionals, and toward the elimination of unauthorized and unethical practices through which the unscrupulous have used and are using the need for visual care to victimize the public.

You have now passed another milestone—a very important one. I assume all of you are more or less familiar with the Oklahoma case of *Williamson* v. *Lee Optical, of Oklahoma, Inc.*, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on March 28 last. The case, as you know, involved the validity of an act passed by the Oklahoma Legislature, several parts of which were struck down by a Federal district court as in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The attorney general of the State of Oklahoma appealed to the Supreme Court. So did Lee Optical, of Oklahoma, and other plaintiffs. They complained that other parts of the Oklahoma law should also have been held to be invalid, so there were 2 appeals and 2 cases in the Supreme Court, growing out of the 1 suit to prevent the Oklahoma law from being enforced.

It was at this point that Mr. William T. MacCracken, Jr., who has represented you so long and so successfully at Washington, developed the idea that I and my firm might be useful in presenting this association's views to the Supreme Court. That gave me the opportunity to meet and to work with your general counsel, Mr. Harold Kohn, who carries around in his brain a storehouse of information about optometry in all its phases, and the laws and regulations and rules and court decisions affecting the practice and optometry. My partner, Mr. Ellis Lyons, made a detailed study of the facts and the law involved in the case, and became convinced that the law not only was good but was valid in every respect. Then he convinced me, and then we set out to learn all that we could about optometry and how it is practiced.

Mr. Kohn came to Washington and answered a lot of questions, many I suspect being rather foolish, and Mr. MacCracken worked on us almost daily, trying overnight to make us, especially me, expert on the subject. I say especially me because it was agreed that if arrangements could be made to obtain permission for us to participate in the argument of the case, I was to do the arguing.

The suit was between the Lee Optical, of Oklahoma, Inc., and others, against the Attorney General and all the county attorneys of Oklahoma. We were not parties to the case, and had no right even to file a brief, except with the consent of the parties, unless the Supreme Court itself granted permission. These restrictions do not apply to the attorneys general of the States, and briefs supporting the validity of the Oklahoma law were filed by the attorneys general of Arkansas, California, Kansas, Mississippi, and Pennsylvania. The other side wanted the attorney general of Oklahoma to give permission for a brief on behalf of the Guild of Prescription Opticians of America, and he agreed on condition that they do likewise for a brief on behalf of the American Optometric Association, Inc. And that is the way we got into the case. Mr. Mac Q. Williamson, the attorney general of Oklahoma, then gave me one-half of the time allotted for argument to Oklahoma, and that is the way in which your representative was permitted to present an oral argument to the Supreme Court in a case in which we were neither plaintiff nor defendant.

Of course, although this meant more work for Mr. Lyons and me, it meant more work for Mr. Kohn and Mr. MacCracken too. They had to make sure that the Justices of the Supreme Court asked no questions of me which would, so to speak, catch me with my diapers down. And so they redoubled the effort to give us a brief but intensive education in what an optometrist does, and why.

Mr. MacCracken even arranged for an afternoon session with a Washington optometrist, Dr. Evart Warren, and in his offices we were told and shown exactly what an optometrist does when he refracts eyes, and when he decides on the strength of the sphere, the strength of the cylinder, if there is a cylindar, where the axis should be, and all of the other data necessary to determine the content of the lenses and the position in which they should be worn.

We had learned from the testimony about the lensometer, but now we saw and were given demonstrations of many other instruments and devices helpful in the production of lenses to counteract faults in vision. We saw, standing perfectly still, how one lens can appear to move objects to the left, another lens to the right, but it wasn't until we had all our diopters straight, without too much understanding of the mysteries of multifocal lenses, bifocals and tribocals and such, and what optometrists and patients are supposed to do about them, that we were allowed to stagger out of Dr. Warren's office, with Mr. MacCracken's approval, primed at long last to locate and discuss the greatest possible intolerance, or imbal-

ance or anything else that might be wrong with the arguments made by those who wanted to destroy the Oklahoma statute. The law, as it came from the legislature and was signed by the Governor, looked all right to us, and we were then sure that anyone who saw flaws in it was suffering from myopia or some other defect of vision, not to say understanding.

The great day of argument before the Supreme Court came at last, and the educational work done by Mr. Kohn and Mr. MacCracken had its effect. There were many questions from the Justices on the points decided adversely by the lower court: First, the power of the legislature to prohibit any person not a licensed optometrist or ophthalmologist to fit lenses to a face or to duplicate or replace into frames lenses or other optical appliances, except upon a prescription written by an Oklahoma licensed ophthalmologist or optometrist; second, the power of the Oklahoma Legislature to exempt sellers of ready-to-wear glasses; third, the power of the Oklahoma Legislature to prohibit the solicitation of the sale of frames, mountings or any other optical appliances; and fourth, the power of the Oklahoma Legislature to prohibit any merchandise retailer from renting or subleasing space or otherwise permitting persons engaging in eye examination to occupy space in his retail store.

There were other reasons why some people objected to the Oklahoma law, but attention was centered around those I have mentioned, with special emphasis on the provision requiring a prescription before an optician is authorized to fit lenses to a face or to duplicate or replace lenses. The plea was made that the Oklahoma law was designed to increase the professional opportunities of the optometrists and to decrease the business done by opticians in the State of Oklahoma. But the Supreme Court unanimously rejected all of the arguments against the validity of the Oklahoma law and reversed the adverse actions of the lower court. In brief, the Court decided that the Oklahoma Legislature had ample authority to enact the law.

It should be stated, however, that the decision does not mean that the Supreme Court declared that every provision of the Oklahoma law was a necessary provision or even a good provision. The Court was careful to point out, in answer to arguments in opposition, that "the day is gone when this Court uses the due-process clause of the 14th amendment to strike down State laws, regulatory of business or industrial conditions, because they may be unwise, improvident, or out of harmony with a particular school of thought," and the Court said that "it is for the legislature, not the courts, to balance the advantages and disadvantages of the new requirement."

I state these propositions to you because it seems clear that the decision by the Supreme Court imposes additional responsibilities upon the American Optometric Association. You have undertaken to bring State and local organizations of optometrists together, to the end that you may plan, and continue to plan together, to raise the standards of your profession higher than ever before; to weed out the incompetent and the unethical and to assure the public of service of the best quality, performed by optometrists not only of the required ability but who are equipped with such high character and understanding as to make them a credit to their profession.

The history of your profession during the past 10 or 20 years is a truly marvelous one, especially in light of the difficulties and the obstacles you have met and are still meeting. The progress you have made is but an indication, it seems to me, of the greater destiny still in store for you. But you must not relax your efforts. It was the optometrists of Oklahoma who educated the legislature of that State, and who took the lead in the preparation and urging the passage of legislation which should eliminate from that State most of the evils in the field of visual care still prevalent in so many other places. When an optician or any commercial enterprise not qualified to perform refractions is permitted to advertise eye examinations, it usually means that he or it is employing on a salary or percentage of some kind the services of a physician or an optometrist, or, as we have discovered, persons who should not be permitted to give advice or prescribe remedies for faulty vision. There was testimony in the Oklahoma case indicating that an osteopath in the service and pay of an optician was issuing prescriptions to unsuspecting patients.

Your success in Oklahoma may be the occasion for you to review again the many and diverse laws on the statute books of all the States in the Union. I am thinking of a review of each and every provision, and the writing of new provisions in the light of the experience you have had, designed to produce a complete and up-to-date piece of legislation which would put visual care in the hands of qualified professionals only, and through which abuses existing in different sections of the country could be terminated, and every area of the field of visual care be removed forever from the grasp of the avaricious, the unethical, the charlatan and the plain, unvarnished faker.

The public has a right to be protected and safeguarded against those who are so much interested in the profits from sales that they engage in practices injurious to the health, the safety and the general welfare of the people. This association is fully equipped to assert and exercise its moral leadership against those who invade the rightful domain of its members. I do not know what steps you are contemplating, and much of what I am suggesting may be either irrelevant or unnecessary, but my recent contacts with the subject induce me to believe that this may be a good time to intensify your educational campaign for the general public in order to inform people how to avoid dangers and pitfalls and injury to themselves whenever examinations of the eyes are needed. I say you are fully equipped to exercise your leadership because, so far as legal questions are involved in your activities, I have never met more able informed and dedicated men than your general counsel, Mr. Harold Kohn, and your Washington counsel, Mr. William P. MacCracken, Jr.

The Oklahoma case should emphasize to all of the members of this association what your officers and your counsel know full well, and that is that you should, all of you, take a continuing and lively interest in what your legislative bodies, national, State, and municipal, are doing. Legislation in the field of visual care affects you directly in the practice of your profession, but legislation on a multitude of other problems also affects you in varying degrees.

You now know some of the major problems involved when an association such as yours, whether in the professions or in the commercial world, champions the adoption of codes or regulations or laws to enforce high standards of conduct, in an effort to bring order out of confusion, and to give the public the value in services and goods it has a right to expect. There are a multitude of organizations in this country engaged in similar endeavors.

You have learned, if you did not realize it before, that such activities require that your proposals, after the most intensive consideration, be reduced to writing, and that whatever legislation may be advisable or necessary be carefully prepared and introduced in the appropriate body. Thereafter, there is the work of arguing for the passage of the legislation, whether it be a municipal council or board, or a State legislature or the Congress of the United States. And there are hearings to be attended and amendments to be proposed, or to be accepted or resisted. And, after all this is done, it may happen that the legislation will fail or be vetoed and the work done all over again at some future session. Or, if it is enacted into law there may be attacks on its validity, and the courts will be called upon to consider whether every word, clause, sentence, or section of the law is a proper exercise of the authority vested in the legislative body which enacted it. If there are adverse decisions in lower courts, there is the problem of whether to seek new legislation or whether to fight for the law under attack, and to carry appeals to higher courts, even, as you have done, to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Legislation of especial interest to the professions and to business enterprises is usually arrived at in this way. And, just as the legislation in which you are particularly concerned affects tens or hundreds of thousands of others, so legislation sought and obtained by other organizations affects you. Also there is the legislation proposed by executive and legislative branches of government for the general health, safety, and welfare of the people, for the strengthening of the national economy, and for all of those policies designed to enable us to maintain our leadership of the free peoples of the world. I outline this situation because your experience in seeking beneficial legislation of the character you are advocating should make you appreciate the fact that the greater interest you take, not only in the legislation which affects your profession, but in all other public questions, including the personnel of legislative bodies, the better citizens you will be. And it goes without saying that the better citizens you are, the better practitioners you will be.

We pride ourselves upon the dignity, the worth of the individual. We believe that the state—the government—exists for him, and that he is not and will never be in our society the slave of the state. A great contest is being waged to preserve the dignity, the liberty, and freedoms of the individual. That contest is being fought at home as well as abroad. You can, you must, play whatever part you can, in that great struggle. The elimination of abuses and evils achieved by the Oklahoma law and the similar legislation for which you are working tends to cleanse and strengthen our Nation and to arm it to face and overcome its enemies—the enemies of freedom and of peace on earth and good will toward men.

And as I reflect with you upon the seemingly insoluble problems of this troubled world of ours, I recall the words of that great jurist who graced the Supreme Court of the United States for so many years—Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes—when he said:

> If I am right, it will be a slow business for out people to reach rational views. But as I grow older, I grow calm. * * * I do not pin my dreams for the future to my country or even to my race. I think it probable that civilization somehow will last as long as I care to look ahead—perhaps with smaller numbers but perhaps also bred to splendor and greatness by science. I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be—that man may

have cosmic destinies he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace.

A Solution for the Problem of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Solution for the Problem of Juvenile Delinquency" by Homer Rodeheaver, of Winona Lake, Ind.

Homer Rodeheaver, who is known to millions of our American citizens as a great song leader, song writer, and publisher, has established the Rodeheaver Boys' Ranch on the St. Johns River in Florida, where they gather boys from broken homes, and where they are given proper discipline and the loving care of men and women who are interested in building character and manhood for the future.

Mr. Rodeheaver makes the interesting suggestion that we might well follow this pattern in many sections of the Nation by using deactivated military camps for this type of care and training of youth. It is an interesting suggestion and I commend the reading of his article to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOLUTION FOR THE PROBLEM OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

We hear the statement frequently that "youth is on the march." That is right, they certainly cannot stand still. The trouble is they are marching in the wrong direction because the signs have been turned around. They did not put up the signs, they did not create the society in which they have to live. We older people did that. We are responsible. Let us take a good look into the future. Ordinarily statistics are very uninteresting. Statistics and records show the trend of our country. They should be shocking to everyone who loves God, home, and native land. Juvenile delinquency is increasing far more rapidly than any other movement in our country.

Let us take a good, square look into the future and see where we are going. We read the headlines in the paper but very few of us pay any attention to them or very few of us analyze them carefully enough to see what is happening in our country.

Here is a quotation from an editorial in one of our great newspapers. "The entire Nation is justly alarmed at the unsuspected magnitude of this fascination some teenagers have for immorality and crime. Something is being done to save these young lives but it is not nearly enough. It is not enough because too many parents feel that juvenile delinquency is no concern of theirs." Then this paper went on to give a report from the police of just one night in one large city, telling the shocking stories of teenage narcotic addiction, sex orgies, thefts, brutality, sordid forays into the vice dens of the community. This same story has been told in many newspapers about many cities, but very few people seem to be alarmed.

Dr. Martha Elliott, the head of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said in 1952, 385,000 children were in the juvenile courts of our country, charged with some crime or some form of serious juvenile delinquency. She said this juvenile delinquency was increasing at a rate of 10 percent a year.

The most recent statistics show us that the number of juveniles brought to court has doubled in the last 13 years. This last year's total was 435,000 brought into juvenile courts. One statistician says that at the same rate of increase, the estimate of juvenile court cases in 1960 will be 540,000. Dr. Elliott puts it at even a greater number than that. This means that 1 out of every 25 children will have been brought into juvenile courts by 1960.

The United States has 19 million youngsters between the ages of 10 and 18. More than a million of them are in some sort of trouble with the police each year.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation brings us another startling statement, based on a survey of 200 cities. The crime rate of adults went up only 1.9 percent last year but among adolescents under 18, the rate rose by an estimated 7.9 percent, nearly 8 percent. The proportion of crimes committed by youngsters shows an increase in murder, burglary, auto theft, stolen property, rape, weapon carrying, liquor law violations, and assaults.

Three years ago when I talked to J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and one of the most vital important officials of our Nation, about this question, he told me the age at which the greatest number of men were being arrested for crime that year was only 17, the greatest number of women only 18. When I asked him the reason for all this youth criminality, he replied, "It is the lack of religious training in the American homes."

Our psychiatrists used to say the time to train the children was between 12 and 20 years of age. They have moved the time back now and say we must start not later than 3 years of age if we expect to direct their lives and their thinking in the right channel.

Recently our legislators in Washington have been alerted and they have sent groups out to investigate the reason for the rapidly increasing juvenile delinquency.

The first reason is the lack of religious training in the American homes. That lays it right back into the lap of every individual who has not been giving their children religious training; into the lap of the men and women who have been sending their children to Sunday school instead of taking them. Too many homes are just places to eat and sleep and to house the television set with no religious training or family altar in the home.

Second, they say the churches of the land are not giving enough attention to gathering and giving the right kind of religious training to the children. This, of course, applies to adults as well and there is no cure for that except just an oldtime revival of religion. The fathers and mothers must be made to feel a personal, individual responsibility. Every judge to whom I have talked tells me that if he had the privilege of bringing in the parents instead of the children and giving them the penalty, he would have some chance at the problem.

The September 6, 1954, issue of Newsweek gives us some startling statistics. This article is headed, "Our Vicious Young Hoodlums, Is There Any Hope?"

So far every survey brings us the startling facts about the causes of many of the crimes but none have presented any cure. I believe I know a cure. Of course, we would all say, "Yes, the right kind of religious training." However, that must start in the home and then be carried on in the church. How are we going to alert the fathers and mothers and the ministers of the churches to redouble their efforts in this direction? Without very positive religious experience there is little hope for any boy or girl who has to remain in an unwholesome, ungodly, non-Christian atmosphere. We must find a way to take them out of that atmosphere and surrounding.

I have been in many fine homes where the parents do not seem to understand their children and much less do not care. I often wish I could take some of those children and place them in a good, well-managed orphanage where they would get practical, helpful, religious training.

There are many incidents where children have been taken from a bad environment and placed in a new and better environment and in nearly every instance, the boys and girls have made good.

Down in Florida on the banks of the beautiful St. Johns River, 14 miles south of Palatka, there is such a place. It is called the Rodeheaver Boys' Ranch. We have established it in the nature of a ranch because the large majority of boys are fascinated by the idea of a ranch. Nearly every boy, even 5 or 6 years old, wants a pair of cowboy boots for his Christmas present. Here we take boys from broken homes, boys who have never had the proper discipline from a father and very few of them have ever had the affection of a mother. Many of them are from homes where the father has deserted the mother and she cannot take care of the children and work to support them at the same time. Every boy we have is from a broken home and everyone of them is getting the right kind of discipline and training. It doesn't take long to change them when they get in touch with people who love them and who know the importance of taking care of a boy.

Our plan is to expand this ranch until we get a 100 or 150 boys. Instead of trying to make it too big, where they cannot have the personal attention of their leaders, we would like to go into every other State of the Union and get the people there to start another ranch like ours. The boys do like the idea of the ranch. They like the ranch life and they have more wholesome fun out there than the boys do in the big cities. Then being out away from the big cities, they are not tempted to roam the streets at night where the vast majority of boys get into trouble.

Our present reformatories, jails, and penitentiaries are not curing crime. Judge Ben Irving Cooper of the Court of Special Sessions in New York City said in an article in the Reader's Digest not long ago, that in 14 years he had sentenced 15,000 teen-age children to some term in the jail, reformatory, or penitentiary. Following their records carefully through, at the end of the period of their sentence, he found that 3 out of 5 of them had gone on to greater crime and some of them finished in the electric chair. At the same time, he believes that 80 percent of these children could have been saved if they had been given probationary help.

A ranch like Rodeheaver Boys' Ranch can assist in solving the problems of boys who have been neglected and deserted. Too many times boys of this type get into trouble. Quite naturally when they are thrown into a reformatory or jail with boys with criminal tendencies, the trend of human nature is to go down instead of up. We would like to see enough ranches started to take care of the boys from broken homes, who are unfortunate through no fault of their own. This other crowd is a greater problem and I believe I know a solution to this problem. In nearly every section of the country there are a great many Army and CCC camps which cost our Government millions of dollars to take care of the boys during the days of the war and before. Now they are lying vacant—not being used. They are fully equipped. Their streets are paved. They have kitchen and dining room equipment and plenty of

dormitory space. There is room around them for farm and ranch activities. Many of them have shops where boys could be trained in some vocation.

Instead of continuing the apparently futile plan which certainly is not working, let the Government organize a teen-age army. No, not universal conscription but a teen-age army to take in these boys with criminal tendencies who are constantly getting into trouble with the courts, bring them together in these Army camps under the training of intelligent Army leaders. Establish a school which they will have to attend and get the kind of training they need, a church for every denomination which they will have to attend. Give them the practical training and discipline they have never gotten in their own homes. Give them the military training they need which will build them up physically and mentally. With the right kind of surroundings they will be built up morally and spiritually as well. When the time comes that we will have to augment our present Army personnel, we would have between four and five hundred thousand well-trained young men. As they come to the proper age for armed service, already trained young men, already given discipline and having had the basic training that every soldier has to go through, we would have one of the greatest armies that has ever been enlisted in the history of our country.

We hope, of course, that the Army will not be necessary but if it should be, we would have them ready. Even more important is the fact that they could be sent out through the country as fine, well-trained, well-disciplined workmen into the shops, the stores, the offices, and the places of business and professions of every kind. Our universities of medicine, law, and trade would find them able to take their places in the great schools of the Nation.

The right kind of men with unusual ability and personality that is necessary could be selected from our Army, Navy, and Air Corps for the training of these boys. For some, it would require some hard-boiled Army sergeants who had problems of this kind in their days of service in the Army. There would be schools and churches established in these Army camps, just as in the days of our Regular Army training.

They tell us that 600,000 boys and girls dropped out of the eighth grade this last year. One of the greatest reasons given for delinquency was that these boys had not had the right kind of scholastic training even through the eighth grade. In most cases, the parents lacked control over their own children. They couldn't make them get up in the morning or attend school. In this teen-age Army camp they could not refuse to go into the schoolroom at the proper time or get up when the reveille bugle sounded. They could not refuse to obey their teachers and when the time came for them to go to their churches for religious training, they would not say, "No, Sergeant, I don't believe I want to go this morning." There would never be any question about it. They would learn the finest type of discipline the world has ever known.

Instead of having 435,000 boys locked up in some reformatory or jail, where the big majority are learning more clever crimes, don't you agree with me that it would be better to put them in a great Army camp like this. In a little time they would learn the importance of discipline and after they go into the world and become the fathers of the next generation, they would know how to give proper discipline to their children.

One other very important thing in connection with this idea of a teen-age Army is the boys in various cities who are forming gangs and doing all sorts of destructive crimes. If they knew that when caught they were going to be inducted into this teen-age Army for a year or maybe 2 years, it would cut down on this percentage of juvenile delinquency tremendously. The Army camps should be so conducted that they could have baseball, football, and all kind of sports. As they are developed the boys would have a great pride in having been a part of this great organization that is developing fine soldiers and some of the finest, well-trained citizens of the United States.

Of course, the cost of saving a boy should be the last thing considered. Even from the economical standpoint, it would be much cheaper to put 435,000 boys in the camps of this kind, than to put them into reformatories and jails where it is costing all the way from $1,500 to $2,500 a year for each conviction. This plan was tried out in a measure back a few years ago when the CCC camps were organized. They worked very successfully and helped a lot of boys. It has much greater possibilities because the Government would not have to go to the great expense of building these camps. They are already waiting for boys to step in and begin their training.

We are proving this in our ranch for boys down in Palatka, Fla. Because boys are boys and the same treatment and method will work with human nature everywhere, I know this is a plan that will solve, at least to a great degree, the problem of juvenile delinquency with the least possible cost and with the least possible regret, disappointment, and disgrace to many fathers and mothers throughout the land. If you know of a better plan, let us know about it. If you think this is a workable, plausible, possible plan, talk to the authorities of your community about it and we will see if we cannot create enough public sentiment to get it started before it is too late.

Unless something is done by 1960, 1 out of every 25 boys and girls will have to be dealt with by the judges and officials of our juvenile courts. Wouldn't this be a much better plan?

Bartering Human Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 2, 1955:

BARTERING HUMAN LIVES

All decent men will rejoice at the release of 11 American airmen by Red China and pray that other Americans held in China can be released soon.

But this is no time to be thankful to the Chinese Communists or to engage in the folly of thinking they have changed.

We recommend Ludwell Denny's dispatch from Geneva, on the page preceding this one, in which he reports on the baldfaced lies which the Chinese are using at this conference.

It doesn't take much reading between the lines to realize how cleverly the Chinese Communists have been bartering with the lives of Americans in Chinese jails.

Why did Red China release these men? Because the United States agreed to enter direct ambassadorial talks with Red China in Geneva with sort of half promises of even higher level talks.

What price did Red China pay for these talks? So far only the release of 15 prisoners of war of the United Nations command—men who never should have been held after the Korean armistice.

If the only way of getting these men freed was to agree to such bartering, then we must try to reconcile ourselves to such a compromise. The American Government properly has made their release a major task of its diplomacy.

But let us not sugar coat what we had to do. Far better to face the unpleasant facts—that we are dealing with barbarians—than to kid ourselves into believing the Communists suddenly have got religion.

Secretary of State Dulles says release of the fliers came about "without the United States making any concessions or giving any promises as the price of the release."

But item 2 on the agenda of the Chinese-American talks at Geneva—to discuss other practical matters at issue between the two sides—is the concession, or price.

Both the Chinese and Russian Communists lately have been reaping a harvest of good will by trading in stolen goods, by giving back things they never should have taken, by stopping actions civilized nations never would be guilty of.

Isn't it about time the Communists gave up something besides stolen goods? When they do we will be more optimistic about the genuineness of their peace talk.

Pornographic Materials and Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief summary of the hearings and the results of the investigation by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, on the relationship of pornographic materials to juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency held hearings on the relationship of pornographic materials to juvenile delinquency.

One of the most shocking discoveries we made was the fact that the pornography business in the United States grosses nearly half a billion dollars each year. We found that much of this business flourishes because of inadequate Federal legislation.

The ease with which pornography is reaching children was brought home to us time and again. Business lists taken from convicted pornographers demonstrated that their nasty trade flourishes in every section of the country. These men, who operate virtually as traveling salesmen in filth, take advantage of certain loopholes in Federal law, as well as weak enforcement of existing laws by some local communities, to run small sums of money into large profits.

In Los Angeles, one candid witness told us she made $1 million from a $600 investment. All of this money was amassed by sending lewd pictures through the mails.

Even if convicted, most of these pornographers have little to fear. Penalties are so light that they can be written off as overhead.

The Post Office Department prepared a display for our Washington hearing which illustrated the wide extent and the character of the mail-order operation in pornography. The subcommittee learned that a good deal of this material is sent through the mails to

children. Letters from worried and indignant parents pour into our office daily, complaining about material and advertisements sent to their homes through the mails. The Post Office Department also receives thousands of complaints about this situation.

Post-office authorities are vigilant in their efforts to stop the pornographer's operations. When they detect an individual sending obscene material through the mails, his mail can be stopped. However, the operators of this business told us themselves, that they merely go out of business at one address and start up again at another address under a different name. Then the entire process must start over again. After the pornographer's operations from a new address are detected and halted, he merely moves to a new location.

At our New York and Washington hearings, post-office officials indicated to us that tighter Federal laws are needed by them to curtail the sending of lewd matter through the mail. Therefore, after study of the problem, the subcommittee recommends that the first of the two bills I am introducing today be adopted.

Under this measure, the Postmaster General could detain, for 10 days, the mail of persons suspected of violating existing Federal laws against sending lewd and obscene matter through the mails. This bill spells out in detail the safeguards necessary to protect the civil liberties of those concerned. No mail may be detained for more than 10 days without action being taken under existing law. Only if a petition is filed by the Post Office Department can the restraining order be continued.

The second bill provides graduated penalties for convicted pornographers, which are considerably more severe than under existing statutes. For example, under the new bill, a convicted second offender faces a prison term of not less than 3 years. Under existing law, a prison term is not mandatory.

This measure also tightens the law on pornography for the District of Columbia, and penalties are made more stringent. It also affords the judge in the District of Columbia the choice of applying either a more severe fine or a longer prison sentence than heretofore. This was recommended to us by those who administer the law in the District of Columbia.

A good illustration of the necessity for these more severe penalties is provided by the case of a pornographer who was apprehended in Washington with 80,000 feet of negative and positive film in his possession. He was freed on $300 bail. Naturally, he did not return to face trial. His film can be used over and over again and to produce other prints. His total operation can run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Had he been convicted, his fine would not have been in keeping with the size and nature of his operations. The small fine of the present law is no deterrent to a man with so large a business.

The public demand for congressional action is great. I hope we can act on these bills this session.

Housing Amendments of 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, of course, the most controversial part of this conference report is on public housing. But there are many other things in the bill which are distasteful to many, including the President of the United States himself. On the question of public housing, let it be clearly understood that the conferees have brought back to you a bill which calls for 45,000 public housing units in 1 year without any questions being asked, without any limitations, without any criteria, without any formula tying these public-housing units in with slum clearance and urban development. Now the President said, in substance, as has been declared on the floor of this House, and I shall read his position on it:

> The low-rent public-housing legislation requested by the administration, unlike the provisions of S. 2126, would be limited to meeting the relocation needs of families of low-income displaced by slum clearance and urban redevelopment projects or by other Government action. The legislation proposed by the administration would authorize the continuation of the public-housing program, but would retain present requirements which make public housing a part of the Government overall program to help cities eliminate and prevent slums and urban blight.

That provision, in keeping with the President's recommendation, was written into the 1954 act, under which we have been functioning for the last year. Under it, over 29,500 units of the 35,000 units we authorized for the fiscal year, 1955, have been contracted for. There are about 6,000 of them left. The President's program does not call for 35,000 units for 1 year or 2 years without that formula, and therein lies the difference between the President's program and the program as brought back to the House by the conferees.

The President does not want public housing without tying it in with slum clearance and urban renewals. He wants only the authority to house those persons who may be displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal.

The President does not want many other things in this bill. The President does not want the provisions in respect to trailer camps. He does not want the independence of the Home Loan Bank Board, because of administration problems. He does not want the provisions of this bill in respect to facility loan programs because that facility-loan program contained in this conference report bypasses the Committee on Appropriations. They go directly to the Treasury for financing, and you will have absolutely no say henceforth about whether they indulge in this program or not. We provided for facility loans in the 1954 act, and it is just and reasonable that the provisions of the 1954 act be continued in that respect. It has worked out splendidly. There is no reason why this Congress should be bypassed to make direct Treasury financing of facility loans.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, not at this time.

Now, we create a new assistant to the FHA Administration. The Administration does not want it. And with a staff, which it does not want or need. It is in this conference report. There are a great many budgetary problems in this conference report that we have not given too much consideration to.

In respect to public housing, our files are full of information as to vacancies in public housing. We all perhaps have a file full of newspaper clippings of material, wherein public-housing agencies are advertising—advertising for occupants—can you imagine that? Advertising to people to come into public housing units. The outstanding one that I have tells about the merits of renting public-housing units in New Orleans. The Public Housing Authority asks people to come in and apply, and tells them that they can get rent as cheaply as $15 a month. Other places say to the Federal Government, through the press, "We do not expect to have any workable programs. If we are going to have a workable program, we would rather build our own public-housing units."

There are numerous cases where localities themselves do not want public housing because of the expense they are put to. Of course, they would want to turn it over to the Federal Government and let the Federal Government take the responsibility, take Federal money and build those houses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In the city of Pontiac, Mich., in my district, the city commission did not pass a motion or a resolution. They passed an ordinance prohibiting public housing within the city of Pontiac.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Many other municipalities have done the same.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I will ask the gentleman even though the number of public-housing units authorized in the conference report is considerable lower than the original Senate figure, if the House conferees have not in effect completely surrendered on this subject of public housing in this conference?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think on five different occasions throughout the last 5 years this House has refused to provide for any public-housing units. We surely surrendered in that respect, because the one time that we did provide for them, last year, we added requirements tying them in to slum clearance and urban development.

Mr. FISHER. I notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today that when this conference report was taken up in the Senate yesterday the Senator who was in charge of the Senate conferees made the statement that—I quote:

> Ninety percent of the conference report is the Senate bill.

Does not the gentleman think that finally, somewhere along the line, after all these years, the will of the House should be maintained to some extent in these conferences?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I agree with that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I inquire of the gentleman whether or not provisions which have heretofore been carried in the Independent Offices appropriation bill, namely, limitations on public-housing units, are repealed in this conference report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. My understanding is that they are repealed. There is no limitation; the sky is the limit. The only limitation on the number of public-housing units that can be built is the 45,000; and I understand there is another 43,000; I am not just clear on that, but I think the total number of public-housing units that can be built under this will be in the neighborhood of 90,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Has the leapfrogging provision been repealed? And has the provision against Communists living in these units been repealed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let us take them one at a time. The leapfrog provisions are left in the bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. In the public housing preamble it states that the number of units shall be limited to the number of persons displaced in slum clearance programs, and sets up $100 million to take care of gas, electricity, and other things.

It goes even further, Mr. Speaker, and the majority of the House managers accepted the Senate provision that permits FHA insurance of mortgages up to $500,000 on trailer camps.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yet the preamble of the bill states that this is to make homes for people If a trailer camp is a home, all right, I would vote for it, but I do not think it is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is the first time we have adopted the concept of making FHA mortgage financing available to potentially vacant properties, because you can move a trailer off a trailer camp and you have no house left there; so virtually under this we are making FHA financing available for vacant property.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to clarify what the President's position is with regard to the public housing feature apart from the number of units involved. Am I correct that his position is that we have reached the point in this country where any public housing should be coupled only with the clearance of slums or an urban development program?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is the President's position.

Mr. KEATING. And in this conference report am I correct that there is no such linking up of those features?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is absolutely none.

Mr. KEATING. It has been completely eliminated?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Assisting the Handicapped Is in the National Interest and Merits Cooperation From All Segments of American Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an excellent article entitled "Jobs for the Handicapped," which appeared in the July 1955 issue of the American Federationist, authored by Thomas C. Healey and Stephen E. McCloskey, president and secretary, respectively, of the Boston Central Labor Union.

The articles follows:

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

(By Melvin J. Maas, major general, U. S. Marine Corps (retired); chairman, President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped)

In the complex field of job placement for the handicapped the employer, to be sure, has the basic responsibility. However, the labor unions of the Nation can make a major contribution to the program by stimulating a more widespread attitude of fair play in regard to providing equal job opportunities for the impaired.

Unions as a whole have done an excellent job in this field. More emphasis on this policy in the future, however, would further enhance opportunities for handicapped workers to obtain productive employment and to lead dignified, useful lives.

The American Federation of Labor has made a major contribution by clearly defining its policies in the booklet, Jobs for the Handicapped Through Union-Management Cooperation. The five contract clauses regarding the handicapped recommended to local unions, if generally included in collective bargaining, will stand as an eloquent testimonial of the A. F. of L.'s enlightened approach to the problems of the impaired worker.

The proposal that disabled veterans be reinstated in jobs within the limits of their abilities, with retention of accumulated seniority, including military service time, indicates the fine sense of fair play embodied in the recommendations.

The provision that a worker who cannot perform his former duties after injury be transferred to another job for which he is qualified, or which he can be trained to perform, equal consideration for the handicapped after determination of the physical requirements of all job openings, and preemployment examinations only to determine the physical abilities of the worker, plus determination of suitability of the job for the worker by a joint committee, are all farsighted policy recommendations and tend to place the handicapped in a more equitable position with his nonimpaired fellow workers.

No less important is the recommended clause whereby an employee takes his seniority with him when assigned to another department because of physical disability.

It is heartening to see the power and prestige of the American Federation of Labor placed solidly behind such policy. It is my fervent hope that all locals will strive to see that these clauses are included in contracts wherever possible.

There is much for union members to consider in the newly accelerated program for vocational rehabilitation which came into being last August by act of Congress. The vocational-rehabilitation amendments of 1954 provide for an expanded Federal-State program whereby the number of persons rehabilitated and made employable annually would be increased from about 60,000 in 1954 to 200,000 by the end of 1959.

What does this mean? It means that if the number of employable handicapped people is tripled in the next few years, the problem of placement increases in direct proportion. I have frequently said publicly that to rehabilitate these additional thousands annually and not provide jobs for them would be perpetrating a grave injustice on these workers and a hoax on the taxpayer.

It is not a question of "Will it be done?" It must be done. And if the placement job is to be done properly, management and labor must cooperate to the fullest extent.

We must face the realities. Either these workers get jobs or they become charges of the community. Take a man off the public-assistance rolls, give him a job, and he becomes a taxpayer. Multiply the single case by thousands and you can realize the impact on the economy. In the long-range view, this program has a direct bearing on profits and wages, so it becomes a problem involving the general welfare of all. It is a challenge that goes beyond unionism. It is a basic economic problem, and all unions and individual members of unions can share in the responsibility.

Major accent in the national program to hire the handicapped has always been placed on employer acceptance of the principle that such action is good business. To get jobs for the handicapped, it is basic that the man who does the employing is the man who should be sold first.

But there is another factor which all members of labor unions well might ponder. Any handicapped person, once he has broken through the sound barrier of employer resistance, still has another invisible wall ahead. That is employee acceptance.

This is the subtle but frequently the greatest hazard in the problem of placing the handicapped in productive, useful work. If his fellow workers avoid him, dislike him, for no other reason than that he is handicapped, his plight is a sore one. It is doubtful if he can perform as a capable worker in such a hostile environment. Treated with resentment or slighted on every occasion, he cannot perform to the maximum of his abilities. That is the problem of employee acceptance.

Fortunately, natural feelings of human kindness and compassion rule the greater number of American workers, like all other Americans. But it is doing the handicapped a disservice to ignore the fact that prejudices of this sort, mostly unfounded, do exist in cerain areas of the industrial life of our country. One man doesn't like to work next to a blind man. Another objects even to a facial disfigurement.

It is a carryover from the medieval days when any sort of impairment was considered sufficient reason to ban a person from normal social intercourse. It is basically the result of selfishness, oversensitivity, unfounded resentment, or a combination of all three. It can be brutal.

In his first resistance, an unimpaired worker may fear that a handicapped worker may injure the man next to him or do harm to himself. The facts are that handicapped workers, as a whole, are safe workers. The accident rate among them is lower because in their vocational training heavy accent is placed on the safety factor. I have also been told by insurance firms prominent in the field of workmen's compensation that they have never heard of a case where the actions of a handicapped worker caused injury to another person on the job.

The case is rather for the handicapped instead of against them. I have had many foremen tell me that the presence of handicapped workers in the shop has had the tendency to make other workers safer in their work habits. A man with one arm is a constant reminder to the non-handicapped fellow worker of the potential danger of accident. Also, by his conduct the handicapped workers sets an unconscious example for others.

In overcoming such prejudice and ignorance of the facts, the individual, nonhandicapped worker can play an important, personal role. If he looks for the man instead of the impairment, the rest is easy. It is a well-established fact that most people who live day by day in company with all manner of handicapped people rarely are conscious of the handicap. Joe becomes one of the boys. He reacts naturally to treatment that makes him just like others and not apart from them. In my own case, many times people have told me:

"Mel, I forget most of the time that you are blind."

Thus, if the union members on the job will accept Joe or Tom or Dick or Harry as one of their own, those workers with deep-set prejudices will rapidly lose them entirely. I know. I've seen it work. It is an attitude which, if projected throughout the rank and file of labor unions, would in not too long a time produce miracles in fellow well-being and also that happy end-result—greater and more efficient production.

Unions can also play a key role in local programs. They can take part in State and community activities devoted to finding employment opportunity for the handicapped. Being at the grassroots, locals can translate into reality the contract clauses outlined by your federation.

In this connection I would like to emphasize that I do not believe handicapped workers should receive any special concessions such as not paying dues or not conforming with union regulations. I do not believe they expect it or want it. The handicapped worker should accept his job and his union responsibilities on the same basis as the nonhandicapped.

It is in the field of providing equal job opportunity that consideration should be given. Once that climate has been created, the handicapped should accept equality both for its advantages as well as its responsibilities.

Admitting the existence of exceptions, I am convinced that the average handicapped worker is a conscientious, able worker who wants no special privilege. And I am equally positive that the great majority of the rank and file of organized labor have normal feelings of compassion and understanding. The more universal we can make this attitude, the nearer we are to our goal.

I recall with pleasure a typical instance where unions demonstrated their humanitarianism.

In 1951 Nils Josefson, an electronics engineer, conceived the idea for a company known as Paraplegics Manufacturing Co., Inc., in Franklin Park, Ill. A number of paraplegic veterans pooled their resources and leased a building and named Josefson president.

The project would have had rough sledding had not help come from an unexpected source. The building was badly in need of repair and renovation. Out of a blue sky the A. F. of L. Cook County Trades Council came forward and provided free labor to recondition the plant.

The donation, figured at regular wages, exceeded $15,000. The plant is in active operation today and employs more than 80 persons, a large number of them seriously handicapped. I consider this action by the Trades Council to be in the best tradition of American labor.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has for many years noted the outstanding achievements of the American Federation of Labor in the hire-the-handicapped program. During the last A. F. of L. convention it was my personal pleasure to present the distinguished service certificate, highest award of our committee, to George Meany.

Presented in the name of the president, it was our way of saying "thank you for a job well done."

Mr. Meany's response, upon receiving the award on behalf of the American Federation of Labor, should be an inspiration, I believe, to every member of the A. F. of L. He said:

"I accept this citation, not in a personal way, because the contribution I have made to this work is very minute. I accept it in behalf of the organizations which go to make up the American Federation of Labor, international unions, central labor unions, local unions, State federations, and all the way down the line. It is at that level, the local level, that this cooperation is given.

"I agree with General Maas that not only is this a good thing to do from the sympathetic, human standpoint of view, but it is good business.

"I went to an exhibit last spring and saw a group of outstanding examples of physically handicapped men actually at work, in some of the most intricate types of work, and doing a very good job, turning out a job insofar as time and quality are concerned that is comparable with anyone who was working at the same operation and who is without any physical handicap.

"So I am very happy to accept this citation on behalf of the American Federation of Labor and to express to General Maas our complete and continued cooperation in this work in the future."

In summary, individual members of unions can make important contributions to the success of the hire-the-handicapped program by calling the attention of employers to accomplishments of handicapped workers in the shop.

There is one on-the-job activity in which each can do his share. That is by using the oldest means of communication—word of mouth—to increase the understanding in his or her community of the value and known benefits that accrue from rehabilitating impaired workers and giving them an opportunity to earn a productive livelihood.

All union members can make a study of the needs of the handicapped in their own home towns and work as individuals in helping to provide opportunities for filling the needs of the future.

I recall the story of a young soldier who was addressing a huge war bond rally in a stadium in Seattle during the war. He was trying to show how the combined efforts of a large number of people can produce a tremendous result. He was trying to persuade everyone to buy at least one war bond.

"Let's consider the light from one match to represent the price of a single bond," he said. "Now, will every man in the stadium light a match?"

His audience complied, and the stadium glowed like a thousand Christmas trees. He had made his point.

The individual contribution of union members in helping the hire-the-handicapped program will work the same way. If each member of the American Federation of Labor will, in some small or large way, perform one act during 1955 to further the hire-the-handicapped program, the cumulative effect will be colossal.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

It will be noted that out of a total of 147 rollcalls I missed on only two occasions for an attendance record of 99.3 percent. The footnotes at the end of the compilation will indicate the reason for the absences and how I would have voted if present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1955		
1	Jan. 5	Quorum call	Present.
2	do	Election of the Speaker (Rayburn; 226; Martin, 198)	Martin.
3	Jan. 25	H. J. Res. 159: Authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting Formosa, etc. (Passed 409 to 3)	Yes.
4	Jan. 27	H. R. 587: To provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veteran Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. (Passed 366 to 0).	Yes.
5	Feb. 8	H. R. 3005: To Extend Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents' Assistance Act for 4 years. (Passed 394 to 4)	Yes.
6	Feb. 16	H. R. 3828: To adjust legislative and judicial salaries; Congressmen to receive $22,500 plus $2,500 for expenses. (Passed 283 to 118)	Yes.
7	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
8	do	H. Res. 142: Motion to stop further debate on the question of a closed rule on H. R. 1. (Defeated 207 to 178)	Yes.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1955		
9	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142: To permit 5 hours of debate and amendments from the floor on H. R. 1. (Defeated 193 to 191.)	No.
10	do	H. Res. 142: Closed rule on H. R. 1 to prohibit amendments from the floor. (Passed 193 to 192.)	Yes.
11	Feb. 18	H. R. 1: To recommit to Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to amend to require the President to comply with recommendations of the Tariff Commission except when national security is involved. (Defeated 206 to 199.)	No.
12	do	H. R. 1: Final passage to extend the authority of the President for 3 years to enter into trade agreements for reduction of tariffs. (Passed 295 to 110.)	Yes.
13	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
14	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
15	Feb. 25	H. R. 4295: To recommit to Committee on Ways and Means in order to delete provision calling for a $20 credit against individual income tax for each personal exemption in tax year 1955. (Defeated 210 to 205.)	Yes.
16	do	H. R. 4592: Extending existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates and providing $20 credit against individual income taxes for each personal exemption. (Passed 242 to 175.)	No.
17	Mar. 1	H. R. 3828: An adoption of conference report setting judicial and legislative salaries: Congressmen to receive $22,500. (Passed 223 to 113.)	Yes.
18	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
19	do	H. R. 4720: To increase the compensation of members of the Armed Forces. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Yes.
20	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
21	Mar. 18	H. R. 4903: Amendment to restore $4 million for the United Nations technical-assistance program which had been deleted by a point of order. (Passed 174 to 107.)	Yes.
22	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
23	do	H. R. 4646: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing postal employees' salaries on an average of 7.5 percent. (Defeated 302 to 120.)	Yes.
24	do	Quorum call	Present.
25	do	H. R. 4957: To suspend the rules and pass the bill directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for 1955–56. (Defeated 260 yeas to 151 nays, a ⅔ majority being necessary.)	Not voting.[1]
26	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
27	do	H. Res. 170: To disapprove of the disposal of some of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. (Defeated 283 to 132.) (Effect of my vote: Permits sale of plants to private companies.)	No.
28	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
29	do	H. Res. 171: To disapprove of the disposal of some of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. (Defeated 276 to 137.) (Effect of my vote: Permits sale of plants to private companies.)	No.
30	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 30	H. R. 4295: To accept conference report extending corporate and excise taxes for 1 year and deleting the $20 income tax credit for each taxpayer and his dependents. (Passed 386 to 8.)	Yes.
34	do	H. R. 5240: Amendment to restore a provision limiting to $1 per month the fee to educational institutions for reports on veterans. (Defeated 226 to 156.)	Yes.
35	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
37	do	H. R. 4644: Amendment to the postal pay raise which would increase the annual rate for certain classes of employees; raised the overall increase from 7.5 to 8.2 percent. (Passed 224 to 189.)	No.
38	do	H. R. 4644: Motion to recommit to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. (Defeated 287 to 125.)	Yes.
39	do	H. R. 4644: On final passage of the bill as amended to grant a postal pay raise of about 8.2 percent. (Passed 324 to 85.)	No.
40	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
41	do	H. R. 4393: To provide for construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels; calls for a $1.3 billion, 4-year navy shipbuilding program. (Passed 373 to 3.)	Yes.
42	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
46	do	H. R. 12: Amendment to remove peanuts as one of the basic commodities in the farm price-support program. (Defeated 215 to 193)	Yes.
47	do	H. R. 12: To recommit to Committee on Agriculture. (Defeated 212 to 199.)	Yes.
48	do	H. R. 12: To restore the 90 percent of parity supports on 5 basic crops and fix the minimum level for support of dairy products at 80 percent of parity. Final passage. (Passed 206 to 201.)	No.
49	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
50	do	S. 1 and H. R. 4644: To recommit the conference report on the postal pay raise bills (8.8 percent increase) to the conference committee. (Defeated 275 to 118.)	Yes.
51	do	S. 1 and H. R. 4644: On final passage of conference report on postal pay raise bills (8.8 percent). (Passed 328 to 66.)	No.
52	do	H. Res. 223: To authorize consideration of the bill to permit statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. (Passed 322 to 66.)	Yes.
53	do	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	do	Quorum call	Present.
56	do	Quorum call	Present.
57	do	H. R. 2535: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. (Passed 218 to 170.)	No.
58	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
59	do	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
61	do	Quorum call	Present.
62	do	H. R. 6042 (Department of Defense appropriations): To strike out provisions requiring approval by congressional committee before the armed services may move any permanent facility. (Defeated 202 to 184.)	No.
63	do	H. R. 6042: Final passage of defense appropriations bill. (Passed 382 to 0.)	Yes.
64	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
67	do	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 23	S. 727: To increase the salaries of judges for the District of Columbia. (Passed 282 to 32.)	Yes.
70	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
71	do	H. Res. 224: To create a select committee to investigate the White County (Ind.) Bridge Commission. (Passed 205 to 166.)	No.
72	do	H. R. 2851: To make agricultural commodities owned by the CCC available to needy persons in areas of acute distress. (Passed 343 to 1.)	Yes.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
74	do	S. 727: To recommit to conference committee a bill which would raise salaries of District of Columbia judges to an amount greater than previously voted by the House. (Passed 170 to 165).	Yes.
75	do	Quorum call	Present.
76	do	H. R. 5881: To recommit to committee the bill which provided for Federal compensation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal reclamation projects in order to limit the scope of the bill to 17 Western States instead of all 48 States. (Defeated 229 to 62).	No.
77	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
78	do	H. R. 3990: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate projects for conservation, development, utilization of the water resources of Alaska. Motion to recommit bill to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (Defeated 278 to 79.)	Yes.
79	June 7	S. 2061: To increase salaries in the postal service by an average of 8 percent and to provide for reclassification. (Passed 409 to 1)	Yes.
80	June 8	H. R. 5923: To authorize an appropriation of $57,730,000 to complete the Inter-American Highway. (Passed 353 to 13)	Yes.
81	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
83	do	H. R. 1: On acceptance of conference report on the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. (Passed 347 to 54.)	Yes.
84	do	H. R. 6227: To provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies. (Passed 371 to 24.)	Not voting.[2]
85	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
86	do	H. Res. 210: To authorize an investigation of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board. (Defeated 214 to 178.)	No.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
88	June 20	S. 67: To increase salaries of civil-service employees by about 7.5 percent. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Yes.
89	do	H. Con. Res. 109: Authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference. (Passed 348 to 31.)	Yes.
90	do	H. R. 6295: To raise the per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses for Federal employees from $9 to $13. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Yes.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1955		
91	June 21	H. R. 4663: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, and to authorize an appropriation of $225 million therefor. (Passed 230 to 153.)	Yes.
92	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
93	...do	H. R. 6040: To recommit to committee the customs simplification bill with instructions to strike out sec. 2, which would make export value the primary basis for assessing ad valorem duties. (Defeated 232 to 143.)	Yes.
94	June 23	H. Con. Res. 149: Expressing the sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism. (Passed 367 to 0.)	Yes.
95	June 27	H. R. 6992: To extend for 1 year the existing temporary ceiling on the public debt of $281 billion. (Passed 267 to 56)	Yes.
96	...do	Quorum call	Present.
97	...do	H. R. 6829: To authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations. (Passed 316 to 2)	Yes.
98	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
99	...do	H. R. 3005: To recommit the conference report to committee. (Defeated 171 to 221)	No.
100	...do	H. R. 3005: To extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years and to extend for 2 years the Doctors-Dentists Draft Act. (Passed 388 to 5).	Yes.
101	...do	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
103	...do	S. 727: To recommit the conference report on the bill which adjusts the salaries of the judges of the courts of the District of Columbia. (Defeated 157 to 227.)	No.
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
105	...do	S. 2090: To authorize appropriations totaling $3,285,800,000 for carrying forward the mutual security program. (Passed 273 to 128.)	Yes.
106	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	...do	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
109	July 6	H. R. 3210: To recommit the bill which would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. (Defeated 74 to 316.)	Yes.
110	July 7	S. 2090: To adopt conference report authorizing $3,285,800,000 for the mutual security program. (Passed 262 to 120.)	Yes.
111	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
112	...do	H. R. 7224: Appropriating $2,638,741,750 for mutual security during the fiscal year 1956. (Passed 251 to 123.)	Yes.
113	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 13	H. R. 6766: Conference report making appropriations for the AEC, TVA, and certain agencies of the Departments of Interior and the Army. (Passed 315 to 92.)	No.
115	...do	H. Res. 295: To provide for the consideration of H. R. 7080, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. (Passed 376 to 24.)	Yes.
116	...do	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
118	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
119	...do	H. R. 7225: To amend the Social Security Act to extend coverage to certain disabled persons who are at least 50 years old, to women at 62 years of age, and to certain disabled children over 18 years old, and to certain occupational groups. (Passed 3.2 to 31.)	Yes.
120	...do	Quorum call	Present.
121	...do	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
123	...do	Quorum call	Present.
124	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
125	...do	H. R. 7214: To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective Mar. 1, 1956	Yes.
126	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
127	...do	Quorum call	Present.
128	...do	Quorum call	Present.
129	...do	H. R. 7000: To agree to the conference report on the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. (Passed 315 to 78.)	Yes.
130	July 26	H. Res. 314: To provide for 3 hours debate on H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill. (Passed 274 to 128)	Yes.
131	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
132	...do	H. R. 7474: To recommit this highway bill to committee and to substitute therefor the administration bond financing proposal for highway construction. (Defeated 193 to 221.)	Yes.
133	...do	H. R. 7474: Final passage on the highway construction bill increasing certain taxes. (Defeated 123 to 292.)	No.
134	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
135	...do	H. Res. 317: To provide for 3 hours of general debate on H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. (Passed 272 to 135.)	Yes.
136	...do	Quorum call	Present.
137	...do	H. R. 6645: To recommit to committee the amendment to the Natural Gas Act. (Defeated 203 to 210.)	Yes.
138	...do	H. R. 6645: The Harris bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to remove from control of the Federal Power Commission natural gas producers and gatherers. (Passed 209 to 203.)	No.
139	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
140	...do	S. 2126: To adopt the Wolcott substitute for the Senate housing bill. (Passed 217 to 188.)	Yes.
141	...do	S. 2126: Final passage with the Wolcott substitute inserted in the housing bill. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Yes.
142	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
143	...do	H. Res. 299: To grant to the Small Business Committee an additional $35,000 for operating expenses. (Passed 231 to 134.)	No.
144	...do	S. 2576: To strengthen the power of the District Commissioners in relation to the Capital Transit Co. and to authorize repeal of the franchise of the company. (Defeated 215 to 150, a ⅔ majority being required to suspend the rules.)	No.
145	...do	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
147	...do	S. 2126: To adopt conference report on Housing Act of 1955. (Passed 187 to 168.)	No.

[1] En route to Michigan to keep an appointment. If present, would have voted "no."

[2] En route to Michigan to keep a speaking engagement. If present would have voted "yes."

The Story of TVA: More Abundant Life at the Expense of the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a recent publication, the 1955 Tennessee Valley Yearbook, which contains features of special interest to the Members, and to the public in general, in light of current discussions of public versus private power development in this area.

The yearbook is obviously designed to extoll life in the Tennessee Valley and to lure new industries to the region.

With that purpose I certainly have no quarrel.

Nor do I have any objections whatsoever to a desire on the part of the citizens of the Tennessee Valley to enjoy a more abundant life. That is the common goal of every American.

But I am getting a little fed up with the methods that are being used to expand the advantages of the Tennessee Valley at the expense of the rest of the country, including the taxpayers of the Second Congressional District of Indiana, in whose welfare I have a special interest.

We have heard a lot of irresponsible talk about the Dixon-Yates contract including shameful attempts to cast reflections on the integrity of the President of the United States in connection with this program to build a $100 million powerplant with private instead of public funds.

The President has now ordered the contract canceled for the good and simple reason that the city of Memphis has agreed to build the needed plant itself. Had such assurances been given earlier, there would have been no necessity for the Dixon-Yates arrangement, and contract termination expenses, whatever they may be, would have been spared the Federal Government.

Meanwhile, however, a desperate attempt is being made by public-power advocates, an attempt generated, if I may use that term, by extreme TVA partisans,

to create the impression that there was something dishonorable about the Government's dealings with the Dixon-Yates group.

The purpose of these efforts is to create, if possible, a political issue by discrediting President Eisenhower and the Republican administration.

The attempt is doomed to failure. The Dixon-Yates contract was a good one, honestly arrived at, which would have benefited the Government, the people of the Tennessee Valley, and the taxpayers of the whole country.

If there is an issue at all, it is that the trend toward the socialization of electric power in this country has been halted under a Republican administration and that the demands for further subsidization of one small segment of our population at the expense of the rest of our people have been successfully resisted.

The Congress has refused, and rightly so, to spend another $100 million of public funds to build a new steam generating plant at Fulton, Tenn., which would further subsidize the production of low-cost electric power, about which the 1955 Tennessee Valley yearbook speaks in such glowing terms.

So far, the Congress has invested $1.5 billion for the development of this vast power empire. This money is either collected from taxpayers all over the country, or it is borrowed.

Three percent interest on $1.5 billion is $45 million a year, a further subsidy of the TVA being borne by all our taxpayers.

Interest on the proposed $100 million steam plant at Fulton would be another $3 million a year.

That means a cost of $48 million annually to the Nation's taxpayers, in addition to the money invested.

No wonder the Tennessee Valley can offer power benefits to business, industry, agriculture, and homeowners far beyond benefits available to the rest of the country.

The first advertisement in the yearbook, a full-page affair, should be of particular interest to sections of the Nation which have lost industries in recent years.

Sponsored by the industrial committee of 100, Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce, the ad indicates that 7 new industries have invested $127 million in that community since 1948 and have invested $57 million in industrial expansions during the same period.

The advertisement is an invitation to other industries to avail themselves of the benefits of low-cost power—subsidized by the Nation's taxpayers.

A second full-page advertisement further extols the virtues and benefits of life in Chattanooga, although the sponsorship of the advertisement is not listed.

The city is described as "the Electrical Center of the South," with "the highest average annual kilowatt-hour residential consumption—9,050 kilowatt-hours—of any city of equal size or larger in the world."

The advertisement goes on to point out that—

> Power, low-cost power and plenty of it is what the people of Chattanooga demanded in 1939 when they established the publicly owned electric power board of Chattanooga.

The following statement will be interesting to the rest of the taxpayers of the country who have helped to foot the bill for this low-cost power:

> Through 1954 our customers have saved $96,191,795 (based on private power rates in 1939) in electricity costs with rates that are less than half the national average. They have used this power to enjoy better living on farms, in homes, to increase production in business and industry.

Who do you suppose made it possible for the customers of the electric power board of Chattanooga to save more than $96 million on their electric bills?

It was the taxpayers of the entire country, who supplied the $1.5 billion invested by the Congress to develop first hydroelectric power and then steam-generated power as the demand grew for cheap, subsidized electricity.

I must say the copywriters were a bit loose with the facts in another part of the advertisement when they state that "all appropriations for electric-power development are repaid to the National Government with a 6-percent-interest payment."

TVA pays no interest to the Federal Government and it does not pay normal taxes.

In fact, the editor of the Yearbook, in a presentation on page 35 of the publication, states that TVA has paid to the Federal Treasury $123 million on the original investment.

Compare that with the $1.5 billion of public money which the Federal Government has invested in TVA to date.

According to another full page advertisement sponsored by the electric power board of the city of Nashville:

> More than 22,000 homes are heated solely by electricity in the Nashville-Davidson County area—largest unit of electrically heated homes in America.
>
> Nashville folks live better with cheap, abundant electric power—

Says the advertisement.

> Life in Nashville is lighter and brighter because of cheap, convenient electric power.
>
> We earnestly advise any industry considering the establishment of a new southern factory branch, plant, or distribution warehouse to come to Nashville, where you will receive the finest electric service in the entire Nation.

The advertisement concludes with this slogan:

> In Nashville we say "Electricity: Biggest bargain in your budget."

It should be, with the rest of the Nation helping to pay for it.

I want to give credit where credit is due.

Not all of the people of the Tennessee Valley area are happy about relying on Federal handouts.

Following a recent appearance which I made on television to explain the background of the TVA development and the administration's policy with regard to further expansion of power facilities in that area, I received a number of letters and telegrams from all over the country from people who agreed with that policy.

Some of these communications were from the Tennessee Valley region. One, postmarked from Knoxville, comments in part:

> I heartily agree with your views on TVA on Today program this morning. All honest people agree with you. * * * I buy my own shoes with no help from 41 States.

Even the editor of the 1955 Tennessee Valley Yearbook recognizes that a situation exists which should not continue, pointing out on page 37 of the publication that—

> Sooner or later we must live within our income; we should repay to the United States Treasury the full cost of TVA for the good of our souls.

Cutting through the smokescreen of misrepresentations, innuendoes, false charges, and sly insinuations, the issue can be defined as whether the taxpayers of the country are going to be required to underwrite the continued expansion of public power for a favored section of the country, whether that expansion shall continue until we have completely socialized the power industry in America, or whether we are going to realize that "cheap" public power is a myth, an illusion created by the fact that many are paying for the benefits of a few.

It is time we heeded the logic of President Eisenhower who wrote, in a letter to the Honorable STERLING COLE, of New York, at that time chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

> My general thinking on the subject is this: it seems to me that all arguments for the construction by the Federal Government for the additional steam plant ignore this one and very important truth. If the Federal Government assumes responsibility in perpetuity for providing the TVA area with all the power it can accept, generated by any other means whatsoever, it has a similar responsibility with respect to every other area and region and corner of the United States of America.

No one quarrels with the original purpose of the TVA: to promote flood control, navigation and recreation in the area and to dispose of the surplus power generated incidentally.

But we have now arrived at the point where more than twice as much power is being generated by auxiliary steam plants as is being generated by the hydroelectric installations.

President Eisenhower also wisely pointed out in his budget message earlier this year that—

> To the greatest extent possible, the responsibility for resource development, and its cost, should be borne by those who receive the benefits.

The President has also suggested that studies be made looking to legislation which will provide "that an adequate rate of interest be paid to the Treasury on appropriated funds invested in power facilities in the Tennessee Valley Authority."

I think that proposal is sound.

It is time that TVA stands on its own feet.

It is time that the people of this region show an appreciation of the advantages already given them, meeting their obligations to the rest of the Nation's taxpayers by reimbursing the United States Treasury at an equitable rate.

I am glad the people of Memphis have decided to proceed with the construction of a powerplant to supply their own needs.

As long as they are willing to invest their own money, pay interest on the funds they borrow, pay back the principle and work out the manifold problems of such an enterprise without coming to the Federal Government for subsidies, I say more power to them.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, this spring I issued a questionnaire to each family of registered voters in my district. The response to this questionnaire was tremendous, and the replies have been most helpful to me. The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. Are you in favor of the United States defending: (1) Formosa and the Pescadores Islands? Yes, 79 percent; no, 15.2 percent; no opinion, 5.8 percent. (2) The islands of Quemoy and Matsu off the coast of China? Yes, 45.5 percent; no, 41 percent; no opinion, 13.5 percent.

2. Should we grant more foreign aid, 10.5 percent; less foreign aid, 49 percent; or the same amount as during the past year, 30.4 percent? No opinion, 10.1 percent.

3. Should there be an expanded program of Federal aid for school construction? Yes, 76.9 percent; no, 19.5 percent; no opinion, 3.6 percent.

4. Do you favor the military reserve program recommended by the President to supplement the present selective-service program? Yes, 73.7 percent; no, 16.5 percent; no opinion, 9.8 percent.

5. In view of the Post Office Department deficit:

(a) Do you favor raising the first-class postal rate to 4 cents? Yes, 50 percent; no, 42.4 percent; no opinion, 7.6 percent.

(b) Do you favor raising the air-mail postal rate to 7 cents? Yes, 58 percent; no, 34.5 percent; no opinion, 7.5 percent.

(c) Do you favor raising second- and third-class postal rates? Yes, 68.4 percent; no, 25.7 percent; no opinion, 5.9 percent.

6. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes, 15.3 percent; no, 78.5 percent; no opinion, 6.2 percent.

7. (a) Should Alaska be granted statehood? Yes, 81.6 percent; no, 13.7 percent; no opinion, 4.7 percent.

(b) Should Hawaii be granted statehood? Yes, 82.1 percent; no, 13.3 percent; no opinion, 4.6 percent.

8. Do you favor the President's recommendation that the Federal Government reinsure private and nonprofit health insurance plans? Yes, 57 percent; no, 30.9 percent; no opinion, 12.1 percent.

9. Should the minimum wage be increased to 90 cents, 21.8 percent; $1, 34.6 percent; $1.25, 21.1 percent; or left at 75 cents, 17.9 percent? No opinion, 4.6 percent.

10. Should the Taft-Hartley Act be amended, 38.3 percent; repealed, 14.2 percent; or left as is, 39.4 percent? No opinion, 8.1 percent.

11. Should the Federal Government put the Dixon-Yates contract into effect, 25.8 percent; or cancel it, 26.9 percent; or do you have no preference on it, 47.3 percent?

12. Although the budget is not balanced, do you believe there should be a cut in income taxes this year? Yes, 28.9 percent; no, 68.1 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

13. Should the voting age be lowered from 21 to 18 years? Yes, 36.8 percent; no, 60.6 percent; no opinion, 2.6 percent.

14. What type of farm-price supports do you favor? Flexible (75 percent to 90 percent), 59.2 percent; rigid (90 percent), 7.3 percent; none, 25 percent? No opinion, 8.5 percent.

15. If you are a Federal Government civilian employee, do you favor extension of social-security coverage to all Federal Government employees? Yes, 24.3 percent; no, 10.7 percent; no opinion, 65 percent.[1]

16. Should tariffs be lowered, 32.5 percent; raised, 10.4 percent; or left as they are, 42.6 percent? No opinion, 14.5 percent.

[1] Question not applicable because of non-Federal employment.

It Is a Myth Scientists Can Make Progress Only in an Atmosphere of Complete Freedom—Communist Scientists Are Outstripping Us in Some Fields Although Working in Complete Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following challenging article by David Shea Teeple, who is a former Assistant to Louis L. Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is reprinted from Human Events of July 30, 1955:

SCIENCE, SECRECY, AND SECURITY
(By David Shea Teeple)

At the present time we are in the midst of a full-scale onslaught on the United States security program. There is every reason to believe that the attack will be successful and that further revisions to weaken the program are inevitable.

Led by the usual groups, with the addition of some strange bedfellows, the liberal segment of the American press is thundering denunciation of the infringement of the security program on the civil liberties of the American people. Security through progress and not through secrecy seems to be the keynote of the present attacks.

Those who have had experience with security programs will not dispute that they infringe on civil liberties. To require an investigation of an individual before he can be employed or retained in employment is to set into motion a chain of events which is bound to violate personal privacy, probably the most precious of civil liberties.

The only justification for any security program is the recognition of an existing danger to the society. In order to protect and perpetuate the social entity, the people by law authorize temporary infringements upon the civil liberties of the individual citizen. The suspension of the right of habeas corpus, in certain instances as provided by the Constitution, is the more obvious example of such a temporary relinquishment of a personal right.

Admittedly the administration of any security system is an extremely difficult assignment. As free people we should be constantly critical of a security program. We should be ever vigilant to see that there is a necessity for the program and that the results obtained from the program justify the sacrifices made.

There is one facet of the present assault on the security program which seems to be specious in nature. Since it is the most widespread and persuasive criticism, it deserves very close examination.

The statement has been made, and repeated by responsible persons over and over again, that secrecy, security, and science are irreconcilable. Dr. Karl T. Compton, one of the leading men of science and holder of many important Government positions, stated in 1949 that:

"Unfortunately, secrecy and progress are mutually incompatible. This is always true of science, whether for military purposes or otherwise. Science flourishes and scientists make progress in an atmosphere of free inquiry and free interchange of ideas, with the continual mutual stimulation of active minds working in the same or related fields. Any imposition of secrecy in science is like application of a brake to progress."

Prof. Walter Gellhorn in a book entitled "Security, Loyalty, and Science," subsidized by a Rockefeller Foundation grant to Cornell University, states:

"The hope for science in this country and for the Nation's security is that the public at large will shed its fears, grow in understanding, and cease credulously accepting assertions that safety lies in secrecy. Secrecy is antithetical to the spirit of science. It is socially hurtful. Only for brief periods can it be practiced without destroying the scientific superiority it is intended to preserve."

Dr. Vannevar Bush in Modern Arms and Free Men gives an example of the stifling effect of secrecy and security in the following words:

"Why were they [the Germans] so far behind [in atomic-bomb research]? Bombing and the destruction of needed industrial facilities account for some of the lag. Limited availability of critical materials accounts for some. But the real reason is that they were regimented in a totalitarian regime. * * * The whole affair was shot through with suspicion, intrigue, arbitrary power, formalism, as will be all systems that depend for their form and functioning upon the nod of a dictator. It did not get to first base in the attempt to make an atomic bomb."

We have been told that the lifeblood of science is the open interchange of information within the scientific fraternity. It is frequently said that the very existence of a security program in Government has prevented our scientists from entering into Government work and has further resulted in a lack of desire on the part of our young men and women to pursue courses of scientific education at our colleges and universities.

Almost all of the scientific journals have attacked the security program and have warned the American people that progress and secrecy are irreconcilable. The American public has accepted this thesis because it is in accordance with our heritage and tradition.

Upon close examination, however, it will not hold water.

Even the most caustic critics of our present security program will admit that ours is mild and extremely well balanced in comparison to the Soviet system. The absolute police state with compartmentalization, classification, and secrecy exists within the Soviet Union and has existed under that system for the last 30 years. If the major premise of these critics of the security program is correct, how can we account for

the astounding series of exposes to which we have recently been subjected? For example:

1. Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and, therefore, presumably knowledgeable, stated on June 1, 1955, that:

"In the field of science the Soviets have made rapid progress and their accomplishments here should not be minimized; least of all by those who are directly concerned with our national security. * * * It is well to note that the Soviets are now turning out more university graduates in the sciences and engineering than we are—about 120,000 to 70,000 in 1955. In round numbers, the Soviets will graduate about 1,200,000 in the sciences in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, while the comparable United States figures will be about 900,000."

He further states that scientific and technical education in the Soviet Union today presents a challenge to the free world.

The education editor of the New York Times, Mr. Benjamin Fine, in commenting on Mr. Allen Dulles' remarks, says that the caliber of training which the Soviets receive is rapidly approaching ours and, in some respects, may even surpass it.

2. Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of Columbia University School of Engineering, referring to Russian technical training, says, "We have almost lost the battle for scientific manpower."

3. On May 18, 1955, Brig. Gen. Woodbury M. Burgess, Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence of the Continental Air Defense Command, said, "The Russian Air Force is currently at least as good as ours, possibly better." He added that he was afraid that "the Russians are ahead of us in the effort to perfect the guided missile."

4. The Defense Department has announced that the Soviets have developed a turbo-prop bomber and an all-weather jet fighter incorporating radar and other electronic equipment. The announcement implies that the Soviet radar network may be at least as good as ours, if not better. According to some supposed experts, the Russians have a jet engine twice as powerful as any we possess. Senator SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, has stated repeatedly that the Soviets are not only challenging us in the development of big bombers but probably leading us in the development of the intercontinental guided missile.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Military Application Subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, is very disturbed about the rapid progress the Soviet Union is making in the field of airpower. In a letter to the Secretary of Defense dated June 27, 1955, Senator JACKSON states:

"Six years ago American air-atomic might was incontestable * * * yet the Soviets broke our atomic monopoly in 1949—years before the expected date. * * * What concerns me * * * is my fear that if the present trends continue the Soviets will be demonstrably ahead of us in airpower—both quantitatively and qualitatively—5 years from now. * * * The Soviets have been narrowing the technological gap between our two nations with awesome speed."

The Senator then addressed a series of questions to the Secretary of Defense concerning the development of Soviet airpower, continental missiles, and intercontinental ballistic missiles, and requested that the Secretary's reply be as "explicit and categorical as possible, since the very survival of our Nation may hinge upon remaining decisively and unquestionably ahead of the Soviets in this field."

5. The President of the United States admitted in June 1955 that we have grossly underestimated the Soviets in the past. Newsmen covering his press conference gathered the impression that there was no reason to believe that the Soviets would not continue to forge ahead until they gain air superiority in the immediate future.

6. To further shock the complacent, Mr. Erik Bergaust, of Aero Digest, recently writes that the Russians have been hard at work on photonic rockets (propulsion created by light beams). If successful, this would be the optimum power source for flight above the atmosphere and in space. According to Mr. Bergaust, this is a subject largely neglected in the United States.

7. The optimism of those who felt that secrecy would strangle science in the Soviet Union was rudely dispelled by the rapid development within that country of the atomic bomb and hydrogen bomb.

It should be clear from the recitation of the above examples (there are many more) that scientific progress is not stifled by secrecy or security provisions, despite what security critics say to the contrary. Even Dr. Bush's criticism of the German's lack of progress in atomic energy, upon examination, is faulty; to say that the Germans did not develop the atomic bomb because of the Nazi regime is to leave unexplained the method whereby they developed the V-2 and the Snorkel submarine under the same tyrannical and regimented society.

To complete the record, mention should be made of the fact that the development of the atomic program of the United States was carried out under the most rigorous of security precautions. Although there were the usual complaints from the scientists, the fact is that under the security restrictions of the Manhattan district scientific developments were compressed into a period of several years, which under normal circumstances might have taken many decades. This example alone should be convincing proof that the thesis concerning secrecy and science is erroneous.

While the United States scientists have published tens of thousands of papers on past and present scientific developments, there has been practically nothing emanating from the U. S. S. R.

Obviously, if there was only one scientist in the world, there would be no need for publication of research findings. By the same token, optimum progress could be made in world science if all scientists in every country published all of their findings. However, great advantage accrues to the Soviets under the present one-way-street arrangement.

It is admitted that even the scientists and engineers in Russia must qualify in communism as well as in science. They are as regimented, indoctrinated, and controlled as it is possible to be in a police state. If the critics of our security system are correct in their major premise, Russian science should be primitive. Yet one of the realities of our times is that Russian science, far from being backward, poses a threat to our very existence.

As stated before, any security system is an infringement on personal rights and should be constantly examined, reevaluated, and revised to protect the liberties of our people. It would be foolhardy and dangerous, however, to accept as valid a criticism of the security program which has no basis in fact. In the light of reported Russian scientific progress, where are the facts to prove the contention that secrecy, security, and science are irreconcilable? Perhaps in the still of the night American scientists should give some more thought to this question before they accept as axiomatic a statement which might not only be inaccurate but possibly dangerous to the future of western civilization.

Perhaps those who continue to urge that we tell all, while the Soviets tell nothing, are unknowingly contributing to their own destruction.

The Seamy Side of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I include the following enlightening article by Henry Hazlitt as it appeared in the August 1, 1955, editorial of Newsweek:

THE SEAMY SIDE OF TVA
(By Henry Hazlitt)

One wonders whether the hue and cry that Democrats have raised over an alleged Dixon-Yates scandal is intended to divert public attention away from the failure of TVA and from the deceptions practiced to put over and extend that and many other socialized power projects.

In the 218-page report of the Hoover Commission, and in the 1,783-page report of the tack force under Admiral Moreell on which the final Commission report was in large part based, we now have a mine of material exposing some of the misleading estimates and unkept promises by which Congress and the taxpayers were induced to undertake many public-power projects. There is not space enough here to cite more than a few random examples from the Hoover Commission report.

Among these are the persistent underestimates of Government engineers concerning the real cost of these projects. "In the field of reclamation the original estimated cost of the 90 projects (outside the Missouri Basin) was $1,580 million, and in 1952, the estimated cost at completion was $3,317 million. The cost of the reclamation portion of the Missouri River Basin project was estimated in 1944 at $350 million. In 1953, the same work was estimated at $3,717 million, an increase of about 343 percent." Only a small percentage of these increases was owing to soaring prices.

"A report to the House Committee on Public Works, rendered by its subcommittee to study civil works, in December 1952, states that the TVA reports its costs had exceeded its estimates by only 3.1 percent. But an examination of a 1936 report of the Authority showed that later estimates for Kentucky Dam exceeded the original by 93.6 percent; for Fort Loudoun Dam, by 74.7 percent; and for Fontana Dam, by 137.7 percent."

In a group of Bureau of Reclamation proposed projects the construction costs of irrigated land averaged $509 per acre for land that had an average market value of less than $150 per acre even with the full water supply.

Under the Constitution, Congress has authority to control navigable streams and floods, but no discoverable right to build hydroelectric powerplants. This has led to the development of the shrewd doctrine that hydroelectric power may be developed and sold by the Federal Government to the extent that it is incidental to flood control and navigation. It has also led, as the Hoover Commission report points out, to a bookkeeping allocation of all the costs possible to flood control and irrigation rather than power.

The Hoover task group laid down certain criteria for determining the real success or failure of Federal power projects: They ought to earn 3 percent interest annually to insure return of Federal borrowing costs. The investment should be properly amortized. The projects should pay local taxes equal to those of private utilities. Earnings of Federal projects should

include an amount equal to the Federal tax exemptions, based on the tax payments of private utilities. With such an honest yardstick, the TVA would show a deficit of $30 million in the fiscal year 1953 and an accumulated deficit up to that time of $100 million. The principal groups of Federal projects would show a cumulative deficit of $332 million.

The Hoover Commission points out that the Federal taxpayer is subsidizing these projects. Less than 10 percent of the total population will be directly benefited even when the programs are completed. This means that 90 percent of citizens are forced to subsidize an arbitrarily favored 10 percent. The task group estimates that the Federal projects are selling power on the average at about 50 percent below its real cost.

Finally, while hydroelectric powerplants were built under the pretense that they were merely incidental to navigation and flood control, the TVA has now embarked upon an expansion of its power-generating capacity beyond hydroelectric plants by the building of steam plants.

The moral indignation of the zealots for socialized power at the Dixon-Yates contract seems misplaced.

Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PANAMA CANAL

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I received tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of July 12 and mailed a copy to the Panama American. There is a great deal of local enthusiasm for the support you have been giving to the non-Panama Canal segment of the Canal Zone community.

Until very recent years the armed services were sent to the Canal Zone to defend the canal from hostile action. Under the present-day policy of the GAO, Father Confessors to the Panama Canal Company, the defensive role has been more or less superseded. Today the armed services are a Government cow stabled in the Canal Zone to be milked by the Panama Canal Company for the sake of showing a bookkeeper's profit on operations. Uncle Sam takes money out of his pocket to buy defense for the canal, but before guns or bombs can be bought the Panama Canal Company gets its very considerable share of the budget. There is a heavy charge for sending military dependents to Canal Zone schools, there is the almost frightening charge per person for treatment in the Canal Company's hospitals—in fact, the military can scarcely use the sidewalks without being in danger of having to pay the canal people a couple of bucks for the right.

I told you in a recent letter that the Governor claimed that the canal did all the employing of local labor for the Armed Forces as well as the Panama Canal Company. Since then a definite campaign has been underway to do that very thing. It seems fantastic. The idea probably represents to the master minds of the canal an opportunity to get additional income from the armed services. In this connection, it should be noted that anything the Canal does costs more than the same job would cost when done either privately or by another Government agency. Only in the last few months the armed services were compelled to turn their garbage-collection machinery over to the Panama Canal Company. This service was operated by the Army at an annual cost of $90,000, prorated to the 3 services. Under the present arrangement inferior garbage-collection service is performed by the Canal Company for $105,000 per year.

This sort of thing is happening all the time. The people you refer to (as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clipping) as "later-day marvels" are doing so many marvelous things in the way of bookkeeping legerdemain that we who live here are only a little less astounded than were the Japanese when the first atom bomb fell.

Why? Why? Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech by L. J. Howell entitled "Why? Why? Why?" delivered by him on May 25, 1955.

Mr. Howell is an outstanding teacher of vocational agriculture. He lives at Reform in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

I commend his speech to the reading of the membership:

WHY? WHY? WHY?

(By L. J. Howell)

This is a rapidly changing world—why? In less than 350 years the United States has come from a small shipload of men to 165 million free American citizens—the greatest nation on earth. We have enough automobiles for everyone to be on the highways at one time.

We have more labor-saving devices and a higher standard of living than any other people in the world. Why?

We have free enterprise, free speech, freedom of religion, press, radio and television. Why? Freedom of franchise places the political power in the hands of the common people.

All of these inalienable rights exercised by the votes of the liberty-loving people have made it possible for free thinking, public education, invention, and scientific research. But all of these factors are not the real reason.

In the beginning of our Nation, and all down the 3½ centuries, our Presidents, the Congress, our governors, and our legislatures have always invoked Divine guidance. "If God be with us, who can be against us." and as long as our people put God first in their affairs, we shall always win.

We believe in all the mentioned freedoms and one more—freedom from fear. We do not believe in aggression or oppression; but we will keep our Nation prepared to oppose them. We believe in progress and happiness of our people and all other peoples.

WE HAVE PROGRESSED. WHY, HOW?

We were all farmers in the beginning—Adam, Eve, and their sons; likewise, as a human race, we were all farmers in this great country in our beginning as a nation. Necessity, the mother of invention, has caused many changes. Production of food, fiber, and shelter is and always will be primary. Every one depends upon the farmer first. Our Nation has gradually changed from an agricultural nation to a highly industrial nation. As progress has been made in the fields of agriculture, so has progress been made in the different lines of industry.

Agriculture depends upon industry, improved machinery and better means of transportation of farm commodities to the markets of the world. All nonfarm workers depend upon the farmer for food, fiber, and shelter.

FEWER FARMERS AND MORE OF OTHERS

In 1787, the year when the 13 Original Colonies or States met in Philadelphia in a convention to organize the United States and draw up our Constitution, how many farmers were there? Practically all of them were farmers. At that time 19 farmers made a living for themselves and one nonfarm person.

In 1920 each farm worker produced enough for himself and seven other people. Now, each farm worker, according to figures given out by Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, produces enough food for himself and 18 other people.

In 1920, 34 years ago, there were 13.4 million farm workers; now, there are only 8.5 million farm workers. These 8.5 million farm workers feed themselves and in addition feed 156,500,000 nonfarm people. After all of these are fed, there still has accumulated a huge surplus of food and fiber in this country.

Our horse and mule population has dwindled from 25.7 million to only 5 million. Four million nine hundred thousand farm workers have left the farms. There are 20.7 million less horses and mules to feed than in 1920. This means that there are more than 60 million more acres of land to divert to production of human food. Much of this land has been used for grain production; much of it to pasture. Now, 8½ million farmers are making 30 percent more food than 13.4 million did 34 years ago.

WHY? WHY? WHY?

Why all the above changes? As already stated, education has played a great part. When people are educated, their desires for a higher standard of living are increased. People read more, travel more, see more, make more money per hour of labor; therefore, want more and actually buy more of what industry has for them.

Research has discovered new drugs, new insecticides, new disease preventives, as well as antibiotics for both man and animals; better balanced foods and feed for man and farm animals. Many new inventions have reduced drudgery and increased production per man-hour of labor.

Some other reasons for increased production of food and fiber per man-hour of labor; knowing proper kind and amount of fertilizer requirements; use of hybrid seed corn; better varieties of other field crops, fruits, and vegetables; soil conservation and soil improvement.

Farmers are making twice as much food as they did 34 years ago; and why? Some more reasons given in numbers of different kinds of implements used in production and transportation. Thirty-four years ago, there were only 246,000 farm tractors, now there are 4.6 million farm tractors; then 139,000 trucks, now, 2,650,000 trucks; then, 10,000 corn pickers, now, 640,000 corn pickers; then, 4,000 combines, now, 950,000 combines; then 55,000 milking machines, now, 730,000 milking machines.

Today, the average farmer in the United States is making 2.4 times as much food per hour of time as he did 34 years ago. Electricity—yes, electric power has been one

of the greatest factors both in the home and on the farm. Cheaper power for all, farm, factories, and office buildings; results—better health and more happiness.

Well, the above is not all of the story Why? Why? Why? Suppose you take up from here and carry on. This story was started many years ago—it will continue as long as man lives. Inquiring minds spell progress. Why?

Dangers of Russian Peace Moves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, recently it has been my great honor and pleasure to meet possibly the last of the Polish intellectuals to flee Poland before the invasion of that country by the Russian armies, the Reverend Dr. Andrew J. Krzesinski, doctor of philosophy and doctor of theology, an eminent philosopher, an author of many books in various languages, and a Polish patriot who battled from their inception, nazism, communism, and other movements hostile to the ideals of western culture.

There is neither space nor time to detail here the numerous intellectual achievements of the Reverend Dr. Krzesinski. Suffice it to say that he has been a member of the faculty of the University of Warsaw, a professor of philosophy of the University of Cracow; that he has traveled widely in Palestine, Egypt, and the principal countries of the Far East, where he lectured in all the great universities and conferred with their leaders including Gandhi, Nehru, and others playing an important part in the political and social life of those lands.

These studies and contacts, including a visiting professorship of philosophy in the University of Montreal and other universities on the American continent have qualified the Reverend Dr. Krzesinski to throw light upon the cataclysmic events afflicting the world today.

Since he is a recognized authority, not only on philosophy but also on the subject of culture and civilization, I have asked the Reverend Dr. Krzesinski to give to this Congress the benefit of his vast knowledge and experience as to the dangers to the free world of the current Russian peace moves, which I have the honor of presenting, as follows:

Many people in the United States of America and in Great Britain think that the smiles and the kindness of Soviet Russia's representatives are a sign of their good will and of their real desire for an international peace. Such an opinion is not justifiable. It is based on a superficial knowledge of Russian communism, for the essential goal of Soviet Russia is to dominate the entire world. The persons ruling Soviet Russia and their tactics may change, but the political goal remains the same. It is unchangeable.

Let us not forget that Soviet Russia's representatives started to smile and to be genteel not until their great efforts to stop the rearmament of Western Germany and its ratification by the French Parliament seemed futile.

Then suddenly they changed their tactics, and have been trying to obtain indirectly what they could not obtain directly. The smiles and the kindness in this respect have to be helpful. And we must confess that with these new tactics they have been very successful.

First, the treaty of independence and neutralization of Austria is for them very advantageous. They have to receive great amounts of money which mostly comes from the United States of America, and the whole Austrian territory has to be free of the Allied armies. When the suitable time comes, they will, in this country, not find any military resistance from the part of the Allied military forces, and the whole Austrian territory would be taken within a few hours.

Second, at the Geneva Conference, with smiles and assurances, public as well as confidential, they provoked in the United States of America and in Great Britain some kind of relaxation and hopes for an international peace. The whole system of defense in these countries has been slackened and weakened, when, at the same time, in Soviet Russia and in its satellite countries very great efforts have been made to strengthen and discipline the armies, and to increase their war potentiality to the highest degree.

Soviet Russia's representatives do everything possible to stop the rearmament of Western Germany, to unite it under their own terms, with Eastern Germany, and to neutralize the reunited Germany in the same way as they did Austria.

At the same time, they try to neutralize France, Italy, and all other countries of Europe. In this way they are preparing themselves to be succesful when they are ready to attack the free countries of Europe, of America and other continents. All such neutralized countries deprived of allied armies would be invaded within a few days without great Communist military losses.

The illusion of an international peace provoked by smiles and kindness of Soviet Russia's representatives are for the whole free world very dangerous.

If Soviet Russia's rulers would have a real peace, they must prove it with facts not only with smiles. The only way of proving it is the restoration of freedom and complete independence to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Lithuania and to all other countries invaded and enslaved by them.

This would be the first step for a real international peace.

Another step would be disarmament under an international control.

Unless Soviet Russia's rulers, with such steps, prove the sincerity of their desire for an international peace, we must be prepared for the worst, and not allow ourselves to be guided by illusions.

Outstanding Performance of Metropolitan Police During Transit Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many favorable comments about the fine courteous job the police are doing in Washington during the transit strike. They have handled the traffic in an admirable manner, and in spite of their greatly increased duties and the hot weather, they have remained friendly, courteous, and efficient. I think I am only voicing the general feeling of all of us that theirs is a work that is being well done.

Increased Rates of Compensation for Veterans and Reinstatement of National Service or Government Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of increased rates of compensation for dependents of veterans with service-connected disability and reinstatement of national service or Government life insurance. You will note that eligibility requirements have already been decreased from 60 percent to 50 percent disability by Public Law 339, 81st Congress, Sixty-third Statutes, chapter 900, section 4.

H. R. 5574 would enable some to obtain national service life insurance. It should be pointed out that under its provisions they would have to pass a health test. It is doubtful if veterans with 50 percent or more disability could pass such test. I, therefore, endorse H. R. 3664 under which such veterans would not be subject to a health test.

THE DISABLED VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—ARE THEY ON EQUAL FOOTING WITH THEIR FELLOW CITIZENS?

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a situation concerning our disabled veterans which is deplorable. Every man wants to see that his wife and children do not lack the necessities of life and that they have all of the good things which he can secure for them. Yet our totally disabled veterans lie in hospitals faced with the knowledge that they can do little or nothing to provide their families with even the bare necessities of life. Still other veterans with 50 percent or more disability find that they can only work part time at only the lowest paid jobs and are hardly able to provide even the necessities let alone the one or two small luxuries which we all expect as a matter of course.

In 1948 with the enactment of Public Law 877, 80th Congress, Congress recognized that the veteran with 60 percent or more disability needed help in supporting his family and provided additional compensation for his dependents as follows for totally disabled veterans with a proportion of the amounts for the partially disabled with 60 percent or more disability:

Wife, no child	$21.00
Wife, 1 child	35.00
Wife, 2 children	45.50
Wife, 3 or more children	56.00
No wife, 1 child	14.00
No wife, 2 children	24.50
No wife, 3 or more children	35.00
Each dependent parent	17.50

On October 10, 1949, in Public Law 339, 81st Congress, the Congress included veterans with 50 percent or more disability.

Having recognized the principle that the seriously disabled veteran needs and deserves help in supporting his family, we have promptly forgotten it. In spite of the fact that the cost of living has increased year by year, these rates have not been increased. It is true that for the veteran himself we have passed increased pensions, now amounting to $181 as compared to $115 at the end of World War II. But Mr. Speaker, it is now time to step back and take a look at the whole situation which includes the veteran and his family. While we have been preoccupied with increasing his pension, he has been forced to devote an increasing amount to the support of his loved ones. By failing to increase the rates for his dependents since 1948 we have actually failed of accomplishment of our objective, that is, to place our disabled veteran in the same competitive position with respect to his fellow citizens, as if he too had not been called upon to make the sacrifice he did made in the service of his country.

At this point I am going to quote from a letter I received from a disabled veteran in my district. I am sure each of you gentlemen have received from time to time many letters of a similar nature. I quote:

I have been more than "considerably under the weather" for some time which necessitated another stomach operation during the latter part of March, performed in the veterans' hospital in Erie. That was the third such operation, all service-connected, of course, from World War II.

* * * * *

Fourteen dollars a month is hardly sufficient to buy the milk for one child. In my case, my wife and I are separated, my children are with my father and I get the amount of $24.50 for 2 children. The rent (excluding clothing, allowances, medical or dental bills and miscellaneous) is $70 per month—and I receive but $24.50. Both are in school, so you can see what it does to my check. This is a general problem and certainly not confined to the undersigned.

Our disabled veterans are proud men. They do not want a handout. They only want to compete on an equal footing with their fellow citizens. We must see to it that inadequate aid for his dependents does not rob the veteran of the benefits more generously provided by the Congress for the veteran himself.

DISABLED VETERANS—REINSTATEMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE AND GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE LOST THROUGH NO FAULT OF THEIR OWN

Mr. Speaker, I have already made a statement respecting the need to increase the rates for dependents of our disabled veterans with 50 percent or more disability. There is one more aspect of the disabled veterans' problem to which I wish to call your attention.

Veterans with 50 percent or more disability have a very hard struggle, because of their disability, to find and keep steady employment. Every one of them at times finds himself faced with unemployment, either because he is unable by reason of his disability to obtain other than a temporary or part-time job or because of the necessity of further hospitalization. Mr. Speaker, during those periods of unemployment, our seriously disabled veterans and particularly those with families and dependents find that it takes every penny that they can scrape together and more to keep going and to keep their families going. As a result many of our disabled veterans have been forced to give up their national service life insurance for the simple reason that they just did not have the money to continue the premiums and still continue to furnish their families with the necessities of life.

I have, as I am sure you have also, received letters from disabled veterans in my district who would like the chance to obtain this insurance again. They, however, are prevented from applying by the provisions of section 619 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, see United States Code, section 38, page 820, which prohibits the issuance of such insurance after April 25, 1951. I feel that this section should be amended to give our disabled veterans, who have lost their insurance through sheer necessity and through no fault of their own, another opportunity to obtain such insurance. In addition, I feel that our veterans who have suffered disabilities in our country's cause should not be discriminated against in obtaining such insurance by being required to pass a health test.

Undoubtedly, some of our veterans whose disabilities are slight could pass such a test. Those, however, who have suffered most, whose disabilities are the greatest, could not possibly pass such test. They would be precluded by the very sacrifice which they have made for their country from obtaining the insurance. I therefore feel that section 619 should be amended in such a way that the disabled veteran would not be penalized by his disability. I therefore endorse H. R. 3664.

Our Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1955, the 42d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C. The highlight of the convention was a banquet with representatives from 46 of the 48 States of the Union present and representatives from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska. At this session was read a most interesting and important message from the President of the United States, dealing with the utilization of our water resources. Under unanimous consent, I reproduce this message herein for the information of the Members of this Congress:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 27, 1955.

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR OVERTON: I should prefer to convey personally to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress my congratulations and best wishes on the occasion of its 42d annual convention. Since, however, I cannot be there, I have asked my Secretary, Mr. Shanley, to bring my cordial greetings to everyone in attendance.

The problem of assuring our people of adequate water has become of utmost importance to every one of us. In my remarks to your group a year ago, I mentioned that the administration was embarking upon an effort to coordinate and increase the efficiency of the many Federal activities which impinge upon this problem. Since then a special advisory committee on water-resources policy has been hard at work, and I have received regular reports on its progress. I am satisfied that its recommendations—soon to become publicly available—will constitute a valuable basis for the improvement of our national water-resources policy. While many improvements can be made by administrative action, major changes will, of course, require congressional action. There will thus be ample opportunity for public review of basic revisions in national policy.

The tremendous proportions of this task are well known to your congress. No organization at any level of government or outside the Government can perform the task alone. The best efforts of all groups, at the local, State, and Federal levels, working in harmony toward the common goal, will be required. I know that in this undertaking the National Rivers and Harbors Congress will continue to play a significant and valuable role.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Supplemental Income for Recipients of Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include Senate Joint Resolution 10 adopted on June 27, 1955, by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of Illinois:

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Whereas the Federal social-security law permits recipients of old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments to supplement these benefits by earning up to a specified amount in covered employment without a loss of such benefits; and

Whereas such provision encourages those who can do so to engage in productive employment; and

Whereas the Federal law governing grants to States for old-age assistance does not allow such supplementary earnings without a loss of benefits; and

Whereas the basic purpose of the two programs—old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance—is the same, namely to safeguard against old-age dependency: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to make provisions which would permit recipients of old-age assistance to supplement their old-age assistance benefits by earning an amount equal to that permitted recipients of old-age and survivors insurance benefits without a loss

of such benefit, by and with the consent of the legislatures of the respective States which have State old-age assistance plans; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, and to each Member of the House of Representatives in the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the senate June 27, 1955.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives June 30, 1955.

WARREN T. WOOD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Averaging Taxable Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 7837, to provide greater equity in our tax structure by permitting the averaging of taxable income by individuals over a 6-year period.

It has long been recognized that the bunching of income creates one of the most serious inequities under our present tax system. Individuals who experience a concentration, or bunching, of income in 1 year are taxed much more heavily than those who reecive the same income over a period of years.

Our tax rates are generally based on the principle of ability to pay. But this basic principle is violated when an individual is subjected to rates, ranging as high as 91 percent, which bear no relation to his ability to pay if that ability were determined realistically over a period longer than 1 year.

This injustice is prevalent throughout the American economy. The farmer who struggles along on a small income for many years and then has one big crop is taxed in the good year as if he had been earning that level of income consistently. The same is true of the small-business man whose enterprise suddenly becomes successful. It also applies to the professional man, the performing artists, the writter, or the employee whose efforts over many years are rewarded with increased compensation.

In planning our tax laws, we should recognize that our economic system is highly dynamic. Our tax sturcture should take account of this fundamental fact and allow an appropriate adjustment to those whose income fluctuates sharply from year to year. The present rate structure more or less assumes a static level of income and penalizes those who by their extra efforts, increase their income at a sharply accelerated pace. In many areas of business enterprise, the effect of the present system may be to act as a deterrent to increased output within a single year because of the extra heavy taxes which will be incurred.

The problem of averaging income has been approached tentatively at several points in the Internal Revenue Code but there is no overall provision which is generally applicable. For example, sections 1301–1304 allow an individual who performs services over a period of 36 months or more to spread the income received there from over the 36-month period. These provisions, however, apply only if 80 percent or more of the income is attributable to the services received in 1 taxable year.

Another averaging provisions, section 72 (e) (3), applies to the proceeds of endowment policies or face amount certificates which are paid off in 1 year. The recipient of the income may spread it over a 3-year period.

The 1954 code added section 481 (b), relating to inventory adjustments, which permits the amount of the adjustment to be included in the taxable income of the year of receipt and the 2 preceding taxable years.

The new estates and trusts subchapter of the 1954 code contains a so-called 5-year throwback rule in section 666, which has some of the characteristics of averaging with respect to the recipient of a distribution of accumulated income.

This brief summary by no means covers all of the provisions of existing law which attempt in some fashion to ameliorate the rigidity of the annual accounting concept. There are many other provisions, such as the installment-sales provisions and the capital-gains sections, which are concerned in part with the same problem.

However, all of the present provisions are geared to one or more specific situations. There is a fundamental need, as I have indicated, for a provision which is applicable to all taxpayers regardless of their occupation and the source of their income.

Many leading tax writers and practitioners have recognized the inequity and gone on record in favor of the principle of tax averaging. The main obstacle has been the lack of any sound, workable proposal which would permit averaging of income without causing excessive administrative complexities.

The bill which I have submitted, and which is intended primarily as a basis for study and analysis, provides a very simple form of averaging. An individual who has a substantial increase in income in any one year would be allowed to spread the increase over the taxable year and the 5 preceding years. His tax on the increase would be computed on the lower rates applicable to the preceding years.

The bill limits the adjustment to cases in which there is an increase of more than 50 percent over the income of the past 5 years. Minor fluctuations in income do not need or warrant the adjustment.

As an illustration, assume that a small-business man averages $5,000 for 5 years and in the 6th year has a $20,000 income. He would qualify for the adjustment with respect to the excess of $20,000 over $7,500—150 percent of the average income for the past 5 years. The $12,500 would be spread over a 6-year period for the purpose of computing the maximum tax in the year of receipt.

A tax averaging proposal of the type which I have described is both simple and flexible. The 5-year period moves forward constantly. Any individual who has a marked increase in taxable income would be able to qualify for the adjustment by reference to the 5 prior years of income experience.

I should like to emphasize that the proposal does not exempt any portion of taxable income or allow a preferential rate to any individual or group. It simply provides for a more realistic application of the progressive rate structure to irregular fluctuating incomes.

The proposal for tax averaging would be of benefit to millions of farmers and small-business men. It would remove some of the penalties of our present rate structure for entertainers, athletes, and others whose income characteristically fluctuates widely from year to year. The adjustment would tend to equalize the tax burden of those with irregular and those with stable incomes and provide greater incentive for maximum contribution to the economy. It would also reduce the constant pressure for many special tax relief provisions.

Resolution to Prevent Reduction in United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts requesting the Congress of the United States to prevent a reduction in force of the United States Marine Corps. This resolution was sent to Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and by him to me because of my activity in behalf of the Marine Corps.

Resolutions Memorializing Congress To Prevent the Reduction in Force of the United States Marine Corps

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has proposed a reduction in the force of the United States Marine Corps; and

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has established an outstanding record as part of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas any reduction in force of the Marine Corps at this time would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent a reduction in force of the United States Marine Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Common-

wealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted: House of Representatives, July 18, 1955.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

General Ridgway Is a Man To Be Listened To

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an Associated Press article covering the letter of General Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, addressed to Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson challenging the basic military policy of the present administration. I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary passes off the warning of the Nation's leading soldier as not very important. This statement pinpoints the problem. Politicians, and not military men, are deciding the vital questions of military requirements.

RIDGWAY CRITICISM OF ARMS POLICY TOLD

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon has ripped the secrecy label off a letter by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway sharply challenging the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration.

In one of his last official acts as Army Chief of Staff, General Ridgway lashed out with particular vigor at what he described as the administration's overemphasis on air-nuclear weapons—atomic and hydrogen bombs.

General Ridgway addressed his letter to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, who ordered it made public July 15 after its contents had leaked into print.

In its strictly military phases the letter was essentially a restatement of criticisms General Ridgway had voiced piecemeal and in less pointed terms for months before he retired June 30.

But the paratroop general gave his contentions new emphasis by putting them all together in a compilation and relating one argument to the others.

SOVIET TREND NOTED

The 10-page study of the relative military positions of the United States and its free world Allies versus the Soviet bloc made two main contentions:

1. The Communists are pursuing their worldwide aggressive course along lines not likely—and probably not intended—to bring nuclear weapons into play.

For that situation, General Ridgway said, the free world needs "an immediately available joint military force of hard-hitting character in which the versatility of the whole is emphasized and the preponderance of any one part is deemphasized."

2. Some time between 1958 and 1962 the Communists will have developed such nuclear weapons and delivery capability that "the United States nuclear-air superiority will have lost most of its present significance."

In that situation General Ridgway foresaw a nuclear stalemate, either through mutual destruction if the weapons are used or through their cancellation because neither side will employ them for fear of what the other will do in retaliation.

The letter, which had been classified "confidential" at the Pentagon, was released on orders from Mr. Wilson, who was at Quantico, Va., for his annual conference with military and civilian chiefs of the Armed Forces.

NOT VERY IMPORTANT

Mr. Wilson acted in response to inquiries by newsmen after the New York Times had quoted extensively from the letter in the July 15 edition. The Times said it had been given access to the material by "competent sources."

In telling newsmen of his order to the Army to give the letter out, Mr. Wilson commented laconically:

"I don't think it's very important."

President Eisenhower put it a little differently at a news conference some months ago. Questioned then about General Ridgway's objections to administration plans to reduce Army strength, Mr. Eisenhower said General Ridgway was expressing a "parochial" (narrow) view.

Memorandum to President Eisenhower on the Condition of the Ukrainian People in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a memorandum prepared by Mikola Lebed, secretary general for foreign affairs of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, on the occasion of the recent Geneva Conference. This memorandum was submitted to the President and deals with the captivity of over 40 million Ukrainians in the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council is the political representation in the free world of the Ukrainian underground forces in Ukraine, which is the largest non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe. It depicts the unyielding resistance of the Ukrainian people to Communist imperialism and colonialism. Because of its informative contents,I ask that this memorandum be included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JULY 12, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States of America, The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In behalf of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, the governing body of Ukrainian underground forces in Ukraine, I have the honor, in connection with the forthcoming Geneva conference and the presently conducted peace offensive by Moscow, to bring to your kind attention the following:

1. The present policy of the Soviet Government which, among others, has made the Geneva Conference possible, should be recognized as a temporary strategic diversion which does not in any manner alter the basic objectives of communism and Russian imperialism. This policy is the result of: (a) a failure of the line of general attack on all fronts pursued by the Soviet leadership immediately after the termination of World War II which had to be abandoned approximately at the time of Stalin's death; (b) following the death of Stalin, the people of the Soviet Union, who had always desired freedom, perceived a possibility of its realization and the Soviet leadership was compelled to give this matter its reluctant consideration; (c) the dictatorship has thus far not succeeded in becoming authoritatively stabilized; (d) internal difficulties of an economic nature constitute a major contributing factor to this changed strategy of the Soviet leaders; (e) every opportunity to gain some measure of freedom has been seized upon by the non-Russian peoples with particular alacrity, as witness the East German rebellion, Czech insurgence, Ukrainian underground activities, or the Vorkuta riots, to cite just a few examples.

2. The present Soviet leaders expect their policy of concessions to solve for them, at least in some measure, their main difficulties such as those of an internal nature, i. e., those enumerated under (b), (c), (d), and (e); forcing the West to abandon its military bases located at an uncomfortable proximity to the nerve-center of Moscow; neutralization of those countries which are not as yet fully committed to the Soviet camp; and by talks with the West to create an impression upon the enslaved nations of the Soviet Union that the West approves the presently existing status of enslavement and hence there is no point to their struggle against the Kremlin.

3. This does not mean that the present Soviet leadership has abandoned its long-range objective of world domination. It does mean, however, that it is committed to a most vehement pursuit of a policy of coexistence which, in view of its nonrelinquishment of basic objectives, will have to be a coexistence of a competitive nature.

4. In spite of the above-mentioned strategic diversion of new tactics adopted by the Soviet Union, its leadership does not preclude the possibility of achieving the long-range objective by means of preventive war (cf. recent articles by top military men of the Soviet Union, like General Korniyenko and Marshals Rotmistrov and Vasilevsky). These latter tactical propositions indicate that the military theories of the late Marshal Boris M. Shaposhnikov and General Svechin on the necessity of integration of the work of the General Staff with that of political leadership is being put into practice. The existence of such integration is evidenced by the following facts: (a) Intensification of military preparedness through a re-emphasis on heavy industry; (b) assurance of the Soviet Union's security through establishment of a neutralized zone along its borders in Europe and Asia; (c) moral disarmament which would weaken potential enemies by undermining their willingness to sacrifice a high standard of living in favor of armaments; (d) strengthening of Soviet intelligence work in the West by means of expanding cultural and economic relations with the West.

An effective realization of these concepts requires time. To gain this precious time the Soviet Union is now staging "the most spectacular peace movement on record" with "electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions" (quotations from a speech by M. Z. Manuilsky delivered to the graduating class of the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow, in 1931).

5. The dangers of these concepts of Soviet policy (competitive coexistence and preventive war) could be considerably minimized, or even rendered completely ineffective if the West would take full advantage of natural partners within the Soviet Union.

The internal front in the U. S. S. R. has never been liquidated, and the partner facing the West in Geneva is not merely Premier Bulganin nor his Government, but the multitude of peoples of the U. S. S. R. Thus far, the West has these peoples as its partners behind the Iron Curtain, bound to the West by ideals, whereas the Soviet leaders have to gain partners within the orbit of the West only by means of the establishment of fifth columns consisting of traitors to their own lands and civilization.

6. Whether or not these real and potential partners of the West within the Soviet Union will be able to play the role of allies is entirely up to the political leadership of the West. Thus far there are no indications that the West intends to go through with a formal diplomatic renunciation of the goal of liberation of the satellite countries, and the difference between the satellites and non-Russian Soviet republics such as Ukraine or Byelorussia being only geographic, there is no valid reason for the West to abandon these real and potential allies within the Soviet Union itself. If such an abandonment were to be considered, it would have fatal repercussions in the areas behind the Iron Curtain. This could throw the nations of the U. S. S. R. into the arms of the Kremlin against their will, an incident of history which would be a repetition of what had already happened before, during the Nazi-Soviet war. It would mean that the West approves the Kremlin's rule over these nations as its integral colonies and would dampen their will to resist the Kremlin. Thus a major part of the Soviet Union's internal troubles would be eliminated and these nations would be forced to look for the best offer from the Kremlin. Moreover, this would strengthen Bolshevik propaganda which works without cessation to convince the nations of the U. S. S. R. that the West has no other intentions toward them except to turn them into capitalist colonies.

7. Ukraine occupies a peculiar position among the nations of the U. S. S. R. In order to subdue Ukraine, which Stalin considered to be the central knot of world revolution and Russia's main economic base (Izvestia, March 14, 1918, and Pravda, October 10, 1920) Soviet Russia had to wage war against the Ukrainian National Republic for 3 years, from 1917 to 1920. Communist Moscow countered Ukrainian opposition by applying alternately unconcealed terror and tactical concessions. The premeditated famine of 1932–33 alone took over 7 million Ukrainian lives. And yet, World War II found Soviet Russia facing old and new difficulties in Ukraine. Ukrainians in the Red army surrendered in droves and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) conducted a fight for complete national independence. In this situation Stalin admitted at the time of the Yalta Conference that "his position in the Ukraine was difficult and insecure" and asked President Roosevelt to agree to admit Ukraine to membership in the U. N. "for Soviet unity" (Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Roosevelt, and the Russians at the Yalta Conference). With the objective of gaining Ukraine's adherence to the Soviet-Russian concept of attacking the West, Moscow permitted the Crimea to be annexed to Ukraine in 1953 and is waging uninterrupted psychological warfare, attempting to convince the Ukrainian people that the West is their enemy and that Ukraine's only chance is to stay together with Moscow. On the other hand, any Ukrainian opposition to Moscow is called subservience to the West.

In this situation it seems to be indicated, in raising the problem of the satellites at the Geneva Conference, for the West to find means which would permit it to assume a definite attitude toward the problem of Ukraine, whose struggle for freedom is also in the interests of the West. The particular point of emphasis here is that such a clarification of the attitude of the Western Powers toward the problem of the enslaved nations within the U. S. S. R. should give the Ukrainian people reasons to believe that the West has no intention of approving their enslavement by the U. S. S. R. by any treaty or agreement to be concluded with the Soviet Union, and that the free world is ready to aid the Ukrainian liberation movement both morally and politically.

In conclusion, it is respectfully suggested that:

The West should not be deceived by the diversion which is the basic strategy of Russia in today's changed form. Peace talks have not altered the real long-range objectives of the Kremlin.

The West must continue vigilant, increasing its strength and weakening that of the enemy to avoid the mortal danger of being taken by surprise.

The enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R. expect the Geneva Conference to make the position of the West toward the problem of their eventual liberation entirely clear, therefore an indicated strategy on the part of the West is to nurture allies within the Soviet Union itself, such as Ukraine and other enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R.

Respectfully,

MIKOLA LEBED.

Eighty-Fourth Is Cooperative Congress—"Cold War" Failed To Materialize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, confirmation of what some of us have been saying about the splendid cooperative record of the 84th Congress came this morning in editorial comments published by two independent newspapers, the Washington Post and Times Herald and Labor's Daily.

It is pertinent to point out that both editorials begin with very similar unqualified statements.

The most notable fact about the first session of the 84th Congress is that President Eisenhower's fears of a "cold war" between the White House and Capitol Hill did not materialize—

Said the Post and Times Herald.

Mr. Willard Shelton, writing in Labor's Daily, said that—

It may fairly be said that the first session of the Democratic 84th Congress kept many of its promises—

And he then goes on to praise the cooperation we gave the President in matters of foreign relations, which was the promise we made when campaigning and the promise we have kept.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include portions of the editorial from Labor's Daily and the entire editorial from the Post and Times Herald.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

COOPERATIVE CONGRESS

The most notable fact about the first session of the 84th Congress is that President Eisenhower's fears of a cold war between the White House and Capitol Hill did not materialize. The President's remark was made, of course, in the heat of the 1954 campaign, and he himself later acknowledged that his choice of words had been unfortunate. Actually there has been a large degree of cooperation between the Republican President and the Democratic Congress. On a number of issues, especially in the field of foreign policy, the Democratic majorities have given the President more support than members of his own party.

On such vital questions as the Formosa resolution, the Paris treaties and the Austrian treaty party differences were not discernible. Both parties were also firmly behind the President's efforts at Geneva. While his foreign-aid program was trimmed, it came through with a large part of what he had requested. Authority was also given to enter into reciprocal trade agreements for 3 more years. According to the Congressional Quarterly, majorities of both partics in the Senate stood with the President on 31 of the 33 issues on which votes were taken.

Credit for this sensible and constructive policy of working together for the national interest goes in considerable measure to 4 men. President Eisenhower consulted with the leaders of both parties and in general kept partisanship in the background. Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, played a role similar to that of Arthur H. Vandenberg in the Truman administration. His wise counsel and initiative helped to keep the administration looking forward in foreign affairs. And Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who missed the last month of the session because of a heart attack, consistently placed the national interest ahead of party interests in marshaling his forces. In large measure, the same can be said of Speaker RAYBURN.

In the field of domestic policy, the President was less successful in getting his program enacted. Congress defeated his highways bill as well as the Democratic substitute. The aid-to-education bill and statehood for Alaska bogged down in controversy.

Also postponed were revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Refugee Act, and the Walter-McCarran Act. The Colorado River bill was put aside in the House to avert defeat. On the other hand, Congress passed a military Reserve bill that had at one time appeared to be doomed, extended the draft for 4 years, and renewed the Defense Production Act. It raised the minimum wage to $1 an hour, and the President is likely to accept this despite the fact that it exceeds his recommendation. It increased the pay of its own Members as well as that of judges and executive personnel.

Congress corrected the investigative excesses of the previous session, but it effected no general reform of the procedures of investigating committees. The improvement was largely in the shift of control to more responsible committee chairmen. Senate investigations led to cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract and put Secretary of the Air Force Talbott on the spot, but otherwise they have made little impression on administration policy. Congress sensibly turned over the loyalty problem to a Commission on Government Security.

Although they control both Houses of Congress, the Democrats did not offer a formal legislative program. In the House there was a drive for a $20 income-tax cut, for restoration of farm price supports at 90 percent of parity, and for further liberalization of social-security benefits. These measures were clearly aimed at establishing a record for the 1956 campaign, but they were killed or put aside in the Senate. The Congress as a whole is entitled to generous thanks for keeping partisan considerations at a minimum. It has notably minimized the fear of divided control over the White House and Congress and has shown that men of good will under separate banners can work to-

gether when public-spirited leaders point the way.

[From Labor's Daily of August 2, 1955]

RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FOURTH

(By Willard Shelton)

It may fairly be said that the first session of the Democratic 84th Congress kept many of its promises.

On the overriding issue of foreign policy, the Democratic Congress freed President Eisenhower from dependence on his own Republican leaders. This may lose another election for the Democrats next year, since Mr. Eisenhower has a remarkable capacity to claim the credit, but that cannot be helped.

On the foreign policy issues the Democrats voted as their consciences required, and if it happens to assist the President politically, the safety and security of our people still commanded that they vote that way.

In the field of domestic policy, the Democratically controlled committees kept their promise to kill the Dixon-Yates contract.

The President pretends he canceled out the private-utility deal because he was finally assured, in an atmosphere of good comradeship, that the city of Memphis would build a powerplant.

This is nonsense: Memphis said all along that it simply would not accept Dixon-Yates power. The deal was killed because unendurable proofs of scandal in the handling of the contract were being piled up against the administration.

The personages involved include "assistant president" Sherman Adams, in the White House; former Budget Director Joseph Dodge; present Budget Bureau Director Rowland Hughes; J. Sinclair Armstrong, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Brig. Gen. Herbert Vogel, Eisenhower's appointee as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Administrator Lewis L. Strauss, Eisenhower's Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Not until the full record detailing the actions and conduct of each of these personages has been exposed will the Dixon-Yates story be complete.

In the legislative field—taxes, farm program, unemployment compensation, social security, housing, and education—the record of the 84th Congress is mixed.

The House, generally speaking, did a good job for the people. It passed a bill to repeal the Benson flexible farm price support policy; another bill to liberalize social security; another bill to cut income taxes at the bottom, where they should be cut.

* * * * *

There were fewer giveaways in the first session of the 84th Congress, and a new minimum wage law was passed, better than the President proposed.

The Small Family Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in the days of our fathers a certain type of hired man on the farm was described as "a great woodchopper in summer, a great hand with a scythe in winter."

The majority party in this session of Congress professes great concern for the welfare of the family farm. They almost seem to resent the idea that anyone, other than they, can, or will, or should help the low-income farmer.

They have blithely tried to restore the high, rigid price supports which have been clearly seen to help most of the larger and more prosperous farmers. Their motto seems to be: "Billions for the rich, not even millions for the poor."

The request for $30 million, plus certain enabling legislation, to start a rural-development program has fallen upon deaf ears. Truly, there are those who are "woodchoppers" for the small family farmer in the summer of helping the large farmer. They, too, can "swing a scythe" for the small family farmer in the winter of economy or the rush of adjournment.

Congressional Quitters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, most newspaper editors continue bitter over the incredible developments that allowed politics to kill highway legislation during the recent session of Congress. Most editors think a compromise plan would have been possible, one of part taxes and part bonds.

An effective editorial expressing this viewpoint was published last week in the Oregonian at Portland, Oreg. It follows:

CONGRESSIONAL QUITTERS

The almost incredible development is that rather than shorten their 5 months' vacation—at the new salary they voted themselves, $22,500 a year plus perquisites—Members of Congress are preparing to go home without doing anything about the vital national highways program.

The Democratic leadership of Congress laid a fat egg on that issue. It should heed President Eisenhower's advice to reconsider the sweeping plan he proposed, with its bond-financing feature. Or it should revise the Democratic program, billed as "pay as you go," to win the necessary votes. It would only require a few days more in Washington.

For Senate and House to adjourn with nothing done to meet the urgent national need for stimulated highway construction would be a push in the face the American public does not deserve. It would, in addition, be a Democratic political boner of the first magnitude.

On the basis of the Clay report, President Eisenhower informed Congress that a grand total of $101 billion must be spent on the 40,000-mile system of national highways. This program was boiled down in Congress to an administration bill for expenditure of $38,500,000,000 in Federal and State money in 10 years, with a Federal bond issue of $21 billion to provide extra funds. Experts estimated the increased use of highways for business and pleasure would repay the bonds without additional taxation.

The Senate came out with a half-baked measure to provide more money for primary, secondary, and urban roads—but included neither bond authorization nor increased taxes. Democratic leaders of the House, also rejecting the bond proposal, produced a measure to spend $48,500,000,000 on highways in 12 years, and to raise $12,400,000,000 of the Federal share from a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax plus harsh taxes on truck tires, recapping materials, tubes, and diesel fuel.

But the House buckled under the pressure of a blitz lobbying drive by the trucking industry, although automobile owners would have paid about three-fourths of the new taxes. This week the House defeated both the administration bill and the Democratic leadership's Fallon bill by substantial margins. The President immediately appealed for reconsideration, the intimation being that he would take the Democratic measure, or a compromise, if he couldn't have his proposal.

In the face of this record of ineptitude and disregard of the public welfare, Speaker SAM RAYBURN has the temerity to say that the highway program is dead for this year, "and probably for next year, too." He is "shooting" for adjournment.

A reasonable compromise between the pay-as-you-go and higher taxes position of the Democrats and the bonding plan of President Eisenhower could be reached in a few hours if the Democratic leaders wanted it. The people would go along with a 1-cent gas tax boost plus some bonding to obtain a program adequate to the Nation's needs. For Congress to quit cold on this matter is unforgivable.

Richard S. Reynolds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared on Monday, August 1, 1955, in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va.

Throughout his life, Richard S. Reynolds was an individual of ingenuity and enterprise. He was an outstanding example of the progressive American businessman, capable not only of achieving success for himself, but also of making a substantial contribution to the industrial and economic progress of his country.

Mr. Reynolds will be sincerely missed by the many who admired his genius and, particularly, by his countless friends in Virginia.

The editorial follows:

RICHARD S. REYNOLDS

The imaginative gift which caused Richard S. Reynolds to write poetry in his few leisure hours, also made him one of the foremost industrialists of his time. For it was that same quality—imagination—that enabled Mr. Reynolds to expand the Reynolds Metals Co. into a serious rival of the Aluminum Company of America.

Mr. Reynolds' death came after a period of failing health, but not before he had made a huge success of his aluminum business. Along the way, he had also made great contributions to the success of the tobacco industry, when in his younger days he was an employee of his uncle, R. J. Reynolds, in Winston-Salem.

But Mr. Reynolds' achievements, like those of most successful men, would not have been possible, if he had relied solely on sudden inspiration or haphazard bursts of energy. He probably worked harder than anybody in

his organization, and spent a vast amount of time traveling from one plant to another. This stocky, genial man was likely to turn up at any of his plants at almost any hour of the day or night.

When the Reynolds Metals Co. established its headquarters in Richmond in 1938, it was a valuable industrial acquisition to the city. Since then, the company's operations, both here and throughout the United States, have expanded hugely. Reynolds Metals is now one of the Nation's major enterprises.

It has been important to the economy of Richmond and Virginia. In addition the company and its late founder have contributed generously to many charitable and civic enterprises.

The passing of Richard S. Reynolds removes a leader in a generation of men who contributed importantly to the present industrial preeminence of America. Because of such able, tireless, ingenious executives, the United States was the decisive factor in winning two world wars, and its people enjoy by far the highest standard of living on the globe.

Refugee Relief Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is regretable that the Democrat leadership of both Houses of Congress—in control of all committees—completely ignored the President's request for vitally important amendments to the Refugee Act of 1953, notwithstanding pledges of the Democrat Party to make needed revisions in the laws concerning admission of qualified persons. Both the Senate and House majority leaders failed to act, notwithstanding the efforts of Senator WATKINS to get action in the Senate and of Mr. CRETELLA, of Connecticut, and of myself in the House.

The President asked for these essential revisions on May 27 last. I introduced a revision bill on January 5, 1955, and I later introduced H. R. 6733, which specifically provided for carrying out the President's request by amendment of the act in order to permit the entry of bona fide immigrants. I requested a hearing on H. R. 6733 from subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee and was advised on June 10 that my bill was before this subcommittee. On July 5 the subcommittee chairman notified me:

We have not scheduled any hearings on legislation designed to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

The reason given was that Senator WATKINS' bill would be brought before the full Senate Judiciary Committee. However, Senator WATKINS' efforts to carry out the President's wishes were whipsawed in the Senate, as were mine in the House, by the Democrat leadership in both bodies.

The difficulties which will face bona fide qualified applicants in the future will continue, thanks to the broken promises of a Democrat Congress, which also failed to keep its promises on education, health, and labor legislation. All of these measures to help people had been urged by the President, and all are very much in accord with the President's middle-of-the-road policy.

Congress and the Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Hearst newspapers for the past 3 years have been compaigning continuously for better roads for this country. It was their awakening of an enlightened public opinion that brought the highway problem to the attention of this Nation and to the Congress.

Their opinion of the failure of the House to enact any highway legislation is of patricular value because of all of the publications in this country they understand the highway problem best.

Therefore, I would like to insert in the RECORD two editorials that were published in all of the 15 Hearst newspapers from coast to coast on Saturday, July 30, and Sunday, July 31. The first is entitled "Disgraceful Performance" and the second "Why Is a Congressman?"

In my opinion, these editorials express exactly what the sentiments of the Nation are on Federal highway legislation. I commend them especially to those Members responsible for the failure of the House to act on this vital problem.

The editorials follow:

DISGRACEFUL PERFORMANCE

The performance of the House of Representatives in voting down any form of Federal-highway legislation was sickening.

In 12 hours of action in 2 days on the House floor, Congressman after Congressman expressed his great concern at the slaughter on our highways and the great economic loss the American people were suffering.

The need for a Federal-highway bill, they kept saying to each other, is not in question.

Then when their names were called, they voted down any form of Federal aid at all.

Some of them, when the final vote was announced, laughed aloud, as though they had done something amusing.

Up in the galleries, enjoying this display, were the lobbyists who today are being held responsible for the defeat of the various bills.

Many of them represented industries and associations that have fought for good roads for many years, but who found that they didn't really want them if they were going to cost any money.

The lobbyists won a battle, but they lost the war, because they represent industries that cannot survive unless the highways of America are made adequate within the next few years.

Down on the floor the Congressmen were running the lobbyists' errands and deserting their own party leadership.

Today many of them have the decency at least to be somewhat ashamed of themselves.

And the lobbyists are telling everybody that they really were for a road bill and that they didn't expect that Congress would become so panicked under lobby pressure that nothing would result at all.

If these gentlemen are to be accepted at their word—and that is a gigantic "if"—then we agree with Republican House Leader MARTIN that President Eisenhower should call a special session of the Congress and make it sit in Washington until it does its duty.

There is nothing funny or politically smart about sabotaging a Federal highway bill.

About 200 Americans died in our chaotic traffic while these Representatives of the people were issuing pious statements and finding a way to save their own political hides.

Now let them act like the statesmen they pretend to be.

Let them forget their miserable and petty differences.

Let them sit down together with their eyes off the galleries and do the job the American people are demanding of them.

And let them sit there until they do.

WHY IS A CONGRESSMAN?

If you don't want to think about the traffic jams you'll be in today as you and your family try to take a ride in the country, you might think about Congressmen.

As you notice the ambulances and wreckers and State police cars heading toward the latest highway disaster, notice also what went on last week in Washington.

Congressmen of both parties, stampeded by lobbyists representing industries that make good money from the use of the highways, voted down any attempt to get you out of the traffic chaos or to make the ambulance trips unnecessary.

The lobbyists and our Representatives all piously agreed that better roads are absolutely vital.

They also agreed that it was absolutely vital that somebody else pay for constructing them and that it was absolutely vital that everybody get reelected.

Realizing what they had done, after they had made sure they had done it, the Congressmen pointed at the trucking industry lobby as the villain.

And the truckers, after the bills were well sunk, issued statements that Congress should never have acted like that; that President Eisenhower was right when he criticized Congress and demanded reconsideration of its failure to pass a bill.

The same people who caused 100,000 telegrams to flood into Washington demanding the defeat of highway legislation, issued press releases that said the recipients of the telegrams must have misunderstand.

The 100,000 telegrams came from a tiny minority of the American business community.

We wonder what might happen if the American people sent in telegrams themselves, preferably after a frustrating, dangerous day on the roads the Congressmen refused to improve.

In fact, why don't you do it right now?

We don't know whether you mean as much as a lobbyist does to your Congressman, but we're pretty sure a lot of you acting together mean more, much more.

Why not let your Congressman know what you think about the House action last week and tell him to start all over again right now and pass a bill?

And tell him to stay in Washington until he does.

Biggest Mistake Congress Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the present Dem-

ocratic Congress to pass a highway bill was a disappointment and a disgrace.

The Nation needs more and better roads to save lives and to prevent the crippling of citizens. Experts estimate the economic savings on hospital and medical bills, on wear and tear on equipment, in time on commercial vehicles, and through lower insurance rates at $4,300,000,000 annually. These economic savings would more than pay the cost of building the needed highways.

Concerning the failure of Congress to pass highway legislation, the Democrat and Chronicle, of Rochester, N. Y., in disgust said editorially:

Lack of action on a highway program is a disgrace. The national-road situation will grow worse before Representatives and Senators get back to Washington next year. The delay is inexcusable and a black mark on the Congress.

The Tuna Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from the American Tunaboat Association:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Congressman BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Tuna producers have asked assistance under United States trade policy which promises not only to expand trade but that no domestic industry will be sacrificed in attaining that end. Despite serious injury no aid has been forthcoming. This condition was wantonly disregarded and worsened by the recent trade agreement with Japan. Record imports of frozen tuna, refusal of the United States Government to take remedial action, decline in number of canneries buying domestic fish, decline in deliveries of such fish by the tuna clipper fleet by over 23,000 tons this year compared to 1954, extended delays in unloading and inability of the major portion of the fleet to get sailing orders, have resulted in a decision by the association to reduce the price on yellowfin and skipjack tuna by $40 a ton effective on fish caught by vessels departing after August 1. The new prices are the lowest since the OPA. They mean still further reductions in wages to our fishermen. Unless a vastly greater volume of tuna is now purchased by domestic canners this action may hasten the demise of the fleet. Unless the United States Government sees fit to implement its trade policy to the end that a domestic industry shall not be put out of business, this action will likewise be unavailing. There are few, if any, other industries that because of imports have declined in production, prices, profits, wages, employment, and their share of the domestic market, all of which trends must be reversed if the industry is to survive. United States trade policy as it has been recklessly and grossly misapplied to the tuna fishery now makes it clearly possible for the Japanese to take over the entire United States market. Producers will fight this discriminatory treatment by every honorable means as they believe our Government should honor not only its commitments to the Japanese but to a domestic industry as stated and restated by the administration.

HAROLD F. CARY,
American Tunaboat Association.

People Who Live in Glass Houses Shouldn't Throw Stones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the Republican Party has made much of the so-called mess in Washington which they have attributed to the Democrats. The events of more recent date, however, would seem to point up the moral in the old saying that, "people who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones." The Mulligan letters, so wonderfully reminiscent of another Republican scandal of some years back, is only the most recent example of the Republican "mess" in Washington. This whole situation is very aptly summarized in an editorial which appeared in the Trentonian on August 1, 1955, and I should like to include this editorial as a part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

IT MUST BE CONTAGIOUS

Thirty months ago, Republican crusaders burdened with mops, pails, and much detergent marched triumphantly into Washington. They were pledged to clean up the "mess" it took their Democratic predecessors 20 years to create.

They plunged into their janitorial chores with a furious delight and dedicated activity.

First they went after the security risks. Came McCarthyism and the famous administration security "numbers game."

After much accusation and vilification in which hundreds lost their jobs and reputations on hearsay evidence, many objects of the numbers game were cleared and went back to work with scarcely an apology.

But it reached such a crescendo of madness that a roar of protest was heard from ex-Republican Senator Harry Cain, once an arch reactionary and now head of the Subversive Activities Control Board. He protested at length over the malevolent irresponsibility of the security program.

Next came the Dixon-Yates deal, ordered by President Eisenhower himself. The combine was to set up an atomic powerplant to pay back the Tennessee Valley Authority the power drained by Atomic Energy Commission installations.

This one touched off a hot fight, and out of the wash came the fact that a banker, working as a consultant for the Budget Bureau, advised the Government on the deal. Conveniently, his firm was doing the financing.

It didn't take any of Defense Secretary Charles Wilson's bird dogs to scent the pronounced fragrance of this deal, so Ike canceled it. He gave as his reason that the city of Memphis was planning to build its own powerplant and wouldn't need any from TVA.

Next came Madam Hobby, who comes from Texas where they do things real big. She left us words that will long be remembered: "Nobody could have foreseen the demand for the Salk polio vaccine."

Thereupon, the vaccine inoculation program program was, to borrow from the Republican lexicon, a mess.

Now comes l'affaire Talbott. This one involves Air Force Secretary Harold Talbott. He is a partner in a management efficiency firm that suddenly became prosperous after he was named to his high post. It seemed he gave it a little help by soliciting business from companies engaged in defense work. Conveniently, he used his official stationery.

Harry Truman got hung with the mink coat, deep freezer, and fancy vacation shakedowns that his subordinates pulled.

And since sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, we think these latest bobbles legitimately and fairly can be hung on Ike.

It all goes to show that neither side has a mortgage on political morality, although this later gang showed far more sophistication and went after bigger stakes than did their predecessors.

But it seems that these janitors, in charge of cleaning up the mess they say they found, brought in some ringers. And they're mired down in some pretty sticky muck of their own making.

The Veteran's Right To Compete in the Air-Transportation Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article on North American Air Lines:

THE VETERAN'S RIGHT TO COMPETE IN THE AIR-TRANSPORTATION FIELD

I should like to talk about how to be for the veterans and for free enterprise—up to a point.

In the closing days of World War II people in Government began to realize that one postwar byproduct of the fantastic air armada we had created to win the war would be a number of veterans who wanted to make their lives in aviation. Accordingly, certain regulations were passed which made it possible for veterans to own and operate commercial airplanes.

At this same time, in spite of the wartime boom in air travel, most of our major airlines were operating in the red, and making up their deficits by receiving public funds in the form of subsidies and mail-pay contracts. The reason was that the major airlines had always sold air travel to the public on a luxury basis. Fares were so high that only well-to-do people could afford to fly. Nobody had ever gotten through to the airline executives with Lincoln's famous words, "The Lord must have loved the poor people, He made so many of them."

Thanks to the new regulations permitting veterans to own and operate airplanes, a new and dynamic force came into commercial aviation. One group of veterans invented something they called aircoach. The idea was to sell air travel at fares everybody could afford. From the very first the response was tremendous, and the uproar was tremendous. The executives of our sick major airlines said aircoach was bad for the industry. They said it couldn't be done profitably, they said they couldn't even dare to try it; they asked for higher fare and bigger subsidies to blot their red ink.

But their breast beating and pessimism didn't stop the veterans operating under the Government's regulations that permitted them to fly commercial airplanes. They went ahead and advertised aircoach to the public. They sold millions of people on the idea that they could fly in safety and comfort for a lower fare.

North American airlines, the largest of these groups of veterans, flew over 600,000 passengers more than a billion passenger miles, with a perfect safety record, never received a nickel in Government subsidy, bought and paid for their own airplanes, and made a profit.

All this at the time when the major airlines executives were crying up a storm in congressional hearings that the only thing that could save our airlines was higher fares and bigger ladies to scoop up the taxpayers' money.

About 4 or 5 years ago, the major airlines finally got the word. By this time the public was educated to aircoach travel, airlines received thousands of phone calls asking whether they operated aircoach flights, and they were finally forced to put on a few flights. Well, glory be, they couldn't handle the business. Even though their fares were still higher than North American's fares, the public went for low-cost air travel as if it were a tax refund.

Today, with oversas plane traffic carrying more passengers than all the ships, more than half of it is aircoach, more than a third of all domestic travel is aircoach, and the percentage is growing all the time.

Our airlines are healthier than they have ever been in history, because they have finally found the North American way of reaching a bigger market by charging a lower fare.

Now, how does the Government thank the veterans who courageously pioneered in this new kind of air travel, who led the sick airlines back to health, who brought the speed and comfort of air travel to millions? Have these veterans had a new oak leaf cluster added to the decorations they won while serving their country in the war? Have they gotten an official letter to the effect that this achievement was beneficial to the air-transport industry and the public? Here is the big surprise: The Government's gratitude is expressed as follows: They are trying to put the veterans out of business. Trying is a mild word for it. They are using every means in their power to set these veterans down on the ground, to deprive them of the use of their airplanes, to execute our companies as ruthlessly as a guillotine blade chops off a head.

What's their excuse. Not public safety. Remember, North American has flown 600,000 passengers a billion passenger miles with a perfect safety record, and no airline can surpass that record.

Their excuse is that North American has grown so much that it is in competition with the major airlines. Our question is, Who's competing with whom? Who started aircoach and who educated the public? Now that majors belatedly put aircoach on, they want the people who invented it to disappear.

The sad part of all this is that their gun barrels are only incidentally trained on NAA and the courageous veterans who developed air coach. Actually, they are taking dead aim on the public's pocketbook. NAA is the one big reason why air-coach fares on the major airlines aren't booted 20 percent in the next month or two. Do the majors want to raise the fares? Their intentions are clear. Recently they got themselves a blanket dollar-a-ticket increase which has cost the traveling public a hundred million dollars since it was passed. Only North American refused to increase the fares. Draw your own conclusion about why they want this stable, soundly operated airline out of business.

Here's the present picture. The CAB, which authorized our operation in the first place, is now surprised at what creative free enterprise has accomplished. They shouldn't be that surprised. It was the same kind of doggedness and ingenuity that flew the Hump, that broke the Berlin blockade, that got soldiers to the Far East in the Tokyo airlift when the Korean crisis broke. But they are surprised and, on behalf of the monopolistic group of major carriers who might as well own the air between our great cities, they are now trying to take back the authorization they gave to the veterans of our air battles of World War II.

Shall big business own the air?

Shall these veterans be callously deprived of their right in the new kind of travel they invented?

Will you be forced to pay more for air travel?

If the present decision of the CAB to revoke North American is not set aside, these things will happen—and the public will be the loser.

One-thousandth Anniversary of the Christianization of the Ukraine: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions Canadians and Americans join in mutual celebrations of events important to both nations. It is fitting that they should do so particularly on this celebration commemorating the Christianization of the Ukraine 1,000 years ago, because both nations have substantial numbers of their citizens whose ancestry is traced back to the Ukraine.

In the history of the world the acceptance of Christianity by what is now called the Ukrainian people has had the greatest significance. Christianization of the Ukraine had a two-fold effect upon the Ukrainians: It brought them into the Christian family; and secondly, it created a bridgehead for the dissemination of Byzantine culture into the heartlands and distant borders of Eastern Europe. With its Cathedral of St. Sofia, Kiev, the capital of ancient Ukrainia, became a religious and cultural center, rich in art, architecture, and literature. Within a relatively short time Kiev became one of the most prominent outposts of Byzantine civilization. From this medieval Kievan state Christianity spread throughout the vast areas east of what is called today the borderlands of Western Europe, and as the eastern branch of Christianity enveloped this area, it diffused with it the Byzantine civilization in all its brilliance and grandeur. In this manner the entire area, formerly inhabited by pagan barbarians, was brought into the Christian family and into the Byzantine civilization.

The 1,000th anniversary commemorating the Christianization of the Ukraine takes on a special meaning today when one calls to mind the unfortunate fact that the Ukrainian people have been overwhelmed and suppressed by one of the greatest pagan forces of the age, Russian communism. However dismal the future prospects of Ukrainians may seem, it ought to be the hope of every freedom-loving person that in this 20th Century as in the 10th a new movement will take root in the depths of the Ukrainian soul which with equal force and influence will spread eventually throughout the Soviet empire, a movement which will bring to the Ukrainian people a new era of religious, cultural, economic, and political freedom. A people who have done so much for the betterment of humanity deserve nothing less than that.

The Small-Farm Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the low income farm family is again largely forgotten by Congress. They are being denied even the small fund requested by the Secretary of Agriculture to help get the new rural-development program underway.

April 27 President Eisenhower sent to Congress the study and recommendations showing how low income farm families can be helped. He said:

> We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our million and a half farm families with extremely low incomes—for their own well-being and for the good of our country and all our people.

To implement the program Congress was asked to appropriate $3 million and to provide $30 million for additional loans to small farmers.

Congress would have gone home denying any of this help for the small family farm had not Senator AIKEN and Senator THYE spoken out in protest. As a result, there will be $15 million additional to loan to small farmers. All the rest was denied.

Senator AIKEN said:

> I believe it will be too bad if the Congress does not go along with the President's proposal and undertake by legislative action to afford needed relief to the million and one-half families—comprising probably 6 million or 7 million persons—who today are living on farms, but do not have the means of a decent livelihood, and in many cases do not have educational opportunities, particularly vocational-education opportunities. If they leave the farms and find work elsewhere, they cannot command high wages, because they are not trained. They are trying to make a living on farms which are so small that even if they received 300 or 400 percent of parity for the crops they produce, they still would be unable to make a decent living.
>
> So, Mr. President, I should like to see the Senate today vote to restore the cuts in the appropriation which were made originally by the House, and subsequently agreed to by the Senate committee.

June 7 and 8, leaders from 27 States met in Memphis, Tenn., to plan how best to push forward with the new rural-development program for low-income

farmers. They are moving ahead with plans, hoping Congress would provide the funds to get at least 60 pilot operations going in the 1,000 counties where low income farm families are concentrated. Now they must be told Congress would not make this possible. The low income farm families have again been largely forgotten.

Who Is Responsible for Our Inadequate Airpower?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am only one of the Members of this Congress who are increasingly appalled by intelligence of Soviet air strength, and our own relatively inadequate airpower. We have been assured by the Secretary of Defense that the Russians were building only a defensive force, comparable presumably to the police force of any civilized state, but even the Secretary of Defense has now acquiesced in the decision of Secretary Talbott and General Twining to increase procurement of long-range B–52 bombers for our Air Force by 35 percent. This was presumably because the Secretary was belatedly convinced that intelligence concerning the new Russian long-range heavy bomber, the T–37, was correct.

What we know about the T–37, and what we hope the Secretary also knows, indicates that the Soviet rate of aircraft production is about twice that of ours. Planning of our B–52 intercontinental jet bomber, the chief weapon of our long-range bombing Air Force, began in 1947, and construction began 2 years later. Planning of the Russian equivalent, the T–37, began probably 4 years ago, and actual construction less than 3 years ago. These alarming figures emphasize what even our own Air Force leaders have been telling us, that Russian technology is forging ahead of ours.

A recent article by Prof. Barton Leach of the Harvard Law School and the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration, examines some of the reasons for our failure to build adequate air power; that is, for the failure of the American people to demand it. Recognizing that airpower is expensive, Dr. Leach still complains that we approach airpower from the dollar sign of its cost insteadof from an appraisal of its value. The fabulously expensive B–36 has performed its mission, and can only perform its mission, if it never has to drop a bomb. Its value is the assurance it gives us of peace. Its visible sign is a strong and healthy America enjoying peace.

For 8 years, however, we have juggled with figures of Air Force wings and Air Force personnel to serve political ends. Currently we are expecting the Air Force to increase wing strength 14 percent with a manpower increase of one-half of 1 percent. I am proud of the record of my Democratic colleagues in bucking President Truman and President Eisenhower impartially when they sought to reduce the size of our Air Force.

I wish the people of America and my colleagues here had today the instinctive understanding of airpower that the British had of seapower. In an age of seapower, that understanding made the British a great nation. Today, appreciating the fact that the air age is now half a century old, and the atomic age has been with us for a decade, the British are showing equal understanding of airpower, and are giving adequate attention to the problems attendant upon its build-up. Perhaps it is, as Dr. Leach suggests, primarily a problem of leadership. If it requires "men of war leader stature with a wartime sense of responsibility and urgency" to give us the airpower necessary to our defense, and our survival, we of this Congress are abdicating our leadership.

Mr. Speaker, by consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a telling appraisal of our failure by Dr. W. Barton Leach. It is a long article, but a readable and a stimulating one, which appears in the May 1955 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

The article follows:

OBSTACLES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN AIRPOWER

(By W. Barton Leach)

"Airpower is the dominant factor in modern war"—this is the common currency of strategic discussion. But in this second decade of the atomic age, 5 years after the first Soviet nuclear explosion, the theoretical dominance of airpower has not been realized in American force in being. It is well that we should examine the political, economic, professional, and administrative pressures that have repeatedly reduced and delayed the realization.

Actually the above quotation is incomplete. In its usual form there is an additional word: but. The but may appear in the same sentence, the following paragraph, three pages later, or next week's press conference. Yet appear it will. "Airpower is the dominant factor in modern war * * * but we also need a navy second to none and an army adequate to fight all kinds of war, large and small; * * * but since there is no single year of crisis we must build in an orderly way for the long haul; * * * but the aircraft we buy must be the ones we need, not those that will be obsolete before we get them; * * * but in building our military power we must not undermine our economy and thus allow communism to achieve its greatest triumph without firing a shot; * * * but," and so forth.

These but clauses are always unimpeachable verities. And each in its own way is a factor retarding the growth of national airpower. Thus far the but clauses have had far too much success. Landpower and seapower, at least since 1951, have had forces in being at the levels approved as the Nation's strategic need. This has never been true of airpower since V–J Day. Instead the country has been assured that "new emphasis is being placed on airpower" and "our airpower is greater than ever before in peacetime history." But the standard of evaluation must be the strategic requirements of the present, not the gross inadequacies of the past.

A QUESTION OF DEFINITION

In this article United States airpower is defined as the United States Air Force—not because of its name or any theoretical concept that airpower must be unitary but because of the military tasks that have been assigned to the Air Force, that it is organized and prepared (given the means) to perform, and that will not be performed at any significant level of effort except by the USAF. To avoid oversimplification some discussion of this definition now follows.

Broader terms have recently come into fashion in defining airpower. National airpower, it is said, is not only the Air Force but also the air elements of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, our civilian airlines, and our incomparable aircraft industry.

Such a definition can be of some occasional use in pointing out the multiple uses of the air space in modern war. But it blurs the focus and can lead the unthinking to equate the organizations listed in the definition and conclude that a deficiency in the Air Force is cured by abundance elsewhere. It offers an anodyne for the agony of decision—the hard task of putting first things first, second things determinedly second, and third things out the window. It lets one say, "Of course, we all agree that airpower is the dominant factor in modern war. But all these things are airpower. So we can give something to everybody—they are all so sincere and persuasive—and let each build airpower in his own way." This is surely the pathway to self-delusion, perhaps to disaster.

If we are to surmount the perils that face us we would be well advised to sharpen the focus of our definition as follows: United States airpower is military airpower in being to (1) deliver massive attack upon any enemy anywhere as ordered, (2) defend the United States against enemy air attack, (3) provide tactical airpower, the air component of the ground-air fighting team, and (4) provide global airlift of men and materiel for all military purposes.

These four military tasks are primary missions of the United States Air Force. With regard to each of them certain plus values may be contributed by others, but it is well that these should be precisely understood to avoid false inferences that if the Air Force is not given the means to do these jobs someone else will do them.

Massive attack

The massive attack capability—the deterrent to big war and a major war-winning factor if big war comes—is the job of Strategic Air Command. This does not mean that SAC hugs a monopoly to its bosom. It does mean that no other military force has the capability of delivering massive attack at the required level of intensity and continuity. Further, no other military force has indicated any willingness to accept firm responsibility for any defined part of the job. This appears to include carrier-based aircraft, which must be considered a plus value available fortuitously if at all.

Air defense

The air defense of the United States is the job of Air Defense Command insofar as fighter aircraft and early warning systems on land are concerned. The Army contributes antiaircraft fire, especially ground-to-air missiles such as Nike. The Navy contributes seaward extensions of the radar early warning lines. Possible contributions of fighter aircraft by the Navy and Marines must be considered indeterminate plus values, unlikely to materialize owing to the necessity of building an air defense system around firm commitments, assigned responsibilities, and integrated training. If ADC does not have the means to provide fighter defense of the United States, this country has no fighter defense.

Tactical air support

Tactical air support of ground troops, protection against enemy air attack, interruption of the flow of enemy supply and reinforcement, attack upon battlefield targets, is in a somewhat different category. Basically it is the job of Tactical Air Command and the overseas tactical air forces. But the 3 Marine air wings (equivalent in total to about 9 TAC wings) do much the same kind of job, tending to specialize in attacks upon battlefield targets. Marine air and TAC units are usable together, the presence of the former reducing plane for plane the requirement for the latter, as in Korea. In some circumstances, notably, as in Korea, where the battlefield is near a coastline and the enemy does not employ submarines and attack aircraft, carrier-based aircraft may fill a need for tactical air forces. But this plus value is limited in quantity and, more important, in continuity. Nothing approaching a plane-for-plane reduction in land-based air requirement is produced by the carriers; under the best circumstances the air complement of a carrier replaces less than half its number of land-based aircraft (Marine or USAF). Field Marshal Montgomery has made it clear that tactical use of carrier-based aircraft has no significant part in North Atlantic Treaty Organization plans.

Air logistics

The air logistics mission is basically the job of Military Air Transport Service (a joint command operating USAF and USN aircraft, the former in much greater quantity than the latter) and the troop-carrier units of TAC. There are supplementary sources of airlift, notably the Fleet Logistic Air Wings, the civilian airlines, and private transport aircraft. However, it is well to note that in a genral crisis—as contrasted with such local crises as the Berlin blockade and the Korean war—there will be multiple demands for airlift, and a transport unit that is itself overtaxed will not have resources to send to the aid of its equally overtaxed neighbor.

Summary of USAF responsibility

To summarize: As to massive attack capability and continental air defense against enemy attack, American air power is for practical purposes synonymous with the United States Air Force. As to tactical support of United States ground troops American air power is synonymous with the United States Air Force to about the same degree that American land power is synonymous with the United States Army—the Marines add air wings and divisions to each. On each of these three missions carrier-based aircraft may provide plus values when the fighting starts, but do not reduce by as much as a single wing the USAF requirement. As to military airlift the picture is more complex, but the USAF must carry the major burden.

Thus, obstacles to the growth of the United States Air Force are obstacles to the growth of American air power in a straight-line relationship. Put it this way: If obstacles to the development of the United States Air Force are removed, the Nation will have the air power it needs. Otherwise not.

DEVELOPMENT OF USAF BEFORE AND AFTER 1951

Prior to 1951 the national need in air power had never been determined, much less programed by the Department of Defense. The Finletter Commission and the Brewster-Hinshaw Committee, reporting respectively to the President and Congress, had stated a peacetime requirement of 70 wings as of 1948. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff had annually been restricted to the exercise of dividing among their services a progressively reduced total defense budget—$15 billion, then 14, 13, and 12. This, in the days of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, was known as "cutting fat without cutting muscle." It is useless to bemoan the inadequacy of the resulting forces and the invitation to trouble they presented; the Korean war is its own best witness. But it is worth while to point out the folly of starting with a dollar sign and restricting our military professionals to the job of dividing the pot. This could happen again, and it could have the same result.

In 1950–51 this country was apprehensive, and rightly so. In September 1949, we detected the first nuclear explosion in the Soviet Union. And in June 1950 the Korean war showed us what happens when we drop our guard. So, for the first time since V–J Day, the Chiefs of Staff were directed to state what forces the country needed—all forces, land, sea, and air. The process was started in January 1950 and completed in a National Security Council decision on October 1, 1951. The agreed and approved requirement was 21 divisions for the Army, 409 major combat ships for the Navy, 3 divisions and 3 air wings for the Marines, and—here mark well—143 wings for the Air Force to be achieved by June 30, 1954, and to be manned by 1,200,000 military personnel. These forces represented relatively small percentage increases for the Army, Navy, and Marines, but more than a doubling of the Air Force. For the first time military and civilian planners, accorded full opportunity to state the military need, had given real substance to the precept that "Air power is the dominant factor in modern war."

As all know, 143 wings never materialized and 1954 disappeared as a target date. The hard facts of the fiscal year 1953 budget produced a stretchout to 1955. Then in the Truman budget for fiscal year 1954 another stretchout to 1956 was programed. The Eisenhower budget for fiscal year 1954—the only one that really counted for that year—cut $5 billion out of the Air Force, adopted an interim 120-wing program, and left the whole thing to a re-examination by the new Chiefs of Staff, all of whom were to be changed in the summer of 1953. The new Chiefs, operating with a problematical freedom of action, found that security, airwise, could be attained with 137 wings to be achieved by 1957 and to be manned by 975,000 military personnel. The manpower figures are striking: someone discovered that with "better utilization of manpower" the Air Force could get, in 1955, 120 wings with 970,000 men; in 1956, 127 wings with 975,000 men; in 1957, 137 wings with 975,000 men (sic).

That is where matters stand today. What happens now will depend upon how insuperable the obstacles, herein described, prove to be.

THE OBSTACLES

Obstacle 1. The Air Force is in process of growth, having never achieved its planned strength: When a policymaker wants to reduce total defense money and manpower—and this is a constant state of mind—it is far easier to cut back planned future force than to disband existing military units, scrap existing weapons, and discharge personnel already on the job. The fact that the planned future force is indispensable and the existing present force dispensable is not always a sufficient reason for building the former at the expense of the latter. The reluctance of Secretaries of Defense to accept split papers from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to insist on JCS agreement loads the dice in favor of the status quo; if unanimity for change is unobtainable the situation tends to remain unchanged—existing forces stay; new forces are reduced, delayed, or both.

Obstacle 2. Airpower is expensive: Aircraft cost a lot and become obsolete fast. Take for example the B–36, the 10-engine intercontinental bomber. It cost $3 to $5 million a copy, and it will probably pass into the junk pile before it ever sees action. Many find it difficult really to accept the principle that the B–36 has performed its mission—and can only perform its mission—if it never has to drop a bomb. Sir Winston Churchill can say, "It is certain that Europe would have been communized and London under bombardment some time ago but for the deterrent of the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States." But this concept of an international revolver-in-the-cop's-holster is elusive. A battleship or a carrier is different. You can see it, even visit it on the Fourth of July. A division is different, too; it marches—with guns. But a B–36 flies above visual observation, nobody is permitted to board it, and its crew is unimpressive in a parade.

Obstacle 3. Air power is the victim of a cultural lag: The end of the last paragraph could be the beginning of this, for they are related. Anyone will find ways to afford expensive things if he understands them well enough to be convinced of the need. Men now of mature age were boys when military force meant soldiers and sailors, ships and guns; these early impressions leave their mark—"the anachronistic power of saber and broadside." Few have ever operated an aircraft; fewer still have flown in combat. Fortunately at the time but with unfortunate consequences now, Americans have never had the experience of living or fighting under skies controlled by an enemy. In the great debate of 1951, the subject was "troops to Europe." Discussions of rearming Germany deal with "12 divisions." If airpower is mentioned at all in these contexts it is in the second or third paragraph, and perhaps between parentheses. This is not ignorance; when reminded, all acknowledge that we must have air power—too. Rather it is a lack of instinctive understanding, that quality of the recesses of the mind that goes deeper than knowledge. Why does this lack of understanding persist? That leads to—

Obstacle 4. The military commentators were brought up in the older services: Compile a list of writers and broadcasters on military affairs arranged in the order of their influence on national thinking. Then see how far down the list comes the first who can wear silver wings on his chest. Wings on the chest are not requisite to a realistic belief in airpower; both in this country and in England some of the firmest supporters of the Air Force have never flown a plane, and this includes some writers of national reputation. But too often the military writer, long familiar with the problems and command personnel of the older services, speaks in understanding, vivid terms of big ships and infantry tactics, reserving the but clauses and the confidence-sapping doubts for air operations.

Some readers of this article may be surprised that the present writer voices dissatisfaction with the development of United States airpower. Readers of the daily press could easily get the impression that current policies lavishly nourish the Air Force while starving the other services. Some military critics feel a poignant sympathy for the "squeeze" upon the Army, Navy, and Marines produced by lowered budgets and manpower levels. But as to the Air Force they tend to focus on the single fact that Air Force manpower and money are programed at slightly increasing figures, ignoring the "squeeze" implicit in a directive to increase wing strength from 120 to 137 (14 percent) with a manpower increase from 970,000 to 975,000 (one-half of 1 percent). All forces are squeezed by current policies—the surface forces by being directed to operate existing (or slightly lower) forces with men and money lower than existing levels; the Air Force by being directed to operate much larger forces with men and money increased only slightly. If a military writer recognizes the squeeze in the former case and not in the latter, his readers (who may well

include key Members of Congress) are to that extent given an unbalanced analysis.

Obstacle 5. The Air Force lacks representation in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The key civilians in OSD are the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and nine Assistant Secretaries. None of the men now holding these poistions has any Air Force background—and this has been true, with a single exception, since the first Secretary of Defense took office in 1947. The Army is only a little better off. Men with an orientation toward the Navy have consistently held most of the important posts, a legacy from the days when Secretary of Defense Forrestal simply imported his staff from the Navy Department. The all-important office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense is essentially a Navy office containing no responsible personnel with Air Force background. These civilian officials are not prejudiced against the Air Force, nor are they unwilling to learn. But an instinctive understanding of Air Force problems is not in their blood; they do not naturally seek the association of Air Force people; and when the chips are down it too often happens that the Air Force gets the short end of those very important decisions that are controlled by the staff of the Secretary of Defense. Attention has been repeatedly called to this imbalance of personnel, but appointments continue to be made which perpetuate it.

The single exception above referred to was Robert A. Lovett, Deputy Secretary, then Secretary of Defense from late 1950 to January 1953. Mr. Lovett, a naval aviator in World War I, served as Assistant Secretary of War for Air in World War II. It was during his regime in the Department of Defense that the 143-wing Air Force was authorized and the precept of equal division of money between the services temporarily discarded. But Mr. Lovett had not been out of office 3 months before the Office of the Secretary of Defense had shelved the 143-wing Air Force and cut $5 billion from the Air Force share in the fiscal year 1954 budget—all without consulting the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the statutory "principal military advisers" of the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. It is unlikely that this could have happened if men with Air Force background had been included in OSD personnel, particularly in the Comptroller's office.

For the most part OSD has been staffed with able men. But ability is not enough. A Supreme Court comprising the nine ablest lawyers in the country would not be acceptable if it turned out that all nine came from the Wall Street firms. Nor can any President choose a Cabinet without reference to geographical distribution and diversification of career background. Those who are led, governed, or judged must have confidence that all aspects of a matter under decision are understood and objectively evaluated.

Obstacle 6. The congressional relations of the Air Force are inferior to those of the other services: In Great Britain the military services have no such relationships with Parliament as are commonplace between United States services and the Congress, and as an abstract proposition much can be said for the British practice. However, any such reduction of military-legislative contacts must take place across the board. If the Corps of Engineers, the Marines, the Reserve Officers Association, and the Navy have the number of watchful supporters in Congress they now enjoy, another service lacking such supporters will surely not be treated as "the dominant factor in modern war." The record of the Air Force in this matter is spotty. There have been periods when stanch support came from both parties in both Houses of Congress—for example, when in 1951 a greatly expanded Air Force was jointly sponsored by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and Representative CARL VINSON. There have been other periods, notably in the budget proceedings of early 1953, when Air Force support came from a few Democrats alone. More than a score of Air Force veterans were then in Congress; yet during this 1953 episode when General Vandenberg was subjected to a bullyragging never before inflicted upon a senior general officer and when $5 billion were being cut out of the Air Force budget, no Republican veteran of the Air Force came to its support and some delivered denunciatory speeches on the floor. At the present time any observer of the Hill can identify Democrats who, with a firm understanding of airpower, have backed the Air Force against all comers including a Democratic President and Secretary of Defense. But, among the Republicans, it is difficult to find those who can be counted Air Force supporters in the same sense that a dozen in the House of Representatives and a half dozen in the Senate can be counted Navy-Marine supporters.

Obstacle 7. The Air Force is really the silent service. Its senior commanders do not write books and articles. As to the war in Europe there are books by Eisenhower, Bradley, Montgomery, Patten, and a host of junior commanders, but none by Spaatz, Doolittle, Vandenberg, Eaker, Twining, Norstad, Weyland, Anderson, or Quesada—and as a result, 10 years after, several of these names are not even remembered by the public. No Air Force officer has recounted the strategic bombing effort that brought Japan to its knees—the first time in history when air power was a principal factor in causing a nation to surrender before its homeland was invaded and while its armed forces were intact. The same pattern appeared in the Korean war—some 10 books about the Army, 5 about the Navy, 4 about the Marines, and 1 about a single squadron of the Royal Australian Air Force. But not one book about the United States Air Force. Those responsible for the development of national air power have not made use of the basic instrumentalities of information and enlightenment to get the public behind them.

Obstacle 8. The Air Force has been the most serious victim of stop-and-start planning: Air Force wings have been successively programed at 66, 55, 48, 95, 143, 120, and 137—all in a period of about 6 years. No business in the world could operate under these conditions, nor can any Government department. Dislocations are frequent, and when they appear, those who have been responsible for the forced reprograming often take the lead in criticizing the Air Force for the difficulties caused by the reprograming itself. Base construction has first been held up and then ordered forward on a crash basis. Everyone knows that money and time cannot be saved concurrently. Yet when the waste appears, the flood of criticism breaks forth. Sooner or later someone says, "If the Air Force can't use money any better than this, then we should cut their appropriations," as if the money were going to the generals for their personal use.

Obstacle 9. The Air Force appears reluctant to state its full case. The overriding national priority of the air-atomic power of Strategic Air Command has survived for a long time as these things go. But it has been under steady attack, and the integrity of SAC has not always been assured. Under these conditions the Air Force is understandably hesitant to make claims for additional force that might have to be satisfied out of SAC planes, money, and men. Let us suppose for the moment that, as serious commentators have suggested, the difference between adequate and less-than-adequate strength in the Continental Air Defense Command represents an additional $3 billion a year for 5 years. The Air Force in deciding whether to request such a sum must ask itself where the money will come from. Certainly not from an addition to the total defense budget. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey is much too influential to permit any such dislocation of plans for a balanced budget and a 1950 reduction in taxes. Certainly not from the Navy, which is much too firmly entrenched in positions of power in the Department of Defense. How about the Army? The Army has already been programed for a cut of some 300,000 men, and serious resistance in Congress and in the press has appeared. A further Army cut would not seem likely. So it appears that the funds would have to come from the Air Force. A cut in Tactical Air Command would be resisted by the Army, which could logically point out that a smaller army will need greater supporting airpower to make up for its own reduced firepower. So, by a process of elimination, one suspects that the cut would come out of Strategic Air Command. Still fresh is the memory of that episode in 1948–49 when the Air Force, having performed the incredible feat of airlifting all supplies for Berlin through an entire winter, was congratulated—and told to pay most of the bill out of its own pocket. Some of that money came from SAC, and the same thing could happen again if big additional investment was required in Continental Air Defense Command. Strategic Air Command is no "mania of the bomber generals" but SAC's ability to fight and deter is their responsibility, and they cannot look with indifference on a threat to its integrity.

OBSTACLES AND LEADERSHIP

Obstacles are things to be overcome, or to be proffered as excuses.

The obstacles here listed pose problems of leadership—some at the national level to be met by the President and Congress, some at departmental level to be met by the Secretary of Defense, and some at Air Force level to be met by its civilian and military leaders. All of them put heavy demands upon determination and courage. Persuasive reasons for inaction or delay sprout in every file cabinet and blossom in every staff conference.

But airpower is an instrumentality to be enrusted to men of war-leader stature with a wartime sense of responsibility and urgency. Under these conditions each of these obstacles, and all of them together, can be overcome.

Pork-Barrel Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wausau, Wis., Daily Record-Herald of July 27, 1955:

PORK-BARREL CONGRESS

Terms such as "economy" and "balanced budget" are among those most commonly tossed around in congressional oratory.

They sound good, but in the case of many of the lawmakers they are rather meaningless. That fact was strongly pointed up recently by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD in commenting upon congressional action on the civil functions appropriation bill.

Laird noted that the House added $420 million in non-budgeted civil works projects to the amount originally recommended by the administration, and the Senate added another approximately $1.5 billion. Congress approved a conference report which included $1.8 billion of commitments not

contained in the administration's budget estimates.

Why?

As LAIRD pointed out, many projects were added, not on the basis of merit, but purely for political expediency by coalition of Republicans and Democrats who wanted to "bring back the bacon" to their home districts.

The dismal record of Congress in that regard led Laird to label it "the greatest pork-barrel Congress" and he noted that many of those who fought so hard for the pork-barrel appropriations are among the loudest advocates of a balanced budget.

LAIRD, we're happy to be able to report, strongly opposed the pork barrel drive. Too bad there aren't enough like him in Congress, lawmakers who practice what they preach about economy and a balanced budget.

A Better Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this session of the Congress is about over and we have made the record as complete as we can for this year. The end of the session always is of great interest to the public and comment in the press is always considerable. Having read many of the editorials appearing in various papers in the past few days, I think I can safely say that the Nation's editors regard this session as being unusually productive, both as far as useful legislation is concerned and in respect to the degree of cooperation between the White House and the Congress.

It was predicted by many of these same editors before the session got underway that the Democratic Congress would not be willing to go along with the President's ideas simply because they would be Republican ideas. As the record clearly shows this has not been the case. Indeed, in many instances, the Democrats have saved measures sponsored by the President when his own party refused to go along. This, it seems to me is indicative of the best type of responsible party leadership and I feel proud of the record of the Democratic Party in the Congress.

This record has met with grateful response in the Nation's press. I should like to include an editorial from one of the papers in my district as a fine example of this type of comment. The editorial from the July 30, 1955, edition of the Trentonian follows:

A BETTER RECORD

It may have escaped general attention, but it should be noted that the record of this Congress is pretty good.

Several major measures have been taken care of with reasonable dispatch, particularly the foreign-aid bill, the military Reserves legislation, and the highway construction and housing bills. Also there is the minimum-wage law, a customs simplification act and a military-survivor benefits statute on which progress has been made Unfortunately, the school construction program ran into a snag but not because there was any difference of opinion on the need for it. In addition, New Jersey is particularly proud of the fact that Congressman FRANK THOMPSON got the ball rolling on a national cultural center in Washington.

So it can safely be said that the accomlishments of this Congress have been many and noteworthy. Some will wonder why so much has been done in contrast to last year. Well, we think one answer is that Members of Congress spent less time investigating and more time legislating.

The Imports Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that every Member of Congress interested in the welfare of our cotton farmers and the future existence of our great American cotton-textile industry read a recent editorial published in the Greenville News, Greeneville, S. C., entitled "The Imports Danger."

The editor of my hometown paper, one of the leading newspaper publishers of the Southeast, gives very interesting and forthright analysis of the conditions and circumstances now confronting the cotton mills in this country. The extemely low margin of profit over the past several years has made it almost impossible for these mills to operate successfully. When the textile mills curtail or close down, both laborers and cotton farmers are vitally affected. The laborer fails to earn a livelihood to support his family and the producer of cotton is injured by resulting lower prices and loss of market. Two-thirds of all the cotton grown in the United States is purchased by the textile mills in this country. So the problems of the cotton farmer and the cotton manufacturers are so interrelated that one cannot profitably exist without the other.

In view of the tremendous reductions in tariffs on imported cotton goods recently agreed to by the State Department at the Geneva Conference—GATT—I feel that it is imperative for the President to establish quota limitations on such goods for the future protection of our textile industry and cotton producers. I commend the following editorial to your attention:

THE IMPORTS DANGER

In light of the textile industry's prolonged price depression, its struggle to keep mills running and people working despite present stepped-up imports of foreign goods, and in view of fears that things will get much worse after new tariff cuts become effective in September, it seems high time official steps were taken to keep close tabs on the situation.

States whose economic wellbeing depends on the textile industry might profitably make use of a plan just now instituted in North Carolina. The governor created a special, three-man commission of top public officials to make a continuing study of the effects of United States trade policies on industry operations, employment, agricultural conditions and the general economy of North Carolina. Factual information gathered in this manner should help guide those in Washington whose authority in trade matters has a direct bearing on jobs and living standards in the South.

Contrary to an impression voiced a good deal of late the textile industry has no margin of profit with which to combat foreign imports. Textile profits have been so slim for several years that there is no room in the profit margin to lower prices.

Official Government figures prove this. The data comes from the Securities and Exchange Commission and Federal Trade Commission. They report that industry profits, after payment of taxes, for the past year averaged less than 1 cent per dollar of sales. Profits on stockholders' investment in the same time averaged only 1.8 percent. So whichever way you measure industry profits, the answer is the same. They are low and considerably below the average for all United States business and industry.

The insidious thing about the new tariff cuts, negotiated for Japan's special benefit, is that imports from low-wage Japan will hang a Damocles sword over American markets and American mills. Japanese goods, made at one tenth of American labor cost, will cause a constant drag on American prices, wage rates and industry operations. A ceiling will be set on progress, on earnings of American employees and investors alike resulting in forestalling textile plans for new equipment and new plants; a damper on confidence in the future.

Thinking ahead to the long-range aftermath of such a forlorn trend of events, the outlook appears grave. Obviously there is one effective answer to the problem: the setting up of quota controls so as to limit the inflow of foreign goods. Efforts are reported under way in Washington to that end. Meanwhile, the gathering of all pertinent facts on this problem, as they relate to this State, would seem imperative without delay.

Hon. John Patrick Higgins, Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Superior Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to learn of the passing of Chief Justice John Patrick Higgins.

Born in Boston in 1893, educated at Harvard, Boston University, and Northeastern College of Law, he was destined to serve his State and the Nation, in the Navy during World War I; in the Massachusetts House of Representatives from 1929 to 1934; in the Congress of the United States from 1935 to 1937, and as chief justice of the Superior Court of Massachusetts to which high office he was appointed in 1937.

He had a distinguished career.

He also had great human qualities.

He will be greatly missed by his wide circle of friends.

I have personally valued his unfailing friendship over the years since we served together in the Congress.

I join in the heartfelt sympathy to all those close to him.

Sale of A-Power Bears Watching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star on July 30, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

SALE OF A-POWER BEARS WATCHING
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

About this time a year ago, when Congress was rushing pell-mell to adjourn and go home as it is now, a significant battle was fought in the Senate of which we now are having an echo.

A band of Senators resorted finally then to a filibuster against the administration bill for private development of atomic energy until they were able to write into it certain provisions to protect the public and consumer interest. In the case of this new source of energy they were determined to prevent the exploitation that was revealed by Government investigations a quarter of a century ago in the case of electric energy.

Among the protective clauses was a guaranty of preference for nonprofit groups—municipalities and other public agencies as well as rural electric cooperatives—in the sale of atomic energy from publicly owned projects, such as is already required by law in the case of electric power from public hydroelectric projects.

We thought that was all fixed and settled. But not necessarily, evidently.

Now for the echo. For that we take you to the town of West Milton, N. Y. You probably saw photographs in your newspapers of an event there. Chairman Lewis L. Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission throwing a switch which started the flow of 12,500 kilowatts of electricity from an AEC installation into a private utility system, the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

This was an epochal event. For it was the first peacetime use of electrical energy from an atomic installation. To give a human touch that the usually stern-visaged Chairman Strauss is not sure of providing, there was an added stunt for the news photographers. This was a shot of a housewife at nearby Ballston Spa, a Niagara Mohawk customer, cooking a hamburger on her electric stove with the atomic power.

What was wrong with these pictures was spotted immediately by a group several hundred miles away in Chicago—the board of directors of the Cooperative League which happened to be meeting there. And lucky it is for us that such groups are on guard.

Members of the board are thoroughly familiar with the law passed a year ago by Congress and they knew also that two cities which have municipal electric plants, Illion, N. Y., and Holyoke, Mass., as well as the Delaware County Rural Electric Cooperative at Delhi, N. Y., had applied for power from this first AEC reactor months ago, way back in January.

Under the law they are entitled to preference. They didn't get it. Niagara Mohawk is getting the power at 3 mills a kilowatthour. The reactor, which is a model of one installed in the United States submarine *Sea Wolf*, produces enough power to supply a city of 20,000 people.

The cities and the co-op would need some way to get the power to them. Rather than build transmission lines to West Milton, they had decided upon the alternative of having it "wheeled" to them over lines of Niagara Mohawk. They offered a reasonable fee to the private utility for this service. But they were turned down—and it's easy to see why, with the company getting the power for itself so cheaply.

In a resolution it drafted, approved, and sent to Chairman Strauss here in Washington, the Cooperative League's board of directors said that, under the law, the AEC itself should have hired Niagara Mohawk to wheel the power to the nonprofit groups which had applied for it under the preference guaranty. The co-ops and the cities then would have been charged for the service when they were billed by the AEC for the power. The board bluntly accused the AEC of violating the law.

What the Cooperative League is chiefly concerned about is the danger of a precedent being established which, it said in its resolution, "far outweighs the economic importance of the electric energy involved."

This might seem to be an exaggerated concern unless you know the eagerness of powerful private utilities to get their hands on this new source of energy, and how great now is their influence here in Washington.

You may recall that the AEC, under Chairman Strauss' direction, was the "broker" in the Dixon-Yates deal involving TVA which finally exploded in the face of the administration with the contract being canceled when it was shown to be the first step in a planned campaign to liquidate the great public multipurpose water resources program.

Because of AEC authority over atomic energy, that agency will bear constant watching to protect the public interest in private development of this new energy source.

One Way for the Russian Leaders To Prove the Sincerity of Their Announced Intention To Cooperate for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a very timely article entitled "Peace?—Then Let's Start Practicing It," which appeared in the July 29, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

This thoughtful writing points out how comparatively simple it would be for the Kremlin leaders to give concrete evidence of their sincerity to cooperate for peace by curtailing the barbaric attitude and actions of the satellite nations by ordering them to stop such savage brutality as they displayed in the recent shooting down of the Israeli airliner by Bulgarian guns.

The editorial follows:

PEACE?—THEN LET'S START PRACTICING IT

If the new rulers of Soviet Russia really want to help create an era of international good will, they can begin by getting the word to their satellite nations.

Bulgarian antiaircraft guns shot down an Israeli airliner this week, killing 58 persons. The plane's usual course was along the Yugoslav border, but for some reason it had crossed to the Bulgarian side. Perhaps the pilot had lost his way temporarily on the route to Greece, or maybe he assumed, carelessly, that cutting across the corner of Bulgaria would not matter.

Whatever the reason, this murderous act of the Bulgarian military against a civilian airplane was inexcusable. Bulgaria is not at war with anyone, least of all with little Israel. And hardly a civilian plane crosses Europe these days without having citizens from a half dozen countries aboard it, as this one had—Americans, British, Russian emigrees, and so on.

Unhappily, this incident typifies the mentality which created the Communist Iron Curtain, and which has perpetuated the virtual state of war between East and West. It is the mentality of barbarians: Shoot to kill and investigate later.

There is no way to evade Moscow's responsibility for this. It was Moscow's policy originally. It was Moscow's power and her absolute control over the satellites which made the policy effective.

Recently the Soviet government has been puting on a dramatic display of sweet reasonableness. It has been sending Russian delegations to America, and inviting American groups to Russia. Its bosses indulged in much backslapping and toasting at Geneva. Some of them are talking about making state visits to London and Washington.

Do they mean it, or is it just an act?

If they mean it, then it is high time they told their lackeys in Bulgaria and elsewhere to stop shooting down innocent women and children merely because some airliner pilot strays over the Iron Curtain border for a few minutes.

Such killings are utterly stupid and useless. But the Government at Moscow started them, and it will have to stop them.

This would require no more than a half dozen words from the Kremlin: "Don't let it happen again."

Until that order is put into effect, we shall all reserve judgment about the current Russian smiles and soft talk.

Road Map Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of July 29, 1955. The editorial entitled "Road Map Needed" follows:

ROAD MAP NEEDED

Americans aware of the serious gap between supply and demand in our road system will support President Eisenhower thoroughly in his appeal to Congress to reconsider road legislation.

The House defeated the administration highway plan by 224 to 193 and then defeated a Democratic substitute by the even greater margin of 292 to 123. As a result, Mr. Eisenhower said he was "deeply disappointed." He added:

"The Nation badly needs good roads. The good of our people, of our economy, and of our defense, requires that construction of these highways be undertaken at once."

Nobody, including all the congressmen who voted against highway legislation, can deny this. And if these Congressmen are as interested as the President in getting action on a road program, they will take advantage of his offer of a compromise. For Mr. Eisenhower said that contention over the method

of paying for roads should not deny the Nation the roads.

His program, first offered Congress, suggested a special Federal corporation to issue road bonds outside the Federal debt limit. The House substitute proposed a penny increase in the 2-cents-a-gallon Federal gas tax and increased levies on trucks, tires, and tubes. There was little difference between the two plans as to the roads to be built or total expenditures.

Many Congressmen opposed the administration plan because special bonds would be costly and devious in terms of increasing the national debt without seeming to increase it. And as it turned out, the powerful truckers' lobby fought the House substitute because of the increased taxes proposed. House Democratic Leader McCORMACK observed, "The answer is, Everybody wants a road bill and no one wants to pay for it."

The answer to that is, The Nation needs a road bill and cannot have it without paying for it. Bonds will only postpone and increase the payment. But if major tax increases are not politically possible, then Congress has to find a program which it feels the public will support.

That program might lie somewhere between the defeated plans, or in a scaled-down version of them. If Congress will not accept a 10- or 12-year proposal for $38 to $42 billions in expenditures, it might settle on a somewhat less ambitious 5-year plan such as the Gore bill which the Senate approved. And if Congress cannot approve either special bonds or sharp tax increases, it might agree to regular Treasury bonds plus a limited tax increase.

Highway legislation is must legislation, both to the President and, we think, to millions of motorists and the American people. It should not be put off until an election year, when politics could crack all the proposed pavement.

What is needed now is a legislative beginning that will get the highway expansion under way. Obviously the only way this Congress can begin is to compromise. President Eisenhower has given the legislators a good road map in the right direction.

The Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Congress may take a vacation but death on the highways takes no holiday. Congress should stay in session until it passes an expanded highway bill or it should come back in special session to do so.

Public demand for a highway program is growing and will continue to grow. Here is an example of the type of telegram I and, no doubt, other Members are receiving:

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Cities of State hope Congress will not adjourn without enacting expanded highway program of vital importance to all cities and towns of Washington.

ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON CITIES,
G. W. BURNS,
Mayor of Yakima, President.
CHESTER BIESEN,
Executive Secretary.

The organization that sent this telegram to me is composed of the mayors, clerks, and city officials of practically all of the incorporated cities in Washington State.

Article by Rev. James A. Bryant Entitled "Has Your Home a Room To Pray In?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend James A. Bryant, former resident of my district and at present pastor of the Wisconsin Avenue Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., is the author of an excellent short article which appeared in the American Weekly of July 31 entitled "Has Your Home a Room To Pray In?" Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include the Reverend Bryant's article, as follows:

It was D-day plus 30. The Fighting Fourth Infantry Division, in which I was a chaplain, had been under constant fire since landing at H-hour on Normandy Beach. Now the pressure was on. The bombs were hailing down. Everybody ducked for cover.

I went for a foxhole. As I crouched there, knowing that scores of us would not be alive when this assault was over, I wondered how many were prepared to meet their Maker. It was then the thought came to me, and I said a simple prayer.

I don't remember the words, but I know I promised God that if I emerged alive I would devote the rest of my life to reviving the old-fashioned idea of altars in the home.

I've been at it ever since, and I am happy to be able to report that there has been progress. Today in 70,000 American homes at least a corner is set aside for God. Our goal—mine and that of the hundreds who have enlisted in this project—is that 5 million homes eventually will have a spot where a small table and an open Bible serve as the center of family worship and prayer.

It hasn't been easy because there are so many scoffers, particularly among the young. I recall an instance in one of the first homes in which our message stuck. Two teen-age boys in the household sneered openly when their hard-working parents designated a portion of the living room for worship.

One night, after they presumed everyone was in bed, they sneaked out of their room to keep a date with some other boys and a hot-rod. The sound of low voices halted them and they stopped a moment to listen.

Their father and mother were praying together. They admitted they had failed in the upbringing of their sons and they asked God to take over. The boys crept back to bed. A few nights later they joined in the family prayers. One of them is now studying for the ministry.

Maybe I had hopefully envisioned scenes like this when I made my vow in the foxhole. Anyhow, when I came out alive I didn't wait long to get started. The next day I began to write letters to leaders of every denomination.

The responses were enthusiastic and mail-call became an inspiring spiritual experience for me on one battlefield after another.

After my discharge I toured the country for 8 months, speaking in a different church each night. Soon I was no longer alone. Volunteers in many communities organized to help with the work. Today, a decade later, 45 teams of men and women from dozens of denominations travel and speak to all who will listen. We call our organization the Christian Home League.

When our forefathers were battling the wilderness and churches were largely for city dwellers, worship was a warmly personal matter and the home was usually its setting. But even in the atomic age, families that pray together stay together.

I know of a young couple in the South who were headed for divorce. The wife was seeking escape in alcohol and the husband seemed powerless to help her. One of the Christian Home League teams suggested a home altar. "It's probably futile," the husband said, "but what have I to lose?"

Each night, whether his wife was sober or not, he led her into the living room and they prayed together. For months there was no reaction but then, gradually, the tippling lessened. It's a happy household now.

I can say honestly that I have never known a marriage to fail where there was an altar in the home. And there can be other dividends, too. The two most ardent workers on one of our teams in the midwest are a father and mother whose daughter's life had been given up by doctors. The girl recovered almost miraculously after they set up a home altar and prayed.

It may be apocryphal, but I like the story of the little girl whose father had rejected the home-altar idea "because church is the place to pray."

"What's the matter, Daddy?" she asked. Aren't you and God as good friends on Monday as you are on Sunday?"

Manpower Cuts in the Army Are Endangering National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Don Whitehead, of the Associated Press, which appeared in the July 17th edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, having to do with the reduction in the Army's manpower. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that we are ignoring the hard lesson we learned in World War II and Korea. In my opinion we have reduced our Army manpower below a safe and reasonable point.

The article follows:

ITS STEPCHILD ROLE WORRIES THE ARMY

(By Don Whitehead)

The gray-walled Pentagon is a divided military household these days, with the Army—senior member of the Armed Forces family—feeling like a spanked and rejected stepchild.

An immediate factor in this somber mood is the impending reduction in the Army's manpower, a step which the Nation's top generals had sharply opposed. Cutting even deeper, however, is the Army's concern over the lack of clear agreement within Government circles as to the exact role the soldier would be assigned in case of nuclear war.

Army men feel that their famous 5-star comrade in arms, President Eisenhower, yanked them rather roughly into the woodshed in the course of approving the manpower cutbacks. Gen. Matthew Ridgway, who on June 30 stepped down as Army Chief

of Staff, publicly opposed the reductions before the House Appropriations Committee.

President Eisenhower, questioned on this position at a subsequent news conference, described it as "parochial"—meaning narrow and limited.

In Pentagon circles, however, one hears that the opposition went beyond the views of any single individual, such as Ridgway or his successor, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor. It was the thinking of the men who make up the Army's top command.

The cutbacks emphasize that, despite the opposition of the generals, the administration has decided to base the Nation's security and military policy more on nuclear weapons and less on manpower.

It underlines, too, the historical fact that the Army itself is marching into the shadow of airpower. Nuclear weapons and airpower have had such an impact on military thinking that some quarters even believe a war would be over before an army could swing into action.

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, voiced this viewpoint recently when he said that the next war would be over in 3 or 4 days—"at the most a week"—and the Army and Navy wouldn't have time to get into full action. CANNON added: "What could we do with 3 or 4 more divisions? We wouldn't possibly use them."

But the Army doesn't agree. It questions whether the nuclear weapon would be as decisive a factor as it is being painted. It insists that the foot soldier would be needed in atomic war just as he was needed in past wars—and in even greater numbers.

Nobody is speaking out loud at the Pentagon about the situation. The Army appears resigned to seeing its forces cut to 1,027,000 men by June 30, 1956, from the present level of 1,270,000. General Taylor has steered clear—at least in public—of the controversy.

There's no sign of a "generals' rebellion" brewing, such as the "admirals' revolt" in 1949, when the Navy went to war against the Air Force's B–36 strategic bomber program and fought successfully to have its own carrier program. But beneath the surface acceptance there is resentment, sharp disagreement, even dismay over the military policy taking shape under the Eisenhower administration.

Army men say privately that the administration's concern over a balanced budget is overshadowing military requirements. They argue that this is creating an unbalanced military situation in which too much reliance is being placed on machines and nuclear weapons to win a decision in war.

One officer summed up the Army's thinking in this manner:

"Our military policy today is following the line which was advocated by the late Sen. Robert A. Taft—that is, to put a balanced budget and the so-called dynamic and expanding economy above all else.

"The Truman administration, after the Korean war began, put the military requirements first and decided to worry about the budget later. This administration has reversed the policy and gone to the other extreme in emphasizing a balanced budget.

"We had no choice in fixing the Army manpower level in the New Look. Ridgway was given a budgetary framework and told to fit the Army forces into that frame. It wasn't a question of our requirements.

"The present policy puts less reliance on manpower and greater emphasis on machines and atomic weapons. This policy is cheaper. It's more popular politically. And it holds forth the questionable promise that victory can be achieved with one weapon—the nuclear weapon.

"We happen to think that if there is a war, big or little, the foot soldier will be needed just as badly as he has been in past wars, although we certainly don't intend to try to match the Communists on a man-to-man basis.

"We are not asking for balanced forces in the sense of dividing up the approximations evenly. We think the emphasis should be on airpower. That is all right. But with the cuts, we believe we are losing our own mobility."

Another Army argument is that by cutting back the Army, the United States is giving allies an impression that we won't stand beside them and fight with troops to repel aggression. One Army man commented: "We're saying in effect, 'You will have to do your own fighting on the ground—but we'll be along later to liberate you.'

"This policy of liberation isn't going to keep friends. If a country must make a choice between neutralism and liberation—it is likely to be neutralism."

On the other side, the Army's arguments have been opposed by Defense Secretary Wilson, Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and retiring Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens. They have been backed by the military prestige of President Eisenhower.

Wilson and Radford told Congress that the Armed Forces were being shaped for a readiness which this country could afford to maintain for an indefinite period of time. Radford said this span may be 10 years or it may be 50.

Both men agreed that more reliance is being placed on nuclear and other modern weapons and less on manpower. But even so, they argued, the strength of the Armed Forces has increased tremendously, with the Army having 80 percent more firepower than it had in World War II with conventional weapons.

Radford said that the manpower cuts had come as no surprise to him because they conformed to the New Look review made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff 2 years ago. And he added that the long-range defense program had been evolved only after the most searching review of the Nation's military requirements for security.

Stevens gave the Army no support. He said the pullback of American troops from Korea, increased Army firepower, and greater military strength in the free nations do not make it necessary to change this program at the present (to avoid the cutback in Army strength).

And Charles Finucane, Under Secretary of tthe Army, said the Army at its present strength "has twice as many men in it as it had at the outbreak of the Korean war; the Army today has more material and is better equipped to fight, and has a higher degree of training than ever before in peacetime."

In addition, he said, the Army was "ready and willing" to take care of any brush-fire war.

The cleavage in military thinking isn't so astonishing as it might seem (considering the impact of nuclear weapons on war plans. With this new and terrible power available in case of war, some old concepts become distorted and some military terms lose their old meaning.

For example, there has been considerable talk of nuclear bombs being used as "tactical weapons". In World War II and even in the Korean war, tactical weapons were conventional bombs up to 1,000 pounds, artillery, rockets, mortars, and so forth.

Secretary of State Dulles spoke recently of "small" atomic bombs being used for pinpointing tactical military targets such as airfields, bridges and supply dumps. Actually, the "tactical weapon" of today can be an atomic bomb as destructive or even more destructive than the bomb which wiped out Hiroshima.

The Army's 280-millimeter atomic cannon fires a shell that's almost equal in destructive power to the Hiroshima bomb, which had the explosive equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT.

It is the realization in high places of the power of nuclear weapons that has caused the uncertainty over the role of the foot soldier. The Army is crying that infantrymen will carry the drudgery of ground fighting in any future war just as they have done in the past. But the cries have been muffled from above in the drive for air and atomic supremacy over Russia.

A Tribute to Free Enterprise in Behalf of Its Obligation to the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues will agree with me that we, and Congress, are called upon from time to time to lend our high offices to the furtherance of various projects which are at best highly commercial in nature.

However, when a large commercial organization shows a consistent policy of engaging in civic activities designed for the general public's good, I think we would be derelict, to say the least, were we to ignore such an organization purely because it is of a commercial nature. I refer specifically at this time to another of the fine examples of public service carried out by the P. Ballantine and Sons Breweries, of Newark, N. J.

My colleagues may remember that 5 years ago, when each of us was concerned with the vast and disturbing problem of civilian defense in our various constituencies, P. Ballantine and Sons were quick to evolve a program of mobile emergency disaster relief in the area surrounding the company's home office in Newark, N. J. They may recall that this became a model for other large organizations to follow, and that we took cognizance here in Congress of that public mindedness. At the time this organization outfitted fleets of trucks as emergency disaster units, manned by drivers trained for civilian defense work, and placed them at the call of the New Jersey civil defense director. It was, perhaps, as I suggest, a venture in the commercial interest; but it was also a gesture of invaluable aid to the community, and one which we here in Congress should have and did laud.

Several years later, in 1953 to be exact, when the National Symphony Orchestra here in Washington was in danger of having to be disbanded because of the lack of public support, P. Ballantine again rushed into the breach and rendered incalculable assistance in the preservance of this admittedly fine musical organization. By presenting a successful summer musical festival here in Washington, this company contributed to saving the National Symphony Orchestra and continuing its excellent concert programs. I submit that this was

a public service of a type which, although admittedly containing its commercial overtones, was not duplicated by any of the many private interests also concerned with the welfare of the National Symphony.

Now, once again, my attention has been called to another public-spirited gesture on the part of Ballantine. I refer to the membership drive now being conducted on behalf of the American Legion.

I am sure I do not have to remind my colleagues of the necessity for maintaining a strong and virile veterans organization such as the Legion. For many ex-servicemen it is their one link with their Government in matters concerning our national defense and the creation of a vigorous and always prepared America.

And now, in furtherance of that aim, the American Legion has instituted a vast membership drive. American Legion members have been engaged in signing up new members for their organization, including renewals of memberships which may have become inactive, through the stimulus of a contest supported by the Ballantine Co.

As I am an active member of the American Legion, I think it is not outside our province to give due recognition to the advantages to be gained from such gestures, and to extend our thanks to P. Ballantine & Sons, as well as to any other organization similarly motivated.

Mr. Talbott's Split Personality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the difficulties involved when a man in high public office attempts to be two different personalities are discussed in a column by Walter Lippmann published in the Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. Lippman refers to the case of Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott, who is another shining example of the high ethical standards of this administration.

Other examples which come readily to mind are the early "four per center" scandal and the Dixon-Yates deal.

The column by Mr. Lippmann follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE OFFICIAL AND THE PARTNER

The mystery of the Talbott case is how he managed to act so foolishly, and the best explanation would seem to be that he has been two men, public official and private promoter, inhabiting the same body. The Secretary of the Air Force and the Mulligan partner have lived and worked side by side in the Pentagon, each more or less uncontrolled by the other. The Secretary did not serve the partner corruptly. But neither did he rule the partner properly.

There is no evidence, I believe, that Mr. Talbott used his power as Secretary of the Air Force to induce or compel defense contractors to give profitable business to the Mulligan firm. There is no evidence, that is to say, that he meant to act corruptly. On the contrary, the evidence, including his own admission of his mistakes, shows that the Secretary was not really aware of what the Mulligan partner was doing. Had he realized it, had he been acting consciously and corruptly, he would have taken the trouble, as a competent villain would, to cover his tracks. The last thing he would have done was what Talbott actually did do, which was to promote his private business from his office in the Pentagon and with the help of Air Force personnel and on Air Force stationery.

There is no obvious explanation of such extraordinary foolishness. There is no doubt that he has been proud and happy to be Secretary of the Air Force, and that he is deeply attached to his and honorable office. There is no doubt that he is a rich man to whom $60,000 is not important money, and that it could buy him nothing remotely so precious as his public office. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that his Mulligan activities, once they were known, were obviously bound to ruin his public career. There is no doubt, moreover, that his activities will hurt badly the Mulligan firm itself.

The whole performance makes no sense except on the theory that Talbott was two men, and that when the Mulligan partner was in charge of his body, the Secretary of the Air Force was sleeping and unconscious. For no Secretary of the Air Force who was functioning at all could have supposed that it was right to promote from his office in the Pentagon, a profitable private business on the fringes of the national defense. In this case the Secretary did not veto the partner's activities. Neither did he hide his activities. So I say that the public official must have been suppressed and asleep.

The question, then, is why the Secretary of the Air Force did not govern the promoter, why he did not enforce the standards of public behavior upon the private businessman. There is here a great and persistent ethical question which has been discussed since the days of the Greek moralists. Can a man who knows what is right do wrong—can he knowingly give in to his appetite, say for the Mulligan profits? Socrates held that no one acts against what he knows to be right—that men act wrongly from ignorance.

But Aristotle disagrees with Socrates, pointing out that a man may do what is wrong if his convictions about what is right are confused and weak, not clear and strong. In this deplorable case we must, I believe, side with Aristotle and say that as compared with the avarice of the Mulligan partner, the moral convictions of the Secretary were confused and weak.

It has been pointed out that the Talbott case poses the problem of the workability and the fairness of the old statute about conflict of interests. There is, of course, such a problem and it is a very difficult one. But the Talbott case bears only indirectly, in my view, on that problem, for no matter how much the statutes were liberalized, it could never be stretched to the point of tolerating the use of a public office to promote a private business that is closely related to the public business. The law might be revised, for example, to permit a man to keep his old securities and to receive the dividends. But nobody would suggest that it could be made lawful for him to use the facilities of public office to enhance the value of his securities.

The essence of the problem of conflict of interests, is that only the most elementary rules can be fixed in the law; that all the rest lies in what Lord Moulton once called "the domain of manners," which includes "all the things that a man should impose upon himself from duty to good taste." It is possible to say in the law that an official must not make a private profit out of his public actions. But it is not possible to set down in the law just how he must decide the more complicated issues where his private interest, though it is involved, cannot be measured in dollars and cents. His moral duty is to decide every question on public grounds alone, regardless of whether this hurts or helps him, his family, his partners, his friends, or his political party. But here, not the law but only an instructed conscience can help him make the decision.

In the case of a high and conspicuous public official, who must not only do his job but cannot help setting an example, the sovereign rule is never to give his private interests the benefit of any doubt. Talbott seems not to have understood that rule.

Though I think it has no bearing upon the Talbott case, which is quite simple and obvious, the wider problems of the conflict of interests need to be reexamined and reconsidered. They are a complicated cluster of problems. One of them, though only one, arises from the fact that for many business executives the holding of a public office is not a new career but an interlude in their normal careers. The question is whether a temporary public servant can be expected, or should be required, to reorganize his private affairs as if he were a Federal judge or a foreign security officer or a civil servant in a lifetime career. Many men refuse the temporary public assignment because they are unwilling to make the big personal sacrifice which the existing rules now demand. And, on the other hand, insofar as the temporary officials are intending to return to their old business, can it truly be said that there is not, in the intent of the statute, a conflict of interests?

We must, I think, ask ourselves whether, except in the emergency of war, it is good public policy to rely so much on temporary officials. For myself I do not think it is. For no matter how able the business executive, it will take him a long time to learn the public business. The Pentagon has seen a continuing stream of civilian officials, coming in with no knowledge of the Pentagon and going out just about when they have acquired some knowledge. Does not the public business of national defense require civilian as well as military officers who make the national defense the work of their lives?

Sometimes I wonder whether the President is not mistaken in thinking that a trained private executive and a trained public official are interchangeable. For, instead of building up a corps of high career officials, he seems to be trying to get along with men borrowed temporarily from the official hierarchy of the private corporation.

Richard B. Vail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of the untimely death of Dick Vail, whose friendship I valued highly. He was a man whose many fine personal qualities endeared him to all who knew him, a charming person with whom it was a pleasure to be associated.

But he was a great deal more than that, and it is these additional qualities

which make his death a public as well as a private loss. Richard B. Vail was devoted to the principles of republicanism, of democracy, to those qualities which have made America great. He was an ardent anti-Communist and performed a significant service to his country through his participation in the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the 80th Congress. He saw clearly the danger to the strength of this country which lay in the growing power of the Federal Government, and he opposed vigorously, both as a Member of the 80th and 82d Congresses and as a private individual, the impending threat of the trend toward socialism.

Dick Vail was a Christian gentleman, whose deep and real kindness was evidenced by frequent and generous contributions made quietly and privately to many needy individuals and organizations. He was a man who never knowingly injured another, and who was scrupulously fair to all.

His death is a great loss to the people he served, to his friends, and to his family. I should like to extend to his sisters, Emily and La La, and his brother, Walter, my deepest sympathy.

Religious Services at West Point Academy Should Be Conducted by Regular Army Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time two articles pertaining to the manner in which religious services are currently afforded the cadets attending West Point.

The first article is an editorial entitled "West Point Chaplain," which appeared in the June 17, 1955, issue of the Catholic Free Press; the second article is a letter written to me under date of July 29, 1955, by the secretary of the Atlantic district of the Lutheran Church, Missouri synod.

Both of these writings advocate action of the United States Senate to harmonize the policy of religious practice at West Point in accord with that now prevailing at our other Academies of the Navy and Air Force, thus preventing infringement upon the religious rights of any West Point cadet and providing equal status for the chaplain representatives of all religious faiths.

The articles follow:

WEST POINT CHAPLAIN

The United States Senate should make a thorough review of the West Point chaplaincy situation before acting upon a recent bill filed by Senators RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican of Massachusetts, chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, of the Senate Armed Services Committee. This measure would increase the salary of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy and provide for an assistant chaplain.

By a tradition that predates the present controversy over separation of church and state, the chaplain at West Point must be a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church and a civilian. Nominated by the President, the minister is confirmed in office by the Senate. The official Sunday service at the United States Military Academy is of an Episcopalian character.

There are indications that some members of the Armed Services Committee are seeking a long look at the curious relic of denominationalism in the Armed Forces, tradition or not. At West Point, the present practice is to excuse Catholic and Jewish cadets from the Sunday service at the Academy chapel. Two diocesan priests, assigned to West Point by the archbishop of New York, provide the spiritual care of Catholic cadets in a Catholic chapel built at the Academy several years ago under an act of Congress.

At the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, two chaplains, a Catholic and a Protestant, are assigned from the ranks of Regular Navy chaplains. A similar policy has been announced for the new Air Force Academy in Colorado.

It seems only just that the West Point chaplaincy be filled from the ranks of Regular Army chaplains and that the denominational character of the appointment be avoided as an infringement upon the rights of the cadets. The priests assigned to West Point over the years by the archdiocese of New York have done admirable work in behalf of the Catholic cadets, but it certainly would be more in keeping with Army policy and present American practice to provide equal status for representatives of the Jewish and Catholic faiths.

ATLANTIC DISTRICT,
LUTHERAN CHURCH, MISSOURI SYNOD,
Closter, N. J., July 29, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DONOHUE: The Atlantic district of the Lutheran Church, Missouri synod, comprises the area of New England, New York, and New Jersey. The Lutheran Church—Missouri synod numbers 5,000 congregations in its membership; the Atlantic district numbers 230. Delegates from the 230 congregations in convention assembled June 27–30, 1955, at Bronxville, N. Y., passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the Lutheran cadets attending West Point Military Academy are required to attend religious services conducted by a clergyman not of their denominational affiliation; and

"Whereas this may constitute an invasion of conscience; and

"Whereas this requirement conflicts with the practice of the Lutheran Church—Missouri synod, which practice is substantiated by the Bill of Rights: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this convention respectfully request the President of the United States and the Congress to support such legislation as will harmonize the religious practices at West Point Military Academy in this matter with the other service academies; and be it furthermore

"*Resolved*, That the district secretary convey a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and to all Congressmen representing the Atlantic district area."

May you give this matter your valued consideration.

Sincerely,

CARL M. ZORN,
Secretary.

Agriculture Storm Signals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a press release from the National Live Stock Producer, one of the leading livestock magazines.

The release relates to an article in the August issue by H. M. Conway, market research economist, who warns that agriculture may be heading for hard times similar to those which happened the last time Republicans controlled the administration and were content with predicting good times based solely upon activity by coupon clippers and stock-market speculators.

Once again we have an administration which is content with the status quo, and which speaks of the necessity of the adjustments which the farmer must make. Unfortunately these adjustments always seem to be downward.

The press release follows:

CHICAGO.—Watch out for a repeat of the 1930's in agriculture, warns H. M. Conway, market research economist, in the August issue of National Live Stock Producer, the Nation's leading livestock publication.

Conway points out that hog prices are averaging 77 percent of parity and lambs 78 percent. In terms of the cost of products the stockman buys, the livestock industry has a purchasing power of between 75 and 80 percent of normal.

For agriculture as a whole, the value of the farm dollar is 85 cents, a level that eventually wrecked a generation of farmers during the 1930's.

It is possible that the present economic situation may be helped by a continued upward industrial and inflationary trend. That would not correct the cause, says Conway, but only aggravate and temporarily delay pending adjustments.

In addition to the growing price spread between the producer and consumer, the livestock industry is being faced with delayed retail price adjustments.

This has been quite significant in the case of hogs during the early part of this year. A more serious situation is in prospect for the late summer and fall. It may also extend to cattle.

The result will be a still greater price spread because retail prices will be too high to move the meat supply to consumers at a normal rate.

Hogs will be hit extra hard because more costs are involved processing and distribution.

Livestock producers and feeders are faced with a renewed and growing disparity between agriculture and industry and by a temporary delay in the downward adjustment of retail prices to the prevailing demand and supply of meat.

Such conditions were faced in the early 1920's and 1930's but during the past 2 decades they have been largely offset and obscured by the general uptrend in commodity values—a reflection of industrial prosperity and extreme inflation.

Fundamentally, nothing has ever been done to correct the cause of these conditions so it is now expedient for livestock industry to recognize the situation and move the supply

of meat to consumers on a normal price basis during the next 6 months.

As to the welfare of the livestock producer, such economic conditions are often more serious than droughts or overproduction.

Davy Crockett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when you presented my 9-year-old grandson, Danny Doyle Stanton, from California, the gavel of the day the other afternoon after the House adjourned, one of the reasons I made it my business and pleasure to learn about the legislative experiences of Davy Crockett, former Member of this House of Representatives.

For, Mr. Speaker, my own grandson, Danny, who is visiting his "nanna" and me until Congress adjourns, almost daily insisted that he wanted to know "what kind of a Congressman Davy Crockett was." Not only he asked me, but other children from the great 23d District of California, and adults, too, asked me. So I found out. I knew you would be pleased to see some of the public response my effort received.

Here is an article handed me by our distinguished colleague, GORDON CANFIELD, of Paterson, N. J. It appeared in the Paterson Morning Call of August 1, 1955:

FINDS DAVY CROCKETT SERVED THREE TERMS IN UNITED STATES CONGRESS

(By Pat Paterson)

Now all you loyal Davy Crockett fans will be able to wear your coonskin caps with new dignity.

It's authentic, right from the archives of the Congressional Library: David Crockett did serve three times in Congress, 1827–31 and 1833–35.

This valuable information was dug up at the request of Congressman CLYDE DOYLE, of California, who has been besieged by Crockett admirers of all ages to confirm the current hero's service as a representative from Tennessee.

Crockett's record in Congress, while not spectacular was admirable. There is no reference to his "patching up the crack in the liberty bell" but he did go down the line for his constituents getting quite a few of them on the military pension list, clearing up titles and land grants, and establishing post roads. He came the closest to gaining national prominence when he offered a resolution on February 9, 1830, to abolish West Point Academy and "the appropriations annually made for its support be discontinued."

His suggestion must have stirred up quite a rhubarb in the capital because farther down in the record it is noted that Crockett submitted another resolution calling for the reprint of "6,000 copies of the report of the Secretary of War in relation to the Military Academy at West Point."

"MIGHTY HUNTER"

There seems to be no record of his having "kilt a bar when he was only three" but he is described as a "mighty hunter," although "a poor farmer, indolent and shiftless."

Crockett's tragic love life, in the words of today's popular ballad, reads a little differently in the brief biography compiled for Congressman DOYLE by Norman D. Burch, of the Congressional Library's history and general research division.

Crockett's first brush with love came when he was 18, and it hit him so hard he conceded to attend school to win the favor of his lady love. He went for 6 months, but when she turned him down, he tossed in his books.

His broken heart was mended a few months later by one Polly Findlay, who turned over a dower of two cows with calves. Crockett did his share by borrowing $15 and renting a piece of land with a horse thrown in. Polly died in 1815 leaving with him three children. But a few months later he married again, this time the widow of a fellow soldier who added two children of her own to Crockett's three.

Without education, polish or culture he managed to get himself elected a magistrate, a justice of the peace, and a full colonel of a militia regiment organized in his district. Next he was elected to the legislature, although at the time his knowledge of public affairs was so limited he did not even know the meaning of the word "judiciary." He boasted of rely on "natural sense instead of law learning."

He prided himself on his lack of education, correct spelling appearing to him as something "contrary to nature" and grammar as "nothing at all" * * * despite "the fuss that is made about it."

STARTED AS JOKE

Crockett's congressional candidacy started off as a joke, but he took it seriously, and he carried on a campaign that ran second only to Paul Bunyon for tall stories. He was ridiculed and laughed out but he won the race, was reelected for a second term and then after an unsuccessful run was elected again. He was defeated on his next try for reelection by an upsurge of Jacksonian sentiment in his district.

"When he came home his politickin' done," Crockett took up his rifle and went off to join the forces fighting for Texan independence. He went down in the final assault at the Alamo.

But for the imagination and enterprise of a team of modern song writers and disc jockeys, Davey Crockett would have remained just a shadowy figure in the early history of the Nation, instead of a brand name for Tee shorts, pup tents, coonskin caps, and all the other gear that today's small fry clamors for.

There are those who have sneered at the current Davey Crockett hysteria, and even so powerful an organization as the UAW–CIO has termed him a reactionary, an enemy of labor, but thanks to Congressman DOYLE, the record has been set straight and Davey Crockett has emerged in true perspective as: "A brave soldier, an able scout, and an expert rifleman * * * generous and openhanded, frank and upright, of a sterling independence of spirit and blessed with bubbling good nature and an exceptional degree of self-confidence," a self-made man who loved, served, fought and died in the typical American way * * * and followed his star right into the West."

As you know, I placed his record as a Congressman in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within the last few days.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is the treatment of my subject in the New York Times for August 1, 1955:

THE LIGHTER SIDE OF AN EXPIRING CONGRESS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 1.—The work of Congress, as reflected in the daily news, leaves the impression that the legislative grind goes on hour after hour, unrelieved by pleasing distractions. This impression is the strongest, and nearest to the fact, as Congress races toward the adjournment of a session. But even last week, when issues of great importance were being disposed of by action, deferral, or rejection, the legislators indulged themselves in several relaxing activities.

These covered a wide range. The Senate twice entertained groups of guests who took a bow. The House listened to a Member's account of the value of holding grassroots conferences in their districts during the recess. It was also the privilege of the House to receive from another Member, undoubtedly for the first time, a complete history of the legislative record of the Honorable Davy Crockett of Tennessee.

HONORED GUESTS

Senator ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, opened the social activities in the greatest deliberative assemblage on earth. After notifying the Vice President of the absence of a quorum, and thus obtaining one, he emceed as follows:

"Let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that today we are particularly honored by having with us a group of fine young Las Vegas high-school students, the Rhythymettes. They are a precision drill team without equal anywhere in the United States. I should like to direct the attention of all my colleagues to the section of the gallery to the left, where the Rhythymettes are seated; and I ask that they stand and take a bow from the Senate of the United States."

Of course, it was the Senate that took the bow and the Rhythymettes who performed it. But, according to the official transcript, "the designated guests of the Senate rose and were greeted with applause by the Members."

FROM DOWN UNDER

The amenities thus established, it was the turn of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. "I should like to present," he said, "some distinguished visitors from Australia." They were the Minister of Supply, the Chairman of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, and the Ambassador to Washington. With an admirable sense of proportion, the Senate not only applauded louder and longer than it did for the Rhymettes. The Members also rose in their places.

Meanwhile in the House, Representative PAUL F. SCHENCK, of Ohio, was explaining how he would employ the recess to win friends and influence people in his constituency, the plain implication being that his colleagues would be well-advised to do likewise instead of going fishing. "Our Third District of Ohio," he said, "is located in the great and beautiful Miami Valley. The people of this district have made many outstanding contributions to the health, welfare, and progress of our Nation and the world. * * * It is the birthplace of aviation."

His aim, said SCHENCK, was to be "of service" to every constituent with a Federal problem, and he had discovered that the "face-to-face conference" helped him to serve them "in a much more effective manner." He would, SCHENCK told the House, beginning September 6, from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m., hold these meetings with his electorate in eight of the towns in his political domain. For this hint of the higher salesmanship the Ohio statesman received grateful applause.

KING OF THE WILD PENSIONER

But as a public service, the more unselfish because clearly the group most interested is not of voting age, the lighter moment supplied by Representative CLYDE DOYLE, of California, easily bore off the laurels. He was, he said, now in a position to answer

his own grandchildren's questions about the congressional career of Davy Crockett and also "enable every Member of this great legislative body to do the same." Through DOYLE the House learned that when Davy sat in the 20th, 21st, and 22d Congresses, from the next of which President Jackson's voting friends unkindly displaced him, the king of the wild frontier did these things, among others:

Offered a resolution looking to the placement of a national armory on Big Shoals Creek.

Paved the way for pensions for Andrew Dewberry, William Walker, and many other veterans of the Revolution and the War of 1812.

Sought an inquiry into the "expediency of having a survey of a rout [sic] for a canal from Muscle Shoals to Bolivar, Tenn.; into the expediency of putting George W. Shell "on the pension role as an involede" [the spelling was Davy's]; proposed the abolition of the West Point Military Academy, and unsuccessfully contested the election in which he was defeated.

When DOYLE's colleagues get home, they will now, thanks to him, be able to relate these stirring tales, which Disney overlooked, to their coonskin-capped progeny.

Who's Overruling Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed editorial from the Indianapolis Star of July 5, 1955, is significant. It really should have been inserted before the recent favorable action by the House on amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHO'S OVERRULING WHOM?

The proposal to exempt natural-gas producers from price regulation by the Federal Power Commission has passed the first congressional hurdle. It has been approved by the Commerce Committees of both House and Senate. Indianapolis and other Indiana communities which use natural gas have an interest in the passage of the bill, as it will have direct bearing on adequate future gas supply at reasonable cost.

Meanwhile, opponents of the measure, who have little to support their position other than a mania for Federal controls, have been trying to stir up sentiment with an argument that the exemption bill is an attempt to "overrule the Supreme Court." This is utter nonsense.

From the language of the 1938 Natural Gas Act, it seems quite obvious to the lay citizen that it was the intent of Congress to exempt independent natural-gas producers from FPC control. But the Supreme Court decided last year that the act does not mean what it says, and that all gas entering interstate commerce is subject to FPC price control from wellhead to distributor. If there is questionable use of authority here, it is in the Supreme Court decision, which has the effect of making law.

The making of law is the province of Congress. There is no question whatsoever of the right of Congress to make a law, and to change a law at any later time. The FPC was created by Congress and has—or ought to have—no jurisdiction other than that specifically given to it by Congress. Congress can alter that jurisdiction at any time, or abolish the FPC at will. It is empty-headed demagoguery to talk about "overruling the Court" in relation to a proposal to put the intent of Congress into such plain language that the Supreme Court cannot fail to understand it.

A Businessman Looks at Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, who delights in adjusting farm income downward, has a pet suggestion that farmers should not lose their ability to sweat.

I do not know how long it has been since Mr. Benson has been around farmers in any spot other than some air-cooled office in Washington, but I can assure him that Pennsylvania farmers have not forgotten how to sweat; in fact they along with all farmers, are not only sweating, literally, now during the heat wave, but they are sweating figuratively as they try to live under the adjustments which have brought about declining prices and higher costs.

One of best analyses of the farm problem I have seen is by a businessman, Ira K. Dutweiler, chairman, agriculture committee, Lebanon County Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Dutweiler's analysis has been printed in the monthly publication of the Lebanon County chamber.

The article follows:

WHAT'S THE ANSWER ON AGRICULTURE'S PROBLEM?

(By Ira K. Dutweiler)

It is generally conceded that at present agriculture is the weakest link in the national economy. It therefore seems logical that a thorough diagnosis of its present condition and the cause thereof, is absolutely essential before intelligent recommendations can be made for improvements.

For years I have heard one of the poultry experts from Penn State annually make the same recommendation. "Competition is getting keener, and only farmers operating most efficiently and pulling their belts a notch tighter, will survive this year." This prediction was only too correct, but some of us are wondering why farmers shall pull their belts a notch tighter every year, until their tongue sticks out so far it is getting tangled up with their shoelaces, while at the same time industry and labor are loosening up their belts a notch each year, and receiving greater remuneration annually for less hours of work.

In the midst of the country's greatest prosperity, practically only agriculture's income is going down.

While industry and labor are enjoying the greatest income ever received, neither agricultural leaders not Government agricultural officials have anything to offer or predict for agriculture except more declines in income for the present, while talking about long-range programs for the future.

It can be noted, however, that industry's and labor's long-range programs are planned by leaders who have produced successful and prosperous results for 1954 in 1954. Perhaps it would be a good idea for agriculture to copy the same idea, and to insist that its leaders in and out of Government solve 1955 problems in 1955, before they start talking about long-range programs. What good is a long-range program for a small farmer who has a note coming due September 1, 1955? What will his banker say when the note comes due, and all the farmer can give him is a promise of a long-range program at some indefinite future time?

The agricultural problem is difficult to solve because it is difficult to understand. Much reading and study is required. You must understand the functions and operations of government, the economics of agriculture, and the relation of one to the other and the effects of one or the other.

Many farmers who are using all the latest and most improved implements and machinery for operating their farms are advocating economics of the Daniel Boone era, and they just don't fit.

The average family size farmer who works long hours out in the open is usually physically so fatigued by night that he is asleep before he gets through with the local personal news and does not read anything economically enlightening.

In a general way farmers realize that every time an increase of wages is granted to the steel, etc., workers, the cost of the things they buy is bound to go up, but very few have any idea that anything can be done about it. I cannot find any prominent agricultural or Government leader who has gone on record in favor of tying the prices farmers are to receive for their crops to the rise and fall of industrial and labor prices.

It is unfortunately only too true that the vast number of farmers' knowledge of the economics of Government and agriculture is limited to the political harangues shortly before elections, when statements are made, which I think the late Wendell Willkie stated had better never been made.

The Soviet Farm Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, through the newspapers, periodicals, and newsreels, we have been reading and hearing accounts of the visit of the so-called Soviet farm group to the Iowa farm belt. The avowed purpose of this trip is the observation of the techniques and industry of the American farmer. This group has been showered with the traditional hospitality of the American people.

No one has objection to a welcoming of delegations to observe the progress under free enterprise as enjoyed by the American people, but many are wary of the actual reports which will be made according to the dictum and rules laid down by the rulers in the Kremlin.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the American Friends of Russian Freedom have issued a statement which I am sure will be of interest to all my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this statement:

The Soviet farm delegation touring the corn belt of Iowa has been met in a spirit of warmhearted cordiality, typical of American hospitality to strangers. To this no one can object.

But the rules of hospitality do not require that we Americans close our eyes and our minds to the grim realities of the Communist dictatorship—and in particular to the cruel ordeal of Soviet farmers under the Kremlin's regime of terror.

Because a portion of our public and our press seem to have forgotten these realities and gone overboard in know-nothing sentimentality, the American Friends of Russian Freedom considers it necessary to call attention to some basic facts:

1. The Soviet delegates are not farmers—or peasants, to use the Soviet term—but Government officials of high rank, traveling under the viligant control of MVD (secret police) agents within the delegation and attached to the delegation. They do not represent the Soviet peasants. They represent the regime deeply hated by nearly all Russian peasants, and the Red agricultural system against which the peasants have fought with heroic desperation. The men we are entertaining are the jailors and slavemasters over the farmers in whose name they have the effrontery to speak.

2. In showing hospitality to the Red delegation, Iowans are eager to convey friendship for the Russian people, rather than sympathy for the Soviet dictators. They know that the people of the U. S. S. R. are not our enemies, that they are the first and worst victims of the totalitarian setup. Unfortunately too few of our editorial writers and speechmakers have made this essential fact sufficiently clear.

Already, it is evident from a study of Soviet newspapers, the Kremlin is misrepresenting our hospitality as an expression of friendship for the Soviet Union. It is vitally important that this falsehood be punctured. No doubt should be left that Americans continue to look with loathing upon the bloodsoaked Soviet regime and upon the system of collectivization it has imposed by unlimited terror upon the Soviet peasantry. We must draw a sharp line between the people of the U. S. S. R. and their despotic masters.

3. The Soviet peasants, still the great majority of the population, have paid with millions of lives for their relentless resistance to collectivization. Driven into so-called kolkhozes against their will, they have consistently refused to cooperate in their own enslavement. Not only the economic fallacies of collectivization but the active and passive opposition of the farmers has made agriculture the weakest link in the Soviet chain of power.

The great majority of the 15 or more millions in the Soviet slave-labor camps consist of recalcitrant peasants. Resentment against forced collectivization, more than any other single grievance, caused millions of Soviet soldiers to desert to the German invaders in the last war.

In writing or speaking about the Red farm delegation, this background must not be ignored. After 38 years of brutal tyranny, the Soviet peasants continue to fight for land and freedom. To forget this, in a mood of exuberant hospitality, is to give aid and comfort to their tormentors.

4. Upon their return to the Soviet prison land, the Soviet delegates, we may be sure, will not report the truth to the people of the country. They may feel obliged to allude to the remarkable technology of American farming. But they will not dare reveal that our farmers enjoy superior standards of living, and that this is due to our free economy. Indeed, how much they say publicly and how they say it will not be decided by themselves but by the Kremlin bosses, who cannot in the nature of the case admit the superiority of our system of freedom.

These are the hard facts. The American people must not overlook them. Ways and means must be found to inform the Russian people that we have not forgotten their ordeal and their aspirations to be as free as Iowa farmers.

Mexico a Land of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, realizing that the U. S. News & World Report, under the guidance and direction of David Lawrence, editor, has, as a result of his leadership and care as to the content of the articles appearing in the magazine, become on of the outstanding and influential magazines in the United States, it seems appropriate where misinformation, or, inaccurate information, has inadvertently gained entrance to its columns that such should be corrected.

It is with this intention that I include as part of these remarks a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. David Lawrence, editor, by Hon. Antonio J. Bermudez, director general of Petroleos Mexicanos, popularly known as Pemex, calling the attention of Mr. Lawrence to misstatements or, at least, inaccurate statements contained in an article appearing in the June 17, 1955, issue of U. S. News & World Report, which, in part, relates to the production of oil in Mexico. The letter of Senator Bermudez seeks to clarify the situation so that an entirely true and correct understanding of the matter may be had.

To fully understand the degree of credence to be attached to any statement made by Senator Bermudez it is necessary to know something of the character, ability, and honesty of purpose that underlies, influences, and actuates him in his every act, both public and private. All through his life, in his every activity of a private or public character, he has shown a strong attachment to his country and an overwhelming desire to advance the welfare of his people. It is fortunate for Mexico and likewise of our own country that Mexico has in its public service two such outstanding men at President Ruiz Cortines and Senator Antonio J. Bermudez. Each has gained the high regard and respect of their fellow citizens for the honesty, integrity, and ability they have shown in the service of their country. It would be well for our Nation to recognize to the fullest extent the high caliber of these two men, their dependability to stand for right and justice, and, be glad to be associated with them in promoting the mutual welfare of our respective nations and their people.

With this short statement as to the writer of the letter to which I have referred, I now make it a part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

MÉXICO CITY, *June 20, 1955.*

Mr. DAVID LAWRENCE,
Editor, U. S. News & World Report,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAWRENCE: With reference to the article about México in the issue of U. S. News & World Report of June 17, 1955, I want to give you my impression of the information which refers specifically to Mexican oil.

Without an iota of a doubt in my mind and after carefully reading your report, I firmly arrive at the conclusion that it does not reflect the real status of our petroleum industry, and for this reason I want to make the following comments:

It is mentioned that México's production is much smaller than that of the State of Texas, which by itself is a 19.6 percent of the world's oil production. Texas is the most prolific oil area in the world and its production is higher than that of any country outside of the United States, in fact, it produces almost 50 percent of the whole U. S. A. output.

The comparisan of our 1954 production with that of the 1920's, omits the essential fact that México's peak oil production, obtained in 1921, was due to an extremely intensive exploitation of the oilfields, created by an emergency and therefore without technical support. Present exploitation policies, both in the U. S. A. and México, call for a much more conservative exploitation of oilfields in order to increase ultimate oil recovery. The soundness of our exploitation policy, and our exploration effort, is shown by the continuous increase of our proven reserves, in spite of the fact that yearly Mexican oil production, has more than doubled in the last 10 years.

You state that the Mexican Government has been reluctant to explore and drill new areas and that many of the reported new oilfields should be considered as extensions to old ones. Unfortunately I find this statement untrue, unfounded, and misleading; the truth is that the increase in production and reserves has been the result of a continuous exploration effort which led to the discovery and development of four new production provinces or districts.

During the first 37 years of this century, that is from 1901 to 1937, the foreign oil companies discovered oil and gas in 4 provinces: (1) Pánuco or Ebano, (2) Old Golden Lane, (3) Poza Rica, and, (4) Isthmus (southern Veracruz). Pemex during its 17 years of life has discovered oil and gas in 4 new provinces or districts just as important; (1) Northeastern Mexico (Reynosa), (2) New Golden Lane, (3) Veracruz Embayment (Angostura), and, (4) Tabasco. These new districts discovered by Pemex are, so to speak, still in their infancy, subject to a great deal of development. However, they are just as important as the 4 discoveries made in 37 years by the foreign oil companies, since even in its present initial state of development they contribute to about 40 percent of our oil production. Old oilfields contribute 44 percent, and extensions to old ones the balance of 16 percent of the total production.

It is true that Petróleos Mexicanos, as any other oil company, devotes part of its exploration effort to find extensions of existing oilfields. As a result of this work it has been possible for us to maintain production in the old producing districts. However, the main aim of Petróleos Mexicanos' exploration has been directed to the study of new areas and the discovery of new oil and gas fields in the above-mentioned new provinces or districts, where the first commercial production was obtained by Petróleos Mexicanos. This is a proof that successful exploration work has been done in widely separated areas and shows that both management and technical skill of the Mexican people are capable of discovering and developing the oil and gas reserves of the country.

In addition to our successful effort to increase production and reserves, which is the foundation of a sound oil industry, there has been also a continuous improvement and increase in our capacity to refine and market all kinds of petroleum products; at present we are able to process and distribute within our country a much greater volume of the various oil products, and of a far better quality.

It would afford us pleasure to supply you with information on Mexican oil. I can readily see that a magazine of such wide circulation and great prestige as the U. S. News &

World Report can only misjudge things through lack of proper information.

May I ask you several pertinent questions? Do you honestly believe that a report like this is constructive? Do you believe that it contributes to friendship and understanding between our neighboring countries? Your high ideals and responsibilities as editor of an outstanding publication that influences so many people are fulfilled by such a report?

As this letter comes to an end I wish to extend you a cordial invitation to visit our oil industry. It would be constructive if you would accompany yourself with outstanding expert technicians specializing on oil, so that you get a true picture of our oil industry.

I would show you what we have done, what we are doing, and what we intend to do in the near future.

Hoping to hear from you, and thanking you in advance for your attention to this letter, I am

Cordially yours,

ANTONIO J. BERMÚDEZ.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the First Electrically Lighted City in the World, Wabash, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, Wabash, Ind., will celebrate the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world on September 14–17. Elaborate plans are being made for this event which coincides with the national plowing contest that will be held in Wabash County during this same week in September.

For this reason, I insert the following letter from the National Carbon Co., Cleveland, Ohio, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE CARBON ARC

(Prepared for use in connection with the diamond jubilee, Wabash, Ind.)

While the first carbon arc was lighted about the beginning of the 19th century, its commercial application awaited the invention of a practical dynamo for generating electricity. Charles F. Brush invented such a dynamo in Cleveland in 1876 and at the same time, designed and demonstrated on the Cleveland public square the first practical commercial arc light. (High-power costs had previously forced the abandonment of an earlier Parisian wet-cell powered installation.)

In March 1880, the then little city of Wabash, Ind., purchased a 4-light plant from Charles F. Brush for $18,000 and became the first municipality to demonstrate the utility of the new light. Today we can scarcely appreciate the miraculous transformation that followed. Instead of groping uncertainly in the dark, Wabash residents walked securely in the brilliance of the four strategically placed arc lights—night had become as day.

The lighting of Wabash streets was an innovation, a tremendous contribution to the progress and welfare of society. Installations spread like wildfire until thousands upon thousands of arc lights shone brightly all across our country; the carbon arc light symbolized American lighting progress.

The light from the arc has never to this day been matched in brilliancy by any other similarly practical light source. But, although the carbon arc was the brightest light source, it was not the cheapest, and so substitutes began to appear as municipalities succumbed to cold-hard economics. In the early days, carbons were replaced daily, a costly task. Later improvements in both arcs and carbons, notably the development of the enclosed arc, increased the life of the carbon trip to approximately 100 hours. But gradually, after many years of successful operation, the carbon arc finally gave way to the improved incandescent lamp as the most important street-lighting medium. But while hundreds of thousands of street-lighting arcs were disappearing other arc lamps were finding new applications until today the carbon arc is a most important industrial tool which touches our lives in many ways.

Older readers will remember the nickelodeon—embryo of the far-flung motion-picture industry and also the beginning of a huge market for arc carbons. Every time we go to the modern motion-picture theater, we enjoy the large, bright, lifelike picture on the screen. How many of us are aware that all the light that makes this picture, blazes from the white-hot tip of a carbon about as big around as your little finger? And, that the picture on the screen in some cases is a million times as large as the original carbon cross-sectional area. But, motion pictures exhibition is just half the story. The carbon arc also makes motion pictures; studios depend on its brilliance to capture the true mood of every scene.

Now for another most familiar communication medium—the printed page. Much of our daily reading is possible because the unique qualities of the carbon arc entered into its production. The twin photographic advantages of high speed plus snow-white light quality yield infinitely finer monochromatic or natural color reproductions from photoengraved printing plates. In photolithography and other branches of the graphic arts industry, the high intensity carbon arc supplies the true white light necessary for perfect reproduction.

Have you ever wondered how the manufacturer can tell in advance how well a new paint will stand up under weathering? To test the material out of doors would require months and even years of exposure. Carbon arc, accelerated weathering machines speed up testing and give quick, accurate answers for paints, varnishes, enamels, lacquers, plastics, rubbers, roofing, building materials, awnings, and many other products.

Millions of people have gazed with awe at the magnificence of Niagara Falls brilliantly lighted on the darkest night. Behind this magic of turning night into day stands a battery of 24 huge carbon arc floodlights.

The sharp, white shafts of light which play across the blackness of the night at military demonstrations, premiers, expositions, or similar shows come from powerful carbon arc searchlights. The Armed Forces use the carbon arc for widely divergent purposes. Ocean liners and river boats alike depend on it. And beacons like the huge 6-foot diameter, high-intensity searchlight on Chicago's Palmolive Building are symbols of safety to aircraft pilots. This particular light, which is reported to project a 2 billion candlepower beam, is visible for over 100 miles.

In addition to these applications for the arc, there are others which, with or without our knowledge, daily affect our lives. Many of us have received therapeutic light treatments from carbon arc lamps. The same lamp, by a simple change of carbons, can supply any 1 of the 3 types of "tailor made," highly effective therapeutic light for the treatment of certain physical disorders. It can duplicate natural sunlight more closely than other artificial light source; it can supply specific bands of powerful ultra-violet radiation; or it can give off penetrating long-wave infrared rays. No other light source has this adaptability.

Foods and tobacco have been irradiated to produce a desired effect on the product in many plants throughout the country. Blueprints have been made for years under the enclosed carbon arc. And, the carbon arc in the spectrograph ferrets out the various elements in all types of chemical compounds and reveals the quantities of such elements present.

The days of the carbon arc for street lighting are past, but today the carbon arc touches our lives more than ever before. Spectacular, practical, its applications serve to make life better for all of us.

H. J. WALTER.

Others, Too, Lean on Price Crutches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, the cost of our price support program for agriculture has been publicized and dramatized to such an extent that one would believe that the farmer is the only one who receives support from the Federal Government. Just to keep the record straight, I would recommend that our antifarm propagandists read the following editorial which was taken out of the Daily Argus-Leader, of Souix Falls, S. Dak., for Sunday, July 31, 1955:

OTHERS, TOO, LEAN ON PRICE CRUTCHES

The Wall Street Journal suggests that the farmer has been leaning on price crutches so long that he can't handle himself without them.

Quite so, Mr. Wall Street editor. But why confine your comments to the farmer?

Why not say something about the eastern industrialists who have been leaning on tariff price crutches for half a century or more? Tell them to learn to get along without them. Also tell the other segments of our economy to throw away the crutches.

And remember, Mr. Wall Street editor, that the farmer didn't start this price crutch business. Your pals in eastern industry did—and they did it so long ago that you've virtually forgotten that they have crutches.

Check back in history a bit. The real agitation to do something for the farmers started in the twenties and the argument advanced then—a very solid one—was that industry was on price stilts and that the farmer needed some protection to place him on the same level. The contention was that "the farmer can't survive if he must sell in an open market and buy in a protected market."

That was the theme song when the famous McNary-Haugen bill was presented to Congress in the twenties. That was the gist of the argument in its favor. No one could provide a really sound answer against the farmer's contention then—and no one can do it today.

Start a campaign, Mr. Wall Street editor, to induce the eastern industrialists to abandon their price stilts. Then after you've accomplished that objective, come to the farmers and ask them to do likewise. But begin at home.

The farmer can battle his way in a free economy with no holds barred. He can take care of himself as well as anybody. But he has a right to expect the same economic rules for everybody.

An Address by Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a distinguished constituent, Charles Hann, commander general, Naval Order of the United States, I include the remarks of Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz at a dinner given in his honor by the Naval Order of the United States at the New York Yacht Club on March 12, 1954:

THE ORGANIZATION OF OUR GOVERNMENT TO WIN A WAR AND THE PEACE WHICH FOLLOWS THE WAR

(Address by Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz, U. S. Navy)

Charles Hann, Bill Halsey, Dick Conolly, Struble, Dubose, and Hillenkoetter. All through this large audience I see friends and shipmates of mine—Rex Belknap and Gus Read, former commanders general of the Naval Order of the United States; Paul Hammond, "Sandy" Cushman, and Gene Tunney, who, during the war, brought me a bottle of brandy, all crusted with dust. I put it away until I could use it for a notable occasion. Some weeks later the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air came for a visit of inspection and I told the steward, "This is the time to get that Tunney bottle."

Well, he got the bottle, all encrusted with the dust of ages, which bottle Gene Tunney had found in some famous old wine cellar in France. We waited and waited with the glasses on the table, but no brandy. I finally called to the steward, "Where in the heck is that brandy?" He said, "We're having an awful time getting all of that dust off it." In a few minutes they came in with a glistening clean bottle.

I am grateful to Charles Hann and his Naval Order of the United States for this opportunity to greet so many of my friends. I could organize a Davis tennis cup team right here; there are so many of my tennis opponents present, not to mention a few horseshoe pitchers, with whom I played so often.

Just before the war I was Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. I probably signed the orders of many a man sitting here, calling him back to duty.

Well, we were having a terrific time. Those of us who were trying to forecast the future knew that the war was coming. President Roosevelt had given us all the money to be used for the building of ships but he would not let us take on additional men.

Paul Hammond came to Washington one day and said, "You fellows aren't going to have enough officers to man the new ships." And we said that we knew it. He said, "Come on; we'll go to the White House." We went to the White House and inside of 2 hours the V–7 training program was born. There he sits, Paul Hammond. [Applause.]

That's the way that program got started. At that time we had 15,000 Regular officers in the Navy including civil engineers, doctors, and supply officers. That's all we had, and we had new ships coming up for commissioning and we didn't know how we were going to man them. At the peak of our strength afloat we had 225,000 officers, a 15-fold expansion. That was made possible by the great response to the call for Reserve officers. And I know that many of you sitting out there were in the group which answered that call, to come and join the Reserve and help us win that war.

I suppose 200,000 officers came from civilian ranks. We had a truly civilian Navy. We didn't suffer from this extensive dilution. At first when we began to send these Reserves to the ships some of the old Regular officers began to complain that they did not have enough Regular people, and Admiral Kimmel almost had a hemorrhage out there in the Pacific. He used to send me a message nearly every day: "For God's sake, send me some trained people."

Instead of doing that we were taking trained officers away. The new ships were coming down the ways and we had to provide some experienced officers for them.

One day a young marine officer came in to say goodbye to me. "I'm going out to the Pacific. I've been working under your command here, way back in the recesses of this building. You don't know it but I was under your command, and I am going out. Do you want to send any messages out to your friends?"

I said, "No, I have nothing to send. I have nothing but trouble." Then I looked on my desk, and there were two telegrams. Then I said, "Wait, please take these two telegrams to Admiral Kimmel." I scribbled on them, "Dear Kimmel, read these and get a laugh and leave me alone for a little bit." Then I forgot about the incident. That was about September or October 1941. I asked, "Where are you going." He said, "I'm headed for Wake Island. I have been assigned to the defense battalion there."

In 1944, after the Marianas had been recaptured, our combat intelligence teams went ashore and picked up everything that appeared valuable and interesting. Later my staff intelligence officer came to me and said, "Here's something that has just come in that I think is extraordinary. We can't dope it out at all. It's got your name on it and was taken from the body of a dead Japanese officer on Saipan." He showed me the two telegrams I had given the young marine officer.

When Charles Hann wrote me in California that I was to make an address that was to be recorded and circulated—I must be frank and say that I wasn't prepared for anything so serious. I thought I was going to stand up here and continue the line of stories we have heard from the other speakers. I do, however, have something to say on a serious subject. It is the organization of our Government for the conduct of war, and then to win the peace. Both are very important subjects. We have often won a war but we have frequently lost the peace which followed the war.

But let us get back to some stories about manning the ships. The captains of ships used to give me hell, when I was Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, over sending them so many young Reserve officers. When I got out to the fleet at Pearl Harbor I was pleased when they would come to me and say they had a wonderful group of officers. They told me their Reserve officers were doing as well as the regulars. They said, "They are so good we can't tell apart." That was delightful music to my ears.

Starting with the American Revolution, which lasted about 8 years, of which 6 years covered very rugged and desperate fighting, during which we had no real organization for the conduct of the war at the seat of Government. We had a Continental Congress. We had a Commander-in-Chief, George Washington, who didn't know what defeat meant. He never, despite his many hardships and shortages, lost hope. Most of his supplies had to come from the enemy, brought in by privateers who just went out and captured enemy ships. The only organization for the conduct of war at that time was George Washington and his military staff.

The Continental Congress was being pushed around from place to place and if it had not been for the providential appearance of the French fleet in Chesapeake Bay under Admiral DeGrasse, which prevented Lord Cornwallis from being reinforced down at Yorktown, God knows how long the war might have lasted, and only the Lord knows whether we would ever have won it. It was that very brief control of the sea that prevented the British from supporting their principal army or from evacuating it.

Our military situation was most desperate and it was that providential appearance of Admiral DeGrasse with the French fleet that made possible our winning the Revolution. Washington had with him a French army of about 5,000 men under General Rochambeau. However, it was the control of the sea and the resulting hoplelessness of the situation for Cornwallis that made possible the winning of the Revolution, and the independence of this country.

I am sure that in this room there are some men who, like myself, have been impatient with the French people and the French government for their failure to agree with our idea of cooperation. Then I try to remember that if it had not been for the French fleet in our Revolution we would not be in the position we are now. How and when do we pay off that debt? Whenever you feel critical of the French people, just remember that they came to our aid in a decidedly critical period in our history and that their fleet made the difference between victory and defeat.

The War of the Revolution was our longest war. All our other wars were of shorter duration. The Civil War lasted 4 years. The Spanish-American War, a matter of months; World War I, for us a matter of months. It wasn't until we came to World War II that we again went through a long war.

Up to the present the organization of the Government of the United States for the conduct of military operations was more or less haphazard. George Washington conducted the war with his staff, with not much help from the Continental Congress. Students of the Civil War know that Lincoln had little help in winning the Civil War from his Cabinet. Lincoln is the only President of the United States, who, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, exercised such command in the field. He was in command of the forces which recaptured the navy yard at Norfolk.

There was little or no organization for war either in his Cabinet or in other agencies in the Government. Lincoln's Cabinet was not only of little help to him but its members were at odds with one another. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, with Lincoln's approval, organized a naval expedition to Pensacola, Fla., where secessionists had taken possession of the navy yard in January 1961. The Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, didn't even know about it. You can readily imagine the lack of cooperation in that incident.

World War I was of such short duration that our planning arrangements had no real test. We had no statutory setup for the conduct of war, and certainly we had no effective plan for winning the peace. There was no statutory arrangement whereby the various responsible departments of Government, like the State Department, the War Department, the Navy Department, were called together to consider what our national policy shall be, for what we should aim. Should we join the League of Nations and try to control the peace with collective security, or should we return to isolation? We had no well-considered plans, and this state of affairs continued until we found ourselves in World War II.

But one thing I never cease to be proud of—our Naval War College—and I want Admirals Belknap and Conolly to hear this—I think that our Naval War College did a marvelous service for the country in preparing our naval officers for the campaign in the Pacific against the Japanese.

I was in the Naval War College class of 1923. During that year under Admiral Belknap's supervision the students studied the strategic side of the war that was to come some 18 years later. Also it was in that class that was evolved the circular cruising formation which was used so extensively and so successfully during our war against the Japanese. The Naval War College has unquestionably justified its existence and the money the Government has spent on it.

In World War II we had a rather long period of preparation behind the protection of the British Fleet, before the Pearl Harbor attack suddenly precipitated us into war. We were given the opportunity to study the organization of the British Government for war, with their chief of staff system; so it was natural that there should be set up in Washington the Joint Chiefs of Staff, consisting of the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and General Arnold as head of the Army Air Corps. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were presided over by Admiral Leahy, the Chief of Staff to the President. There was also in Washington a Combined Chiefs of Staff, which coordinated American planning with that of our allies.

The military side of the conduct of war is only a part of it. The supply of ships, materials, and equipment was a most important part of our war effort. The OPM—and God knows how many more alphabetical agencies—was set up to control and coordinate the productive capacity of the country.

Over the years there had been a haphazard relationship between the Army and Navy. There wasn't even a Navy Department until 1798, when the Secretary of War McHenry decided that the War Department organization was getting too complicated by the handling of our Navy. He recommended, and the Congress legislated, that there should be a separate Navy Department. Our first Secretary of the Navy was Benjamin Stoddert.

After World War II had ended I came to Washington as Chief of Naval Operations. Mr. Forrestal had succeeded Col. Frank Knox as Secretary of the Navy. Secretary Forrestal used to tell me of his sense of frustration in attending Cabinet meetings. He said that the Cabinet never accomplished anything. He said, "Nobody transacts real business in the Cabinet; if a Secretary wants to get anything done he either comes early or stays late, to get the President's approval of his project."

Forrestal instructed me to get in touch with my opposite number, General Eisenhower in the War Department, to see if we could set up some sort of an agreement for the War Department and Navy Department to work more closely together. It was about this time that the President instructed Mr. Patterson, Secretary of War; Mr. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Generals Eisenhower and Spaatz, and me as Chief of Naval Operations, to get together to plan for a merger or unification of the Armed Forces. It is of interest that in a recent issue of U. S. News & World Report, on a page labeled "Whispers," there appeared a paragraph which says, "Michael Rabb, Associate Counsel to the President, is getting the added title of Secretary to the President. Mr. Raab set up machinery to keep minutes of the Cabinet and to provide agenda and to make sure that Cabinet members are informed on questions which Mr. Eisenhower wants to discuss. In the past, no real record was kept of the Cabinet meetings." If he left out the word "real," he would be nearer correct.

Adm. Forrest Sherman and General Norstad were designated by the Navy and War Department to confer with appropriate Senators to write what became eventually the National Security Act of 1947, which has already been amended several times.

The National Security Act of 1947 in its opening paragraph states its purpose as follows:

"In enacting this legislation it is the intention of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States, to provide for the establishment of an integrated policy of procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security, to provide three military departments (now the Air Force is being born) separately administered for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy, including Naval Aviation and the Marine Corps, and the Air Force; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control of the Secretary of Defense; to provide for the separate strategic direction of the Armed Forces for their operation and unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces, but not to establish a single Chief of Staff over the Armed Forces general staff; but this is not to be interpreted as applying to the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

The most important section of the National Security Act of 1947 is that which sets up the National Security Council as a statutory body composed of the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director for Mutual Security, the chairman of the National Resources Board, which is another important agency set up by the act to blanket in the numerous agencies which were used to coordinate production in this country during the last war. Also included in the National Security Council are the secretaries and under secretaries of other departments.

The National Security Council has the responsibility (1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of National security for the purpose of making recommendations to the President, and (2) to consider policies in matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

For the first time in our history we have a commonsense planning body set up by statute.

The National Security Council meets weekly, usually on Thursday, to consider a carefully prepared agenda. The President presides. For the first time we have an orderly consideration of the grave international problems which confront us. The act attaches to the National Security Council the Central Intelligence Agency, which has control of all the intelligence activities outside of the country and access to all intelligence data gathered by all agencies within our borders, such as the FBI and the intelligence agencies of our Armed Forces.

The National Security Council is by all odds the best agency in the country devised to win the peace after our combat forces have won the war.

If we had had a statutory National Security Council during World War II, it is more than likely that we would have avoided many of the problems which now plague our international relations.

Another important section of the National Security Act sets up the National Resources Board, which aids the President to coordinate the military, industrial and civilian, including mobilization. The act also legalized the Joint Chiefs of Staff and established the Defense Department, consisting of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Thus was provided for the first time one Department of Defense, with a Secretary of Defense, who is the alter ego of the President in military matters.

The National Security Act of 1947, as amended to December 31, 1953, contains so many important provisions of interest to military men that copies should be available to members of the Naval Order of the United States. The act has been amended several times and no doubt will be amended in the future as the need arises. However, we have made an excellent start for the proper planning for war and peace.

Public Law 177 of the 80th Congress, June 25, 1948 (a copy of which I had not seen before March 12, 1954, when I discussed this matter before the Naval Order) establishes the order of succession to the Presidency. This is of more importance these days of new bombs of vast destructive power than when the National Security Act was passed in 1947. As of now the legal succession to the Presidency is as follows: The Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, and lastly the Secretary of Labor. You will not from the law of succession that the secretaries of the all-important military departments are not included. This—in my opinion—is wrong. Not only should they be included in the line of succession to the Presidency, they should also sit in the Cabinet. Those secretaries are important men, who between them spend over 50 percent of our national budget. Too much has happened to depress the importance of the military secretaries, that it is hard to get the right kind of men who are willing to serve in these important positions.

Now what I am about to say may be rank heresy, but I maintain that the military part of the Government, even when they have blundered, have always won the war. The same cannot be said for the civilian side of the administration. They have not always won the peace.

Now I have talked enough, Charley. It's an important but dry subject. Mr. Forrestal gave a great deal of thought to the matter of organizing the Government to conduct war and win the peace. He had a very orderly mind and he saw the defects of our old system. The National Security Act of 1947 is really an impressive monument to Mr. Forrestal's genius. We now have a statutory organization for planning that makes us less liable to make mistakes and we might accidently win a peace with it.

Make New England First in Nuclear Industrial Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass., Monday, August 1, 1955:

MOVE FAST

New England should move fast to gain the full benefit of the initial advantages it enjoys in the race to develop nuclear-powered industry. That is the eloquent implication of the report made to the governors' conference by its atomic energy committee.

The advantages it cites are tremendous—a concentration here of scientific and technological facilities, and a large body of skilled workers. The very fact that electricity costs more in New England than elsewhere, because fuel must be transported here, both makes the situation urgent and creates an opportunity.

New England can honestly tell prospective investors that nuclear production of

electricity is likely to be economically feasible here much sooner than in many other parts of the country.

But this region must do more, and quickly. The report suggests tempting atomic industrial enterprise with tax benefits; another possible attraction would be the grant of land for sites. The governors' conference cannot come forward too soon with a concrete program capable of making this region first in the nuclear industrial field.

The 1901 Act Not Repealed

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion among Members about the suggestion that the law of 1901 had been repealed by implication by the Cole amendment to the law of 1951, section 6, title I, Public Law 51.

In this connection I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from the gentleman from New York, Mr. COLE, to Mrs. CECIL HARDEN, chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Opertions of the House of Representatives, in connection with an investigation into the operation of package liquor stores by the armed services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1955.

Mrs. CECIL HARDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. HARDEN: It has been brought to my attention that in the course of a hearing on the subject of alcoholic beverages before your committee, Capt. W. G. Chapple, of the Bureau of Personnel, Department of the Navy, made a statement to the effect that the sale of alcoholic beverages was authorized for the Department of Defense by section 6, Public Law 51, 82d Congress, approved June 19, 1951, and that later on in answer to a question by Staff Director Ward: "Do you have any real authority for saying that the act of 1901 has been superseded by the act of 1951, Captain?" Lieutenant Colonel Wise replies: "I will answer that. I think I speak for the entire Department that our Judge Advocate General of the Army has advised that they are of the opinion that section 6 of Public Law 51 does, by implication, repeal the so-called Canteen Act of 1901."

I introduced the amendment which became section 6, Public Law 51. The purpose of section 6 was not to in any way repeal existing law but to give the Secretary of Defense authority to make uniform regulations for all three Departments of the Armed Services and also to empower him to deal with the problem of alcoholic beverages not only in camps, stations, posts, and other places, but also in their vicinity.

Sincerely yours,

STERLING COLE.

The day previous to the introduction of the Cole amendment, I had myself introduced an amendment intended to supplement the law of 1901 and give the Secretary of Defense power to make regulations which would apply to all branches of the armed services, and in discussing it, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] stated:

I understand that the Canteen Act of 1901 is still in effect which regulates that and is Federal law.

So that the fact that the law of 1901 was still in effect was in the minds of the Members of the House when they were considering the Cole amendment.

My own amendment was as follows:

Following line 11, page 21, insert a new subsection as follows:

"SEC. 5. No person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the confines of or within reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training, or mobilization place which is being used at the time for military purposes; but the Secretary of Defense may make regulations permitting the sale and use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this section."

In opposing the Bryson amendment which was directed to the program which was to be presented by the National Security Training Commission for members of the National Security Training Corps, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, said:

The proper way to approach this subject is somewhat along the line of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, and probably to be offered today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

It is apparent that in considering the Cole amendment, the House had in mind the terms of my amendment which were in harmony with the law of 1901.

United States Junior Chamber of Commerce Voice of Democracy Contest Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, here are portions of three speeches by winners in the National Voice of Democracy contest, annually sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, for high-school students.

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that we of this great legislative body again find pleasure in commending this group of vigorous, vigilant young American citizens who put their time and talent and influence into this sponsoring event.

Also, I know we commend the winners. Yes, we also commend all those who entered this contest, whether they were place winners or not:

[From Judy Abramson, of Yuba City, Calif.]

The key to this democracy we possess is our faith in the dignity and the worth of each human life, and our determination that in every phase of our society we shall build from the bottom up—and not from the top down. The only true happiness is that which the individual creates for himself—and values—because it is his own. To fulfill his own ambitions and to satisfy the needs which are his own expression—that is the goal of each human being. And this can be accomplished only under democracy.

[From Joseph Maletzky, of Schenectady, N. Y.]

Today we are beginning to think of democracy not as a political institution, but as a moral ideal, and a way of living together. The early Christians had an appropriate saying—"We are all," they put it, "members of one another." We must, if our democracy is to succeed, believe as they did. We must realize that no one can stand alone. True, society recognizes a person as an individual with his individual liberties and freedoms, but only if the person recognizes society as a brotherhood of individuals. To be part of a democracy, one must fight the natural tendency to demand equality and freedom for oneself, and not for others.

[From Catherine Esther Styles, of New Zealand, now living in Minneapolis]

You people of America do not stand alone. Democracy extends further than America. Two thousand years ago the Christian doctrine proclaimed the equality of man. Belief in the equality of man means acceptance of all races, all creeds. Belief in democracy means belief in the equality of man. It means respecting the individuality of every human being.

The Meaning of One Word, "And"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, for some years I have opposed giving any American assistance to Marshal Tito's Communist regime in Yugoslavia. I have opposed such aid when both the authorization and appropriations bills were being considered by the House. The reason I took this action was because of my firm conviction that Tito is and remains nothing more than a Russian stooge, and that he will never be an asset to the free world because of his complete dedication to the cause of international communism. My efforts in the past have met with little success because Congress did authorize and did appropriate large sums of money and assistance to the Communist dictator Tito.

This year when the authorization legislation was in the Committee of the Whole, there was a great deal of talk about Marshal Tito refusing to allow American inspection over the manner in which he was utilizing American assistance in Yugoslavia. The opinion was generally held that Tito refused to allow us complete inspection opportunities, but most everyone hesitated to speak out on this matter because the Republican administration had put itself so strongly on record favoring aid to the Communist dictator, Tito.

I became particularly disturbed when I heard from reliable sources that Tito was allowing the Russians to ship military equipment and supplies across Yugoslavia and into Albania. There

were also stories going about relating to the prospect of the Russians cancelling all of Tito's debts to them previously incurred, and that Tito was negotiating with the Kremlin for the manufacture of MIG jet fighters in the industrial establishments of Yugoslavia, many of which were put on their feet by American assistance. These circumstances caused me to offer an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, chapter 4, section 142 (70). That subsection provided that no assistance could be furnished to any nation unless such nation agreed to allow "continuous observation and review by United States representatives of programs of assistance authorized under this title, including the utilization of any such assistance, or provide the United States with full and complete information with respect to these matters, as the President may require."

Now, it will be noted that under the 1954 act this subsection did not make mandatory continuous observation and review by United States representatives because the alternative was allowed for some nations to simply provide reports on how our assistance was being utilized. It was this escape clause which permitted the United States representatives to give Tito assistance even though he refused to permit continuous observation and review by them of the manner in which our assistance was utilized. I later learned that our military representatives in Yugoslavia had not been permitted complete freedom to inspect the military installations, airfields, defense highways, and other public roads, and railroad lines. Consequently, rather than offering an amendment to prevent any assistance to Yugoslavia which appeared certain of defeat in light of the Republican administration's support for aid to Tito, I offered an amendment simply to delete the word "or" and substitute the word "and." By the change of this one word Tito now must permit continuous observation and review of all programs of any such United States assistance, including the utilization of any such assistance, by representatives of our Government.

Shortly after the adoption of this amendment by Congress and the passage of the Mutual Security Act of 1955, a disagreement between the Dictator Tito and representatives of the United States was revealed in the press. While State Department sources denied the disagreement was over the new requirement that Tito permit observation and review by United States representatives or no assistance could be given him, it is clear that this is an issue which has not been resolved. Shortly thereafter stories appeared in the Yugoslav press about Tito negotiating with the Kremlin for the manufacture of Russian MIG fighter planes. This means that the factories of Yugoslavia would be tooled up to support the Russian Communist war machine in the event of a shooting war with the free world. In the last few days stories have been appearing to the effect that Tito finds himself in an excellent bargaining position between United States interests and the Kremlin. In effect, he is telling us that unless we give him what he wants, and under such conditions as he alone determines, he will simply turn to his Russian brothers for assistance and military support. This form of blackmail is even cruder than that employed by Hitler.

This latest maneuver by Tito should cause us to take the position that if he accepts one single bit of military assistance, whether in the form of contracts with the Kremlin or as outright gifts from Moscow, United States aid should be terminated completely and abruptly. It also demonstrates the absolute necessity for the United States to secure the right to, and to enforce continuous observation and review of all those programs in Yugoslavia having to do with military defense because if we support any phase of their defense program, it is necessary for us to know every phase of such program.

There should be no doubt as to the congressional intent with respect to the amendment to section 142 (10) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, which was adopted. That amendment was directed at correcting the scandalous situation with respect to our dealings with the big faker Tito, but it should likewise be applied to all nations who receive any form of assistance from the United States.

When this matter comes before Congress next year, we will expect a full report on all United States assistance to Yugoslavia, including what sort of business he is doing with the Kremlin and what he has done with any United States assistance granted to him under the conditions imposed by section 142, subsection (10) of chapter 4, title 1.

Any assistance given to Tito without first securing the right to continuous observation and review or failure on the part of any United States representatives to fully carry out these requirements will constitute a flagrant violation of the law. Congress will want to know whether or not this law has been violated. In order to avoid misunderstanding when this matter arises again next year, the full impact of this law, as amended, should be impressed upon each and every American representative assigned to Yugoslavia.

Legislation of Interest to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, I want to summarize the legislation that is of special interest to the veterans of the United States. The veterans' interests in this 1st session of the 84th Congress have come through in good shape. In the past, as you know, there have at times been difficulties. While we who are especially interested in the welfare of the veteran may never get all of the legislation that we believe should be passed, yet the vigilance of the veterans' organizations such as the VFW, the American Legion, and the Disabled American Veterans, coupled with a capable House Veteran Affairs Committee headed by "TIGER" TEAGUE, of Texas, has gone a long way toward fair and commonsense legislation for the veteran which the country as a whole believes is just.

The veterans' housing program is still making great progress but there are all too many localities where the lending institutions will not participate and the veterans in that locality are denied the opportunity of this most worthwhile legislation. While each year we appropriate money for direct loans to the veterans, this money is far short of the needs. The veterans' home-loan program has been of great benefit not only to the veteran, but it has helped him to attain and maintain a stability in the community that makes for good citizenship. In addition this program has not cost the American taxpayer.

There has been racketeering in this field of veterans' loans and there are many cases in which the veteran has not received the proper home for the money that was spent. I am happy to say that the Government has been making progress in the elimination and prosecution of the illegal chiselers who have been defrauding veterans.

Perhaps no phase of veterans' legislation has been of as great a benefit as the GI training. There are untold thousands of our veterans who have taken their place in the business, professional, and agricultural industries because of the GI training. This training would have ceased even for those in service if Congress had not succeeded in extending the GI training for all veterans in service prior to January 31, 1955. However, veterans entering the service after that date will not have the benefit of GI training unless new legislation is passed. In the early days there was fraud, and in many instances the veteran and the Government did not receive proper benefit for the money spent, but thanks to the constant effort of congressional investigations, the Veterans' Administration, and the Justice Department, most of these wrongs have been stopped.

One of the most critical problems facing the veteran today is the scarcity of veterans' hospital facilities. The Veterans' Administration is operating 176 hospitals. There are many of these hospitals that are of temporary construction and must be replaced in the near future. Applications for hospitalization come in at the rate of more than 2,000 per day. Outpatient care for service-connected cases run approximately 190,000 per month. The Veterans' Administration is presenting to the Bureau of the Budget a plan for the replacement of the temporary hospitals. However, even if all of these temporary hospitals were replaced, it would not take care of veterans' hospitalization needs.

If all the veterans' hospitals were properly located, the situation would not be so critical. Unfortunately many veterans' hospitals have been built at locations where there are not sufficient veterans' hospital needs to justify their location. Other hospitals have been built

where there is not sufficient medical personnel to staff them. Today unless the hospital is located in a very large city or is close to a large medical center, the hospital cannot be properly staffed and utilized. I sincerely believe and hope that in the future veterans' hospitals will be located where needed and in the communities that can properly staff these hospitals. In the future we must take heed of the mistakes we have made in the past on veterans' hospitalization.

Indiana is especially short on hospital beds, yet it is one of the fairly few locations in the country where there is adequate medical facilities to staff such a hospital. These facts have been and are continuing to be brought to the attention of the proper authorities.

Last year Congress insisted that a Veterans' Administration hospital make the most effective use of all available beds and apparently progress is being made in this direction.

The Appropriations Committee this year was apparently fair and reasonable in the veterans' appropriations.

I believe Members of Congress and the public generally are becoming more familiar with the needs of the veteran. The veterans preference in civil service has remained unchanged in this session of Congress. Legislation was introduced and passed by the Armed Services Committee, giving the veteran the right to an additional copy of a certificate in lieu of discharge if needed by the veteran without extra cost to him. This legislation was blocked before final passage, but I am certain that it will be passed when Congress meets again in January.

Minor changes were made in various regulations of the Veterans' Administration, but there were few individuals involved in these changes. There has been considerable legislation introduced that will be acted upon when Congress meets for the 2d session of the 84th Congress in January.

We as veterans realize that nothing could injure the veterans' cause more than for demands to be made for the veteran that are unfair. We also realize that the greatest gift our country can give to the veteran, and to all Americans, is peace in a strong America—and an America that preserves the freedom and dignity of man.

Certification of Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been focused recently on our national health programs, particularly with respect to government approval of new drugs for public use.

Mr. Frank Cusumano, president of Bio-Rama Drug Co., one of the outstanding in the country, expressed the following remarks to me, which I feel are worthy of the careful consideration of my colleagues:

Most of us are well acquainted with the measures, and the methods taken at every level of our Government, in protecting our health and welfare. Nevertheless, we hesitate to accept these mesaures as the optimum in protection. Adequate in many respects, much is left to be desired—particularly at the Federal level, admittedly the level which should be serving as an example. The present control measures, although functioning smoothly in many respects, are not sufficiently broad to guarantee the needed protection. We need only consult our daily newspapers for support of this contention—the polio-vaccine episode an extreme case in point.

Medical science is to be congratulated on its advances of the past generation. Diseases which formerly demoralized the populace are now under control or eliminated. With no intention to distract from the role played by the medical profession, this in no small part was due to the new drugs placed in their hands. For each of these new drugs, though, we must depend on our medical scientists to tell us that immediate or long-range damage, often more severe than the disease condition itself, will not follow its use. And more important, if the drug falls into the category of highly active complex substances, we must depend on the same group to assure us that the quality is that purported. It is here we needed the added insurance that comes from efficient, nonbiased supervision by the Federal Government. In our opinion this can best be handled through a pretesting or certification system similar to that now in use for insulin, colors, and antibiotics.

The term certification is perhaps in need of legislative clarification, for it apparently means different things to different individuals. The large manufacturer with his well-equipped laboratories and his staff of experts regards certification as an expensive ancroachment on his rights of free enterprise and hurls invective at it as being insidious attempts on the part of the Federal Government to assume authority. To the average clinician it means the added assurance of testing by an unrelated, unbiased group of experts. To you and I—the ultimate consumer—it may mean the difference between health and sickness or even between life and death. We respect the rights of all, for that is the basis upon which our country was founded. We do not, however, favor the barter of health, happiness, and the right to live for the maintenance of hypothetical rights of selected groups.

We do not propose expansion of existing certification—we propose, subject to careful study and deliberation, the establishing of a comprehensive pretesting system of certification for any medicinal agent found important enough to warrant. By comprehensive, we insist it should be complete in all phases, bringing all medicaments, whether they be drugs or biologicals, under an integrated certification system under the direct control and administration of medical men especially trained to recognize and avoid the hazards before they become actuality.

The medical profession and pharmacists strongly recommend that the Commissioner of Food and Drug Administration should be a medical doctor.

The Harris Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to insert in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following telegram:

We understand the Harris bill passed the House by a majority of six votes and that the Republican members of the Indiana delegation supported the bill 100 percent.

Since we believe that this legislation is definitely in the public interest for the people of Indiana, we want to thank you most sincerely for your support.

WARREN BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Public Service Commission of Indiana.

Congress Kills Highway Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News editorially places the blame for the defeat of the highway bill right where it belongs and that is on the Democratic Party.

The Democrats played politics with the highway legislation and that is what killed it. The Democrats voted down the President's plan for financing the proposed expanded highway program with a bond issue. On rollcall, 216 Democrats voted against the President's bonding plan and only 5 Democrats voted for it.

Then, the Democrats turned around and voted down their own substitute for the Eisenhower plan by which they would have imposed new taxes to get money to build highways. They voted this plan of their Democratic leaders down, 128 Democrats voting against it and only 94 for their own proposal.

Obviously a majority of the democrats do not want the President's bonding plan. They do not want the tax finance plan of their own Democratic leadership. In short, they do not want a highway bill.

On the defeat of the highway bill the Detroit News said editorially as follows:

CONGRESS KILLS HIGHWAY HOPES

Congress has turned its back on State and local governments which for more than a year, have been keying their plans to the promise of an expanded Federal highway program. It has rejected both President Eisenhower's pay-as-you-ride proposal and the opposition bill to finance construction from increased automotive revenues.

Speaker RAYBURN blamed lobbyists for defeat of national highway legislation this session. He is contradicted by the House record which identifies the urgently needed highway program as a casualty of pulling and hauling for political advantage.

The opposition was determined not only to hand the President a defeat but to claim credit for any highway bill passed. In control of the House, it was able to beat the Eisenhower plan for long-term financing through present revenues 224–193. But the Democrats then were unable to sell their own plan for new auto revenues to finance a road program on a pay-as-you-go basis to wiser heads in their own party. It was beaten 292–123.

The impact of Congress's action is immediate. Though Detroit will be able to complete that portion of its expressway program now under construction, planning for

the Hastings, Grand River, Vernor, and Southfield expressways is shadowed by uncertainty. Michigan, which just raised its gasoline tax to 6 cents, has its hopes for increased partnership with the Federal Government shattered.

Since it first was submitted to the annual conference of governors and approved there, a year ago, Mr. Eisenhower's plan for rehabilitating and modernizing the Nation's highway system has held the imagination of the motorists and the auto industry. Politics has now brought it to naught.

Speaker RAYBURN says it is doubtful if Congress will act in 1956—an election year—on emergency road legislation. He is mistaken. Congress will find its present decision against the best interests of the Nation in the matter of highways too heavy a burden to carry to the polls.

A Handbook for Southerners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I recommend an editorial by one of America's most distinguished newspapers, the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, entitled "A Handbook for Southerners." This should be a handbook for Americans, as well.

However, I respect those timid souls throughout the country who continue to stand by and see the Supreme Court of the United States wilfully, wantonly, and flagrantly ignore and violate the Constitution of the United States in its senseless, heedless, and contemptible program of forcing integration of the races.

A HANDBOOK FOR SOUTHERNERS

W. E. Debnam, whose book called Weep No More My Lady was a sensationally popular statement for the South in 1950, has done it again. He has written a manual on race for Southerners. His target is the Supreme Court's ruling that white and Negro pupils go to the same public schools. He hits the mark. Again he has taken the title from Stephen Foster's song. Then My Old Kentucky Home Good Night contains the answers that many Southerners already know, plus some that may not be familiar. They are thoroughly documented. Let no one be misled by the breezy style of this little book. It is packed with power.

Debnam's pamphlet—pamphlettering is an historic and respectable form of propaganda—should be on sale at every book store, every news stand, every drug store counter in the South. (It is needed more in the North, but we have no hope that it could be safely circulated in the open there.) Southerners should buy it, read it, and send it to someone beyond the Mason-Dixon curtain.

Like its predecessor, Then My Old Kentucky Home Good Night was printed privately. Though Weep No More My Lady sold 210,000 copies—a best seller by anybody's yardstick—and still is selling, no publisher would undertake the sequel.

"They turned it down," Mr. Debnam writes in his preface, dated June 17 at Raleigh, "for the simple reason that no national publisher is even the least bit interested in any book that attempt to set forth the Southern viewpoint on matters racial. It's true that they do publish certain books by authors from the South, but in every instance accepted manuscripts are either an attack upon the South and its way of life or an apology.

"This book is no apology. With dignity with all of fairness to both races, we attempt to set forth in the pages that follow a clear and factual explanation of why it is a tremendous majority of southerners are opposed to forced racial integration in our public schools and why they are determined that, regardless of that Supreme Court decision, it shall not come to pass."

To the shame of Southern publishers, Debnam's book did not find a publisher in this region. So he hired a printer in Releigh and published the book himself. He charges $1 for it, plus 10 cents mailing charge. We think it's the best dollarten's worth any Southerner is likely to find this summer, even in the July department store sales. For that reason we are giving free advertisement to it on our editorial page.

We suggest, we urge, that every reader obey that impulse. Send $1.10 today to Mr. Debnam, 1313 Williamson Drive, Raleigh, N. C. Better still, buy two copies. Keep one for yourself and give the other to somebody else—preferably a doubting Thomas.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 193[illegible]).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 101 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, AUGUST 16, 1955 No. 134

Daily Digest

RÉSUMÉ OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 5 through August 2, 1955

	Senate	House	Total
Days in session	105	112	..
Time in session	559 hrs., 41′	471 hrs., 19′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	6,251	5,079	11,330
Appendix	..	..	5,684
Public bills enacted into law	162	228	390
Private bills enacted into law	146	344	490
Bills in conference	..	1	1
Bills through conference	14	44	58
Measures passed, total	1,325	1,597	..
Senate bills	574	361	..
House bills	566	966	..
Senate joint resolutions	22	16	..
House joint resolutions	20	24	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	25	18	..
House concurrent resolutions	21	25	..
Simple resolutions	97	187	284
Measures reported, total	*1,426	*1,528	..
Senate bills	626	215	..
House bills	571	1,099	..
Senate joint resolutions	27	7	..
House joint resolutions	20	33	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	28	9	..
House concurrent resolutions	21	17	..
Simple resolutions	133	148	281
Special reports	28	44	..
Conference reports	..	60	..
Reported measures not acted on	**22	**79	..
Measures introduced, total	3,070	8,844	11,914
Bills	2,759	7,869	10,628
Joint resolutions	104	436	540
Concurrent resolutions	58	196	254
Simple resolutions	149	343	492
Quorum calls	62	74	136
Yea-and-nay votes	88	73	161
Bills vetoed	5	6	11
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 5 through August 2, 1955

Postmaster nominations, totaling 1,490, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,131
Withdrawn	12
Rejected	3
Unconfirmed	344
Army nominations, totaling 5,805, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	5,804
Unconfirmed	1
Air Force nominations, totaling 3,910, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	3,594
Unconfirmed	316
Navy nominations, totaling 16,496, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	16,432
Unconfirmed	64
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 11,256, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	11,256
Civilian nominations other than postmasters, totaling 1,729, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,680
Withdrawn	3
Unconfirmed	46

Summary

Total nominations received	40,686
Total withdrawn	15
Total rejected	3
Total unconfirmed	771
Total confirmed	39,897

*These figures on measures reported include all placed on calendar or acted on by Senate even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 1,305 reports has been filed in the Senate; a total of 1,632 has been filed in the House.

**This figure does not agree with the total difference between bills reported and bills passed, because resolutions and bills placed on the House Calendar without having been formally reported were not included in figures of measures reported to the House; the difference in the case of Senate figures is due to uncounted bills "laid on the table" or "indefinitely postponed."

TABLE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Public law			Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Date approved	Amount as approved	Law No.	
	1955 APPROPRIATIONS														
	Supplemental														
H. R. 2091	Urgent Deficiency, 1955	----------	Jan. 13	$25,000	Jan. 13	$25,000	$160,000	Jan. 17	$993,950	Jan. 18	$1,013,950	Jan. 25	$1,013,950	3	+$853,950
H. J. Res. 252	Justice, 1955	$750,000	Mar. 14	710,000	Mar. 14	710,000	750,000	Mar. 15	710,000	Mar. 16	710,000	Mar. 16	710,000	13	−40,000
H. R. 4903	Second Supplemental	920,523,454	Mar. 15	855,212,429	Mar. 18	857,187,429	952,002,718	Apr. 13	938,402,835	Apr. 14	945,412,835	Apr. 22	898,805,875	24	−53,196,843
H. J. Res. 310	Second Urgent Deficiency, 1955	28,263,475	May 19	25,263,475	May 19	25,263,475	28,263,475	May 23	25,263,475	May 25	25,263,475	May 27	25,263,475	48	−3,000,000
H. J. Res. 365	House of Representatives item	----------	June 30	12,000	June 30	12,000	----------	June 30	12,000	June 30	12,000	June 30	12,000	120	+12,000
	Total	949,536,929	----------	881,222,904	----------	883,197,904	981,176,193	----------	965,382,260	----------	972,412,260	----------	925,805,300	------	−55,370,893
	1956 APPROPRIATIONS														
	Supplemental														
H. J. Res. 366	Temporary appropriations	----------	June 30	----------	June 30	----------	----------	June 30	----------	June 30	----------	June 30	----------	123	----------
H. R. 7278	Supplemental appropriations	1,927,785,868	July 12	1,648,876,128	July 14	224,276,628	2,123,351,072	July 23	1,826,111,614	July 26	1,830,078,614	Aug. 4	1,656,625,802	219	−466,725,270
	Regular														
H. R. 4876	Treasury-Post Office	3,360,250,000	Mar. 11	3,282,553,000	Mar. 15	3,282,553,000	3,360,385,000	Apr. 12	3,358,622,000	Apr. 13	3,358,622,000	June 1	3,322,488,500	51	−37,896,500
H. R. 5046	Labor-HEW	2,432,148,861	Mar. 18	2,337,522,261	Mar. 21	2,337,522,261	2,432,148,861	June 2	2,404,055,600	June 6	2,404,905,600	Aug. 1	2,373,516,500	195	−58,632,361
H. R. 5085	Interior	313,353,056	Mar. 21	298,271,246	Mar. 24	297,925,546	314,523,056	May 2	327,987,088	May 5	327,987,088	June 16	317,573,627	78	+3,050,571
H. R. 5239	Agriculture	897,684,574	Mar. 25	880,260,050	Mar. 28	880,260,050	898,384,574	Apr. 21	884,393,923	Apr. 26	884,433,923	May 23	883,051,623	40	−15,332,951
H. R. 5240	Independent Offices	5,639,790,000	Mar. 26	5,845,595,375	Mar. 30	5,845,595,375	5,640,155,000	June 2	5,882,379,500	June 6	5,848,394,500	June 30	5,842,458,500	112	+202,303,500
H. R. 5502	State, Justice, Judiciary	483,531,912	Apr. 13	450,398,227	Apr. 14	450,398,227	483,531,912	May 26	481,985,418	May 31	481,985,418	July 7	466,302,415	133	−17,229,497
H. R. 6042	Defense	32,232,815,000	May 5	31,488,206,000	May 12	31,488,206,000	32,232,815,000	June 14	31,836,521,336	June 20	31,882,915,726	July 13	31,882,815,726	157	−349,999,274
H. R. 6239	District of Columbia	(175,405,300)	May 12	(166,547,509)	May 19	(166,901,780)	(175,462,020)	June 22	(169,456,749)	June 23	(169,456,749)	July 5	(168,843,440)	131	(−6,618,580)
	Federal payment	21,892,700	----------	17,892,700	----------	17,892,700	21,892,700	----------	21,892,700	----------	21,892,700	----------	19,892,700	------	−2,000,000
H. R. 6367	Commerce	1,366,393,000	May 19	1,121,435,000	May 24	1,123,685,000	1,366,393,000	June 10	1,314,617,300	June 16	1,317,192,300	June 30	1,245,360,000	121	−121,033,000
H. R. 6499	General Government	27,700,700	May 26	21,890,700	June 1	21,890,700	28,777,700	June 17	27,166,300	June 21	27,166,300	June 29	27,166,300	110	−1,611,400
H. R. 6766	Public Works	1,789,165,000	June 10	1,285,746,242	June 16	1,372,122,800	1,801,465,000	July 1	1,377,491,000	July 5	1,377,571,000	July 15	1,365,613,500	163	−435,851,500
H. R. 7117	Legislative	67,572,138	June 30	66,298,175	July 1	66,298,175	92,641,411	July 28	92,924,027	July 29	93,025,527	Aug. 5	92,808,972	242	+167,561
	Total (regular)	48,632,296,241	----------	47,096,068,976	----------	47,184,349,834	48,673,113,214	----------	48,010,036,192	----------	48,026,092,082	----------	47,839,048,363	------	−834,064,851
	Foreign aid														
H. R. 7224	Mutual Security	3,266,641,750	July 8	2,638,741,750	July 11	2,638,741,750	3,266,641,750	July 19	3,205,341,750	July 22	3,205,841,750	Aug. 2	2,703,341,750	208	−563,300,000
	Total (regular and foreign aid)	51,898,937,991	----------	49,734,810,726	----------	49,823,091,584	51,939,754,964	----------	51,215,377,942	----------	51,231,923,832	----------	50,542,390,113	------	−1,397,364,851

RECAPITULATION FOR SESSION

	Estimates	Amount appropriated	Increase or decrease
Total 1955 supplemental	$981,176,193	$925,805,300	−$55,370,893
Total 1956 supplemental	*2,123,351,072	1,656,625,802	−466,725,270
Total 1956 regular and foreign aid	51,939,754,964	50,542,390,113	−1,397,364,851
Grand total	55,044,282,229	53,124,821,215	−1,919,461,014

* Does not include $156,500,000 or Post Office Department Pay Act costs (H. Doc. 119), deferred to next session.

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-fourth Congress will be published not later than Thursday, August 25, 1955. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Accomplishments of 1st Session of 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have served in 22 Congresses. In my opinion, this is one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress that I have ever served in.

The work of the 1st session of the 84th Congress has been such that all Democrats in the Congress and outside the Congress should be, and I feel sure are, proud of it.

I also think that the American people are going to endorse and applaud this great record that we have made.

It is a record of constructive legislation, legislation necessary to advance the Nation's welfare. It affects every American and is forward looking to the future of the United States.

The list of accomplishments is long. It represents long and hard work by Members on problems dealing with all the world, this Nation's leadership in global affairs, down to measures lifting burdens on individual citizens.

I am content to rest on this record. If, however, the President's own party had cooperated with him in a better way, then we might have had a greater record.

We Democrats have not hated Eisenhower, as many Republicans and so-called Democrats hated Roosevelt and Truman. The Democrats in this Congress have voted as if a Democrat had been in the White House.

We Democrats did our work as Americans and not as partisans.

We acted as Americans in giving the President power and the legislation he asked to strengthen our foreign policy.

On domestic issues, this session of Congress enacted legislation beneficial to the economy of the country.

President Eisenhower embraced so much of the Roosevelt and Truman programs previously enacted by Democratic Congresses that it was not difficult to expand and renew laws to extend them.

As to certain domestic proposals, this session did not have time to consider a few items. We have another session of the 84th Congress in which to act. We hope by January the President will have his party in line to make our job easier.

We Democrats probably will do many more things the President has overlooked—things that we Democrats believe should be enacted for the betterment of the Nation.

We Democrats gave the Congress an opportunity to vote on the President's highway program. It was rejected. The Republicans in the House did not even vote to get a highway bill to conference with the Senate. If the President will do a little road work with his own party on the highway program during the recess of Congress, his chances of getting a highway bill will be enhanced.

We Democrats had difficulty in getting housing legislation the President requested. Republican opposition made it difficult, and I think the people of the country know it.

On the broad aspects, I feel that the Nation's defense, internal and external, its economy and security were both protected and advanced by this session of Congress. I am proud of the patriotism displayed by the Democratic Party in its consideration of the Republican administration's proposals. Without being boastful, I can say with frankness that it is the opinion of a majority of the thinking people of this country that the Democratic leadership in Congress, even with a Republican administration, conducted itself and the business of the Nation in a masterful manner. I refer not only to the House leadership but also that of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Senator EARLE CLEMENTS in the Senate.

Certainly, the 1954 political campaign claim of the President that a cold war between the Republican administration and a Democratic Congress would begin if the Democrats won Congress, has been belied. If there has been any cold war between Congress and the Republican administration, it has been conducted by Republicans in Congress. A look at the record of Republican votes would convince the most skeptical.

At the outset of this Congress, I said that the Democrats would perform in a patriotic manner; that the Nation's security is paramount with us; that the Democrats always acted first in the interest of the Nation. This we have done. Where we did not agree fully with the administration's proposals, we revised them and sought to enact policies which we believe are the best for most of the people, and not the best for a few of the people.

Frankly, if the Democratic leadership in Congress had experienced less Republican hindrance, I think we could have done a better job with the President's program. Most of the President's program was adopted from the previous Democratic administrations, and that, perhaps, explains the Republican rank and file opposition.

Time and again, we Democrats pulled Mr. Eisenhower's proposals out of the Republican fire. I cite extension of the keystone to the administration's and the Nation's foreign policy—the reciprocal trade program—as one example.

Republicans, in control of the 83d Congress, limited extension of this important program year by year, whereas this Democratic Congress extended the law 3 years and granted additional authority for a 15 percent tariff cut over the period, as the President requested. On a motion in the House to kill the entire program, 119 Republicans voted against the President and but 66 supported him. The Democrats put it over.

For campaign purposes in 1952 and again in 1954, the Republicans alleged the Democrats were soft on Communists. In this Congress, the Democratic Party supported every major proposal the President submitted to protect this Nation from Communist aggression. We authorized the President to use our Armed Forces to protect Formosa against Chinese Communists; the Mutual Security Act was extended; the Southeast Asia Defense Pact was ratified; we approved the freedom of Germany, and enacted other security measures applying externally as well as internally. Congress approved the International Finance Corporation to stimulate foreign trade and bring more friends to this Nation. A comparison of the Democratic votes against the Republican votes on these issues will show who stands where.

Our people want peace and protection. In a period such as this, it is not easy to arouse them to prepare for any

eventuality. Thus, this Congress was confronted with new problems of national defense for a period of coming years and a lack of enthusiasm for the steps necessary to secure defense.

Despite Republican isolationist opposition, the Democratic Congress extended the draft of civilians for military service for 4 years; established a long-range, new Reserve system for a ready standby armed force; renewed the Defense Production Act for a reserve of military production capacity; voted more funds for expansion of atomic power, and provided for new atomic warships and new defense construction at home and at our military and naval bases over the world.

On the internal security side, the Democrats pressed to enactment bills aimed at preventing sabotage through the use of atomic power; providing for severe penalties for disloyal and subversive persons and those convicted of seditious conspiracy and advocay of the overthrow of our Government. We also set up a commission on Government security for the purpose of strengthening our defenses against enemies among us—at the same time preserving our traditional American freedoms embodied in the Bill of Rights.

Since the Republican administration either deliberately ignored or failed to take notice of the condition of many of our people, we Democrats sought to improve the lot of the low-wage earner, the small-business man and the farmer. The Republican administration opposed the Democratic proposal for a $20 tax cut for each income taxpayer. Of 194 Republicans voting in the House on this issue, 173 voted against it.

In the face of strong administration opposition, the Democratic effort to supplant the Eisenhower-Benson flexible price-support program for the farmers with a 90-percent-of-parity formula was passed by the House. It is pending in the Senate. However, a bill increasing by $2 billion the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase farm surpluses was passed, along with bills increasing planting allotments for cotton, durum wheat, and rice, and other bills reducing penalties for overplanting support crops where used for feed and seed. This Democratic Congress also extended emergency loans for drought-stricken cattlemen and secured passage of a bill for processing of surplus grains for use as food in unemployment relief in Kentucky, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and other States.

The Democratic proposal for a minimum wage of $1 an hour prevailed over President Eisenhower's 90-cent-an-hour recommendation. Congress also raised wages of Government employees, including the judiciary and Congress, and increased pay and allowances of members of the armed services. It also raised and broadened veterans' benefits.

Over Republican opposition, the Democratic House passed a bill broadening the social-security laws to provide increased payments, cover more individuals, and to permit women to retire with social security at 62 years of age. It is pending in the Senate.

Disturbed by the growth of big business through mergers, this Congress increased penalties for violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act. It extended the 52-percent corporate income tax, and started studies to help small-business men to stay in business.

The Democrats cut $1.6 billion from the President's budget request, limiting the appropriations to $52 billion. Because the Republican administration has failed to carry out its 1952 campaign pledge to balance the budget, Congress was forced to extend the temporary increase in the national debt limit of $281 billion.

Congress defeated the Eisenhower highway program calling for a bond issue that would have cost the taxpayers $11 billion in interest. Democrats opposed this program on the ground that it would amount to an increase in the public debt to $48 billion. Led by Republicans, Congress also defeated the Democratic pay-as-you-go highway program which would have taxed the users of the highways. This proposal would have prevented an increase in the public debt and would have given the Nation a highway program to meet modern demands.

The President has received approval of around threescore of his proposals to the 84th Congress in this single session. I think that he has experienced cooperation from the Democrats in control far beyond expectations. At least, compared with the modicum of success he experienced with the Republican 83d Congress, I should think he would feel gratified. We Democrats know we have done a good job under the circumstances. If Mr. Eisenhower, as party leader, could exercise any control over the Republicans, we could do a better job in the next session.

Public Housing

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer already is on the hook for $4,700,000,000 to carry out provisions for public-housing units which have been approved by the Congress. If we pass the bill now before us it will add an additional $2,306,000,000 to the back-breaking debt now carried by the American taxpayer.

In short, passage of this bill today will increase the total commitment to over $7 billion over the next 40 years.

The so-called liberals and members of the Americans for Democratic Action do not tell you the real name—and the real purpose—of this evil monstrosity which is more popularly known as a socialized housing bill. The leftwingers are smart, cunning experts in mob psychology. They call this a low-cost housing bill designed to give shelter to the needy and the homeless. The fact is this is a high-cost housing bill and benefits only the privileged classes. If you bear with me a few minutes I will document that statement and any others that I make on this issue.

The purpose of socialized housing is political. There are today 457,000 public-housing units. Here live approximately 1,500,000 men, women, and children—complete wards of a beneficent Government which now owns their bodies and soon will own their minds.

The economic planners—those who are out to destroy the free-enterprise system—have not yet completed contracts for housing units already approved by the Congress and yet they have the gall to come here today with tear-jerking pleas for additional authority and, of course, additional money.

Using the figures of the housing authorities themselves, we can arrive at an average cost of these so-called low-cost housing units. That figure, for construction and land, is about $10,000 a unit. In practice, however, the figure is much higher. Under terms of its subsidy contracts the Government agrees to pay about 4½ percent a year based on the construction costs and this subsidy runs to a maximum of 40 years. The true cost of this scandalous waste, therefore, is 40 years multiplied by 4½ percent or 180 percent. You then multiply $10,000 by this 180 percent and you see that these units are costing the public $18,000. In all fairness, it cannot be said that $18,000 for an ordinary housing unit is low-cost housing.

In the bill before us we find the following items: 35,000 additional units for the coming fiscal year and another 35,000 units for the year after that—a total of 70,000. There is also an item of 10,000 public housing units for elderly families next year and another 10,000 for the year after that—a total of 20,000 for this item which was inserted to give this bill an emotional appeal that will make it difficult for honest men to vote against it. In the earlier days, the public housing advocates were crying about the welfare of children living in the slums which, they falsely claimed, were the breeding grounds for juvenile delinquency. The second-grade student of American history knows that some of our greatest men and women were born and raised in the slums. They also know that juvenile delinquents are found in the homes of our wealthiest people. At any rate, the public planners and do-gooders have changed their mournful pleas from children to elderly families, and I might add that this is one of the sliest bits of propaganda I have ever seen.

But today's bill, the one now under discussion, contains another item of about 15,000 housing units which was approved by the Congress last year but which the planners did not get around to using.

The bill before us calls for the construction of 105,000 units. Despite the fact that of the 35,000 units we permitted them to use last year, on May 23 of this year Mr. Slusser, head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee that he had actually put under contract only 142 units out of the total of 35,000 the Congress authorized last year.

Later, on June 27, Mr. Slusser informed my office that they had completed letting contracts on 20,000 in the past 30

days. I want to ask you this question: If it took 11 months to put 142 units under contract, how is it possible that Mr. Slusser and his organization became swift-footed enough to put 20,000 units under contract in a little over 20 working days? You know the answer as well as I do. If they have done it, they have done it with such speed and with so little consideration that it could only result in waste to the taxpayers. Doubtless, their purpose in blanketing 20,000 units supposedly under contract is to get the Congress to give them the authorization they are now asking for.

If it took 11 months to put 142 units under contract, why do they need 35,000 more units, or the 105,000 they are asking for in this bill? It is the old wreckless bureaucratic maneuvering.

Here and now I want to make my position clear on this subject. I am opposed to socialized housing in any form. It is dishonest, immoral, and repugnant to the American sense of decency and human dignity. Socialized housing degrades the human being and places him in eternal bondage to Government bureaucratics. Actually, it is offensive to the very people it was intended to help.

I do not know where the planners get their figures for construction of these new units. Why do they say 35,000 units for this year? Why do not they just pull the figure 350,000 or 3,500,000 out of the hat? It would make just as much sense as what they are doing.

Since World II, more than 9½ million privately financed dwelling units have been built and occupied in this country. This fact alone should be enough to call a halt to all of this public housing and it shows beyond doubt that private industry can do the job.

The social planners and the do-gooders with other people's money talk so much about slum clearance that you would think that they alone are opposed to slum clearance. As usual, they try to get across the notion that they have a monopoly on social virtue and that those who oppose public housing are not in favor of slum clearance. This is a bit of devious trickery in argument that not even a child would fall for.

Slum clearance is not a problem of the Federal Government. That problem can and should be solved by the States and local governments. To eradicate their slums, all the big cities have to do is enforce existing housing and sanitary codes that will take the profit out of slum housing. They have this authority. All they have to do is exercise it.

Here, I want to go into considerable detail about this bill to show how far afield it is from the original intent of the Congress when it enacted the first public housing bill in 1937. The sole objective, at that time, was to create shelter for the very needy and the destitute. The public planners have perverted this original intent to a point where public housing today is a luxury that only the privileged classes can afford.

The poor and the needy—and we shall always have them with us, despite our prosperity—are not qualified for public housing. They cannot afford the high rents which the Public Housing Authority charges in an effort to hoodwink the Congress into the belief that public housing is a sound and socially useful venture.

If public housing does not include the poor, if it does not contribute to the social welfare of the country, it has no justification whatever for existence.

Now, here is how it works and you can see for yourselves that the Congress never intended this sort of monkey business with public funds:

The city council sets up the local housing authority. When it approves such a local housing authority, the Federal Government provides for payment of a subsidy of about 4½ percent, for 40 years, based on development cost, to the local housing authority. This 4½ percent, taken from all of the taxpayers of the Nation, each year subsidizes about one-third of the rental cost to the occupants in the local housing authority.

In other words, none of the tenants is supposed to pay full rental; some pay two-thirds, others a little more or less, while the ordinary taxpayers who pay their own taxes or rent still are called upon by the Government to pay their pro rata share of the rent losses of those who live in public housing.

For example: In Detroit, a family of 2 adults and 3 children can earn as high as $4,500 per year net income, and still have other citizens paying part of their rent.

This is one reason that Walter Reuther and the big labor leaders are so vigorously supporting this public-housing legislation. It would be interesting to know the number of thousands of people who earn a high net income, while the other citizens of the Nation are forced to pay a part of their rental.

The public is being deceived in the thought that the really lowest-income group is being housed under this act. Unless they can afford to pay a certain amount per month, they cannot rent these houses. That excludes the lowest-income group which still have to get aid from the townships, counties, and local communities.

More of the lowest income groups could secure housing when the act was passed, but those managing this public housing have continued to raise the ceiling on how much people could earn net and still occupy these houses, with the rest of the people helping to pay their rent. They are now taking in the $4,500 and up to the $5,000 net-income groups and the poor people in greater numbers are excluded from renting these so-called low-cost houses. The people in the greatest need get the cold shoulder from these big-hearted do-gooders.

When this law was first enacted it was intended as a welfare measure to house the lowest income group. Now advocates and managers of this welfare program, to perpetuate their socialistic philosophy, and keep themselves in power, and probably to get the support of the big labor organizations, have continued to raise the limit one could earn and yet be a beneficiary of this public housing.

They provide cheap rent to those who are earning net up to $4,000 and $5,000 and live in public-housing units.

The facts are that it is not carrying out the welfare purpose established when this act was first written. It is a hoax. It is a deception. It is dishonest to the public that has to pay the bill and it is a dangerous policy for the Nation to continue to follow.

In 1952, the House voted to end public housing in 1953. The Senate, however, authorized a very limited expansion and the House reluctantly went along. In 1954, on two rollcall votes, the House rejected this program by a substantial majority. Then it went over to the Senate again, and the Senate reopened the program on a modest scale.

Now, the Senate acting on the bill first this time, has authorized over 600,000 units, of which they approve up to 210,000 units per year. When the House reluctantly went along last year, it served notice that the program must be brought to a close on June 30 of this year. This should be done.

I agree with my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that it is an evil program, and that the Members of this House cannot condone even a small amount of evil. This socialistic waste of the people's money, which, at the same time, destroys the morale of our citizens, who left alone would take pride in owning or renting the roof over their heads, should be completely stopped in this session. It is wasting the substance of all of our citizens, and will continue to waste away the incentive and pride of our citizens as well.

The real promoters of this so-called public housing have used every device to keep themselves in power. For many years, they have played on the emotions of our people by stating their purpose was to help the children in the lowest income group, and now, for the first time, they are making a shabby appeal to the old people by asking that 20,000 of these units be set aside for them.

Back of all of this, down deep in this organization they have two purposes in mind: One is to keep themselves in jobs of power, and the other is to wield a political power, and control, and influence over those who will and do occupy these Government-owned rental units. The more they can convince the citizen that they are dependent upon the Government, the more control they will have over his thinking and his life, and it will be easier to control him politically.

In conclusion, allow me, please, to drive home one important point about this bill. This is not President Eisenhower's bill. The leftwingers and the social planners have planted that notion in the minds of some who might be inclined to vote against the bill but will go along with it if they feel that the President is behind it.

The bill as it now stands is wide open for all sorts of abuse, waste, and even corruption. They have thrown aside all of the safeguards we previously had built into this type of legislation. Let me give you a few examples of what I mean:

The bill as it now stands permits Communists, Fascists, and all other members

of groups who would destroy our way of life, to take advantage of these low rentals. In other words, American taxpayers are now called upon to carry the freight of free-riding Communists and others who do not believe in our form of government. This to me is one of the most shocking features of this abominable bill. As Members of the House know, we had inserted a clause in previous housing bills—the so-called Gwinn amendment—which required certification by public-housing occupants that they do not belong to subversive organizations. Now, that is knocked out of the bill we are now debating.

Under terms of the present bill, the public housing authorities can ram down the throats of local groups a housing project that they do not want. Imagine that in a free country. Somewhere along the line the so-called Los Angeles amendment was stricken from the bill. That amendment provided a formula whereby a community does not have to accept a public-housing project after it decides by referendum to reject it. Now the local community must accept a public-housing project whether it wants to or not.

Senators Hear Walcott Give Advice to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a report on the appearance of Jersey Joe Walcott before a Senate Labor Subcommittee studying juvenile delinquency. Mr. Walcott offered some wonderful advice to the young people of the Nation when he told them, "Living clean, serving God, and being good citizens will pay off." I think Jersey Joe is making a great contribution in the Nation's fight against juvenile delinquency.

The report of Mr. Walcott's testimony before the subcommittee appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., for Thursday, July 7, 1955, and is as follows:

SENATORS HEAR WALCOTT GIVE ADVICE TO YOUTH

Jersey Joe Walcott, the former world heavyweight boxing champ with a yen to help kids, earnestly offered this advice to the youngsters of the Nation yesterday: "Living clean, serving God, and being good citizens will pay off."

Three Senators listened just as earnestly, and at the end, Senator PURTELL, Republican, of Connecticut, said, "God bless you Joe, keep up your good work."

Mr. Walcott, heavyweight boxing champion of the world in 1951–52, is now a special officer working against juvenile delinquency for the Camden (N. J.) Police Department. He plays basketball with the kids and teaches them boxing.

Appearing before a Senate Labor Subcommittee studying four bills dealing with delinquency, Mr. Walcott started off: "If I am nervous, it is because this is a new role to me."

DEDICATED TO YOUTH

"I promised God when I finished fighting I'd dedicate my life to young people. And if I can inspire some boy to live the clean American way of living, then I am happy."

Joe's message was to the parents to teach their children and to love their children, because "persons like to know we're wanted."

"The more often I hear the words 'juvenile delinquency' the less I think they fit the situation," he said. "Actually, and to a larger extent, what we have to deal with is parent delinquency."

Mr. Walcott said he was born "on the wrong side of the tracks."

But when he and his brothers threatened to get out of hand, he said, "pa and ma stepped in and stopped the smart-aleck conduct before it had fairly started."

"Pa's actions were direct," he said, "they called for a trip out back to the woodshed and a dose of what, in those days, was called 'strap oil.' It was painful but effective. It taught us the result of wrongdoing. Ma never interfered, but when it was all over used to gather us by her side and explain why what we had done was wrong."

Speaking softly and nervously, Joe answered the questions the Senators rolled to him.

Does race, creed, or color play a part in delinquency

"It's up to the individual. If you have faith in God and the will to persevere, you can be successful, regardless of race or creed."

HUNGRY LOTS OF TIMES

Does segregation?

"It's heartbreaking sometimes, embarrassing sometimes. None of us, regardless of our particular race, asked to come here in any way * * * but when a person feels he's not wanted, then he gets bitter."

Does poverty?

"Lots of times I was hungry, but I never lost faith. I was 37 when I won the championship. After 21 years, God answered my prayers. We were poor when I was a boy. Lots of times at night I've seen my mamma sit up and cry because she couldn't feed us children."

Senator PURTELL said there should be more men like Mr. Walcott setting an example.

"You, Joe Walcott, are making a lot of stepping stones for a lot of people," he said.

Prophet of Atomic Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on the day on which it appears that this Congress will authorize the construction of the atomic-powered peace ship requested by President Eisenhower, and also the first American nuclear-driven merchant vessel, I think it is fitting that this Congress should pay tribute to the man who foresaw these developments more than 4½ years ago, Mr. Joseph F. Kelly, of Ridgefield and Litchfield, Conn.

Mr. Kelly has been a prominent figure in the American shipping industry for the past 25 years. He served with the United States Maritime Commission during World War II; during the postwar period he was editor and executive vice president of Marine News; and presently he is a shipping consultant to the American maritime industry.

Unfortunately I cannot reproduce in the RECORD the illustrations of the nuclear marine reactor engine, the atomic pile that would drive it, and the atomic-powered passenger ship of the future in Mr. Kelly's prophetic story published in the January 1951 issue of Marine News, "The United States Pioneers in Marine Atomic Power."

But as a tribute to Mr. Kelly, I do wish to quote as follows the first of four prophecies of Mr. Kelly concerning the future of this country as a seapower in this atomic age:

THE UNITED STATES PIONEERS IN MARINE ATOMIC POWER—OUR GOVERNMENT, OUR SCIENTISTS, AND OUR INDUSTRY LEAD THE WORLD AND ARE THE FIRST IN ATOMIC MARINE DEVELOPMENT

(By Joseph F. Kelly)

A little over 450 years ago, just after the sailor from Genoa convinced his backers that the earth was round, the old world looked to the new world for riches and vast areas to conquer. Today the new world (U. N.?–One World?), looks to the United States to conquer and harness the great atomic forces in the interests of mankind, world peace, and productive industrial development. As a result from such harnessing of atomic forces, the United States Government and its loyal scientists are fulfilling this great responsibility with amazing speed and efficiency.

In this dawn of atomic-physics (the most exciting decade in world history) American shipping is at the threshold of the most phenomenal development in its long and illustrious history—the using of heat produced by atomic fission to generate steam that will travel through conventional steam turbines and drive the propellers of a vessel so powered.

Westinghouse Electric Corp. is well advanced in its work to develop atomic powered nuclear reactor engines to drive submarines. Similar engines after further development and tests will drive the surface vessel. This type of nuclear engine will give greater speed, range, and economy. These far-reaching developments are very significant at this time for their considerable naval implications, particularly because the nuclear engine can operate without atmospheric oxygen in undersea craft operations. This prodigious evolution would not only outmode the famous Snorkel, but would give the submarine greater speed and an unbelievable cruising range. With the tremendously increased power produced by a nuclear engine a submarine hull, having the right characteristics and design could exceed the speed of a surface vessel of equal power. Atomic power in the marine field will first be utilized in the submarines; then the warship, and finally in merchant vessels.

Research work preliminary to actual construction of the marine nuclear engine has been completed at a 400,000-acre midwestern station. The engine should be ready just after the launching of the first atomic undersea hull built in this country, which is scheduled to take place this spring. By next summer the American shipping industry should know the benefits of this development and the probable time when commercial application of atomic power will replace conventional coal- or oil-fired boilers. One of the most important problems in the application of atomic power for marine use is weight. Heavy shielding is necessary to protect engine rooms and crews from the dangerous neutron beams and gamma rays. The confinement of these rays and beams is at present under intense study and research work.

An essential part of the proposed engine, as it is of any atomic unit, will be the reactor.

PROBLEMS AND APPLICATION OF ATOMIC POWER

A reactor is the machine which converts atomic energy—or more accurately nuclear energy—into forms which can be turned to useful purposes. Reactors are large, complicated, expensive, and controversial. Nuclear reactors provide man with the most concentrated energy source thus far devised and, in imagination at least, have potentially unlimited possibilities. They have been proposed for uses ranging from performance of the world's drudgery to the powering of rockets for space travel. While some of the proposed uses of reactors are strictly figments of the imagination, reactors themselves are real. Reactors are made by so arranging an aggregate of fissionable material that a controlled nuclear chain reaction can be maintained. The chain reaction, in turn, depends on the detailed nuclear properties of materials.

In 1939 the process of fission in uranium was discovered. This discovery culminated an exciting decade in the field of physics during which much of the detailed structure and many of the mechanisms involved in the internal parts of the atom were deciphered.

Think of an atom as a miniature solar system with the nucleus in the center and the electrons circulating around it as planets. The atom as a whole is small, with a dimension of about 10–8 centimeters. The nucleus, the central core of the atom, is of course much smaller—about 10–13 centimeters in diameter. Within the nucleus is found most of the mass of the atom in the form of protons and neutrons, the protons having a positive electrical charge, while the neutrons as the name implies are neutral. You are reminded of these details for two reasons; first, to emphasize the fact that an atom is composed mostly of empty space; and second, to identify the neutron, which is basic to the operation of reactors of any kind.

Now try to visualize a uranium atom. It is mostly empty space, it has a heavy concentrated nucleus composed of 92 protons and about 140 neutrons, and circulating around this nucleus at relatively large distances are the planetary electrons. These electrons are the now familiar electrons of our ordinary electrical circuits and radio tubes and need not concern us further. Our interest is in the nucleus.

Suppose now, that a single neutron somehow gets loose and comes cruising into a uranium atom much like a comet coming into our solar system. If its trajectory carries it close to the uranium nucleus, attractive forces will set up something analagous to tidal waves in the nucleus. In the case of an actual collision, oscillations might conceivably be set up which could become strong enough to cause disruption by splitting the uranium nucleus somewhere near the middle. For our purpose, this is all there is to the mysterious fission process, and deliberately oversimplified to counteract, at least partially, the aura of awe, mystery, and magic which seems to plague the subject of atomic energy.

As previously stated the uranium nucleus contained 92 protons and 140 neutrons, i. e., an excess of about 48 neutrons. If we think of these particles, both protons and neutrons, as composing essentially a liquid droplet and then visualize the fission or splitting process, it is not too unexpected to find a probability that there are a few neutrons left over. This is in fact what occurs and makes possible the chain reaction. One stray neutron produces a fission releasing two or more neutrons, each of which in turn may collide with uranium nuclei and produce still more neutrons and so on ad infinitum. If this chain reaction is uncontrolled, we have an atom bomb explosion. If it is controlled, we have a reactor.

Complete Overhaul Called for in Public Assistance Program for Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 7848 proposing a sweeping overhaul of the public-assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act. The public-assistance section now makes Federal grants-in-aid available to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, needy children, and totally and permanently disabled. As State legislatures are permitted to determine who can qualify for such aid and the amount granted, few if any of the programs in the 48 States are alike. It would appear that many of the State legislatures have gone back 350 years to the poor laws of Queen Elizabeth's time to harass and intimidate the needy of America. The poor laws of Queen Elizabeth have no place in the statute books of our States. England repealed them long ago. Now it is up to the United States Congress to do the same in our country, and my bill will give the States 2 years' time for their legislatures to meet and to accomplish this.

The manner in which we reward the needy of other countries and neglect our own is shameful. It is my belief that the time has come for our Nation to "grow up" and treat needy Americans not as "unwanted citizens" but with love and understanding toward those who have outlived their money or have become handicapped and unable to work.

These amendments will establish a "legislative intent" that public assistance shall be administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life, and without discrimination on account of race, religion, or political affiliation; and that the assistance laws be liberally construed. In view of the fact that the House of Representatives has already passed a bill, now pending in the Senate, to lower the age from 65 to 62 for women to receive social-security benefits, I am proposing in my bill that this same privilege be extended also to women who are in need of old-age assistance at age 62.

Some features of the bill are as follows:

First. Since the Federal grants-in-aid to States for public assistance apply to the aged, the blind, dependent children and the permanently and totally disabled, the bill provides that the States cannot window shop on these programs but must adopt all of them.

Second. The program is to be administered by each State so as to insure uniform treatment of the needy in all its political subdivisions.

Third. No person receiving such public aid shall be deemed a pauper, and no warrant drawn in payment shall contain any reference to indigency or pauperism.

Fourth. A floor of $1,200 is established under the amount of personal property which a recipient is allowed to have. Household furnishings, etc., are allowed in addition to an insurance policy or burial arrangement up to $500 in value. Any amount greater than this would be considered in the $1,200.

Fifth. Prohibits any discrimination of sex.

These new provisions were added to a bill previously introduced by me which included:

(a) Raising the present ceiling of $55 to $100 monthly for each recipient wherein the Federal Government makes available funds to the States. The amount of Federal funds made available would be greater to States with low per capita income and match 50–50 the wealthier States. Additional Federal funds would be made available for the needy-children program.

(b) The aged and handicapped would be allowed to earn up to $50 per month and needy children up to $30 per month to supplement their assistance checks. At the present any amount which they earn is deducted from their monthly payment.

(c) Recipients may own a home of an assessed value, less all encumbrances, up to $5,000 free from the imposition of a lien. The ownership of a home will not be used as an excuse to deduct a so-called occupancy value from the payments to the needy.

(d) Elimination by some States of the practice of using the Federal law to enforce collections from the relatives of recipients.

(e) The prohibition against publishing the names of recipients will be restored to the Federal law.

(f) The value of any United States surplus food made available shall not be deducted from the recipient's aid.

(g) If a citizen in need does not meet State-resident requirements, the Federal Government would direct benefits until qualifying residence is established. I would like to point out that many of these realistic amendments in my new bill, H. R. 7948, had already been adopted by the State legislature in California. According to the latest official United States Government figures, there are 2,552,881 people on old-age assistance receiving an average of $51.85 per month; 103,045 blind persons are receiving an average of $56.74 per month; 2,253,174 needy children are receiving an average of $24 per month, and 229,893 physically handicapped people are receiving an average of $55.03 per month.

Commonsense and the Guaranteed Annual Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much misunderstanding generally about the so-called guaranteed annual wage program so recently being

explored by industry and labor. There have been dire prophecies as to its disintegrating effect upon the economy on the one hand and rather extravagant predictions of its cure-all powers on the other.

It is therefore, of practical value and mental wholesomeness to read something about the subject which contains a little substance and commonsense. In that respect, I would like to include the following article, which appeared in the June 25 weekly issue of America:

IN THE WAKE OF THE FORD-GM CONTRACTS

The day General Motors agreed, at a 3-year cost of $150 million, to the same supplemental unemployment benefit plan which Ford earlier accepted, a nationally syndicated business columnist foretold the demise of our system of private enterprise. With an omniscience to which few economists pretend, he even listed the stages in our inevitable descent to disaster. The very modest payments which Ford and General Motors agreed to guarantee to their laid-off workers would, he pontificated: (1) Increase costs to consumers, (2) foster unemployment, (3) lead to stagnation, (4) bankrupt small firms, and (5) result in the socialization of United States business. Prophetic insight so detailed leaves us speechless. Were it not for the fact that other innovating steps of American business—health insurance, old-age pensions, automatic productivity wage increases—begot equally dire predictions, we might regret that Walter Reuther and the United Auto Workers have now won an increased measure of wage security for half a million workers in a traditionally insecure industry. Lacking omniscience, we cannot say for certain that the economic consequences of the UAW victory will not be bad. We can say only this: that in all innovations designed to improve the lot of workers, unless these are demonstrably unsound, we prefer to take our stand with the pioneers and groundbreakers—not all of whom are economic dunces. We refuse to underestimate either the good sense of labor in making demands or the ingenuity of management in meeting them.

Law and Order Breaks Down in Kohler and Sheboygan, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., concerning the CIO strike against the Kohler Co., at Kohler and Sheboygan, Wis.:

Fomented by Walter Reuther from his CIO-UAW Detroit headquarters, the most costly and vicious strike in current labor annals has been seething for the past 16 months at the Kohler Co.'s plant in Kohler Village, Wis.

Right from its very start, on April 5, 1954, the purpose of this strike has been to promote and bolster Walter Reuther's position in labor circles by deliberately attacking the one company with the best wages and working conditions of any city in Wisconsin. The principle issue is the right to work without joining a union. Reuther denies that right. By now, it is clear that, after squandering over $5 million of the international union's funds to make Kohler Co. give in to that proposition, he has been decisively defeated.

As soon as the strike was called, Reuther sent Robert Burkhart, one of his aids, to direct a reign of terror imposed by union goons in the village of Kohler and in Sheboygan. In addition to the $5 million already lost to the CIO–UAW, $400,000 more each month has been committed to subsidies more than 2,200 who are still out.

The plant now operates at 85 percent of capacity. Many more new employees have been hired. Among 90 union leaders fired for violence and other misconduct, have been Allan J. Graskamp, president of the local, all members of the executive committee and all shop stewards.

All new employees hired during the strike will not be replaced by the strikers when and if they decide to return to work. Whatever the National Labor Relations Board may say about this, Kohler is fortified by the Supreme Court's opinion in *N. L. R. B.* v. *MacKay Radio and Telegraph Co.* (304 U. S. 333) that an employer " is not bound to discharge those hired to fill the places of strikers, upon the election of the latter to resume their employment, in order to create places for them."

Reuther's abject failure to humble the Kohler Co. has brought him great loss of face. His recent attempts to impose a guaranteed annual wage plan upon the automobile companies and his settlement for a "fake guaranteed annual wage", which in reality is but a nickel an hour pay boost, has further contributed to the shakiness of his position. Finlly, evincing actions of a man in desperation, he has launched what is in effect an illegal secondary boycott with the aim of depriving the Kohler Co. of its vital porcelain clay supplies, in an attempt to force the plant's shutdown when the prolonged strike failed to do so. This action—ignored or condoned or even abetted by various Wisconsin elective officials—has made a travesty of the law, just as, in the past 16 months, actions during the strike flouted the law at every turn.

The Kohler Co. is located in a village of the same name 3 miles from the city of Sheboygan. It was started here, grew here, and finally became the second largest United States plumbing-fixture maker, and producer of electric power units, gasoline engines, shells for the Army, and jet engine parts for the Air Force.

The company has not laid off a single employee in 17 years, even though the plumbing-fixture industry depends largely upon seasonally fluctuating residential building demand. Employees consistently have benefited from Kohler's policies. A generation before the steel industry had changed from the 12-hour to the 8-hour day on continuous operations, Kohler was on an 8-hour day. Wisconsin was the second State to enact a workmen's compensation law. Kohler not only worked for that law, but, of its own accord, put a similar compensation plan into effect nearly 2 years before the legislation was adopted.

The Kohler Co. has reduced the accident rate to about half that for the plumbing industry in general. Group life insurance at company expense was put into effect in 1917; group hospital and surgical insurance has been in effect since 1950; and these plans have revised and improved to meet changing conditions.

Kohler has one of the finest pension plans in American industry. It is fully funded and was established voluntarily by the company in 1948, before the CIO–UAW had negotiated pension arrangements in the automobile industry or in any other industry.

The village of Kohler has enjoyed worldwide fame as an outstanding example of a planned industrial garden community. Practically all families in Kohler own their own homes, and, contrary to CIO–UAW propaganda, they own in fee simple the land on which their homes are built.

Average weekly earnings of Kohler Co. employees have been much higher than the average for the entire plumbing industry, the State of Wisconsin, or any city in Wisconsin. In March of 1954, just before the strike was called, Kohler employees earned an average of $87.45 a week, against $65.52 for the nearby city of Sheboygan, $76.04 for the Nation's plumbing suppliers, $77.72 for Kenosha and $77.88 for Racine County—the latter two being big CIO–UAW Wisconsin strongholds.

To this quiet little Wisconsin community of workers with better homes, better working conditions, and superior earning power, the CIO turned its attention. Compulsory unionism was the major issue at the Kohler Co. The union at first demanded a union shop, then a modified shop, and finally a maintenance of membership clause.

But President Herbert V. Kohler rejected these demands. The union, as Kohler sees it, wants to preempt the functions of management. It wants to dictate hiring and firing, seniority rules, promotions and merit increases, and to substitute its own standard insurance and pension plan for those now in effect.

"In my conception," he says, "collective bargaining means just what the law defines it to be—attempting to arrive at an agreement on wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. It does not mean joint management of the company. Nor does it mean that the union can say: 'These are our standard provisions. You must meet them.' "

So the CIO–UAW called its strike against the Kohler Co. on Monday, April 5, 1954, and 2,500 pickets were massed in front of the plant gates. Union goons, imported from Detroit, were ringleaders in outbreaks of picket-line militancy. For 54 days, the plant had to close because of illegal mass picketing. The mob lawlessness, inflamed by Reuther's union goon squads, led to a ruthless reign of terror. The four-man Kohler Village police force, augmented by deputies, could not cope with the rioters. And the Sheboygan County sheriff, Theodore Mosch, showed no desire to enforce the law. He has since been reelected with CIO support. Mayor Rudolph Ploetz, of Sheboygan has two brothers who are striking Kohler employees.

With the green light for lawlessness, the hoodlums' holiday lasted for months. Rioting and violence were the order of the day on picket lines. Despite their requests that the sheriff's deputies give them safe conduct through picket mobs, nonstriking employees attempting to go to work were repulsed, assaulted, and beaten. On the third day of the strike, Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO–UAW, second only to Walter Reuther in the union hierarchy, appeared on the picket lines, and employees were mauled, kicked, kneed, gouged, and punched when they tried to report for work.

Reuther's lieutenant, Robert Burkhart, of Detroit, drummed up the mobs to fever pitch, one of his first statements being: "Let's do everything we can to keep them away from the plant before they get to the picket line." This meant not only goon attacks upon nonstriking workers at the company's gates, but also undercover coercion and violence against loyal workers and their families in the streets and even in their homes at the village of Kohler and Sheboygan.

As Allen J. Graskamp, president of local 833 at Kohler, said on May 9, 1954: "We have tried to discourage people from going into that plant by peaceful means, but from now on the gloves are off."

Reuther's personal prestige was at stake, so heavily committed in fact, that he has

made two trips to Sheboygan to encourage the strikers.

Wisconsin has a criminal statute which authorizes a fine and imprisonment for preventing any person from engaging in lawful work. Sheriff Theodore Mosch became a hero to the union by his stalwart refusal to arrest goons who violated this law. "Thank God there is a sheriff here who will put Kohler in his place," Reuther told the strikers.

Another statute authorizes the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board to issue restraining orders against interference with the pursuit of lawful employment. After a hearing on May 24, 1954, the WERB issued an order permitting only peaceful picketing and forbidding coercion at the plant or in their homes.

Not only this order, but an injunction commanding compliance with it, issued last September 1 by Circuit Court Judge Arnold Murphy, has been persistently violated by the terrorists. Also, Circuit Judge Gerald J. Boileau took under advisement on last March 23 a civil contempt case against the international and local unions and 19 of their leaders, including Burkhart and Graskamp, who were charged with violating the court's injunction.

For 3 days, oral and motion-picture evidence of intimidation and coercion of nonstrikers at the plant and in their homes was presented to Judge Boileau, but he deferred his decision pending a ruling of the State's supreme court on the question of jurisdiction. The union had challenged the jurisdiction of the WERB and of the circuit court, insisting that the NLRB had exclusive jurisdiction in the case. The State supreme court upheld the jurisdiction of the WERB and of the circuit court on May 3, but Judge Boileau appeared to be in no hurry to enter his judgment.

Meanwhile, the union has shown no disposition to comply. It has committed more than 500 acts of violence and vandalism against nonstrikers.

Reuther has at last resorted to a new device.

On July 5, 1955, the Norwegian freighter *Fossum*, carrying a cargo of porcelain clay for the Kohler Co., attempted to unload but could not because operations were completely blocked by union mob violence. On "black Tuesday," as this day has become known, Mayor Rudolph Ploetz, of Sheboygan, did nothing to stem the continuous riot and use of force by terrorists, and finally he ordered the police to prevent unloading the freighter.

After allowing the crowds to run amuck, and after forbidding the vessel's unloading, the mayor was severely criticized but still insisted he did a good job of maintaining law and order on "black Tuesday." "I feel that law and order was maintained, as shown by the fact that we had no casualties in the dock area," Ploetz declared.

But the Chicago Tribune reported that Roman Grunewald, 36, a worker at Kohler Co. and father of four children, was severely beaten by goons. He was recognized in the street and brutally attacked, suffering broken bones and other severe injuries.

Repulsed at Sheboygan, the *Fossum* sought to discharge at Milwaukee. Fifty thousand CIO–AFL workers threatened a city-wide strike. Frank Zeidler, Socialist mayor of Milwaukee, and the harbor commission refused to permit the *Fossum* to unload at the docks which are municipally owned. The attorney for the chartering company, Paper Makers Importing Co., of Easton, Pa., announced he had instructions to seek to recover damages arising from delays in discharging cargo from the *Fossum* and other clay ships. Demurrage and other items had reached a large sum when Mayor Zeidler wrote to President Eisenhower suggesting intervention and after talking to CIO and AFL leaders, announced that they had withdrawn opposition to unloading the *Divina*, another clay ship, upon arrival at Milwaukee.

At Reuther's direction, AFL unions barred ships from Duluth, Minn., and Ashland and Superior, Wis., and, through Canadian affiliates, from Fort William and Port Arthur, Canada. Then both the *Fossum* and the *Divina* sailed to Montreal, where the CIO–UAW with cooperation of Canadian Congress of Labor unions established a picket line which AFL longshoremen refused to cross. Not until the Montreal harbor police expelled the pickets from the docks could the ships unload. At heavy expense, the cargoes were transshipped in 64 railway cars. Attempts to learn shipping schedules were circumvented, and the clay reached Kohler Village without further attack.

Walter J. Kohler, Jr., Governor of Wisconsin, had made no effort to enforce the State right to work laws. He is a nephew of Herbert V. Kohler, president of the Kohler Co., but has no financial or other interest in the company. When Sheboygan businessmen protested against the breakdown of law and order, Governor Kohler agreed to send National Guard units should new violence break out. He suggested arbitration but has abstained from enforcing existing law. He is vigorously supported by union labor.

The Kohler strike has been so revealing of union policies that businessmen could, we believe, study it with profit to gauge its implications for the future. The rising tide of irresponsible lawlessness of labor unions, coupled with pronounced lack of will on the part of many elective officials to do their duty is now apparent.

It was only the large per capital outlay for strikers' subsidies that made Reuther formidable to a medium-sized albeit sound company like Kohler. Reuther's aim was to show he could level any well-entrenched industrial company; to make Kohler an example; and then to hold the all-out money-plus-goon tactics threat to make company after company fall into line. If he has stumbled miserably over just one medium-sized company, think of how little chance he will have if determined American business leaders will fight back determinedly and forcefully.

The Committee for Constitutional Government pledges its every effort to fight this latest attempt at unconstitutional usurpation of power. For example, 4 days after "black Tuesday," when the Sheboygan dock riots were permitted to rage unchecked by Mayor Rudolph Ploetz, the committee dispatched this telegram to Governor Kohler, of Wisconsin, released it to all press associations, and distributed it to more than 5,000 civic leaders in Wisconsin:

TELEGRAM SENT TO GOV. WALTER J. KOHLER, JR., MADISON, WIS., BY COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC., JULY 9, 1955

"It is past the 1th hour for undoing the damage caused by the default of duty by public officials in connection with the Kohler strike. Already, many in job-making private enterprise ask whether other States are not safer than Wisconsin from labor-union violence. But, far more important, a precedent is being set by Wisconsin's failure to maintain law and order that, spreading, may endanger constitutional government and our private-enterprise system.

"Labor-union monopolies have been built into a Frankenstein, a supergovernment, with $500 millions of annual, tax-free income. The bosses of these monopolies now seek to dominate local and State governments and reach for control of the Federal Government itself. To their other overpowering resources they add lawless violence with the connivance of public officials, as in the Kohler strike. In the end, the workers themselves, whom the labor bosses claim to be helping, may suffer most.

"In German and Italy, as Hitler and Mussolini moved to destroy parliamentary and representative government, their Storm Troopers and Black Shirts practiced just such violence to intimidate and destroy opposition of other groups, as lawless labor-union leaders in Kohler.

"The labor-union mob at Sheboygan, which Mayor Rudolph Ploetz failed to control, prevented the unloading of a ship with raw materials for the Kohler plant and caused the ship to seek refuge in another harbor. The great damage of this act can still be undone by courageous, immediate action on your part. Give your assurance of adequate protection against a repetition of such lawless violence in Sheboygan. Urge immediate return of the ship for peaceable unloading with protection, if necessary, by the State militia. Such action is in the line of your duty as Governor.

"We plead only for the maintenance of the basic principles that underlie our constitutional liberty and private-enterprise system. For your information we quote below a telegram sent yesterday to Mayor Rudolph J. Ploetz:

" 'The July 7, New York Times reports you as joining with lawless rioters to prevent unloading of ship carrying raw material for Kohler plant. Is this report correct? Is it not your duty as mayor to uphold law and maintain order? If your police force is inadequate, have you asked the Governor to send military aid? If not, why not? Will appreciate answer to these questions.

" 'When you, any mayor, or publicly elected representative accepts office, it becomes his supreme obligation to uphold fundamentals of our Constitution, to maintain law and order, and to prevent lawless action by one selfish pressure group to the detriment of other citizens. The issue of the failure of law enforcement by your administration will take on national significance as the country learns the facts. It will not tolerate for very long one-class or labor-boss, monopoly-biased rule by a public official.'

"COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC."

All taxpayers and consumers, lawyers, clergymen, farmers, clerks, mechanics, physicians, housewives, etc., must now unite to offset the dangerous, swollen powers of labor monopolies. These must be kept from dominating public officials and the Government. All labor unions must be subjected—just as business has been—to antitrust laws. Inform yourself; arouse others to action to save our form of government.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Military Reserve Service Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of enacting fair and equitable military reserve service legislation is one that challenges the conscience and the experience of the Congress. It is always, of course, a grave responsibility to pass upon legislation that so deeply affects the lives of the Nation's youth.

In accord with the President's recommendations and in respect of his authority, it seems clear that some form of such legislation is vitally needed.

It seems equally apparent that the Congress has a real obligation to exert every possible effort in preservation of the American tradition of noncompulsion in military service other than in time of extreme emergency.

Realizing the thought and deliberation that is being accorded this problem, I am pleased to include a thought-provoking article on the subject entitled "Order and Equity or Take a Chance?" which appeared in the June 30, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, analyzing various aspects of the matter and indicating that the largest measure of voluntaryism possible should be retained in any legislation adopted.

The editorial follows:

ORDER AND EQUITY OR TAKE A CHANCE?

This matter of military Reserve legislation needs to be put in the broadest perspective. It was snarled in committee because it was burdened with a desegregation amendment; it still faces opposition in Congress because of pressures from many sides—from those who mistakenly see in it the camel's nose of UMT; from GI's who see the picture only from their own personal distaste for continued training; and from the many others who are simply uninformed and confused.

The importance of a national "posture of strength" need not be labored. The present easing of tensions came about in part because of it; the trend could hardly be nurtured without it. And the necessity of manpower to this posture is recognized. Congress, without qualm, has renewed selective service for 4 more years.

Then what is the matter with leaving things as they are?

Not too much, perhaps, if it could be guaranteed that things would stay as they are, with no big-war emergency. Anything less than a full call upon selective service is inherently inequitable. Yet the present system is tolerable to individuals. Even though lack of an adequate Reserve requires disproportionately large standing forces, the Nation could probably carry the burden a while longer.

But what happens if an international explosion should demand mobilization? The Nation would be caught without sufficient ready manpower. Including the National Guard, only 30 percent of the present Reserve is much more than lists of names on paper, for enrollment in tactical units and training before of after active service are entirely optional.

Conversely, from the standpoint of the individual young man, if he had already served, he would be called back immediately in the Nation's imperative need for men with some experience.

What, then, might fill the need for an available, trained, and ready Reserve? The bill just reported out by the House Armed Services Committee represents as sturdy an attempt to fill defense specifications as will likely get through Congress. From reports thus far at hand it would—

Establish a minimum period of obligation for military service and training, including active and Reserve—somewhere between 5 and 8 years.

Build toward a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 men by 1960, fulfillment of the duties of which would be compulsory, not optional.

Channel into this Reserve (1) men who have finished their service under the draft, (2) completed voluntary enlistments, and (3) those who before draft age have volunteered for a 6-month course or to begin Reserve training before active duty.

The length of Ready Reserve obligation would be adjusted according to the length and character of active service, first consideration to be given participation in combat.

This is no more than the briefest condensation of the most pertinent features, but enough perhaps to indicate that—

It should give the Nation a real, not a shadow, Reserve.

It should nail down the obligation to defend one's country, but at the same time make that obligation clear in advance so that a young man could take account of it in his plans.

It should preserve a large measure of voluntaryism, not as to whether but as to how the obligation to serve is discharged—thus avoiding the basic regimentation of UMT.

In sum, it would demand no more of the young men of America than would be demanded of them in any case by a war emergency, and much less of them in uncertainties and inequities, and it would exact much less of the Nation in the currency of unpreparedness.

Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address entitled "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy," by George M. Montross, of Detroit, Mich.:

COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE ARMY AND NAVY

In the name of eternal vigilance it is time for the American people to give attention to the erroneous but quite prevalent idea in official circles that the Constitution gives the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, complete control of the Armed Forces of the United States. This is an idea so at variance with the primary purpose of the Constitution to promote representative government and to prevent the dictatorship of 1-man domination, that our constitutional form of government is at stake.

When President Eisenhower last January asked Congress for authority to use the Nation's military for the defense of Formosa, the request was received by more than a few Members of Congress rather resentfully because they contended the President already possessed the power to take the action contemplated without specific congressional authorization and that he should exercise that power. These sentiments were expressed in debate on the floor of the House of Representatives by the Speaker, Mr. SAM RAYBURN:

"I do not think that any one who has ever studied our Constitution or the make-up of our Government denies that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has this power. I quite agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] that this should not be taken as a precedent that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, under any and all circumstances, should feel it his duty to come before the Congress and ask for a resolution such as this; because, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] expressed it so well, there will come times when 12 hours will be too long a time for the President to have to wait to act.

"If the President had done what is proposed here without consulting with the Congress, he would have had no criticism from me. But I fear, if this is taken as a precedent, and followed absolutely to the letter, we may find ourselves in very embarrassing and dangerous conditions."

Speaker RAYBURN and his colleagues of like mind would not deny that Alexander Hamilton had studied the Constitution, even before its adoption. In Federalist Paper No. 69, he denied that the President has this power:

"The President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the confederacy, while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature."

The accuracy of the Speaker's statement is denied by the Constitution itself in the following provisions:

"The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

"To provide and maintain a navy.

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the appointment of officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

* * * * *

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

These provisions are stated in plain English and are readily understandable. There is no need for "interpretation"; the need is for the disposition to look for what they plainly say. It would be incongruous in the extreme for the President to possess complete control of the Armed Forces and at the same time for the Congress to possess the powers "to declare war," "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces," and "to provide * * * for governing such part of them (the militia) as may be employed in the service of the United States." The incongruity does not exist, except by a strained interpretation, because there is no conflict of authority as between the President and the Congress under the Constitution; it is simply a matter of fitting each in the proper place.

The term "commander in chief" is also applied to military commanders. At the time of General MacArthur's dismissal in 1951, one of his titles was "Commander in Chief, United States Forces, Far East." During World War II, Adm. Ernest J. King was Commander in Chief, United States Fleet. During his career, he had served under Rear Adm. A. S. Crowninshield, Commander in Chief, United States Vessels in European Waters; Rear Adm. Robley D. Evans, Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet; Rear Adm. Hugo Osterhaus, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet; Rear Adm. Charles S. Sperry, Commander in Chief, United States Atlantic Fleet.

This does not mean each commander in chief possessed unlimited authority over his

particular command, for each was responsible and accountable to his superior, the President. Similarly, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, is responsible and accountable to his superior, the Congress of the United States, because it is to the Congress that he must look for authority to use the military forces of the United States to engage in and carry on a war, for instance, and he is bound by any rule that the Congress may lay down by law for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President is at the head and a part of the land and naval forces which are thus placed under the control of Congress. He cannot be dissociated from those forces any more than our generals and admirals can be, and any restrictions applying to those forces must apply likewise to him.

Furthermore, in designating the President "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy," the Constitution adds "and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States," while the Congress shall provide "for governing such part of them (the militia) as may be employed in the service of the United States." The President is not given any more authority over the Army and Navy than he is given over the militia, and as to the latter the Constitution is especially specific that it shall be governed by the Congress at the same time that the President is its Commander in Chief.

When the Congress authorizes or directs military action, it is then that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, is to direct the military forces in carrying out the congressional mandate. This was the understanding expressed by Alexander Hamilton. Therefore, the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, subject to authority—much or little—that may be given him by the Congress. This is the logical and the only way the powers of Congress and the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy can be reconciled without conflict, and it is not to be presumed that a conflict exists when actually the respective powers dovetail. Nor is it to be presumed, as Speaker RAYBURN and others of his persuasion must do, that the provisions "the Congress shall have power to declare war" and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" are meaningless and therefore to be disregarded. It does violence to the Constitution to give a mere designation such overpowering significance as to overwhelm powers that are specifically vested in the Congress.

The Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is often spoken of as though in that capacity he were an entity separate from the Presidency and with more power than he has as President. That concept is untenable because the Constitution says "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy" as one of his assignments, just as he is assigned the duty of making treaties according to a specific procedure. As such, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is included within and subordinate to the Presidency. He does not leave one office and take up the duties of another as he deals with different subjects; he is always President regardless of the subject matter with which he is dealing.

The power of Congress to declare war must be taken to mean that Congress shall decide whether or not the United States, of its own volition, shall engage in war. It is fundamental that the Constitution does not authorize any one man, President or other official, to make such a decision, for that would represent dictatorship and the whole theory of the Constitution is to prevent dictatorship. Therefore the power of Congress to declare war must mean in these days, with undeclared wars occurring, that the people shall have the judgment of the more than 500 Members of Congress—their direct representatives—in such a vitally important matter and are not to be dependent upon the frail judgment of one who may occupy the Presidency. Nothing could be more distorted or of greater danger to the Republic than acceptance of the contrary view.

It is to be iterated and reiterated that the Constitution does not in the slightest degree sanction a President operating as a one-man government.

When the United Nations Charter treaty was under consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the question was raised whether the President would be given authority to commit United States forces to any military action by the United Nations without first obtaining congressional authorization. In the course of the discussion, Senator Vandenberg was quoted as declaring:

"The President has the right to employ troops. It has been used 72 times in 150 years. We are merely writing into the charter the constitutional practices of 150 years.

"The President has had the right to use the Armed Forces in the national interest and that is a complete analogy with this charter."

This was saying that inasmuch as a power, even though not granted to him by the Constitution, had been exercised over a long period of time by the President, he had become possessed of it by virtue of the practice; that the Constitution is what the practice has been, not what it provides, which is strange doctrine indeed.

After Senate ratification of the United Nations Charter treaty, the subject of the authority to be given the President to commit United States military forces to United Nations military action in the maintenance of international peace and security, came under specific congressional consideration. This was in connection with a bill providing for United States contribution, along with other member nations, to Armed Forces under jurisdiction of the Security Council of the United Nations when special agreements had been made for the purpose. This bill when adopted provided authority for the President to commit United States forces to United Nations military action, only requiring the President to report his action to the Congress after each such occurrence. The fact of Congress dealing with the matter and passing the bill, under the guidance of Senator Vandenberg, who had by then become chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and who had previously contended the President already possessed the power without special congressional authorization, served to confirm in the Congress control of our land and naval forces. Yet it appears not to have been decisive, for we have the recent statements of Speaker RAYBURN and other Members of Congress to the contrary.

Those members may have been confusing in their minds a situation where the territory of the United States was involved with one in which foreign territory was concerned. In the case of an attack upon United States territory, of course, the President has authority to act immediately and even a military commander on the scene does not need to obtain authority from the President. When Pearl Harbor was attacked, Admiral Kimmel and General Short did not wait for instructions, they returned fire immediately, in accordance with the law of self-defense. That does not apply when foreign territory is involved. Whether or not Formosa was to be defended by the Armed Forces of the United States was not to be determined by the President or by any group of military men. It was a matter strictly for Congress to decide with all the seriousness of explicit duty. The philosophy to the contrary, expressed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is not that of the Constitution but of a dictatorship repugnant to the Constitution.

It is not reassuring when Members of Congress have so little realization of the duty imposed upon them by the Constitution to protect the people from the operation of one man's judgment when war is the issue. So far as those Members were concerned, their action in support of granting the authority requested by the President was purely perfunctory and without the serious consideration demanded by the very important proposal placed before them. In fact, Congress was dealing with a contingent declaration of war, to become effective at the President's discretion.

The effect on President Eisenhower of the congressional attitude may have been to discourage him from going to Congress in the future with a like request, in accordance with the Constitution, for he indicated in his message that, after all, he believed he possessed the necessary authority but was going to Congress out of an excess of precaution when he said:

"Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

"However, a suitable congressional resolution would clearly and publicly establish the authority of the President at Commander in Chief to employ the Armed Forces of this Nation promptly and effectively for the purposes indicated if in his judgment it became necessary."

Even though President Eisenhower did put before the Congress the matter of defending Formosa and requested authority to do so, in accordance with the Constitution, his course in this respect was not satisfying because he did not fully believe it was necessary for him to consult the Congress. He did so as a matter of policy, not for the purpose of meeting a requirement.

When our Government is operated in a manner which does not conform to the Constitution, is operated upon a different pattern, then the form of government established under the Constitution is not functioning; it has been set aside and thereby overthrown.

Control of the military forces of the United States by one man, the President, is contrary and repugnant to the Constitution. If Members of Congress are not alive to this fact so as to maintain its dominance, the form of government established under the Constitution may be said to be overthrown in a vital respect because Presidents in the past have too often taken military action similar to that contemplated by President Eisenhower in Formosa without bothering to seek the consent of Congress and that body has remained quiescent.

It has been pointed out that Congress authorized the President to commit United States Armed Forces for the purposes of the United Nations, if "special agreements" to that end are ever made. Similarly, it could, and probably long ago should, have laid down certain rules pursuant to which the President might take action for the protection of citizens in foreign lands. It did not do so, however, so that every landing of United States troops in Central America, for instance, minor operations though they were, required separate congressional authorization. The use of United States military forces in Central America without such authorization was in each case a violation of the Constitution. More recently there have been violations that involved action in matters of vastly greater importance. "Great oaks from little acorns grow."

Liberty is not restricted to civil rights, upon which great stress is placed. It includes also freedom from the tyranny by which citizens in the Armed Forces have been involved in hostilities regardless of protective safeguards that the Constitution would place around them.

The founders of the Nation were well aware of the one-man governments then existing in Europe, under which the people were treated as mere pawns, subject to the whims of rulers, and were determined that, so far as lay within their power to provide, such a fate should not befall the people of the United States. Accordingly, they provided that decisions of important policy, such as engaging in war, were not to be made by one man, but that the people were to have the benefit of the individual judgments of their numerous representatives in Congress.

So long as public officials operate within the limits set forth in the Constitution, they are servants and the people retain control of their government; when, on the other hand, public officials ignore the safeguards that have been erected and operate outside those boundaries, they then transform themselves from servants into masters—dictators—and the people lose control of their government; a government of laws becomes a government of men.

Words uttered by Benjamin Franklin in the last moments of the Constitutional Convention deserve attention:

"I agree to this Constitution with all its faults, if they are such, because I think a General Government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered, and believe farther that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The price has not been paid and is long past due.

The Basic Question of the Annual Wage and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely article discussing the complexities of the so-called guaranteed annual wage, which appeared in the June 21, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Straight Time or Compensation."

The editorial follows:

STRAIGHT TIME OR COMPENSATION

When, over 20 years ago, the Hormel Packing Co. started paying its regular production employees throughout the year, although they may have been actively employed but part of the year, it called its plan "straight time." In other words, the company took upon itself the responsibility for leveling out seasonal ups and downs as best it could and then filling in the remaining valleys with wages skimmed off the peaks.

It was not and it is not considered as paying workers for idleness or during unemployment. The beneficiaries are, in effect, simply employees "on leave." Someone outside the Hormel organization started using the term "guaranteed annual wage."

The Ford and General Motors agreements predicate the size of the companies' payments on the size of payments to be made available from State unemployment compensation funds. In probably 19 States, says Business Week, the laws would tailor the size of State checks to the amounts that might be paid under the Ford, GM, and similar plans.

The question raised here is fundamental: Are employees laid off because of production fluctuations to be considered employees "on retainer" within the limits of the plan? Or should they be deemed to have joined the jobless to be cared for by some kind of joint compensation funds to which the past employer makes a special contribution?

Ohio has refused to alter its law so that laid-off workers may receive company wages on top of full compensation. Employers and employer organizations who have set out to bring about similar action in other States may be, for the moment, thinking only in terms of slowing down a tide of GAW demands.

For Ford, GM, and the United Auto Workers the key State right now is Michigan. And between them the wanted changes in the State system can probably be effected. As for other States, it would be hard to believe that with the legal advice available to these three giants problems arising from laws or legislation can come as any surprise.

But the basic question remains. How it is approached will likely determine whether industry will direct its prime efforts toward stabilizing its own operations or toward legislatures to liberalize State unemployment funds.

Russians Kidding the United States, Lying in Their Teeth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out for many years that the fate of western Europe is being determined in the Far East, the Middle East, and northern Africa. If the Far East, the Middle East, and northern Africa fall to the Communists, Western Europe will go without firing a shot. The Communist plan is to develop the resources and exploit the abundant manpower of Asia. When the Communists fully develop Asia, western Europe cannot be held by the free world. The odds would simply be too great.

Communist pressure on Greece and Turkey and on Czechoslovakia, the Berlin Air Lift and Western Germany were all part of a carefully laid plan to divert world attention there while they were winning China which was the key to the world situation. The meeting at the summit in Geneva suited Communist plans because it again centered attention on western Europe while at the same time they are pushing their plans in the Far East. I predict even increased activity in this area. At the very moment of the Geneva Conference, Russia is making rapid strides to achieve supremacy in the air. With air domination over Western Europe, backed by the resources of Asia, there would be no alternative for Western Europe but to remain neutral or capitulate to the Communists.

I hope this administration will give the Far East priority in their programing and thinking. The situation is urgent. We must strengthen our real allies in the Far East such as South Korea, the National Government on Formosa and the Philippines. Japan should be offered every encouragement to fully rearm, build an Air Force, and assume leadership in the Far East. Nothing should be done to weaken the position of our tried and true allies, Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee. Only by these friends in the Far East possessing offensive power can we hope to forestall Communist pressure on Western Europe. If we ever recognize Red China and start uncontrolled free trade with this Communist ally, then the road will be open for Communist economic domination of Asia and the way open for further infiltration.

I commend to the House the following article by Victor Riesel which appeared in a number of newspapers but which was taken from the Greenville (S. C.) News:

RUSSIANS KIDDING THE UNITED STATES—LYING IN THEIR TEETH

(By Victor Riesel)

TOKYO, August 2.—Nicolai Lenin, the evil little genius who led the Russian Revolution, once said that communism's road to Paris was through Peiping and Calcutta—capture the Orient and the rest of the world falls.

I've hit that road. What I find proves that the Russians have been kidding us at the summit. Bluntly, they're lying in their teeth. They haven't made one friendly gesture in the Far East. This is still their road to world power—and they are on it.

DON'T NEED WAR

They're pouring saboteurs, espionage agents, millions of dollars, and tons of propaganda into every eastern nation to undermine us and tear our oriental allies from us.

Certainly they don't want war. They don't need it. At this rate they'll win without firing a shot.

And they're winning in Japan. Slowly, but most definitely. They dominate the most powerful labor federation, the Sohyo. I've just been to its national convention and I thought I was at an anti-American Communist rally.

Typical is the schoolteachers' union which won't cooperate with the antinarcotics division of the government by directing its members to warn their pupils of the evils of opium. Of course, the opium trade brings the Sovietized Chinese Government in Peiping $600 million a year.

I've listened to the Japanese counterpart of J. Edgar Hoover. He is Giochiro Fujii, director of Japan's Public Security Investigation Bureau.

He reports that the Japanese Communist Party has 300,000 members and sympathizers and runs a secret army under a central command called the military committee. This is part of a Russian-controlled underground which has 4,500 full-time agents. The Japanese FBI chief just told Cabinet members here that the existence of this underground Communist army gives living lie to the new Communist tactics of peace and good behavior.

REDS ON MARCH

Mr. Fujii warned the government that these new tactics are the most dangerous.

Already the Communist underground has succeeded in infiltrating central government offices here, and fully 60 percent of the Communist-dominated Sohyo labor federation are Government workers in the most strategic bureaus.

There are 28 Communist Party members in the vital Justice Ministry alone, Mr. Fujii disclosed. He added, "That's few compared to some other offices."

This means that the Communist Party is in a position to know what's happening inside the Japanese police and other governmental divisions—to which we, the United States, confide some of our most important defense secrets. Mr. Fujii sadly warned of the danger of the new Communist respectability—but few are taking all this seriously.

The public sees what I saw at a recent Communist rally here. Some 27,000 Communists poured into the International Stadium in the Ryogoku section. My translator told me that some of the Commie leaders, appearing publicly for the first time in years, said, in effect, that the Communists must take their time. Revolutions aren't made overnight. It all must be carefully planned. And once more the lead at the rally was taken by the Japanese Communist labor commissar, Ichizo Suzuki.

UNITED STATES ARMY BLAMED

Here is as good a place as any to point out that Comrade Suzuki and his people had a wild time of it right after the war. At that time certain of our Army officers permitted the conquered Japanese Government to subsidize the growth of Communist labor unions by paying their organizers and supplying them with office stationary and other operating equipment, which were used to agitate against us.

From that labor base in 1945 sprang the powerful Communist labor machine of today, which is the center of Communist underground strength right now. We have no one but ourselves to blame.

That underground machine is kept oiled by the Russians. Whatever they told us at the summit didn't have any effect on their anti-United States operations here. The Japanese intelligence officers and our State Department know that at least $650,000 was sent by Moscow into the Japanese undercover Communist movement in the past 4 years. That's what we've traced. Obviously millions of dollars more have slipped in surreptitiously.

Soon all this undercover work will turn the Japanese people against us. Then we'll have to fight to keep our military bases here or we'll have to get out. If we get out, most of the Asian nations will fall to the party. The road to Paris will be open.

So, what happened at the summit?

The New Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a very timely article by Holmes Alexander entitled "New College Try," which appeared in the June 30, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

The editorial follows:

NEW COLLEGE TRY

(By Holmes Alexander)

LOWRY AIR FORCE BASE, Colo.—America gets a new college when the Air Force Academy opens here July 11. That in itself should be subject for national satisfaction. How often do we find ourselves blessed with a new and reputable institution of higher learning? As to the Air Academy, it is something special under the troubled sun of this fateful half century.

What is this new college? It is not exactly another service academy, although it has obvious similarities to West Point and Annapolis; not exactly another engineering school, although all its graduates will be bachelors of science in aeronautics; not by any means a liberal arts college, although there is an unexpected but perfectly logical emphasis on the humanities.

CAREERISTS

The Academy's justification for public support is that it will not merely train air cadets but will use every honorable means to turn the cadets into Air Force careerists. The 300 first-year men, and all who follow, will be receiving a $25,000 education for which they have contracted to return a minimum of 3 years in Regular service and 3 years in the Reserve. But the Academy authorities will think very poorly of themselves if any number of graduates quit the service for the high pay industrial jobs which undoubtedly will be beckoning. Col. Arthur Boudreau, B. S., E. E., M. A., the assistant dean, told me:

"We know that many a recruit will arrive here with nothing but vague ideas about being a flyer, or he may even arrive with no idea except to get a free education. But we don't care. By the time he graduates, we'll have sold him on becoming a career officer."

How is this voluntary commitment to a risky, medium-paid profession to be accomplished? There is an answer; and the answer contains, I think, nearly the whole concept of this newest kind of American college.

MAGNET OF GOOD EXAMPLE

First of all, the cadet will be drawn toward his career by the wholesome magnet of good example. The 57-man faculty was avowedly chosen for that primary purpose. All of them are Air Force officers, many with distinguished combat records. Practically all of them have both postgraduate degrees and practical experience in college teaching. A number of them have been founding fathers of the Academy. Colonel Boudreau, a former college dean with 15 years' experience in teaching, has been closely involved with the project since 1948. Lt. Gen. Hubert R. Harmon, the Academy Superintendent and a West Point classmate of President Eisenhower, joined Colonel Boudreau in the effort a year later.

In addition to the academic faculty, there will be 66 young Air Force officers assigned to the campus as military training personnel and in lieu of upper classmen. These men are also in the heroic mold, many Korean veterans and all with standout career records. The young training officers are purposely picked with diverse backgrounds. Nine are Annapolis graduates, 10 are West Point graduates, 23 are the products of college ROTC programs, 24 are from the Aviation Cadet Program Officer Candidate School, and other beginnings. The training officers will lead the cadets toward student government. A big question will be whether or not to establish an honor system.

INSPIRATIONAL LEADERSHIP

It would be hard to name another college where so much is entrusted to inspirational leadership, possibly the oldest and best form of instruction there is. There's something very daring, very thrilling about this reliance on youthful hero worship to bring about a desired result in education.

Almost the same rule is applied to the academic curriculum. Inspiration is again a watchword. While stressing mathematics and aviation, the Air Academy turns to the literary and philosophic classics to change its boys into men. This is where the Air Force Academy shows its deviation from the traditional. At West Point, English is taught in freshman and sophomore years and for only half a term in the senior year. At the Air Academy, English is taught all 4 years. History, which gets only 1 year at the Military Academy, gets 3 at the Air Academy.

Some of the book titles on the Air Academy study list show that the authorities are aiming to produce fighting men, of course, but men of vision, too. In their first semester, the cadets will read Hemingway's For Whom the Bell Tolls, Benet's John Brown's Body, Tolstoy's War and Peace, as well as modern short stories and poems. Socrates, Walter Lippmann, and James Burnham are among the philosophers.

NOT SO STRANGE

These methods of educating and indoctrinating young airmen will not seem so strange upon considering what the Air Academy really is. It is formal recognition of the air age. Mere technical proficiency would not be enough for the oncoming generation. Things are changing so fast that truth, as expressed in art as well as science, remains the only substantial reference point.

The Air Academy, like the air age, has no tradition. It's on its own.

This Is Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article written by my very good friend and noted author, Louis Bromfield, and it is submitted to the membership for their consideration:

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY

(By Louis Bromfield)

The deadline is drawing very near for the extension of the so-called Selective Service Act and still nothing sensible has been done by Congress either to correct the obvious evils existing in the old law or to design a law which makes sense—even moderate common sense—under existing world conditions. The present proposals call for a 4-year extension of the existing act and this has been passed in the most irresponsible possible fashion by the House. Considering the fact that the whole question of military service involves almost every young man and woman in the United States as well as countless men, still young, who are in the Reserves and that any law passed may well change the whole course of many young lives, this action is shocking and should be held against every Member of Congress (which means your own) who voted for such hasty and irresponsible action.

The fact is that the Selective Service Act was given from the beginning a deceptive hypocritical meaning. It has never involved selective service at all save in the case of college deferments and of early marriages. Neither of these categories of deferments were ever carried out in a fair and sensible fashion. Apparently Congressmen in general had not the courage to enact a sound and sensible law, and still do not have. This is very hard on all the young people and the members of the Reserve throughout the whole Nation.

The decision and grounds for action, which should have and still should be incorporated in the law itself, were left simply to the discretion and judgment of the officials of the Armed Forces and of the local draft boards. This has generally and consistently produced a condition of general confusion, unfair to every young person. It is especially unfair to the really intelligent and ambitious young man who wishes to plan and get ahead. It is unfair as well to the employer who must know for how long he can count upon the young man he is hiring. It is in fact a law which is unfair and unwise for almost everybody and has undoubtedly made by the confusion and uncertainty a heavy contribution to juvenile delinquency.

Compared to the laws of other countries where conscription is in practice, the present Selective Service Act is simply confused and sloppy. In the first place it calls for a much longer term of service than is demanded of the young men of any other nation, save England and Soviet Russia. It calls upon young Americans to serve 2 years of their lives in defending peoples who recently were cruel and shocking enemies—Japan and Germany. It actually makes no real distinction between the jiving, hot-rodder, and the young man who is either making a valuable contribution to the defense and welfare of his country, or the young man of genius who may be needed in the future as an engineer, a doctor, or a scientist of any sort.

In England a young man, if he is occupying a job concerned with the welfare of the nation or its future, from agriculture to atomic research, is merely drafted to remain in the job without changing for a period of 2 years service. In Soviet Russia such young men are actually exempt altogether from the draft. In the United States the whole thing is left for decision to the prejudices of the Armed Forces and particularly the Army, which apparently would gladly draft even grandparents and men such as the late Albert Einstein; or the burden of decision is placed upon the shoulders of the local draft boards, who should not be asked to bear it.

There is certainly no need whatever to extend any conscription act for a period of 4 years nor to ask for a military training period of 2 years. The Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines have no need for conscription as their demands are being met by voluntary enlistment. This condition is actually true in many areas for the Army and the present unamended Selective Service Act is now creating a whole new set of injustices. It states that the older men must be taken first and the burden of perhaps needless service is being placed on the shoulders of men who during the war periods were justifiably deferred through the judgment of the local and even the appeal boards and now, when they are mature men, with families and deeply concerned with establishing or maintaining businesses or professional careers. This, while each year there enters the draft age some millions of young men, many of whom have no plans or particular ambitions and have not yet embarked upon careers.

It is a shocking fact that under present conditions only 1 in 15 of these younger men will ever actually do any military service of any kind. They are obviously better physical material than the older men, and for many of them a term of Army service might be of benefit so far as that service can benefit any young man. There is also that very large residue of young men who are going about today without even bothering to register. I have never heard of the case of any Government or Army official ever asking to see a draft card. The demand comes mostly from saloon keepers to establish the question of legal drinking age.

The efforts to pass a universal service act, or even to establish a universal Reserve training corps have apparently and fortunately been abandoned by Congress as more than their constituents would swallow. The draft extension may be more politically dangerous than many a Congressman realizes, especially in its present muddled and inefficient form.

Meanwhile the Pentagon keeps up its barrage of expensive and frequently humbug propaganda. On Armed Services Day, they let out all the stops, although they could not drag out the old tired mysterious submarine appearing off the coast which was used for so long. This time it is a flight of new Russian planes. Two facts are evident: (1) That, as high authorities have pointed out, any war would be over long before ground troops could be moved from here to there or any Reserve even mobilized; (2) that the word of the President, who has no ax to grind and certainly knows both the world military and political situations better than any of the Armed Forces brass, and whose honesty is beyond question, should be trusted as against any propaganda of the Armed Forces or any Seidlitz Powder statesman.

Liberty or Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very stirring article commemorating the signing of the Declaration of Independence, which appeared in the July 2, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

Let us pray that the example of these great and grave forefathers will ever remain as the inspiration to all Americans to be ready and willing to forfeit our fortunes and our lives, if necessary, to preserve our sacred honor and blessed freedom.

The editorial follows:

THE DECISION WAS MADE ON JULY 4, 1776

It looks so pat and foreordained in the history books: The great men assembled at Philadelphia, signing the famous declaration; the ringing phrases of oratory; the messages to the several States and to the Continental Army under the command of Gen. George Washington; the eventual victory.

To us, sitting in our comfortable living rooms, conscious of the worldwide might and influence of the United States, it seems like a drama with an inevitable ending. But it was not so to those men of the Continenal Congress who were gathered in that Philadelphia hall to watch the engrossing of the new document written by Thomas Jefferson and revised by Benjamin Franklin and John Adams.

After all, what were they? An illegal body, representing a string of small colonies strung along the Atlantic seaboard. Opposed to them, they knew, was the might of the world's greatest empire. Against Britain's fleets and armies, what availed all this talk about the rights of man and the duties of Englishmen?

Only a year before, in their declaration of the causes and necessity of taking up arms, the men of the Continental Congress had maintained that they had "not raised armies with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain and establishing independent States." At that time, some of them still clung to the dream that the constitutional empire could be rerestablished in amity and equality. A year of British repression had saddened them and made them wiser.

On July 4, 1776, the fateful decision was written upon the page of history. The representatives of America were then ready to "solemnly publish and declare, That these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

Before them lay terrible things: six years of bloody, exhausting warfare; hunger; hatred; death for many; divisions between families and friends; exile for thousands; and bankruptcy and poverty.

They did not flinch. Quite literally, they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. The decision was made; they would live as freemen or not at all.

Report of Activities of the Committee on House Administration, 1st Session, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress 161 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Administration. Hearings were held by the subcommittees on accounts, elections, printing, and library on many of the proposed items of legislation, after which recommendations and reports were submitted to the full committee for consideration and final action.

Funds in the amount of $1,967,067.46 were approved for the following standing and select committees to conduct studies and investigations authorized by the House:

Standing committees:	*Amount approved*
Agriculture	$50,000
Armed Services	150,000
Banking and Currency	75,000
District of Columbia	2,000
Education and Labor	125,000
Foreign Affairs	75,000
Government Operations	495,000
House Administration	65,000
Interior and Insular Affairs	50,000
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	60,000
Judiciary	125,000
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	50,000
Post Office and Civil Service	75,000
Public Works	50,000
Un-American Activities	225,000
Veterans' Affairs	50,000
Ways and Means	30,000
Special and select committees:	
Small Business	170,000
Survivors' Benefits	35,000
White County Bridge Commission	10,000

Many resolutions requesting funds for special and select committees necessarily remain on the pending calendar until the House approves legislation authorizing the creation of such committees for the purpose of conducting proposed studies and investigations.

The Committee on House Administration held extensive hearings in connection with proposed legislation to equalize

and adjust certain salaries in the House of Representatives. The final bill, H. R. 7440, was reported by the committee on July 10. A rule was granted on July 29, but the bill was not called up by the leadership.

The leadership agreed that the Committee on Appropriations should take over the bill H. R. 7440 and adopt its provisions in conference in the general legislative appropriation bill, H. R. 7117. Subsequent changes were made in the bill in conference outside of any consultation with the Committee on House Administration.

One of the important pieces of legislation reported by the Committee on House Administration was the recommendation for expanding the facilities of the House restaurant. The committee's report to the House resulted in action of both the House and Senate in recommending completion of the east front of the Capitol in accordance with the architectural plans which had been approved many years before. When completed the addition to the Capitol will include ample restaurant facilities for Members and employees of both Senate and House.

Hearings were conducted by the Committee on House administration on proposed legislation to amend the Hatch Act, as a result of which H. R. 3084 was reported to the House.

Hearings were also held on proposed legislation to amend the Corrupt Practices Act, but final action was postponed until the second session.

The committee secured enactment of H. R. 4048, which recommends to the States that certain framework be provided which will permit members of the armed services, their families, and other personnel to exercise their voting franchise while absent from their legal residences.

The committee reported House Concurrent Resolution 94, which recommends to the States possible changes in State election laws which govern voting for President and Vice President.

Twenty-five bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Administration during the last session providing for printing of certain documents. The Subcommittee on Printing has carefully examined each request and recommended passage of only such resolutions as it deemed necessary and in the public interest. The committee has approved the printing of a manuscript entitled "The House of Representatives," the first document of its kind dealing exclusively with the House of Representatives. Copies will be made available to each Member in the near future.

The Committee on House Administration, through its Subcommittee on Printing, is making a study and investigation of the operations of federally operated printing services, the sale and distribution of Government publications, and Government paperwork in general. It is the desire of the committee to reduce to a minimum the expenditures for printing, and to discover where there is overlapping and waste. Upon completion of the study the committee will recommend legislation to correct what is considered waste in Government printing.

Forty-one resolutions and bills which would provide for memorials to outstanding individuals have been referred to the Committee on House Administration during the first session. The long-established policy of the committee has been to make few recommendations for the spending of Federal funds for such purposes. However, the committee has recommended the acceptance of a gift from the Republic of Venezuela of a statue of the great South American liberator, Simón Bolívar, as reported by the committee in House Joint Resolution 232.

The committee reported legislation which designated the former Arlington House as the Custis-Lee Mansion and dedicated it as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee—Senate Joint Resolution 62.

Substantially all of the work of the committee for the first session is completed. The committee looks forward to the second session when it plans to recommend the reorganization and creation of a permanent police force for the United States Capitol.

The President's Commencement Address at Penn State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD. D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a most interesting comment which appeared in the June 25, 1955, weekly issue of America, emphasizing the practical wisdom of President Eisenhower's remarks on general education in the course of his Pennsylvania State University speech.

The article follows:

MR. EISENHOWER ON GENERAL EDUCATION

Most of us can take commencement addresses or leave them. But the one President Eisenhower delivered June 11 at Pennsylvania State University is one to take and remember. He packed a lot of thought into a few paragraphs on the subject of general education. Discussing today's divorce between liberal and professional studies, the President pleaded for training which weds "the liberal and the practical, which helps a student achieve the solid foundation of understanding—understanding of man's social institutions, of man's art and culture, of the physical and biological and spiritual world in which he lives."

We badly need technical experts, and as time goes on we shall need more and more of them. But it would be tragic if we did not try to provide that future technicians have as broad a cultural background as possible. The President related this dual need to the worldwide aspirations for peace, freedom, and justice. These blessings, he said, will flow from sympathetic cooperation among peoples. They will be fostered by knowledge and wisdom—the results of education that produces disciplined thinking. Can we Americans find partners in the quest for peace? Yes, he said, for the divisions between us [nations] are artificial and transient. Our common humanity is God-made and enduring. Education alone, we know, cannot solve all our problems, but the broad directions outlined for education by the President would, if followed, help preserve freedom in our interdependent world.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I would like to introduce for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech by the first head of the Soil Conservation Service, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, presented in San Diego, Calif., February 2, 1955, at the meeting of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE RESCUE OF SOIL CONSERVATION

(Address by Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, San Diego, Calif., February 2, 1955)

I have been asked to talk to you about how our national program of soil conservation and good land use is getting along. * * *

I am very sorry to say that what all of us have worked so hard for—effective nationwide soil and water conservation and prudent use of land—has, through no fault of our own, stumbled upon hard going in the form of uncertainties and stubborn opposition. The whole difficulty in my opinion lies at the doorstep of those who should have been true and trusted friends of the program but who have turned out to be the opposite, however good their intentions may have been.

I dislike starting a talk in any such vein. For 20 years prior to the past 2 or 3 years every talk I made—and there were hundreds of them—was along lines of optimism. But now circumstances have darkened the horizons. * * *

In 1928 a slight impression on the surface of our American indifference about the security of the land was made through the publication of Soil Erosion a National Menace, a Department of Agriculture bulletin that was widely circulated. Then came, in 1929, an appropriation for a national program of soil conservation research, as the result of the Buchanan amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill. From the 10 soil conservation research centers that were established with these funds came most of the basic information about accelerated soil erosion and most of the conservation measures that have proved successful in modern soil conservation. * * *

Then came the action program—real soil conservation work out on the land in the form of a nationwide program. This * * * came with the establishment of the Soil Erosion Service. * * * You may be interested to know that some agriculturists were sure the Soil Erosion Service, without precedent or leadership would fold up within a year. I never knew how far that antagonistic point of view spread, but I can assure you that when I was asked to start a national program of soil conservation for the United States only 1 of the 48 land-grant colleges

showed enough interest to come to Washington and sit down with me to help plan the program—just 1. That was the University of Wisconsin. Noble Clark came to Washington from Madison along with several others of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin and gave me many helpful suggestions. * * *

You might also be interested in another incident pertaining to those early days of modern soil conservation.

One morning there was a telephone call from the White House. "Come at once," the White House official said. "The President wants to see you." * * *

Said the President when I got there, "Bennett, I want to congratulate you and your technicians in the Soil Erosion Service for doing a good job. Would you care to know how I found out about it?"

"Yes, sir."

"It was simple," the President said. "They want to take over your agency. If you weren't doing a good job they would not be after you."

I found out before leaving the White House who "they" were. "They" were the Extension Service. And it wasn't the last time—only the first time. Year after year Farm Bureau representatives bore down on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House holding hearings on funds for the Department of Agriculture, urging that SCS be turned over to Extension. It is all there in the printed records. Ted Silverwood gave you the details at your New Orleans convention last year.

Another example out of the past may help you to understand the motives * * * behind a movement that led up to the disruption of the most successful program of agricultural advancement in history. I have reference to the recent disruption by reorganization of the program of the Soil Conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service.

This time it was the Secretary of Agriculture who summoned me to his office; not the present Secretary. The conservation work was moving forward at a good rate of progress by this time, late in the 1930's. And this may have brought on some Extension jitters. Anyway, without hint of what was up, I was ushered into the middle of a well-laid plan of mice and men. There, clustered about the Secretary of Agriculture were 5 State directors of extension and 1 dean of a great agricultural college. * * * Cornell University.

Said the Secretary, as well as I can recall, "Hugh, these gentlemen have a plan by which they tell me the Department's work in soil conservation can be made to move faster. Some preliminary steps have been taken, but it was my feeling you should be told about the plan before final approval. Director Creel, suppose you state the details."

Said the Director in tones of affection, "Hugh, let me say at the outset that you have done a wonderfully good job, first in arousing the Nation to the dangers of uncontrolled soil erosion, and secondly, in establishing a competent agency for carrying out a much-needed nationwide program of soil conservation. Now you must understand, we have no thought of hurting this plendid program in any way. All we propose doing is to help you make it go faster, by relieving you of some of the arduous details. We know you must be very tired; we are going to give you the opportunity to take it easier, to sit down and think things over, to write and help plan for the future. It will be a wonderful opportunity for you."

And that was nearly 20 years ago. Apparently it pays to start early and plan carefully in fostering agency schemes of this nature. * * *

"The extension services of the States are perfectly set up to help with the soil conservation program; we have offices all over the country—an office in almost every county. Now here is what we propose to do, and the proposal has already been reduced to writing in the form of a legislative amendment now in the hands of Senator BLANK who is waiting for the green light from the Secretary before introducing it into Congress. All we propose is that the moneys, properties, and personnel of the field work of SCS be turned over to the State extension services. You will still have the Washington office * * * and your research and your surveys—plenty to keep you busy.

At this juncture the Secretary broke in, "Hugh, do you have anything to say about this proposal of the extension directors?"

"Yes, sir, Mr. Secretary, I should like to say something."

"Go ahead."

I did * * * a summarization of my remarks, as well as I can remember them, will suffice: I said "We too, Mr. Secretary, have work going in many of the counties of the country, but very little of it is in offices. Yes, it did take a long time—about 25 years—to arouse enough public interest in the erosion problem to get a program of soil conservation research started—and additional time to get an action program of soil conservation under way. Our work has proved effective and farmers like it—the rate of progress has been increasing progressively. Many nations of the world are sending specialists to study our program by working with our technicians—it is developing a high degree of cooperation among farmers—we have the only really experienced corps of technicians in soil conservation—these men are working with almost religious fervor—interference such as that proposed here this morning, would break this splendid morale and destroy a going and highly effective program. The Nation was a 100 years late getting started—what point is there in stopping all progress by turning the work over to an agency that has shown little interest in the subject? * * * Perhaps a little could be done, but I am convinced it would be very little, for without experience and vision and enthusiasm this kind of work will be slowed, not made faster. Finally, it will wither away under these handicaps, and we will be right back where we were at the beginning.

"Mr. Secretary, I cannot recall ever having received before this morning one single word of interest, encouragement, or advice during the stages of conservation field exploration, research, or action from a single one of the directors in this room. I am completely and unalterably opposed to their proposal in every single detail. I am shocked and sorely disappointed at the cold acquisitiveness of the Extension Services, from which agencies I had expected cooperation and help, not this proposal of death." * * *

Dillon Meyer was there with me and he, too, came forward with an equally negative reaction.

When we had completed our lamentations, the Secretary said something like this: "Gentlemen, for the time being I withdraw the green light. Will one of you phone Senator Blank to go no further with the proposed amendment until he hears from me? And now, Hugh, will you and Dillon meet with the Assistant Secretary this afternoon and anyone he chooses to call in so that some compromise may be worked out."

No compromise was worked out. My recollection is that either the Assistant Secretary or the Director of Information, who was dead against the Extension proposal, reported to the Secretary later that afternoon, something like this: "We are getting nowhere, Mr. Secretary. Hugh Bennett's opposition increases. No compromise seems possible."

Anyway, next morning I was again summoned to the Secretary's office. He said something about like this: "Hugh, I have called off this proposal of the Extension people. I didn't sleep very well last night; what you and Dillon Meyer said yesterday in my office seemed to place you in the same position with respect to my decision in this matter as I am in respect to the President's decision in the matter of the Secretary of the Interior's proposal to move the Forest Service from the Agriculture to Interior."

And there ended that scheme.

But there were others. They continued to crop up in congressional hearings, on the floor of the House, and in meetings of the National Associations of County Agents and Land Grant Colleges.

Now, I have come to * * * what I want to talk about, and that is what has been done to the Nation's soil and water conservation program, what it is further proposed to do with the program, why the land grant colleges should get back to their knitting—education that is—and how and why Extension should throw off its ancient, passionate, and undemocratic obsession that no other agency but itself should contact farmers—and get on with its real work, of which there is more to do now than can be done. Maybe obsession is not the right word; perhaps it is passion to dominate; but whatever it is, it amounts to the most one-sided, narrowest point of view that has befuddled modern democracy. What the Department of Agriculture's reorganization did to the SCS-district program can be boiled down, as I see it, to some such substance as the following: At increased costs, SCS is now doing less of the permanent type of soil conservation than at any time during the past 5 years.

It is doing more indoors work in the 51 greatly expanded State and Territorial offices where bookkeepers, accountants, checkwriters, and other overhead clerical workers are carrying on the expanded overhead and administrative activities that were formerly efficiently performed in 7 regional offices. What the reformers and reorganizers apparently overlooked was that soil erosions, wastage of rainfall, and soil conservation are all out-of-office activities—land activities, not office activities. * * *

The reorganizers did a thorough job of tearing SCS to pieces and distributing the pieces haphazardly about the country, mostly where they didn't fit and were not needed. Some of the strangest actions were taken in connection with the mutilation of this highly successful world-famed agency. The regional offices were abolished and yet retained for placement of certain engineering functions and personnel, presumably in order to keep this engineering work, one of the inseparable parts of the modern soil conservation near the work job. Precisely that was one of the principal reasons I established the regional offices in the first place, that is, to decentralize the work out of Washington so as to put as much of it as near the work job as we could (which certainly is not in Washington). And this was done * * * after the State office system had failed just as it is failing now. We had State offices, certainly, but they were soil conservation work offices, not offices for doing the indoors job of bookkeeping, letter filing, and letterwriting.

Let's cite a specific example of the senseless shuffling. The regional director for the Northeastern States, a graduate of Pennsylvania State College and a longtime professor of soils in that institution, as well as an experienced scientist in the Federal Bureau of Soils, was moved out to the Corn Belt, where he had had a minimum of experience. Could this have been because he knew so much about soil conservation in the Northeast and so little about the problem in the Corn Belt? Could have been, I suppose, but it doesn't make sense. Then they moved the long-experienced regional director of the Corn Belt area way down South to the Cotton Belt, where he had had so little experience I doubt if he knew whether cotton blooms yellow or red. And that didn't make sense,

either—only more confusion and pure nonsense.

Some few months ago I heard a prominent engineer—Morris L. Cooke, who started off the rural electrification program of the United States—say at a meeting of conservationists in Washington that in his opinion the reorganization to which I refer could easily result in setting back soil and water conservation in this country by 50 years. I believe he was right—unless the blunder can be remedied. I feel this way not only because of the emasculation of SCS but because of that and the resultant danger to the soil conservation districts—representing the most democratic agricultural organization of all time—and its splendidly going program. I am convinced this same element in some but not all of the land-grant colleges and the State extension services was really hitting at the districts by first killing off their strong ally the SCS, and then any other support the districts have. But they say they are not after the districts. * * *

It scarcely seems necessary to comment further on the apparent fact that extension for years has in some parts of the county devoted as much or more time trying to destroy the regional offices of SCS and the service itself as they have devoted to their legitimate job of carrying on needed educational work among farmers—with taxpayers' money.

It must be pointed out, however, that many county agents have worked valiantly to help SCS technicians and the districts to move ahead with the soil conservation program, sometimes against the wishes or instructions of the directing office boys up at headquarters. * * *

Too often in our collective activities it is the work of a few, not the majority, which upsets our programs, no matter how well they are working or how much good they are doing.

The reorganization crushed the fine morale of SCS, which was the wonder of the world, and substituted for it, and the efficiency that went with it, obscuring confusion.

Leadership has been weakened by removal of the head of the Service from civil service.

Research that was making excellent progress was largely removed from SCS, and put elsewhere. * * *

I could go on with examples of the harm that comes from reorganization carried out behind closed doors by reorganizers who know very little about what they are reorganizing—at least on the basis of field experience. They didn't ask your representative in—that is, not much, beyond the foot-cooling outer office of their inner sanctorium. They didn't let me get even so far as the cooler.

No wonder the net results, as well as I have been able to appraise the situation from the sidelines of retirement, were pretty much all wrong and hurt the program terribly—and is still hurting it terribly. Yet, some good work is being done here and there I am informed—in those places probably where the spirit of the technicians was not completely broken.

I am not insisting that all of the reorganizers were without good intentions, but I am insisting that they proceeded too much in the dark, acted precipitately, and failed to call in enough experienced soil conservationists for wholesome advice.

At the time of the lighteninglike reorganization SCS and the districts were making astoundingly good progress. This was recognized throughout the world. The program had provided security for 200 million acres of farmland in the United States. And that was close to 200 million acres more than had been effectively safeguarded in all our previous history. As a matter of fact, until SCS and a little later the districts, came along, very little of lasting nature had been done. * * *

Before I retired from SCS some 80 nations—most of the countries of the world—had sent agricultural specialists to the United States to study our program. This was for the most part before the big technical-assistance programs got under way. And the result was that some of those countries had started programs of soil conservation at home. Some of these I have seen; they are making progress—where there was serious agricultural decline before. * * *

As if the Department's demolishment of SCS by its sweeping reorganization wasn't enough, now comes another gang looking for any leftovers or parts of SCS the State grabbers may want. This time it is a committee or a commission reporting to the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I am told. I have seen the recommendations of the committee as given by your national association. If these recommendations are carried out then the colleges will have what some of them have been gunning for nearly 25 years—that is, the complete takeover of SCS except the name which is to be left to a little group of office boys in Washington with nothing to do.

These committee recommendations which I have seen read like the best-spun product of a Philadelphia lawyer. They sound ponderous and from a legal standpoint I am convinced there are no loose ends. * * *

And let me say that I am not questioning the committee's good intentions, but I most certainly am questioning their familiarity with or knowledge of the national program of soil and water conservation as it has been conducted by the soil conservation districts and the SCS as technical aid. The committee's lack of a clear understanding of modern soil conservation is shown by a number of wholly incorrect assertions accompanying its recommendations, as reported.

For example, the report says in that part dealing with soil conservation, "Nationwide uniformity is not required (nor is it possible or desirable)."

If that were true, * * * there could be no effective program of soil conservation anywhere on earth. This assertion is completely contrary to the physical facts in all that it says or implies. It is contrary to natural law and is exceedingly dangerous misinformation to spread about under the guise of education. To a very large degree this same kind of misconception explains the failure of practically all of our efforts in soil conservation prior to the advent of the program of the Soil Conservation Service (and its forerunner, the Soil Erosion Service). The immediate and widespread success of the conservation work of SCS was due to the fact that it based its program on physical facts insofar as farm economy would permit—and that went most of the way.

In other words, we followed the plan of nature as closely as possible, having realized that the problem of accelerated erosion is due wholly to man's interference with the natural order of land affairs in his use and abuse of the soil. I had learned this in my years of field work in the old Bureau of Soils, and having been assigned to direct the soil conservation program, I insisted at the start on abiding by the following basic physical facts, which were in force then, are now, and always will be * * * due to differences in soil, slope, climate, and vegetative adaptability. It is, therefore, necessary in all true and effective soil conservation work to treat the land according to its natural capability and its condition as the result of the way man has used it. It is physically impossible, for example, to practice clean tillage on a 60-percent slope and keep the soil there without suitable protection—and slope, soil, and climate absolutely determine what is suitable protection in such land situations as well as in most other land situations. * * *

Soil conservation and soil conservation science * * * take terracing. It was the principal tool of soil conservation in this country for more than a hundred years, and yet we had not learned how properly to build a terrace until modern soil conservation came to us. Most of them were improperly built or used on land that was too steep, or on soil that was not suitable for terracing and consequently most of them failed. In the long run they did more harm than good.

When we started our program of modern soil conservation we had to tear down about 90 percent of all terracing that had been put on the land, mostly by farmers who were not told by the colleges and extension how properly to build terraces—because they didn't know how.

To insist that uniformity in our conservation program is not needed and is impossible is the equivalent of denying the validity of a natural law which is just as valid as the law that prevents water from running uphill on its own power. Let's listen to nature and work with her. The old lady is very wise and very cooperative, having learned ages ago how to keep land perpetually productive by abiding by her own basic laws of creation. So, according to the concept of the committee, 48 soil programs are quite all right for America and you can't have just one. We did have just one, however, and it worked perfectly. The truth is we can have only 1 program, not 2, or 3, or 48—just 1—that is if we are going to protect the land.

Now, some are likely to say that Bennett has gone out of his way to lambast the land-grant colleges, the State extension services, and everything about the States. But precisely the opposite is true. Soil-conservation districts are State agencies—and let me repeat, they are doing a magnificent job of conducting the soil-conservation program—they are thoroughly democratic and highly cooperative. What I recommend is leave them alone, quit trying to knock them out, and quit squawking about "SCS doing what extensions was set up to do." A question right there might be appropriate, "Well why didn't you do it." The answer is always the same, "We didn't have the money." But that is not the answer and, furthermore, they never mention Public Law 46—the first Soil Conservation Act of all times, besides representing the will of Congress.

And if the colleges and extension will do what I recommend, they will get along better. My recommendations are that they get out of this business of stirring up controversy by insisting on taking over the whole field of agricultural activity by shoving out all other outsiders and insiders who would contact farmers, and get back on the job of education up at the colleges. If any of them are in politics, they should get out of that, too.

And this would be better, far better, for all concerned: What is needed now over all else is cooperation—cooperation that brings agencies and farmers and city people closer together for sincere discussion to the end of finding ways and means for mutually helping one another. Moreover, what point is there in drawing sharp lines between Federal and State Governments. We are all one Nation—we should all be working for the good of this one Nation—and thereby for the good of every man, woman and child in it.

This can be done, too; it is not a dream. Through the district program it is being done. The districts are getting for the first time real cooperation among farmers. In thousands of communities farmers are working together as friends, copartners, and neighbors. They are coming together in meetings to discuss their common needs. They are helping one another in various ways, even to the extent of lending machinery to one another and sometimes providing labor, in emergencies. What is needed now more than anything else, let me repeat, is more and more friendly cooperation of this kind, and less and less of the spirit of acquisitiveness and domination and rule or ruin. Let's get this concept over to the people.

If only deaf ears meet our pleas, then but one course will be left us. The Nation will go backward, not forward, without a continuing program of effective soil and water conservation, as a number of nations have done down through the centuries. Therefore we stand for and will fight for this principle of mutual cooperation. But fighting is not of our choice—cooperation is our choice. However, we are patriots and Christians and not the kind to yield in principle.

Our population is rapidly mounting; our supplies of productive land is diminishing. Last year we covered up more than 230,000 acres with our 38,000 miles of new roads and we probably took out of cultivation or made useless for cultivation about as much for new buildings, airfields etc. And erosion is still ruining for further practical cultivation every year around half a million acres. Next year we are planning, I am advised, to build 48,000 miles of new roads, with a * * * program of super highways coming up.

We need new and better roads and new buildings, but we do not need to put them all on grade A cropland. * * *

Now * * * my final recommendations are, in all sincerity and with ill will toward none, that the Congress review the Department of Agriculture's reorganization of SCS in the light of a full year's operation, with the view of correcting any mistakes or weaknesses that may be found, especially in relation to (1) amount of on-site technical assistance made available to farmers in soil conservation districts; (2) number of basic conservation farm plans completed, acreage included, and costs; (3) number of initial farm conservation plans and cost, with acreages of specific conservation practices actually applied to the land; (4) same thing for advanced farm conservation plans; (5) amount of conservation completed for the 13 practices reported in the 1950 annual report of the chief of the Soil Conservation Service, with the same unit measurements. I further recommend restoration of 6 of the 7 regional offices abolished, restoration to SCS of all of the strictly soil and water conservation research projects and stations taken out of the agency, and restoration of all of the conservation nurseries where the land is still federally owned or leased.

With respect to the soil conservation recommendations of the committee on Federal aid to agriculture, as reported, my view is that they are not needed and would result in deadly impairment of the Nation's conservation program as established by Congress through Public Law 46, adopted in 1935.

Constitution and Bylaws of the National Association of Veterans Employment Councils

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the constitution and bylaws of the National Association of Veterans Employment Councils. This organization, dedicated to the great American principles of help to others, is in itself evidence of the desire of the veteran to help his fellow veteran.

A nonprofit group of volunteers, they are carrying on in the field of patriotic service and devotion to the causes of those who need help the most—our handicapped war veterans—without cost to the taxpayer.

Through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we can make available to us, as national legislators, and to the public the full details of the constitution and bylaws of this worthwhile and patriotic organization:

CONSTITUTION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF VETERANS EMPLOYMENT COUNCILS

PREAMBLE

We as members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States of America, aiding and having aided in the maintenance of its honor, integrity, and the supremacy of our Nation, associate ourselves for our Creator and Nation in the National Association of Veterans Employment Councils, whose purposes and principles shall be to pledge supreme allegiance to the United States of America; to defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America; to further the welfare of the handicapped veteran, with respect to gainful employment of such handicapped veteran.

Article I. Name

The name of this organization shall be National Association of Veterans Employment Councils.

Article II. Purpose

To cooperate with, and to assist, governmental and private groups now engaged in the promotion of the employment of the handicapped veteran; to operate throughout the United States volunteer veteran employment councils designed to aid, free of charge, the handicapped veteran secure useful and productive employment; to educate the American public generally, and the American employer specifically, as to the value of the handicapped veteran employee; to advance the interest of, and work for the betterment of, all veterans who, by reason of any cause whatsoever, were, are, or have become handicapped; and to promote and arrange for and, in all other ways, obtain suitable employment in all of its phases and ramifications for such handicapped veterans.

Article III. Membership

Any person serving in peace or war, with honor or having been honorably discharged from service in peace or war from the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Article IV. Powers

This organization shall have the power to adopt and amend a constitution and bylaws to regulate this organization, so that they will not conflict with the laws of the United States of America or of any of the several States; to perpetuate the succession, with power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity; to purchase, lease, hold, receive by gift bequest or otherwise, sell, mortgage, or otherwise acquire or dispose of such real or personal property as may be necessary or expedient to the purposes of this corporation and to solicit funds from the general public in order to attain and promote the objects and purposes of this corporation; to adopt a corporate seal with the power to alter the same at the pleasure of this organization; to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business, and to do any and all such acts and things that may be necessary and convenient to attain the objects and purposes herein set forth.

Article V. Amendments to the constitution

This constitution may be amended at a meeting of the national board of directors especially called for that purpose and with a two-thirds vote of the directors.

Article VI. Administration and executive powers

The administration of the affairs of this organization and the executive powers of this organization shall be vested in a national board of directors to be composed of not less than 3 or more than 5 persons including the national president and the executive director; the immediate retiring national president shall be an ex officio member of the national board of directors. The executive director shall carry out the mandates and directions of the national board of directors.

Article VII

The property of the officers, directors, managers, and members of this corporation shall not be subject to or chargeable with the payment of corporate debts or obligations.

BYLAWS, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF VETERANS EMPLOYMENT COUNCILS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Article I. Organization

SECTION 1. The National Association of Veterans Employment Councils hereinafter referred to as "organization," shall be organized with the national headquarters located in Washington, D. C., and councils in such States and Territories of the United States as may be authorized by the national board of directors. Local councils may be formed and administrative groups may be created by authority of the national board of directors.

SEC. 2. The national board of directors, the national employment council, the State employment councils, and the local employment councils shall constitute the working structure of the organization.

SEC. 3. Each of the above bodies shall keep records of its proceedings, which shall be filed with national headquarters within 30 days after any meeting.

SEC. 4. National board of directors—

(a) The national board of directors shall be composed of not less than 3 nor more than 5 members of this organization, 1 of whom shall be the executive director, and the president of the national council shall be a member of the national board of directors.

(b) The executive authority of this organization shall be vested in the national board of directors.

(c) Vacancies in the national board of directors shall be filled by majority vote of the first board. The term of office of the board of directors shall be for periods of 1, 2, and 3 years from the first national council meeting, after which they shall be elected by the majority of voting members of the national council meeting.

(d) State employment council presidents and State employment council directors may attend any meeting of the national board of directors, without cost to the national organization.

(e) Members of the national board of directors may vote on any specific issue before the board by certified or registered mail.

(f) A majority of the national board of directors in person or represented by certified or registered mail shall constitute a quorum; provided, however, that in the event a quorum is not present a majority of those directors present may adjourn the meeting without notice.

(g) The national board of directors shall meet as often as may be necessary to carry out its duties and obligations and in any event annually on the 2d Monday in February of every year.

(h) The national executive director shall issue a notice of each meeting of the national board of directors at least 5 days before such meeting to each of the official members of the board and shall set forth therein those issues to be considered by the board.

Article II. Membership

SECTION 1. Any person serving in peace or war with honor or having been honorably discharged from service in peace or war with the Armed Forces of the United States is eligible for membership.

SEC. 2. No person who is a member of or who advocates the principle of any organiza-

tion believing in or working for the overthrow of the United States Government by force and no person who refuses to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States shall be privileged to become or continue to be a member of this organization. with a suitably inscribed certificate of award for those rendering distinct service to the community and the handicapped war veterans of the Nation, and are eligible to serve on local employment councils. All awards must be approved by the national board of directors.

SEC. 4. Membership fees:

Paragraph 1. The national life membership fee shall be $1 for any veteran qualifying under section 1 of this article who is in addition thereby classified as a handicapped war veteran. This classification shall be automatic for those veterans recognized as disabled by the Veterans' Administration. Peacetime disability will be recognized upon application to the membership committee.

Paragraph 2. National life membership fee shall be $1 for any veteran qualifying under section 1 of this article who supports and subscribes to the aims and principles of this organization.

Paragraph 3. The annual supporting membership fee shall be $5 to any veteran qualifying under section 1 of this article who options to give annual support to the organization. $1 of the first annual dues shall pay for life membership. Such members will be known as annual supporting members.

Paragraph 4. Life supporting membership fee shall be $100.

Article III. Discipline

SECTION 1. The national board of directors after notice and hearing before subcommittee may cancel, suspend, or revoke the charter of any State or local council for good and sufficient cause. Procedure for such actions shall be prescribed by the legal counsel. In the event of such action, the board of directors is empowered to take over the operation of the council whose charter is suspended or revoked until the next State council meeting. At the next State council meeting new State or local officers must be selected to carry on the work of the council.

SEC. 2. The national presirdent, may, for cause, suspend the charter of any council for a period of 90 days, pending the action of the national board of directors. The term "for cause" as used herein, shall refer only to matters specifically required or prohibited.

SEC. 3. Upon revocation or suspension of the charter of a State council, all property, money, and effects of that council shall be immediately returned. In the event that at the end of such period of time, such council is not reinstated, all such property, money, and effects shall become the property of the national organization.

SEC. 4. In addition to any other grounds, a member may be suspended and the charter of a State or local council may be suspended or revoked, should such member or council resort to a civil court action against a State council or the national organization, or the officers thereof, as such, before exhausting all remedies available within the organization.

SEC. 5. The final remedy for any grievance of any member or council within this organization shall be an appeal to the national employment council.

Article IV. National employment council

SECTION 1. The employment program and organization legislative matters shall be vested in the national employment council.

SEC. 2. The national employment council meeting shall be held at such time and place as may be determined by the national board of directors and shall be attended by the national advisory committee, the national officers, the national board of directors, State council officers, and local council officers, who shall comprise the voting members of the national council meeting.

SEC. 3. All matters brought before the council shall be determined by a majority vote of those attending the national employment council meeting.

Article V. State employment councils

SECTION 1. A State council may be authorized by the national board of directors and shall be the governing body of the local councils within the State in which it is located.

SEC. 2. Members of the organization within the State shall once a year elect a State president and vice president, and shall also elect or appoint such other State officers as may be necessary.

SEC. 3. Each State employment council shall hold annually at an appropriate time and place a meeting of local council presidents and directors and accredited representatives of the national organization, the department officers, and all other officers and members within the State.

Article VI. Local employment councils

SECTION 1. Local councils shall be established by direction of the national board of directors. The membership of such councils shall consist of a council director appointed from the membership, members in good standing of the organization who are leaders in industry selected from the local community by the members of the council, and other volunteer citizen workers who have been made honorary members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the local council to set up mechanics to implement the program for gaining employment for handicapped war veterans on a local level.

SEC. 3. The local councils will assist existing agencies in the field of employment for handicapped persons and carry out the policies set forth by the State and National councils.

Article VII. National officers

SECTION 1. Paragraph 1. The national president shall be elected by the national employment council for the ensuing year. The national employment council may also elect any other national officers it may deem necessary.

SEC. 2. Subject to the limitations of the constitution and bylaws and with the consent of the national board of directors, appropriate salaried officers and personnel may be appointed by the national executive director.

SEC. 3. The national president shall be the presiding officer of the national council meeting.

SEC. 4. Paragraph 1. The national executive director shall be the manager of the business and administrative affairs of this organization.

Paragraph 2. The national executive director shall appoint such employees as may be deemed necessary to conduct the business affairs of his office, and shall by and with the consent of the national finance committee determine the salaries of said employees.

Paragraph 3: The assistant to the national executive director shall be known as the national secretary.

Article VIII. Qualifications for office

SECTION 1. Any person holding membership in this organization may be elected or appointed to any office.

Article IX. Tenure of office

SECTION 1. The elective officers shall hold their respective offices from the 1st day of January until the 31st day of December or until their successors have been elected and installed.

SEC. 2. The tenure of office of the appointed national officers shall be at the pleasure of the national board of directors.

Article X. Finances

SECTION 1. Paragraph 1: The revenue of the national organization shall be derived from membership fees, contributions, and such other sources as may be approved by the national board of directors.

SEC. 2. Paragraph 1. All revenue and expenditures of the national organization shall be under the direct supervision of the national finance committee composed of not more than 3 members of this organization, to be elected annually by the national employment council, and 2 by national board of directors, and none of whom shall be paid employees.

Paragraph 2: It shall be the responsibility of the national finance committee to provide for all audits of all accounts and to see that the proper bonds are enforced on all employees who are entrusted with the handling of all funds and revenue; it is the responsibility of this committee to see that bond premiums are paid and that the finances of the organization are handled at all times to secure an economic and businesslike administration of its financial affairs.

Paragraph 3: The national board of directors shall designate the national depository or depositories for all revenue of this corporation which shall be located in the same city as national headquarters.

Paragraph 4: The national finance committee shall have the executive director and those members of the board authorized to sign checks bonded at an amount to adequately cover the total funds of the organization.

The annual premium to maintain said bond in force shall be paid by the executive director from the general funds of the organization, under the direction of the national finance committee, as hereinafter set forth.

Paragraph 5: None of the funds collected by this organization shall be withdrawn from the depository or depositories in which they may be deposited except upon the signature of the executive director and one member of the board of directors of this corporation and/or any other person whose signature may be required by the bonding company. In no event, however, shall any withdrawals be made except upon proper check and voucher.

Paragraph 6: No funds of the organization shall be used for making loans or advances of any character to any individual.

SEC. 3. No fund-raising project or operation shall be engaged in by any State or local employment council of this organization.

SEC. 4. Paragraph 1: The salaries of the executive director and any other paid officers of this organization shall be determined by the national finance committee with the approval of the national board of directors.

Paragraph 2: The national president shall not be considered a paid employee. He shall receive, however, an amount as expenses for his year's tenure in office to be fixed by the national finance committee with the approval of the national board of directors. The national president shall account for such sums and shall be allowed such sums as may be reasonable and necessary to fulfill his obligations and duties of office.

Article XI. Meetings

SECTION 1. All business meetings of this organization shall be conducted under Roberts Rules of Order, when not in conflict with the bylaws.

SEC. 2. All members in good standing of the organization shall be entitled to one vote at a State employment council meeting. A member is a member in good standing providing he has attended four or more bona fide meetings of the organization during the preceding year and is so certified by his local council director.

Article XII. Fiscal year

The fiscal year of this corporation shall begin on the 1st day of February and end on the 31st day of January of the next year.

Article XIII. Seal

The national board of directors shall provide a corporate seal which shall be in the form of a circle and shall have inscribed thereon the name of the corporation and the words "Corporate seal, District of Columbia."

Article XIV. Waiver of notice

Whenever any notice whatever is required to be delivered under the provisions of title 29, chapter 6, of the 1951 Code of the District of Columbia or under the provisions of the certificate of incorporation, the constitution or the bylaws of this corporation, a waiver thereof in writing signed by the person or persons entitled to such notice, whether before or after the time stated therein, shall be deemed equivalent to the giving of such notice.

Article XV. Amendments to bylaws

These bylaws may be altered, amended, or repealed and new bylaws may be adopted by a two-thirds majority of the Directors present at any annual meeting or any special meeting called for that purpose provided that at least 5 days' notice is given by the national executive director of the intention to alter, amend, or repeal or to adopt new bylaws at such meeting.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

No attempt has been made to include votes on all of the numerous bills, motions, and amendments, but the report does include all rollcall votes, all quorum calls, and my votes on some other measures on which there was no record taken, but which I believe are of importance and concern to the people of my district. The purpose of this report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 11,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It also contains information which is not available from any public record but which I feel should be made available to the people.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. I believe this word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which unfortunately do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the ninth report of my voting and attendance record. These 9 reports show how I voted on 1,357 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 1st sess.)

Roll-call No.	Date 1955	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 5	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 5	Election of Speaker	Martin.
		H. J. Res. 159, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area:	
3	Jan. 25	On passage. (Passed 409 to 3.)	Yea.
		H. R. 587, providing that servicemen on duty on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952:	
4	Jan. 27	On passage. (Passed 366 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3005, extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years:	
5	Feb. 8	On passage. (Passed 394 to 4.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3828, adjusting the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress:	
6	Feb. 16	On passage. (Passed 283 to 118.)	Yea.
7	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 142, providing for 2 days of debate and prohibiting amendments on H. R. 1, extending authority of the President to enter into trade agreements:	
8	Feb. 17	On motion to end debate and vote on resolution. (Rejected 178 to 207.)	Yea.
9	Feb. 17	On amendment making amendments to H. R. 1 in order and limiting debate to 5 hours. (Rejected 191 to 193.)	Nay.
10	Feb. 17	On passage. (Passed 193 to 192.)	Yea.
		H. R. 1, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements:	
11	Feb. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to report back with amendment requiring President to comply with recommendations of the Tariff Commission except when national security is involved. (Rejected 199 to 206.)	Yea.
12	Feb. 18	On passage. (Passed 295 to 110.)	Yea.
13	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
14	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4259, providing a 1-year extension of the existing normal corporate tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates, and providing a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption:	
15	Feb. 25	On motion to recommit, deleting the provision for a $20 tax credit. (Rejected 205 to 210.)	Yea.
16	Feb. 25	On passage. (Passed 242 to 175.)	Nay.
		H. R. 3828, adjusting the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress:	
17	Mar. 1	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 223 to 113.)	Yea.
18	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4720, providing incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pay and allowances:	
19	Mar. 10	On passage. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Yea.
20	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4903, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 (second supplemental appropriation):	
21	Mar. 18	On passage of amendment restoring a provision authorizing transfer of $4 million of unexpended funds to the United Nations technical assistance program. (Passed 174 to 107.)	Nay.
22	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4644, increasing the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service by an average 7.5 percent and eliminating certain salary inequities:	
23	Mar. 21	On motion to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 4644. (Rejected 120 to 302.)	Yea.
24	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4951, directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year:	
25	Mar. 21	On motion to suspend the rules and pass with committee amendments. (Rejected 200 to 151; a ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension of the rules.)	Yea.
26	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 170, declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to Congress on Jan. 24, 1955:	
27	Mar. 22	On passage. (Rejected 132 to 283, thereby approving sale.)	Nay.
28	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 171, disapproving proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic-rubber-producing facilities as recommended by Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission:	
29	Mar. 23	On passage. (Rejected 137 to 276, thereby approving sale.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 151, establishing a code of fair practices for conduct of hearings by committees of the House of Representatives:	
	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1955	Measure, question, and result	Vote
32	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3659, increasing criminal penalties under Sherman Anti-Trust Act:	
	Mar. 29	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4259, providing a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates:	
33	Mar. 30	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 386 to 8.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5240, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1956:	
34	Mar. 30	On amendment limiting to $1 per month the fee to be paid to educational institutions for reports on veterans enrolled therein. (Rejected 156 to 226.)	Yea.
35	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5106, authorizing loans to veterans for farm homes under same terms as for residential housing:	
	Apr. 18	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 2225, requiring issuance of permanent certificates to local airlines operating under temporary permits:	
	Apr. 19	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
36	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4644, the postal employees' pay increase and classification adjustment bill:	
37	Apr. 20	On amendment increasing postal salaries by an average of 8.2 percent in lieu of 7.5 percent as provided by the bill. (Passed 224 to 189.)	Nay.
38	Apr. 20	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 125 to 287.)	Yea.
39	Apr. 20	On passage (8.2 percent increase). (Passed 324 to 85.)	Nay.
40	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4393, providing for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels:	
41	Apr. 21	On passage. (Passed 373 to 3.)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 256, authorizing 3-year $1.25 million program of Federal aid for nationwide research and reevaluation of problems of mental health:	
	Apr. 21	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4954, granting Federal Government the right of action to recover damages under the antitrust laws, and establishing uniform statute of limitations:	
	Apr. 26	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
42	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2107, authorizing 3-year program of construction of armories for training of Reserves:	
	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4904, extending Renegotiation Act for 2 years to Dec. 31, 1956, to provide for recovery of excessive profits from defense contracts:	
	Apr. 28	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
43	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 12, amending the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by restoring 90 percent mandatory price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts:	
46	May 5	On amendment eliminating peanuts from the list of basic commodities. (Rejected 193 to 215.)	Yea.
47	May 5	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 199 to 212.)	Yea.
48	May 5	On passage. (Passed 206 to 201.)	Nay.
49	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1, the postal employees' pay and classification adjustment bill, providing an average 8.8 percent increase:	
50	May 9	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 118 to 275.)	Yea.
51	May 9	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 328 to 66.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 223, rule providing 7 hours of debate on, and the limiting of amendments to, H. R. 2535, admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union on an equal footing with the original States:	
52	May 9	On passage. (Passed 322 to 66.)	Yea.
53	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2535, the Alaska-Hawaiian statehood bill:	
57	May 10	On motion to recommit. (Passed 218 to 170.)	Nay.
58	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
59	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
61	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6042, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956:	
62	May 12	On amendment deleting language requiring approval of a congressional committee prior to disposal or transfer of work traditionally performed by civilian employees of Department of Defense. (Rejected 184 to 202.)	Yea.
63	May 12	On passage. (Passed 382 to 0.)	Yea.
64	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
64	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 19	Quorum call	Absent.
68	May 19	Quorum call	Absent.
		S. 727, adjusting the salaries of judges in the District of Columbia:	
69	May 23	On passage. (Passed 282 to 32.)	Yea.
70	May 25	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. Res. 244, creating a select committee to investigate the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission in connection with operation of bridge and approaches near New Harmony, Ind.:	
71	May 25	On passage. (Passed 205 to 166.)	Nay.
		H. R. 2851, making agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress:	
72	May 25	On passage. (Passed 343 to 1.)	Yea.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 727, adjusting the salaries of judges in the District of Columbia:	
74	May 26	On motion to recommit to conference committee with instructions to insist on House amendments providing for lower salary increases. (Passed 170 to 165.)	Yea.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5881, supplementing the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects:	
76	May 26	On motion to recommit designed to limit the scope of the bill to the 17 western reclamation States. (Rejected 62 to 229.)	Nay.
77	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3990, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska:	
78	June 1	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 79 to 278.)	Yea.
		S. 654, extending to June 30, 1956, Veterans' Administration program for direct loans for purchase or building of homes and authorizing appropriation of $150 million:	
	June 2	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		S. 2061, increasing the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
79	June 7	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed 409 to 1.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3882, requiring registration of persons trained in espionage for foreign governments or political parties:	
	June 7	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5923, authorizing the completion within the next 3 years of the construction of the Inter-American Highway:	
80	June 8	On passage. (Passed 353 to 13.)	Yea.
81	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements:	
83	June 14	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 347 to 54.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6227, providing for the control and regulation of bank holding companies:	
84	June 14	On passage. (Passed 371 to 24.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 157, reaffirming desire of people of the United States for an honorable and lasting peace and inviting people of the world to join in effort to attain it:	
	June 14	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1955	Measure, question, and result	Vote
85	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 210, authorizing Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board:	
86	June 15	On passage. (Rejected 178 to 214.)	Nay.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6766, the public works appropriation bill, providing funds for rivers and harbors projects:	
	June 16	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, voice vote.)	Yea.
	June 16	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
		S. 67, adjusting the rates of basic compensation of Federal employees:	
88	June 20	On passage. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 109, authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference:	
89	June 20	On passage. (Passed 337 to 31.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6295, amending the Travel Expense Act of 1949 to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses:	
90	June 20	On passage. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4663, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws:	
91	June 21	On passage. (Passed 231 to 153.)	Yea.
92	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6040, amending certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and repealing obsolete provisions of the customs laws:	
93	June 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section making export value the primary basis for assessing duty. (Rejected 143 to 232.)	Nay.
		H. Con. Res. 149, expressing sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism:	
94	June 23	On passage. (Passed 367 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6992, extending for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit:	
95	June 27	On passage. (Passed 267 to 56.)	Yea.
96	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6829, authorizing certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations:	
97	June 27	On passage. (Passed 316 to 2.)	Yea.
98	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3005, extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years and extending for 2 years the Doctors-Dentists Draft Act:	
99	June 28	On motion to recommit conference report. (Rejected 171 to 221.)	Nay.
100	June 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 388 to 5.)	Yes.
101	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 727, adjusting the salaries of the judges of the courts of the District of Columbia:	
103	June 29	On motion to recommit conference report and insist upon original House amendments. (Rejected 157 to 227.)	Nay.
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2090, authorizing the mutual security program:	
105	June 30	On passage. (Passed 273 to 128.)	Yea.
106	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2854, strengthening penalties for seditious conspiracy and for advocacy of overthrow of government:	
	July 5	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4744, raising limitation on amount of Railroad Retirement annuity to spouses to maximum payable under social security:	
	July 5	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3210, authorizing the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway:	
109	July 6	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 74 to 316.)	Yea.
		S. 609, providing rewards for information on illegal importation, manufacture, or acquisition of nuclear material or atomic weapons:	
	July 6	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		S. 2090, authorizing the mutual security program:	
110	July 7	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 262 to 120.)	Yea.
111	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7224, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year 1956:	
112	July 11	On passage. (Passed 251 to 123.)	Yea.
113	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6766, the public works appropriation bill, providing funds for rivers and harbors projects:	
114	July 13	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 315 to 92.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 295, providing for consideration of H. R. 7089, providing benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans:	
115	July 13	On passage. (Passed 376 to 24.)	Yea.
116	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7089, revising and simplifying laws providing for benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans:	
	July 13	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
117	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Con. Res. 127, expressing sense of the Congress that efforts be made to invite Spain into NATO:	
	July 14	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
118	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7225, amending the Social Security Act providing disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, reducing to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are paid to certain women, providing for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, extending coverage, and increasing social-security tax:	
119	July 18	On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Passed 372 to 31.)	Nay.
120	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
121	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6590, prohibiting Government employment of disloyal persons or those who believe in right to strike against the Government:	
	July 18	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6243, authorizing construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship to promote peaceful uses of atomic energy:	
	July 18	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
122	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
123	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
124	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7214, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective Mar. 1, 1956:	
	July 20	On amendment to increase minimum wage to 90 cents per hour. (Rejected 145 to 188.)	Yea.
125	July 20	On passage. (Passed 362 to 54.)	Nay.
126	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
127	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7000, providing for strengthening of the Reserve Forces:	
129	July 25	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 315 to 78.)	Yea.
		H. R. 314, providing for 3 hours of debate on H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill:	
130	July 26	On passage. (Passed 274 to 129.)	Yea.
131	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill:	
132	July 27	On motion to recommit to incorporate bonding provisions of Dondero substitute (administration program) into bill. (Rejected 193 to 221.)	Nay.
133	July 27	On passage. (Rejected 123 to 292.)	Nay.
		H. R. 5647, repealing excise tax on motorcycles:	
	July 27	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
134	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 317, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6645, removing natural gas producers from Federal regulation:	
135	July 28	On passage. (Passed 272 to 135.)	Yea.
136	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6645, removing natural-gas producers from Federal regulation:	
137	July 28	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 203 to 210.)	Yea.
138	July 28	On passage. (Passed 209 to 203.)	Nay.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1955	Measure, question, and result	Vote
139	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2126, the Housing Act of 1955:	
140	July 29	On amendment removing public housing provisions and extending FHA mortgage insurance authority. (Passed 217 to 188.)	Yea.
141	July 29	On passage. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7618, adjusting civil-service retirement annuities:	
	July 29	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7215, extending for 1 year to June 30, 1956, free postal privileges for members of Armed Forces abroad:	
	July 30	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7030, amending and extending Sugar Act of 1948, fixing domestic and foreign quotas:	
	July 30	On passage. (Passed, division vote, 194 to 44.)	Yea.
		S. 2253, increasing from $700 million to $1.5 billion private sales of surplus agricultural commodities to friendly nations abroad under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954:	
	July 30	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7470, extending Defense Production Act to June 30, 1956:	
	July 30	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
142	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 299, providing $35,000 for further expenses of the Select Committee on Small Business:	
143	Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 231 to 134.)	Nay.
		S. 2576, repealing the franchise of Capital Transit Co., operating in the District of Columbia:	
144	Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (Rejected 215 to 159; a ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension of rules.)	Nay.
145	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2552, authorizing the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie (extending St. Lawrence seaway depths to Wisconsin ports):	
	Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
146	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2126, the Housing Act of 1955:	
147	Aug. 2	On adoption of conference report providing for construction of 45,000 public housing units in 1 year. (Adopted 187 to 168.)	Nay.
		S. 2127, authorizing continuance of Small Business Administration to June 30, 1957, and increasing its revolving fund for loans to total $175 million:	
	Aug. 2	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		S. 756, authorizing Federal aid to States for wildlife restoration projects:	
	Aug. 2	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity the report contains parliamentary and legislative terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

A. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

B. Recommittal: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

C. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate by an S. There are four main types:

First. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which, when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

Second. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

Third. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Fourth. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

D. Rule: Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House resolution (H. Res.), is granted covering the time allowed for debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

E. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

F. Ordering the previous question: A motion to order the previous question, if adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

G. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

First. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye" then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

Second. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

Third. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as teller, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a rollcall. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Fourth. Rollcalls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called and his vote recorded. Rollcalls constitute the official voting record of the House.

The outcome of various votes are indicated in parentheses in the record above. In the case of rollcall votes, the actual vote is shown—the yeas first and the nays last.

Work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, significant contributions have been made by the legislative branch of the Government to the international relations of the United States, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs has played a major role in effecting these contributions.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I want to acknowledge the hard work and wholehearted cooperation of each and every member of the

committee, both on the majority and on the minority side, without which all the accomplishments during the 1st session of the 84th Congress would not have been possible. Operating on a bipartisan basis, the committee has added to the strength and unity which the United States presents to the world. It has considered and reported legislation which has made more effective the conduct of foreign affairs by those charged with its conduct—the executive branch of the Government.

There follows a brief summary of the legislation which the committee has reported favorably after careful consideration:

MEASURES REPORTED AND PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE

FORMOSA

Unanimously reported from the committee January 24, 1955; passed House January 25, 1955, by vote of 409 to 3; passed Senate January 28, 1955, by vote of 85 to 3; approved January 29, 1955; Public Law 4: This resolution authorizes the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area.

EXTENSION OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT

Passed Senate June 2, 1955, by vote of 59 to 18; passed House, amended, June 30, 1955, by vote of 273 to 128; conference report adopted in House July 7, 1955, by vote of 262 to 120; in Senate on July 7, 1955, by voice vote; approved July 8, 1955; Public Law 138: This act extended the mutual security program for another year, authorizing $2,472,500,000 for military aid, of which $1,133,000,000 was for military assistance, $317,200,000 for direct forces support, and $1,022,300,000 for defense support. It also authorized $182 million for development assistance; $172 million for technical cooperation and $459,300,000 for other programs, including an Asian development fund of $200 million and a special Presidential fund of $100 million.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

Passed House, amended, June 23, 1955, by voice vote; passed Senate, amended, July 25, 1955, by voice vote; conference report adopted by House July 29, 1955, by voice vote; by Senate August 1, 1955, by voice vote; approved August 9, 1955; Public Law 285: Provides for distribution to American claimants of $41 million available in the United States for payment of claims against Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, the Soviet Union, and Italy. Utilizes existing claims adjudication organization at no cost to American taxpayer. Administrative expenses are to be met from funds available for distribution.

STRENGTHENING THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Passed Senate June 17, 1955; passed House, amended, by vote of 142 to 27, under suspension of rules, August 1, 1955; Senate agreed to House amendment August 1, 1955; approved August 5, 1955; Public Law 250: This bill increases the number of top-level statutory positions in the Department of State by three officers at the level of Deputy Under Secretary of State; provides for the rank of career ambassador as the highest class of Foreign Service officer; and permits computations for retirement purposes upon the actual salary received by an officer.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, July 30, 1955; passed Senate August 2, 1955; approved August 9, 1955; Public Law 298: This bill amends an act of August 5, 1953, to give more flexibility to the Commission in its plans for a suitable memorial in the Philippines to the Filipinos and Americans who fought there during World War II. It permits the Commission to accept public and private gifts and carries an authorization of not more than $100,000 for the expenses of the Commission. Also, it permits the Commission to contract for work, supplies, materials, and equipment inside and outside the United States and to engage the services of architects and other personnel.

INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE PERSONNEL

Passed House by voice vote March 23, 1955; passed Senate by voice vote March 30, 1955; approved April 5, 1955; Public Law 22:

Enables the Department of State to continue the integration of its personnel into the Foreign Service Officer Corps, as has been recommended by several independent committees appointed to study the State Department personnel and organization.

Establishes a home transfer allowance; permits the Department to defray part of the cost of education of children of Foreign Service officers when living abroad; provides for medical examinations, inoculations and vaccinations for dependents of Foreign Service officers; makes Foreign Service and Reserve officers eligible to receive hardship post differentials like those paid staff officers and employees and civilian personnel of other Government agencies stationed abroad.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES ACROSS CANADIAN AND MEXICAN BOUNDARIES

Bridge across the Rainy River, at or near Baudette, Minn.—passed Senate May 31, 1955; passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, June 7, 1955; approved June 16, 1955; Public Law 79.

Bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.—passed House May 17, 1955, Consent Calendar proceedings; passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955; Public Law 98.

Bridge across the Rio Grande at Rio Grande City, Tex.—passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, May 17, 1955; passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955; Public Law 100.

Bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada—passed Senate June 17, 1955; passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, July 18, 1955; approved July 28, 1955; Public Law 184.

OLYMPIC GAMES AT SQUAW VALLEY, CALIF., 1960

Passed Senate May 13, 1955; passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, June 7, 1955; approved June 13, 1955; Public Law 69: Gives official United States sanction to the extension of an invitation by the United States Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif. No expense to the United States Government is involved. The last games were held in the United States in 1932.

REPEAL OF CONSULAR FEE STAMP REQUIREMENT

Passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, May 17, 1955; passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955; Public Law 101: Repeals the requirement for adhesive official stamps to be affixed by consular officers abroad when any consular or notarial act is performed. Elimination of this stamp dispenses with an obsolete and costly procedure and permits the Department of State to conduct certain of its functions in a more efficient and businesslike manner.

SERVICE CHARGE

Passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, May 17, 1955; passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955; Public Law 102: Repeals service charge for making out and authenticating copies of records in Department of State. Permits the Department to charge for such services at a rate commensurate with cost.

PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES OFFICIALS AND DISTINGUISHED FOREIGN VISITORS

Passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, May 17, 1955; passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955; Public Law 104: Authorizes certain security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms for the protection of United States officials at international conferences and distinguished foreign visitors to the United States.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109

Passed House under suspension of rules June 20, 1955, by vote of 338 to 31; passed Senate July 1, 1955: Authorized appointment of seven delegates by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and by the President of the Senate to meet jointly with representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members at a conference in Paris in July 1955.

OPPOSITION TO COLONIALISM AND COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 149

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, June 23, 1955, by vote of 367 to 0; passed Senate, amended, by vote of 88 to 0, July 14, 1955; House agreed to Senate amendments July 18, 1955: Expresses the sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism.

PEACE, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 157

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, June 14, 1955; passed Senate June 17, 1955: Congress hereby expresses the fundamental desire and hopes of the American people for peace and calls upon other nations to renew efforts to strengthen the peace.

MEASURES REPORTED AND PASSED BY HOUSE BUT NOT FINALLY ACTED UPON IN SENATE

PASSPORT FEES, H. R. 5844

Passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, July 30, 1955: Authorizes increase from $1 to $3 in the passport fee

collected by clerks of State courts when executing passport applications.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 386

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 18, 1955: Calls upon the people of the world to join in protecting their continued right to worship and to practice their own spiritual beliefs.

MEMBERSHIP OF SPAIN IN NATO, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 127

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 14, 1955: Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITIES, S. 1287

Passed Senate June 24, 1955; passed House, amended, under suspension of rules, August 1, 1955; Senate action deferred: This bill provides for a $324 increase for about 250 retired Foreign Service officers and widows. It also makes an adjustment in some annuities similar to the cost-of-living increase already provided for a comparable group of retired civil-service employees. The bill also provides relief through grants, not exceeding $100 a month, to widows living in impoverished circumstances who are not eligible for annuities.

MEASURES REPORTED BUT NOT FINALLY ACTED UPON IN THE HOUSE

UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO, H. R. 5894

Reported July 14, 1955: Amends Public Law 565, 79th Congress, to permit acceptance by the United States National Commission of gifts or bequests of money, such gifts or bequests to be exempt from District of Columbia as well as Federal income, estate, and gift taxes.

UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 186

Reported July 12, 1955: Membership in the United Nations for Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, and Viet-Nam has been blocked by Soviet veto in the Security Council. It is the sense of this resolution that the United States should "exercise all possible influence in the United Nations to support these free and independent countries for membership in the United Nations."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST AGGRESSION, HOUSE RESOLUTION 183

Reported June 9, 1955: Requests the Secretary of State to take action to carry out certain recommendations of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, contained in its report made at the close of the 83d Congress.

PASSAMAQUODDY INTERNATIONAL TIDAL POWER PROJECT, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

Passed Senate June 14, 1955; reported by committee to House July 14, 1955: Not to exceed $3 million is authorized by this resolution for the purpose of making a final survey to determine the feasibility of construction of a tidal power project in Passamaquoddy Bay for the generation of hydroelectric power, its cost, and whether in the interest of national economy and national defense. A similar measure was reported favorably by the committee during the 83d Congress.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION NOT COMPLETED BY COMMITTEE

STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENTS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 309, AND IDENTICAL AND SIMILAR RESOLUTIONS

Provides for revision of Status of Forces Agreements and certain other treaties and agreements so that "foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries."

The committee received testimony from 7 Members of Congress, 7 Government officials, and 5 private witnesses during hearings held on July 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 26, 1955. These hearings are being printed to date and will soon become available. The committee will resume hearings on House Joint Resolution 309 when the Congress reconvenes in January 1956.

Statistical record, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Number of consultative subcommittees		8
Number of special legislative subcommittees		3
Number of conference committees		2
Number of meetings of conference committees		2
Number of bills and joint resolutions referred to the committee		104
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions referred to committee		106
Number of bills and joint resolutions considered by the committee		28
Number of bills and joint resolutions reported favorably		19
Number of bills and joint resolutions favorably reported by committee and passed by House		17
Number of bills and joint resolutions enacted into law		14
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions considered by committee		12
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions reported and acted upon by the House		4
Number of hearings (open and executive)		112
Number of pages of printed hearings		1,988
Number of pages of reports		276
Number of witnesses		179
Number of witness appearances before committee		243
Number of meetings with Rules Committee		8
Number of committee reports:		
Reports on legislation	24	
Minority reports on legislation	2	
Conference reports	2	
Special reports	3	
Total		31
Number of messages from the President and executive communications referred to the committee		25
Number of House documents referred to the committee		15
Number of memorials and petitions referred to the committee		54
Number of reports requested from Government departments and agencies on legislation referred to the committee		46
Approximate number of pages in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of House consideration on bills and resolutions reported by committee		250
Number of Members sponsoring measures referred to the committee		130

Time spent in sessions:

By committee: Executive, 91 hours, 9 minutes; open, 49 hours, 8 minutes.

By subcommittees: Executive, 31 hours, 18 minutes; open, 5 hours, 22 minutes.

Total: 176 hours, 57 minutes.

Approximate total authorization in measures considered by committee and passed by House and enacted into law: $3,285,930,000.

(By way of comparison, the money involved in public bills before the committee during the 73d Cong. was $102,000.)

Georgia Veterans of Foreign Wars Observe Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, each year on May 1, the Veterans of Foreign Wars observe Loyalty Day. This day is set aside annually to remind the people of this great Nation that they must do more than just call themselves Americans; they must support and believe in the American way of life.

The Communist nations of the world celebrate May 1 as May Day, with massive parades, slogan shouting, and military might. Americans hope to minimize the effects of this Communist propaganda by celebrating this day as Loyalty Day.

The energetic efforts of VFW State Loyalty Day Chairman Charles A. Moran have contributed much to make Loyalty Day an outstanding event in Georgia. In a report on Loyalty Day to the 1955 Georgia VFW Encampment at Savannah, Ga., Chairman Moran points up the increasing participation of more VFW posts and auxiliaries in Georgia on Loyalty Day. The success of this program is most gratifying, and it is an exmple to the American people that through the observance of this one day, the Georgia VFW has rededicated itself to the belief of a free country, a free world and a free man.

Under leave previously granted, I attach herewith as a part of these remarks Chairman Moran's report on Loyalty Day to the department encampment:

Comrade Department Commander Roland Richardson, comrades, sisters of the auxiliary, and friends of our great VFW, it is not possible to put into 5 minutes everything that was done during the year by the Georgia Loyalty Day committee. So I will tell you what I think would be of the most interest and would serve as an incentive for more of our members to enter into the spirit of it when the time comes to help sponsor one of the most important days in the entire year—Loyalty Day, May 1.

As you know, this day has been recognized by our Federal Government at the instance of Jimmy VanZandt, a past commander in chief, a personal friend of mine, with whom I served during his 3 years as chief. Two years ago, Loyalty Day was recognized by our general assembly, through the cooperation of another Jimmy—last name Floyd, and Representative Braswell Deen.

A lot has been done and accomplished. There were various and numerous contacts

made—in person, by letters, and by telegram. In that way many organizations holding their national and State conventions in Atlanta and other parts of Georgia learned more about Loyalty Day—what it is and what it stands for. At the same time many more friends were made for the VFW. I will not list these organizations here lest we incur the envy of the State chamber of commerce. Our posts and districts were sent the customary directives from our national committee in addition to some of my own pep notes.

Again there has been an appreciable increase in those posts and auxiliaries that sponsored some sort of observance. We are happy to announce that one of the best parades in the entire VFW organization was held in Georgia by Post 5257, Stone Mountain. Post 5290, Conyers, and Post 5448, Griffin, sponsored their second parade. Post 2681, Marietta, attracted people not only from all parts of Cobb County, but had the participation of Post 7612 of Atlanta and one of the best girls' drum and bugle corps in the VFW—from Post 4421, Monroe. Post 3027, Atlanta, had a very enthusiastic meeting. Rather than not to miss it, the wife of the post quartermaster, Comrade McKenney, who has been afflicted as the result of a stroke, listened as best she could from her car. Comrades: Such a gallant heart, a patriot, can give a lesson in loyalty to those who had something else planned for that day—golf or fishing, etc. Post 8579 joined in with Stone Mountain. Post 6449, Fairburn, attracted widespread and favorable attention with its all-day vigil at the War Veterans' Monument there where members took turns standing at attention. Are there any posts who have been omitted? It is possible for mail sometimes not to reach its destination. So that our comrades and friends—and I—may see those from the posts mentioned, as they helped to make our Loyalty Day a success, I will ask that they please stand. In the name of our department and our great order we extend to you, comrades, our thanks and gratitude.

We cannot let this occasion pass without expressing our gratitude also to the press in all parts of Georgia, the radio, and the 13 TV stations, the ministers and the teachers; also to Herman Talmadge, Marvin Griffin, Ben Huiet, Marion Williamson, Ben Fortson, Jack Langford, Georgia commander of the American Legion; Judge James Davis, our Fifth District Congressman; Pete Wheeler, director, Georgia Department of Veterans' Service; our department commander, Roland Richardson; Sister Lydia Alexander, Georgia VFW Auxiliary president; Department Quartermaster Jimmy Floyd, and Past Quartermaster Kelso Hearn; Ben Mosely, manager of the Scoutorama in Atlanta; also our commander in chief, Merton Tice; AMVETS National Commander Rufus Wilson; National DAV Commander Judge English; Brother Jernick, the grand exalted ruler of the BPO Elks; the officers and members of the Georgia Press Association; and to others who were so cooperative and encouraging.

Comrades, we must exemplify militant Americanism through the medium of our Loyalty Day. We must be fired with a zeal such as that which characterized those who since the founding of our beloved country paid the supreme sacrifice while wearing the uniform, whether he be city boy or country boy, converted Yankee or Georgia Cracker, Protestant or Catholic, Jew or gentile, white or colored, God has given each an opportunity to help eradicate the malignant scourge of atheistic communism—those of us here in our great State of Georgia will do our share.

Recreation Plans Shelved by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the first directives that went out from Washington upon establishment of the Forest Service 50 years ago was that our public forests should be managed to provide the greatest good to the greatest number of people in the long run.

Today we are seeing a reversal of that historic policy as it applies to recreation, one of the multipurpose uses of these forests.

Each year more Americans spend at least part of their vacations in our national forests. Last year 40 million Americans did so. This was more than twice the total number of visits in 1946.

Last year we appropriated $1½ million for the Forest Service to operate and maintain recreational facilities, for sanitation and care of some 4,700 public-use areas, and $210,000 for wildlife management. In other words, we were willing to spend less than 4 cents per visitor on facilities first built in the CCC days and which are falling apart.

But there are also threats to our recreation areas from other directions.

The Hoover Commission task force on water resources disclaims all basic Federal responsibility for recreation, fish, and wildlife conservation. These are the responsibility of local government and private citizens, the task force said.

And the Justice Department has announced a new antirecreation policy, as is pointed out in the following article from the July 26 issue of Labor's Daily:

RECREATION PLANS SHELVED BY UNITED STATES

Conservation groups in the United States are becoming deeply concerned about the present tendency in Washington to eliminate recreation, fishing, and wildlife conservation considerations from Federal programs in the face of a mushrooming demand and growing shortage of recreation facilities in the Nation, says the Washington Window column of the Public Affairs Institute.

National park and forest facilities are now swamped, unable to handle all the skyrocketing number of visitors. Number of hunting and fishing visitors drawn to parks and forests, jumped from 5 million to 11 million between 1947 and 1953. Everywhere recreation facilities are jampacked and prospects are that demand for such facilities will grow in the next decade as never before.

In face of this situation, conservationists are concerned by such actions as these:

1. The Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources has disclaimed all basic Federal responsibility for recreation, fish, and wildlife conservation and similar programs. They are the responsibility of local government and private citizens, the task force reported.

PROHIBIT INUNDATION

Furthermore, the task force recommended that in the jurisdiction of all future water projects, no costs or damages be given consideration which are not "susceptive to monetary evaluation." This would exclude the inundation of a scenic area, a great river gorge or natural wildlife habitat from cost considerations. And on the benefit side of the ledger, the task force recommended that no value be allowed beyond actual sums collectible from users or contributed by nonadministering agencies.

2. The Attorney General's office has just announced, in the name of economy, that land taken for dams, reservoirs, and other Federal projects will be strictly limited "to the absolute minimum necessary for the operation and maintenance of the project."

This appears to be a slap at a policy instituted by the Tennessee Valley Authority to buy a strip of land around the border of lakes to assure access by the public, free of charge for recreation uses.

The Justice Department's announcement of the new policy on land acquisition forecasts millions of savings in land costs to the Government and observes that "development of recreational and other incidental facilities by local agencies or private individuals will be made possible without Federal expense."

The new policy of acquiring an absolute minimum of land is already in effect by agreement of construction agencies, the Justice Department announced.

SOME LANDS TO BE RETURNED

Some lands already taken for pending projects may be returned to private owners. The announcement said that Corps of Engineers has 25 projects underway in which as much as 186,000 acres—10 percent of all land involved—may be allowed to remain in private hands.

National recreation groups believe that the Federal Government should put greater emphasis, not less, on recreation programs. They point to recent growth in attendance at forests and parks and the huge jump in hunting and fishing licenses reported above.

Prospective further growth of demand for recreation facilities has been studied by Stephen Raushenbush, of the Public Affairs Institute, who foresees a further growth of 50 to 100 percent in use of facilities in the coming decade.

Population growth alone would account for some growth. But other factors are at work. Per capita income is rising, and use of recreation facilities rises with income. The present administration is predicting a 28 percent rise in total disposable income by 1960 and 52 percent by 1965. The per capita rise should be at least half of the total rise, percentagewise, and will mean a great increase in the per capita use of recreation facilities. In addition to these two factors, population increase and improved incomes, there is the prospect of shorter workweek, longer weekends and extended annual vacations due to increases in the labor force and increased productivity of all labor.

DEMANDS MAY RISE

Taking all these factors into consideration, Raushenbush reported that demand for outdoor recreation facilities "may easily be up 50 percent to 100 percent in the next 10 years."

Conservation groups point out that the recent Hoover Commission and administration actions in the recreation, fish and wildlife fields are in sharp contrast to recommendations of the Truman Water Policy Commission of 1950–51. This recommended (1) that recreational opportunities be given fullest consideration in planning all projects; (2) that water resources programs be coordinated with local, State, and regional recreational programs and (3) that projects be constructed and operated "to insure full realization for their recreational values."

Further, the Truman Commission specifically recommended:

"Suitable lands adjacent to all Federal reservoirs should be reserved and made available for public recreation use."

That recommendation is the exact opposite of the current Justice Department policy announcement.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government must shoulder its share of the responsibility for recreation, fish, and wildlife conservation, and similar programs regardless of what the Hoover Commission recommends or the Attorney General orders.

It is for this reason that I introduced H. R. 1823 which would—

First. Declare public recreation use of the national forests to be a policy of Congress.

Second. Earmark 10 percent of the national forests receipts each year for development, maintenance, and operation of facilities and areas for recreation use, improvement, and maintenance of wildlife habitat and provisions for adequate safety, sanitation, and health in connection with uses of the national forests. The amount so set aside shall not exceed $5½ million in any 1 year. None of the money shall be used for land acquisition.

Third. Provide that fees, already authorized, collected for use of any substantially improved recreational area where special services or facilities are provided, shall go into this special improvement fund instead of into the Treasury.

Our national forests are making money for us. Receipts in fiscal 1953 totaled $73 million. That same year Congress appropriated about $62 million for the Forest Service. So $11 million went into the Treasury from operation of our national forests. We should reinvest some of this profit in the business.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has about as much land under concrete—in highways, streets, and parking lots—as it has in wilderness areas. If our children and their children are to get to know and love the outdoors as we do, we must act now to preserve our vanishing wilderness.

Age Reduction in Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1st session of the 84th Congress is adjourning and I cannot be accused of playing politics, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Democratic majority leadership, as well as the Republican minority leadership, and the majority members, as well as the minority members, for their assistance in making it possible to give the aged people the relief I asked for when I introduced H. R. 5064 on March 18, 1955.

Especially do I appreciate the thoughtful consideration given to the subject by the members of the Ways and Means Committee. I am also grateful for the many telegrams and letters I have received from people all over the country complimenting me on the introduction of this legislation. I am certain their recommendations and suggestions to me, as well as to their Congressmen, played an important part in the granting of the age reduction from 65 to 60 years to women who desire to receive social-security benefits.

What Next in the Automobile Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of viewing an extraordinary invention in the automotive field which ultimately will save thousands of lives and millions of dollars that would ordinarily be lost in property damage. Mr. Rashid, a resident of the State I am privileged to represent, brought his radar-equipped automobile to Washington for a demonstration.

We rode around the Capitol for some time while Mr. Rashid showed us the almost unbelievable features of this vehicle. This car has a radar screen directly below the grillwork, several inches high and extending the width of the auto, which projects an impulse that is guaranteed to halt the car should anyone or anything appear in its path. Incidentally, there is a similar apparatus on the rear of the car to prevent injuring pedestrians or property while operating the car in reverse. The natural tendency of a person viewing this invention for the first time is to expect to be hurled through the windshield; however, this is not the case. The faster the car is moving the farther the radar beam is projected. If you are approaching an object at a high speed, the radar is reducing car speed before you, the driver, are actually aware of impending danger. The car will then, if not manually halted, stop before striking the object. Tests were conducted in Michigan wherein two radar-equipped cars tried unsuccessfully at 50 miles per hour to crash head-on; both stopped with ease many yards apart. Also, a car changing lanes and cutting you off in traffic will bring your radar into immediate action, thereby eliminating the possibility of a collision.

This radar does not work at less than 10 miles per hour, therefore it does not hinder parking or entering a garage, and so forth. Mr. Rashid informs me that his invention will cost no more than power-steering and will pay for itself in about 3 years if the insurance companies reduce their rates, as is anticipated, on cars containing radar.

It is indeed gratifying to know that Mr. Carl Rashid and his colleagues, who have worked so long and hard on the problems of highway accidents, have at last come up with a device that may prove the solution.

True Pledge of Allegiance to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Charles J. Weber, of the Detroit general assembly, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, Detroit, Mich., I am submitting the following article from Dawn of July 9, 1955, a patriotic journal published by Mr. S. C. Ide, in Portland, Ind.:

TRUE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE UNITED STATES

(By Most Rev. John K. Mussio, bishop of Steubenville, Ohio)

Before God, we today pledge anew our allegiance to the United States and to all for which it stands. Too long have we Americans allowed our pledge of allegiance to be but a mere formality in our lives as citizens of this great democracy. We salute the flag with little appreciation of the tremendous principles of right living for which it is a symbol. We mumble the words of the Declaration of Independence without a true understanding of what it costs in effort and sacrifice to bring its blessings to us. We live our days under the protection of the great Constitution of these United States with little or no concern whether or not men are conspiring to make its words hollow and meaningless sounds.

We are guilty of all these faults, not because we do not love America, not because we do not treasure her blessings, not because we are unconcerned with real threats to our security and preservation as a free people, but simply because we are steeped in the illusion that nothing can happen to America. To us it is unthinkable that anyone would want any other way of life than the democratic way, especially when that way has been the salvation of hungry and persecuted peoples all over the face of the world. Democracy is so much a part of our living that we find it practically impossible to imagine how life could be otherwise. And in this lies the grave threat to our security. For there are people who hate democracy as the greatest barrier to their own selfish designs for world conquest. There are those who are pushing into our American life a Trojan horse which is made to look pleasing to the American eye, but is in reality full of treachery and ruin. We all have to learn again that to preserve America we must fight for the preservation of her democratic spirit.

DEMOCRACY MUST BE KNOWN TO BE LOVED

Unless we know the principles of democracy, how can we be devoted to their preservation? Men do not die for vague theories or for meaningless catchwords. Nor do they live in loyal support to an unhonored shrine. We must know to love. And yet, although we live daily in the enjoyment of rights guaranteed us by the Constitution, few of us know anything about that Constitution. Do you know the Constitution of the United

States? Are you acquainted with the Declaration of Independence?

Our schools are extremely lax in their insistence upon a firm and sound understanding of the basic principles of true Americanism. We fail to see the truth that unless we know the principles of American democracy, we can hardly know when they are being attacked. As a result we are doing things daily that weaken our democratic way of life. It is appalling how easily we will give to anyone who promises much the very custodianship of our most hallowed rights. Any appeal to our selfishness will give to a shrewd conspirator an authority which could crush us; a tongue that knows the language of class hatred and religious bigotry can sway our people to practice real tyranny under the guise of democracy.

AMERICA IS HER PEOPLE

We have in America today shameful examples of the abuse of authority, a setting aside of human rights, the practice of political absolutism unequaled in our history. We see daily the spectacle of men glutting themselves at the expense of social justice, national security, and moral principles. We see Americans ready to barter their vote or too lazy to exercise it. We rub shoulders daily with men who are ready to chisel, lie, steal, betray, and kill without any moral scruples whatsoever, their only fear being one of detection. America cannot long survive if she must be nourished from such a soil. America was born in the spirit of God-fearing men; in that spirit alone can she endure.

We must remember that we cannot hold on to liberty if we do not value it for what it is worth; we will not have America unless we want what America stands for. America is not an official's desk, not a congress, not a state. America is her people. The preamble of the Constitution of the United States opens with the words "We the people of the United States." It is a government of the people, not of the States. President Monroe said: "The people, the highest authority known to our system, from whom all our institutions spring, and on whom they depend, formed it."

Patrick Henry exclaimed in truth: "Its language, 'We the people,' is the institution of one great, consolidated, National Government of the people of all the States, instead of a Government by compact with the States for its agents."

FIDELITY TO FREEDOM'S HIGHEST PRINCIPLES

It is our Government and will be Government as long as we cherish its great character of human liberties. No matter what may happen over the face of the world, America will always remain the great beacon of hope and freedom to everyone as long as we are a people who love freedom, think of freedom, are ready to fight for freedom, and daily live a life in fidelity to freedom's highest principles. We are worthy of America only as long as we are true sons of all for which she stands.

How well are we fulfilling our great trust? Certainly we have been asleep. If we do not soon awaken to our danger, we will never again awaken to the American scene as we have always known it. What has been going on? Well, we have allowed writers and speakers to pooh-pooh our pledges of loyalty; we have had our national heroes ridiculed and called thieves, bumpkins, and louts. We have watched men, under the exaggerated privilege of freedom of speech, preach against America, inveigh against her most sacred institutions, and advocate theories which are diametrically opposed to our democratic way of life. We have exposed our children to this diabolical drivel on the grounds that this is the only way to practice liberty.

ENEMIES IN OUR MIDST AFFECTING PUBLIC OPINION

As a result, our enemies are soundly entrenched in our schools, our universities, and in every channel which affects public opinion. Our courts have been made a laughing stock by these fifth columnists, and at this very time they are using our courts with a contempt designed to show their contempt for everything American. They stretch our protection of rights to a breaking point that might actually ruin America. In fact they are using America to break America. And we stand by, meekly watching men who are selling America down the river take the key places in our literary and dramatic fields, in the movies, the radio, in labor, and in politics—men boasting of their dislike for things American by supporting everything that is un-American—and still we sit by as casual onlookers. We have seen these people maneuvering American policy so that it would seem to oppose the just claims of minorities.

DEMOCRACY OR TOTALITARIANISM?

Having thus set the stage, these troublemakers would then rush in to protect the rights of the minorities in the name of justice, would pit this class against that class, thus paving the way for their own access to power. We find labor organizations shot through with these agitators, whose one purpose, as in Italy and France, is to cripple our economic system. We find the greatest success of our enemies in spreading the doctrine of secularism among our people, among a people who have always been godly and of strong moral fiber.

How they are succeeding need not be told here. The sordid records of the divorce courts, of the juvenile delinquency case histories, the tragedy of broken homes, wandering families, of the cheap price put on human life, the old heads on young children, the disrespect for authority, the contempt for law, the chiseling among those in authority, the lack of honor among the citizenry—all of this is the shame of America, the open sores of her secularist spirit. We have let this un-American spirit run God out of our schools. We have let professors under the guise of academic freedom preach Marxism and all it stands for to young men in whose hands lie the future of our democracy. We have allowed anyone to say anything at any time against America, her ideals, and her leaders, without any consideration whatsoever of that higher right America possesses against such defamers to preserve her integrity and her very existence.

Does America admit the freedom to overthrow her? If so, then our patriots of old were certainly wrong—and fools to boot—when they took up arms to fight off oppression and tyranny and rebellion. Are we ready to allow our children to be trained in the doctrine that totalitarianism is better than our great democracy? Are we? Then, why are we permitting it? What can we expect for the next generation if we of this are so negligent in protecting our great heritage? We today can doom America if, no matter how much we profess our love of democracy, we do nothing to insure its perpetuation in the hearts and minds of our children. Are we to be those who go down in history making Benedict Arnold a tyro in the business of betrayal? Shall we be branded as the tools who let our spiritual heritage go to pieces because we were too taken up filling our bellies with the things of our own desires?

DENOUNCE MEN WHO DENOUNCE AMERICA

We will do and be all this unless we look around and spot the thieves who have been and are carrying our treasures to the dump heap. It is not enough to talk about something being done by someone else; it is imperative that we ourselves do that something. And if we feel that we cannot, as individuals, do something, then already we have lost the American spirit. We have despaired of our opportunity assured us under this democratic way of life; we seem to have confirmed the truth of the charge of recent dictators that we are all washed out as a democracy.

It is time for us to make our pledges of loyalty talk, not in words, but in action. It is time we denounce men who denounce America. It is time we refuse to support men who refuse to support America. It is time we close our pockets to those who open their pockets to the enemies of this great country of ours. It is time we vote solidly against men whose loyalty to America is suspect. It is time we give to our courts the high respect they deserve to our laws the reverence that is theirs, to our leaders the support they must have. It is time that we understand our right arm of defense is a strong FBI, and that our internal security lies in those other great agencies set up to insure the security of America.

We should see in unreasonable attacks against these great agencies the first attack against the first-line defenses of our Nation. It is time we fine-comb our schools, and, even if there is a teacher shortage, throw out every teacher who is not an American at heart. We can do without the kind of education that trains in deceit and sabotage, in treachery and betrayal, and disloyalty. The only school that is American is one that trains children to love America as the truest expression of man's dignity as a human being, of his rights as a citizen, of his destiny as a force for peace.

THROW OUT THE CRACKPOTS

It is time we get rid of the idiotic notion that our universities are sounding boards for every crackpot who lands on these shores. If the universities do not teach truth then they are false to their very reason for existence. And if the universities are teaching godlessness, materialism, and Marxism, they are rotten to the core and giving actual support to the enemies of the state. It is time, too, that we cease making best sellers out of immoral books, that we cease giving accolades to movies which trade on sex appeal and crime, cease tuning in on radio programs whose ideas weaken, cheapen, and destroy the idealism which has inspired the first beginnings of our country.

If we condemn those in Germany and Japan for broadcasting lies about our democratic system, why should we spare those here at home who are doing the same thing? We are not going to save America and things American by timid half-measures, by fear and stupid kow-towing to big names that mask men who are ready to sell America to anyone who meets their price. It is time we understand that our enemies are out to destroy, and will destroy, if their hatred of America is not met by the greater force of our love for things American. It is time we stop expecting the President, the Congress, and J. Edgar Hoover, or this or that agency, to do this battle singlehanded. They can do nothing, unless you are aroused and determined to save America. For you are America. She will stand or fall according to the price you put upon her basic rights and privileges. What America stands for is what you stand for.

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

It is time we wake up and realize that the hand stretched out to crush our spirit is the hand stretched out to kill America. When we see religious groups pitted one against the other, when religious leaders are sucked into the camp of the enemy, when God is banned from our schools, and the existence of the soul branded a fable by men in the public employ as professors; when morality is sneered at, and patriotism looked upon as fit only for fools, then we can see how far

we have allowed the destroyer to invade the sanctuary of our spirit. It is time to wake up, Americans; time to realize that we are being softened up for the knockout blow. If America is not worthy of a terrific effort on our part for her preservation, then none of us deserves America.

RIGHTS UNDER GOD IN AMERICA

Keep this clear in your mind: Anyone who tells you that God has no right in America is telling that you have no rights under God. And, if we have no rights under God, then America has no purpose of existence. For America is all that she is simply because she recognizes our rights under God, and guarantees that no man or group of men, no state or group of states, shall rob us of this high estate. This is America, recognizing our dignity as sons of God, our rights as citizens endowed with the freedom of heaven, our privileges as loyal and dutiful members of this great democracy. God grant we may never fail America by failing her principles of true citizenship and of the innate dignity of the individual whose roots are in the divine decree.

We Catholics in company with our non-Catholic neighbors, patriotism is a religious duty placed upon us by the fourth commandment. We as citizens have an obligation in conscience to love our country, for to that country we owe our protection and the opportunity to promote the common interests handed down to us by our forefathers.

We are bound to show that love of our country by furthering its welfare and by living in harmony with our fellow citizens. And we must especially beware of prejudicing the common good in favor of some particular class or clique. We are, moreover, bound to have respect for authority. The contumelious treatment of one in authority is gravely sinful, especially when it occurs in public; and, furthermore, when it occurs in his very presence.

VOTING IS A CIVIC DUTY

Then, there is the duty incumbent upon us of electing good representatives. Voting is a civic duty, and this is a serious charge upon us when our refusal to vote might result in the election of an unworthy candidate. Again, under this great commandment, we are bound to be loyal to lawfully constituted authority and to obey all law in general. This is not a matter of personal like or dislike, but, rather a duty imposed upon us by our Catholic faith.

From the gradual disregard for the observance of these religious principles of respect for authority and love for country, America has suffered. Unless we are convinced that our obligation to patriotism, and to loyalty, and to obedience, stems from God, we are very liable to begin bargaining within ourselves and to weigh off our own personal profit against the common good. For, if it is a case simply of man against man, or against a group of men, then the individual will calculate for his own profit and security.

RELIGION, MORALITY, DEMOCRACY

The further men move from God and His principles, the worse it will be for America. Our forefathers acknowledged the supremacy of God and the inalienable character of those rights flowing from God. They knew that the basic principles of liberty and justice for all are rooted in God and that without Him they have no meaning. Religion and morality are indispensable to the continuance of America as a truly great democracy. When, therefore, our people give up God for anything else, they are simply declaring that they will serve no one but themselves. And, if they will not serve God, they will not serve America. Our people without God would be a people reading the death warrant to real American freedom.

LOVE OF COUNTRY OBLIGATION IN CONSCIENCE

We Catholics are bound in conscience to love America, to cherish her institutions, to love our fellowmen and to respect them in their way of life, to exert every force in our power to resist the encroachment of any group that might try to monopolize the scene, and we are bound in conscience not to so violate the American scheme of things. We must, moreover, have respect for lawfully constituted authority, obey our leaders when they act within the scope of their high office, take up arms against every threat to our country, weed out plotters, hate rebellion and treachery and disloyalty as sins against God.

We are bound in conscience to protect unto the death the principles that make up the spiritual heritage of America. The defense of America is the true exemplification of the high principles of brotherhood, for we but show a readiness to lay down our lives, not only for our own, but also for our neighbor's right to profess God-given principles, to practice God-given commandments, and to live God-ordered lives. This is America and always will be America. There is no other pattern of life that can bear this trademark.

How well does the great patriot Abraham Lincoln sum up our duty in these words: "Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particular the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. As the patriots of '76 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty."

CATHOLICS TREASURE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

We Catholics, and I am sure I speak for all real patriots, are eternally grateful that we have been given a place in this great scheme of common living; we treasure the American way of life, for it has been for us, as for others, the rich soil in which our religious faith has been free to flourish. We want nothing more than to live in peace with our fellowmen. We pray God that we may so fully live our Catholic faith that our neighbors will have the confidence born of truth that we would not as Catholics do anything to deprive others of even the slightest particle of their full rights as American citizens. Indeed, we will fight to the last ditch for our rights under our great Constitution and we will fight equally as hard and vehemently to secure these same rights for our fellowmen.

A GOOD CATHOLIC, A GOOD AMERICAN

This is our word to all our non-Catholic neighbors. We pledge ourselves in this manner before the altar of God. A good Catholic must of necessity be a good American. We swear our allegiance in the name of Mary, under whose patronage this great country of ours is placed.

Do not listen to the enemies of America, as to what we mean or intend to seek, but, rather, listen to us, who were born among you, reared with you, who have received with you our blessings from the same common font, and whose beloved are buried in the same home soil. Listen to us, for it is time that we knew each other from first-hand knowledge, and not from the pens and tongues of men who are dedicated to destroy America by pitting her people, man against man, class against class, religious group against religious group. It is time that we really be neighbors in the Christian sense, that we live as neighbors, and have trust one for the other. This is the American way; this is God's way.

SERVICE TO GOD IS SERVICE TO COUNTRY

Get down on your knees, America. You will never know what to defend and what to attack; you will never understand what is good and what is bad; you will never know zeal from fanaticism, justice from tyranny, loyalty from betrayal, unless you know your God and love Him and serve Him. In your faithful service to Him is guaranteed your service to the imperishable truths which make you a beacon of hope to the oppressed in every land.

Only God-fearing men can guarantee to America her greatness, her survival, and her continued blessings for the generations to come. For America found her birth in the vision and dedicated efforts of men who worshipped God in humility and subjection. And America can live on only in that same spirit which stamps upon our daily life words "In God we trust." May He be with you all and may we, who love America, give to Him that honor and glory which make our patriotism a living and fruitful service to American freedom.

An Exchange of Notes Between the Late Justice Rutledge and Col. Heber Rice, of Chevy Chase, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article contained in the June 1955 issue of the Federal Bar News:

PRESENTATION OF THE JUSTICE RUTLEDGE PORTRAIT

The late Associate Justice Wiley B. Rutledge, of the United States Supreme Court, was not only recognized as an outstanding jurist but is also remembered for his gracious kindness to his friends and his disposition to spread cheer and extend a welcome to his acquaintances. Such fine attributes were referred to in the recent presentation of his excellent portrait to the United States Supreme Court by Prof. Philip Mechem, of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and its acceptance by Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States. These qualities, along with his sense of humor, are illustrated by the following exchange of notes at the Supreme Court on April 19, 1949, between the Justice and his good friend, Heber H. Rice, of the Federal Bar Association, then just out of the hospital and who was seated in the lawyers' panel of the Court:

"DEAR MR. JUSTICE RUTLEDGE: When asked by a friend if I were the Herbert Rice who featured in yesterday's Supreme Court decision and who was reported to have received a Reno divorce from his first wife and died intestate, my reply was in the negative, because I am happily married, with no divorce, and that recently I was merely in the hospital but did not die, and am now out, feeling about as good as new.

"Most sincerely,

"HEBER RICE."

(Reply by Justice Rutledge:)

"Colonel Rice, I am especially glad to see you here today; and, may I add, looking fit as a fiddle. Your note reminds me of Mark

Twain, who, however, was never accused of securing a divorce or having a common-law wife, to my knowledge.

"I trust, now that all these rumors are corrected, that Mrs. Rice will keep you wholly in the straight and narrow path and complete enjoyment of your fine recovery.

"Mrs. Rutledge would join me in happy regards to both of you.

"WILEY RUTLEDGE."

The South Gets a Sample of What the North Has Been Taking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the late 1930's from the well of the House, I called the attention of my Southern colleagues to the violence in connection with the sit-down and other strikes in Michigan.

At that time, the Honorable John Rankin, always an outstanding proponent of civil rights and constitutional government, in a somewhat delicate way intimated that we from Michigan should take care of our own labor troubles or, as some at that time put it, wash our dirty linen in private. While that was a good suggestion, sometimes it just cannot be done if a deplorable situation is to be remedied.

Our colleague from Mississippi also suggested that the people of the South never would submit to being plagued and pushed around by lawless elements, even though they were supported by labor organizations.

The First Congressional District of Mississippi, as well as the State and the Nation at large, lost a very able, active, patriotic, incorruptible Representative when, through redistricting, the gentleman from the First Congressional District was legislated out of office. We have missed him. Not only his ready wit, his entertaining remarks, but his always effective, vigorous battle for constitutional government.

It is with regret that I note that the goons have hit his hometown of Tupelo.

One of his Southern colleagues sent over to my office a few excerpts from Southern papers which give some idea of what is now happening in the South. As supplementing my talk of today, permit me to quote:

[From the Tupelo (Miss.) Daily Journal of March 23, 1955]

FROM HEROISM TO VANDALISM IN 19 YEARS

Nineteen years ago when one of the Nation's most destructive tornadoes struck Tupelo, telephone operators and repairmen were among the great unsung heroes of the disaster.

But Monday when tornadic winds returned and muddy floodwaters rolled knee deep through Tupelo homes, there was a black void in this field of public service.

Where in 1936 there had been courage, initiative, and a dedications to duty which won the admiration of the whole Mid-South, some of the phone strikers Monday displayed an attitude which could only be described by four words "The public be damned."

Idle workmen stood around with smirks on their faces while supervisory personnel strived desperately to restore lines damaged by the tornado.

And then in almost unbelievable acts of hoodlumism, men who knew exactly what they were doing reached high up on phone poles with special shears and cut the lines over which messages of reassurance were flowing out to relatives of Tupeloans made frantic by wild reports of damaged homes and personal injury.

While women pleaded in tears to get through calls to their loved ones, men who knew where to locate the long distance lines connecting Tupelo with the outside world cut in a dozen places the cables that could have relieved anxiety in hundreds of homes.

What has happened during these last 19 years to turn jobs that once produced heroes into jobs that now produce an attitude that loudly shouts "The public be damned"?

What has happened to turn phone crews who once worked around the clock to repair storm damage into groups which the public suspects of cutting wires at the height of frantic efforts to relieve the fear and anxiety caused by wild rumors of tornado damage?

The answer is that a union has come to town.

And workers once dedicated to serving the public are now dedicated to serving the union.

We have a feeling that, even so, the typical telephone worker in this area isn't too proud of his union today.

Most of the workers, we believe, abhor acts of hoodlumism like cutting wires and otherwise damaging property.

And most, we are sure, would have been far happier pitching in to help with Monday's tornado emergency than sitting back with a public-be-damned attitude while a whole town was torn by wild rumors, fear, and anxiety.

But during the 19 years since our community's last great emergency, union domination has replaced the old creed of public service.

And that change made the difference Monday between public servants of which our community could be proud and strikers for whom the public had little but harsh words of condemnation.

We don't know that the 1936 version of dedication to public service can ever be restored.

Maybe times have changed and people may now consider outmoded the idea of putting service to others ahead of service to self.

But if so, Tupelo—and any other community experiencing a similar change—has lost one of the most essential ingredients of happy living.

For what joy can there be in telling one's grandchildren:

"In the big flood and tornado of 1955 I was a member of the group which stole around under cover of darkness cutting phone lines to isolate our town from the outside world. While others strived to restore service to a frantic community, I stood by and laughed at their efforts. I was a hero to my union—but a failure to my community."

If that is the attitude the Communication Works or America propose to develop among Tupelo men and women who have inherited a tradition of service and heroism in times of crisis, we have no use for their aims.

We feel a sense of deep appreciation to the supervisory personnel who are so admirably upholding the tradition of dedicated public service that in 1936 won widespread acclaim for Tupelo phone workers.

But we feel only disappointment and disgust over the public-be-damned attitude which has been introduced into our community by property-damaging vandals who can think only of themselves even in times of strain and anxiety among their friends and neighbors.

DYNAMITE USED, DAMAGE IS $100,000—TEACHER, SON ESCAPE INJURY IN TRAILER

A dynamite blast last night demolished the dial telephone exchange at Greenback, knocking out approximately 480 telephones in sections of Blount and Loudon Counties.

Group Manager C. R. Mott, Jr., said today that all equipment in the building, and the building itself, will have to be replaced. He estimated damage at between $90,000 and $100,000.

Mrs. Nina Strater, a Greenback schoolteacher, and her 12-year-old son, Billy, who live in a house trailer about 25 feet away from the exchange building, escaped injury in the explosion. They had gone to bed shortly before the blast which occurred about 10:15 p. m.

Asbestos shingles which covered the frame exchange building, were scattered all over the telephone company property, and some of the shingles hit the house trailer. However, the trailer was not damaged. The door of the exchange building was blasted into the roadway.

The Greenback exchange building is located just off Highway 411, on the south side of the Greenback road.

Mott stated today that none of the equipment in the building can be repaired for further use. The building itself, although still standing, is badly bulged out on all sides. Some shingles on the roof are also torn loose.

Under good conditions, said the group manager, it would take at least 30 days to get the Greenback exchange back into operation. He said the company will aim at a 30-day period. In the meantime, the only telephone service that will be available will be in pay stations in the area. They will be tied into toll circuits connecting Maryville and Greenback. Greenback, Brick Mill, and Lanier communities are all served by the exchange.

Mott stated that an extra lock had been placed on the door of the building. That lock was broken off, and the regular lock appeared to have been opened with a key, said Mott. Whoever set the charge in the building locked the regular lock again when he left the building, Mott added.

Sgt. James Waldrop, of the Tennessee Highway Patrol, went to Greenback following the explosion. Police were reportedly alerted to be on the lookout for a black coupe which was at the exchange building shortly before the blast.

At the scene this morning many spectators still milled about the building. Several were Aluminum Co. employees, union members, who expressed regrets over the blast.

"It makes it look awful bad on the union when something like this happens," said one man who stated he was a member of the union.

Several remarked that it is a wonder Mrs. Strater and her son were not injured in the explosion.

In Maryville last night a crowd of approximately 100 men gathered near the telephone exchange building. Mott stated that company legal officials are investigating the incident to see if it violated the injunction imposed last April 2. There was no violence at the Maryville exchange.

[From the Aberdeen (Miss.) Examiner of April 14, 1955]

VIOLENCE BREAKS OUT HERE AS PHONE STRIKE CONTINUES—BELL EMPLOYEES ARE BEATEN ON STREET TUESDAY NIGHT—FIRST ABERDEEN OUTBREAK

Terrorizing mob violence erupted here Tuesday night when two Southern Bell Tele-

phone Co. employees were beaten as tension mounted in the month-old strike.

O. T. Robinson, a 40-year-old telephone company supervisor from Jackson, Miss., was severely beaten.

Mrs. Mae Gill, 28, Aberdeen, was bruised by blows from the mob.

Robinson and George Boardman, Atlanta, Ga., telephone company officials, were accompanying Mrs. Gill home when they were attacked by 20 to 25 persons on South Hickory near the post-office building.

Both Robinson and Boardman are supervisory employees for the phone company and have been working here since the strike began a month ago.

Mrs. Gill had been working at the phone company office here for about a week as a nonunion employee. Boardman wasn't injured by the mob.

Robinson was confined to the Monroe County Clinic, Wednesday with a fractured face bone, multiple lacerations and bruises.

Mrs. Gill was treated by a private physician for bruises and shock.

L. C. Parker, telephone company official, said Wednesday that the company plans a full scale investigation of the beatings.

He said the company had asked the cooperation of County Attorney William S. Turner.

Mayor Walton Bright said city police also would investigate the violence, first here since the strike began.

So far, police have made no arrests in connection with the incident.

Robinson, Boardman, and Mrs. Gill left the phone company office at 6 p. m. Tuesday and went to Nick's Cafe to eat.

The telephone company announced Wednesday night that it had no intention of closing the Aberdeen office because of Tuesday night's incident. A company official said a 24-hour guard would be maintained at the office here to protect employees from any violence.

They were attacked as they walked near the post-office building. Mrs. Gill lives on South Hickory.

It could not be determined Wednesday if Mrs. Gill or Robinson could identify any of their assailants.

Saturday night several hundred persons, mostly union workers from this area, gathered in front of the telephone office hurled eggs and yelled at Mrs. Gill when she left the phone company office with Robinson after completing work.

Large crowds began to gather in front of the phone company office nightly after several nonunion employees were hired by the company.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Alabama News Magazine of May 6, 1955]

PATH TO UNPOPULARITY

With homes being bombed, trains wrecked, bridges burned, telephone exchanges dynamited, and cables slashed, the campaign of terror and violence in the strikes against Southern Bell Telephone Co. and L. & N. Railroad is daily becoming more indecent and intolerable. The public patience has reached the saturation point.

Governor Clement, of Tennessee (who rates, incidentally, as one of the South's leading liberals), has provided rewards totaling $100,000 for the arrest and conviction of the goons who are perpetrating the rampant lawlessness in his State.

In Alabama no such forthright action to quell the continuing outrages and uphold the dignity of the law has come from our State government. Instead, the Governor has made a personal appearance before a CIO convention and thundered words of encouragement to union leaders promoting the strikes and whose national organization is financing one of them to the tune of $1,250,000.

"I have just returned from Atlanta, where I tried to help the workers, but I wasn't too successful," Governor Folsom told the labor delegates. Thus, the chief executive of this State openly admits that he attended the recent governors' conference not as a representative of the public but as a partisan and a spokesman for one side in a labor dispute.

Another public official who addressed the CIO'ers in similar fashion was Senator E. W. Skidmore, of Tuscaloosa, a bitter opponent of Alabama's right-to-work bill. He had accompanied the Governor on the Georgia trip. Without the slightest reference to the unprecedented wave of violence now jeopardizing life and property in Alabama, he denounced the telephone and railroad officials who participated in the governors' conference. Then he took another whack at the right-to-work law which swept through the 1953 legislature by top-heavy majorities, describing it as "the blackest page since the reconstruction act was written."

The ill-advised remarks of the Governor and the senator drew heavy applause from the CIO delegates. But when their statements appeared in the press we doubt that the great majority of Alabama citizens were in a mood for handclapping Beyond doubt, the people are in frame of mind to approve this comment by the Atlanta Constitution (of which Ralph McGill, a recognized liberal, is editor):

"The people * * * wonder whether the L. & N. employees and the telephone workers put themselves above the law. It should be significant that the Taft-Hartley law was not amended chiefly because too many union members didn't want it amended.

"It is folly to suggest that strikers are not carrying out this violence, or having it done by their friends. Of course, they are.

"The American people are being shoved along the road toward more and more antilabor legislation by the violence and destruction of property in both of these poorly explained strikes. In the telephone strike, for example, almost as many persons have gone back to work as there are idle employers.

"Are a few union leaders, who called what seems to be an unpopular strike, determined to have their way by intimidation and violence? If so, the people are likely to rise against them."

Far more likely to win popular approval than the statements of Governor Folsom and Senator Skidmore is the comment of Montgomery's afternoon newspaper, the Journal. It asserts the Governor has offended public decency by "consorting with law violators and encouraging them in their lawlessness instead of lining up on the side of law and order."

And a vast segment of the State's population doubtless agrees also with the Mobile Press, which declares:

"As we recall it, Governor Folsom said nothing in his campaign about letting violent elements take over the State. * * * Yet in recent weeks there has been one violent incident after another. * * *Jefferson County's Sheriff Holt McDowell sometime ago requested National Guard troops to quell violence, but the State's chief executive refused. Such inaction on the part of the Governor in a crisis like this is shameful and inexcusable. What greater obligation does a governor have to his people than that of protecting them from lawlessness?

"The Governor is risking alienation of general support over the State and placing Alabama in a sorry position to attract new industries."

In his campaign and subsequently, the Governor promised repeatedly to represent all elements of the State and to launch a wide-scale drive to promote industrial development. He pledged that the public policies of the State would create a friendly climate for new plants and payrolls so sorely needed. In the light of those commitments, the Governor's recent acts and statements have been most disquieting. Unless he alters his apparent course and sets about making good on his promises, there is grave danger that basic harm will be done the State. If he wants to kiss his development program goodby and let himself in for 4 years of unprecedented unpopularity, about all he needs to do is to continue down the path he has been following recently.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of May 4, 1955]

BIG JIM FOLSOM, CAPTAIN OF INDUSTRY

Folsom has reverted to type, as was inevitable. After a fling in the role of the new Folsom, complete with socks and overtures to new industries for Alabama, he's back where he was 8 years ago, baiting the gotrocks.

Now he wants the legislature to give him the right to seize Southern Bell, and any other strikebound industry. He can't claim public necessity, because telephone service has not been seriously hampered. As we read him, he claims a moral right to seizure because:

Southern Bell is a big corporation, and hence fair game.

He's mad at the telephone company because its workers are on strike.

Even President Truman, when he seized the steel industry in 1952, claimed that the action was in the public interest: to provide a free flow of steel for defense needs and to prevent a disruption of the economy. Folsom eschews such circuitous reasoning. To him it's simple: "When a corporation gets as all powerful as A. T. & T. it should become some sort of public corporation." And he would become some sort of public vice president in charge of settling the strike by turning the company over to the strikers.

It is inconceivable that the Alabama legislature would be so foolhardy as to make Folsom, or any other governor, a captain of all industry in this State. Still the damage has been done by the threat to claim such authority. Any industry that might have been contemplating moving to Alabama would hardly dare now. Whatever success Folsom might have had in allaying fears by all that sweet talk about attracting new industry in now dead and done.

The best answer to Folsom's request for an absolute monarchy over industrial Alabama was given by Justice Jackson in 1952 when the Supreme Court, by a vote of 6 to 3 (the majority including Alabama's Justice Hugo Black), invalidated Truman's order to seize the steel industry. Jackson said:

"Such power either has no beginning or it has no end. If it exists, it need submit to no legal restraint. I am not alarmed that it would plunge us straightway into dictatorship, but it is at least a step in that wrong direction."

[From the Brewton (Ala.) Standard of May 5, 1955]

PHONY ARM WAVING

There is a good bit of phony arm waving going on in 2 seats of Government, 1 State and 1 Federal.

In Montgomery, Governor Folsom has decided that the best way to settle the Southern Bell Telephone strike is to take over the phone company. This would be a convenient way to bail out the Communications Workers Union, but it would not settle the strike. The fact is that telephone service has been good, if not normal, throughout the strike, even where there are no dial systems.

The unions would be delighted to "run home to momma" in this particular strike. Previously, they could depend on an emergency order of some kind from the White

House to rescue them when the going got tough. Now, President Eisenhower has said he is perfectly willing to let the collective-bargaining laws of the Nation function in a normal manner.

Having to stand on its own feet is not nearly so pleasant as letting the Government settle strikes, the union has found.

Governor Folsom's idea is lacking in logic or legality. The State, in one fashion or another, regulates almost every business. Is Big Jim ready to join King Louis of France in declaring that he is the state?

At the other extreme is the cry for Federal control of Salk antipolio vaccine. A majority of Americans probably will be more willing to trust the family doctor for advice on the vaccine than to accept the decision of some newly formed bureau created for the purpose.

Less, not more, government is the answer to many problems.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 7, 1955]

PUBLIC WILL HOLD UNION RESPONSIBLE FOR HOOLIGANISM NO MATTER HOW MUCH IT VIOLATES ATTITUDE OF LEADERSHIP

Night before last a second nonstriking telephone employee got a pointed reminder of the fanaticism which possesses some of her former fellow workers or their sympathizers. A rifle bullet crashed into her home on Columbia Avenue, only inches from her head.

The night before, the home of another nonstriking employee was fired into by some thug with a shotgun. The grandmother at the house happened to be nearest to the charge and might have well been killed.

This kind of thing represents unionism at its very worst. We know that it doesn't represent the feeling or the wishes of any but a handful of fanatics in the CWA, of all the thousands who are on strike.

But, the CWA leadership must keep in mind that, however the acts of hooliganism noted above may violate the attitude of a majority of its members, and however strong the public statements the leaders themselves make against vandalism, the public holds the union responsible for the acts of his members and sympathizers.

If a man keeps a dog that bites he must regard himself both morally and legally responsible for its behavior.

A union card is not, in the judgment of a majority of the citizens of this country, a license to commit crimes which the ordinary, or nonunion, citizen must pay the law a penalty for committing.

Furthermore, a majority of United States citizens hold that the right of the union member of belonging to the union of his choice is not in anyway less sacred than the right of the citizen to not join a union at all, if that is the way he or she wants to work.

A Session-End Review of Klein Mission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, 2 events—1 recently passed and 1 to occur shortly—move me to these remarks today. The event recently passed is the summit meeting of the national leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union in Geneva, a meeting much in the minds and prayers of the peoples of the world who share a common desire to live in peace. The event in the immediate offing is the adjournment of the Congress which, as has been the custom in recent years, will be followed by visits of many of our colleagues abroad on study missions and other congressional business.

Late last year Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago, served as a consultant to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate. In that capacity, and without pay or reimbursement for his expenses, General Klein made a survey of the general political situation in most of the West European countries and prepared a detailed report on his findings, accompanied by a series of excellent and worthwhile recommendations.

His report, which received wide acclaim in the Nation's press, was published early this January.

A few months ago, five Members of the other body from both parties—Senators BRIDGES, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, SYMINGTON, and WILEY [1]—discussed the Klein report and its recommendations at great length. In addition to praising the selfless work of General Klein and the service he rendered his country, they remarked on the technical proficiency of the report and those of its recommendations which have already been put into effect.

Now, it is too early to attempt an evaluation of the results of the summit conference in Geneva. Many reports were colored, some of them were influenced by the wishful thinking of correspondents who reflected the peoples' yearning for peace and security, while others mirrored the pessimism of those who have seen too many international conferences produce no more than an avalanche of words and victories only on the propaganda battlefront.

I hold, Mr. Speaker, that we can perform our duties only as effectively as our information is accurate and reliable. It behooves us, therefore, as many of us travel abroad, to widen our knowledge to the best of our ability. And may I suggest to my honorable colleagues that in their quest for this type of knowledge the report on General Klein's European mission is an excellent guide. His statements are well documented with facts backed up by several decades of first-hand knowledge in international affairs, military matters, and politics.

Perhaps the best yardstick of the value of this report lies in the batting average as it applies to how many of the Klein recommendations have been put into effect. While some of these recommendations may well have been realized in any event, nevertheless, the value of such a study as the Klein report can be evaluated from its success—and the use to which it still must be put.

I am a Democrat, General Klein is a Republican. While we do not share the same political affiliation and disagree on some issues, I find myself in the same position as Senators HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, and SYMINGTON in recognizing the merit and value of General Klein's work.

With the imminent conclusion of this 1st session of the 84th Congress, I believe it would be well to review here the ultimate disposition of the recommendations of General Klein, which were first published as we gathered here for the convening of this Congress.

Recommendation 1:

That Congress maintain in Europe a professional staff of modest size * * * to study and observe the administrative aspects of American programs in Europe and report to appropriate congressional committees at times when pertinent legislation is being considered.

Development: Widespread favorable comment in newspapers and official circles. Members of Congress on survey trips, made more aware of the handicaps involved in obtaining a maximum of information during brief visits, are considered likely to revive consideration of this recommendation

Recommendation 2:

That an official on the cabinet level be designated * * * to achieve a more effective and economical alinement of our diplomatic and administrative agencies overseas.

Development: President Eisenhower has designated the Honorable Joseph W. Dodge as the top-level official to coordinate American policy overseas.

Recommendations 3:

(a) That we redefine, especially for governments of foreign countries, the functions and responsibilities of our ambassadors, reinvesting these officials with the authority they should properly exercise. * * * (b) That we broaden the jurisdiction of our ambassadors and provide them with the necessary staffs to permit them to assume actual authority for cultural, economic, informational activities now being carried on in countries where they are stationed by other agencies.

Development: Following his Latin-American tour, Vice President NIXON concurred in this recommendation. The dissolution of the Foreign Operations Administration, with assumption of its functions by a newly-created agency within the Department of State, its concrete progress in the direction of this recommendation.

Recommendation 4:

To increase our diplomatic effectiveness abroad and to develop an adequate reservoir of skilled personnel for our Foreign Services requires that * * * (a) consideration be given to a reevaluation of existing salary levels * * * (b) in such fields as economic and cultural relations, efforts be made to borrow skilled specialists from American industry * * *(c) * * * existing Federal laws be reexamined with a view toward amendment that will permit the Nation to avail itself of skilled specialists on short-term tours of duty * * * (d) consideration be given to providing compensation adequate to attract trained specialists * * *(e) a training program be instituted, utilizing the skills and experience of existing Federal agencies and private institutions.

Development: A letter from Mr. I. S. Carpenter, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, advises that the Foreign Service is being revitalized, salary levels raised, and other of General Klein's recommenda-

---

[1] Gen. Julius Klein's European Mission—A Job Well Done—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, April 1, 1955, pp. 3457-3463, 3541.

tions are in the process of being implemented.

Recommendation 5:

(a) That offshore purchasing be centered in a single operating agency, the General Services Administration * * *; (b) that the experienced judgment and skills of the General Services Administration be brought into play to assume many of the purchasing and procurement responsibilities now being borne by individual agencies; (c) that consideration be given to insure that the joint committee made up of GSA, military, and economic agency representatives meets agency needs efficiently and economically * * *; (d) that, while GSA participation in the case of military purchasing can relieve the armed services of heavy burdens * * * control of the development of specifications and inspection of finished products * * * must necessarily remain with military services; (e) that recommendations contained in congressional reports, such as the Bridges-Symington report, be followed to their conclusion.

Development: Findings of the Hoover Commission and congressional committees during this session of the Congress confirm the wisdom of this recommendation; further action is anticipated.

Recommendation 6:

That we intensify our efforts to shift to native media the main burden of Europe's defense against the ideological onslaughts of communism; (b) that those of our information activities aimed at countries behind the Iron Curtain concentrate on special appeals to induce defections from Communist regimes by scientists, technicians, engineers, and skilled personnel generally; (c) that exploratory talks be held with our friends in the free world to develop an allied information program * * * (d) that * * * efforts be made to staff all overseas information posts with persons who have practical rather than academic experience * * * and that * * * overseas personnel be rotated to the United States periodically; (e) that our existing program be carefully appraised to determine whether it is adequately serving the political objectives on which it is based.

Development: A letter from United States Information Agency Director Theodore Streibert indicates that these recommendations are being followed.

Recommendation 7:

(a) That American economic policy be more clearly defined to avoid misinterpretations which are being exploited by the Communists, especially in their efforts to lure trade to the East; (b) that American technical aid in retailing and distributive methods be intensified with the objective of increasing the vast untapped consumer markets within the European nations themselves.

Development: Legislation creating the International Development Corporation; money grants reduced in preference to technical aid; Government technical assistance supplemented by private agencies, for example, Pan American World Airways assistance to Pakistan airline and TWA and Pan American assistance to Lupthansa, the German airline.

Recommendation 8:

(a) Intensification of the interchange-of-persons program at all levels; (b) encouragement of European tourist and business travel to the United States through cooperation with the established American travel industry; (c) reexamination of existing law with a view toward facilitating and, with all safeguards of our interests, expanding the opportunities for foreign travel to the United States * * *; (d) an evaluation of our present exchange student and foreign visitors program to ascertain whether we are receiving the fullest possible benefits from it.

Development: Congressional interest manifested by legislation, committee action, and floor speeches. Attention and commendation in important periodicals insure continuing pressure for accomplishment.

Recommendation 9:

That increased attention be paid to political opposition parties in Europe while adequate relations are maintained with government party leadership.

Development: Reports indicate that this recommendation is being followed.

Recommendation 10:

That appropriate congressional committees consult with a selected number of experienced American radio and press correspondents abroad.

Development: It was stressed that such conferences be unofficial for the protection of the correspondents themselves, and there is thus no official record of such consultations. Members of Congress have, however, individually expressed approval of this recommendation.

Recommendation 11:

(a) Establish and maintain unchallengeable supremacy in airpower * * * (b) Ground Forces * * * in adequate numbers to cope with any conceivable emergency * * * (c) * * * both qualitative and quantitative superiority for our Naval Establishment (d) * * * present commitments of United States Ground Forces to Europe be reevaluated, as European military manpower contributions grow * * *, to determine the feasibility of reducing the present United States Ground Force Establishment on the Continent, leaving major emphasis of the United States contribution to air and naval forces; (e) that we continue to maintain a portion of our Ground Forces in Europe * * * as a deterrent symbol to Communist aggression.

Development: This recommendation being generally followed.

Recommendation 12:

(a) * * * maintain our country's lead in the development of trained scientific and technological personnel, (b) that a high-level conference of military authorities and educators be called for the purpose of devising a program * * * to initiate the training of scientific and technological manpower required for future security needs, (c) that such a program be sufficiently flexible to allow for the productive integration of those selected for training in the Nation's peacetime industrial facilities.

Development: General Klein submitted additional testimony on this recommendation to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Congressional committee and White House Conference on Education pursuing this recommendation.

Recommendation 13:

Anti-Communist exiles and refugees * * *; (a) that a careful survey be made to determine how best to assist these heroic enemies of communism in maintaining a cohesive, efficient adjunct of the free world's total defense effort against Communist aggression; (b) that they be encouraged to retain their national identification; (c) that such facilities and assistance as are warranted by their capabilities for aiding the defense of the free world be extended.

Development: Officials and private individuals concerned with this question have expressed approval and indicated their desire to see the recommendation implemented.

Recommendation 14:

(a) That an advisory group—

Similar to the Air Coordinating Committee—

be created in the field of maritime transportation; (b) that a study be made of the feasibility of coordinating the activities of the proposed Maritime Coordinating Committee with those of the Air Coordinating Committee, to avoid duplication, the objective in view to be the preventing of overlapping, duplication, and wasteful competition in the two transportation fields.

Development: Some discussion along this line, but no concrete action as yet.

Recommendation 15:

General MacArthur's views be invited by both our highest policymaking authorities and appropriate congressional committees.

Development: Widespread editorial and congressional support evinced but no specific consultations of the order suggested.

Recommendation 16:

(a) That United States policy in the Middle East be directed toward integrating this area in the total structure of Western European defense; (b) that United States aid to states in the Middle East be predicated on the readiness of recipient countries to join in the free world's defense system; (c) * * * every effort should be exerted to discourage the revival of armed hostilities between the State of Israel and the Arab nations; (d) that in no case should we extend aid to any country in the area unless a recipient state effectively guarantees that United States aid will not be used for aggressive purposes.

Development: Approval expressed in responsible quarters, but no indication that the State Department has altered its policies.

Recommendation 17:

That increased attention be given to furthering the hemispheric solidarity between the United States and her Latin American neighbors.

Development: Vice President NIXON'S recent tour was an active expression of the suggested policy and increasing attention is being brought to bear upon the quest for closer relations with our Latin neighbors.

Recommendation 18:

That a careful study be made to determine how best to utilize the facilities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and * * * strengthening the ICEM personnel structure and screening procedures.

Development: Avoidable frictions arose in administrative circles because of failure to heed the spirit of this recommendation. The attention now centered on the problem presages action.

Recommendation 19:

That United States policy to continue to aim at strengthening the United Nations.

Development: Commanding sentiment favors.

Recommendation 20:

(a) That United States aid to France * * * be geared to the current needs of United States policy objectives * * * (b) that we continue to maintain our military installa-

tions in France and advance such aid as may be required by the military necessity.

Development: This policy being firmly followed with the further extension of a strong position with respect to South Vietnam.

Recommendation 21:

(a) That the people of the Saar be given the opportunity * * * to determine the future political status of their territory; (b) that the people of the Saar also be given the opportunity to express themselves politically through parties of their choice; (c) that a representative of the people of the Saar participate fully in any and all international discussions affecting the status of this area.

Developments: It must be reported regretfully that the temperate course recommended is being ignored and the mistakes made in the past with regard to the Saar are being repeated.

Recommendation 22:

(a) That trade, rather than aid, form the cornerstone of our policy toward Germany * * * (b) * * * Congress expedite the legislation for the return of property to German citizens now held by the Alien Property Custodian * * * (c) that we continue to manifest our support for German unification through free all-German elections; * * * (d) we take the lead in proposing the Federal Republic for membership in the United Nations * * * (e) * * * that adequate safeguard be maintained to assure that German militarism will never again become a threat to peace or an instrument of aggression.

Development: Following the recent conferences here in Washington between American and German officials, the State Department has recommended the return of property up to $10,000 in value. Legislation for full return is presently pending in both Houses of Congress; hearings have already been held by House Foreign Affairs Committee. Other points of recommendations have received strong support or form present policy.

Recommendation 23:

That military authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany be invited to send selected officers and officer candidates of the Federal German Army for training.

Development: Though the embryonic stage of the German Army has provided no opportunity for implementation of this recommendation, the suggestion was well received by affected authorities and efforts toward implementation can be predicted.

Recommendation 24:

That consideration be given to including Spain in our offshore procurement program, particularly with a view toward increasing the western community's capabilities for arms production.

Development: This course being adopted as United States policy.

Passing events have borne out General Klein's keen evaluation of NATO. The Nation can indeed be grateful that it has as the guardians of our security on our European flank General Greunther and his associates.

I could go on to discuss other aspects of the Klein report but I am certain that my colleagues will continue to often refer to this survey. I do hope that the executive departments, as recommended in the debate this spring in the other body, will carry forth the recommendations of General Klein wherever they will aid the peace and prosperity of our Nation.

The Klein report has indeed been a contribution to American political policy. It is hoped that Gen. Julius Klein will continue to be called upon for his services in this manner.

Our Water Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, although it lacks the glamor of a hydroelectric dam and the traveler appeal of a national park improvement program, the soil and water conservation program of the Department of Agriculture has a direct effect on every citizen and taxpayer of the United States. There is no national highway leading to these many projects or no conspicuous sign advertising the accomplishment of any Government agency or bureau.

Soil conservation development is continually growing and progressing at the grassroots level on the crossroads to some degree in every State of the Union. In the great Middle West where the basis of our economy is agriculture this conservation development has been especially outstanding. It symbolizes cooperation between the individual landowner or operator and Government agencies on the national, State, and local level. There is probably no program in the field of government in which cooperation is so vital as in the soil-conservation program. This cooperation is not only financial, but also in overall objectives, method of procedure, and means of implementation. In my opinion, that is the principal reason that the progress of this program has not been spectacular but has always been moving forward on a sound, practical basis. Although I heartily endorse the principle of local financial responsibility by the participant in any phase of government assistance I do feel that this program has not received sufficient recognition from the viewpoint of government financial assistance when analyzed and evaluated according to the objectives anticipated by its development. Whereas some Federal programs receive 100 percent financial assistance from the Federal Treasury the conservation program receives assistance on an average of about 50 percent of the cost by the Government and 50 percent to be assumed by the benefiting area or persons.

Either conservation practices should be brought up to the same level as other agency programs or the programs of other agencies should be reduced to approximately the same division of financial responsibility by the Government and the benefiting areas.

Mr. Speaker, I take considerable pride in the advancement of conservation work in my district and wish to include in this unanimous consent request an editorial expressing recognition and results of this program in my district written by Byron Guise, the editor of the Marysville Advocate, and later reprinted in the Topeka Daily Capital:

LONG IS THE WAY

As long as the sun shall shine, the stars twinkle, the rain come, and the moon gleam, Marshall County will be able to produce food from the soil. It all began back in the late 20's by a few farmers who had the courage to follow the ideas promulgated by the extension service of Kansas State College. The ideas were simple: Make the running water walk, and keep the soil where it is.

Simple as it may seem these ideas were not to gain foothold like the popularity of a movie star. On the contrary the ideas were so new that few accepted them as sound. Had not the land produced the best wheat, the finest corn, the most luscious alfalfa, the good oats, potatoes, and other crops? Why do silly things when the land was still doing a good job?

But the promoters of the new idea knew full well that sooner or later the land out here in the Great Plains Empire would be depleted of some of its most necessary elements, in addition to being washed into the Big Blue River, the Kaw, the Missouri, and the Mississippi. However, when a man lives on the same farm for years, he fails to notice the changing of his land as does another who goes away for years and then comes back.

Inserting the soil-saving idea into the minds of many a Marshall County farmer was something like trying to sell an airplane to a man a year or so after it is first invented. The idea did not take. It took virtual revival meetings to get the idea to soak in. Then here and there a few accepted. Gradually a few terraces were seen over the countryside. A few farmers began farming on the contour. Some built check dams.

When it seemed as if the idea never would become popular, all of a sudden the owners of the land and the tenants saw the need. In recent years soil saving has fast become a must in Marshall County. Farmers who have followed these practices for several years are making better and bigger profits than their neighbors. And when they want to sell their land they can command more for it.

The day is coming in Marshall County when an unterraced farm, or a farm not protected by soil-saving practices, will be an outlaw. And 25 years or more ago the farmer who carried on these practices had what some called an outlaw farm. (Marysville Advocate.)

Operation Brave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Operation Brave, a program to bring together those men of the 22 nations who fought and suffered for freedom for the Republic of Korea, is an idea developed and fostered by George W. Brazier, Jr., of my home town of Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. Brazier's proposal is a simple one—one based on friendship and understand-

ing growing out of mutual sacrifice and common cause—stopping Communist aggression.

Operation Brave calls for 22 carefully selected American veterans of the Korean fighting, formed into small teams, visiting their former comrades-in-arms in their home countries, with other teams from other lands visiting comrades here in the United States.

These reunions, or visits of first acquaintances, would provide a grassroots demonstration of the continued desire of this Republic for continued peace and liberty.

While all details are not yet complete, it would appear that the idea and ideal behind this proposal could spread far beyond its present limits.

Mr. Brazier has put time, thought, and his own money into bringing this idea into realization, feeling quite confidently that better understanding and cooperation in peace among those whose joint efforts brought victory in war can lay the foundation for continued friendly, peaceful relations between men and countries.

Such a program deserves a boost, and knowing the enthusiasm and zeal Mr. Brazier has I, for one, am sure he will accomplish his program.

My best goes with this highly idealistic veteran as he turns his efforts from war to peace.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, on the subject of another meeting at Geneva. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Another meeting at Geneva.

Not the one at the summit at which President Eisenhower made his bold proposal for aerial inspection—the proposal which now gives Bulganin and the Supreme Soviet such a chuckle. Nor the one in which American and Communist Chinese envoys negotiate over the exchange of nationals.

A different meeting at Geneva—and one which may transcend all of the others in terms of eventual international and human significance.

It is the atoms-for-peace conference, attended by atomic scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain, and intended to find ways of putting this horrible and awesome force of destruction to use instead to make life better.

The use of atomic power for energy purposes is no longer a day-after-tomorrow matter. It is taking place right now, chiefly in the generation of electric power and in the propulsion of the submarine *Nautilus*. Its use will expand.

Atomic energy byproducts, meanwhile, are providing some of medicine's greatest weapons against dread diseases. They are, too, serving as the tracking agents—the bloodhounds—of scientific and medical research, by making possible the tracing of body functions.

This meeting now taking place at Geneva, at which the nations are to exchange knowledge and know-how in developing peaceful uses for the atom, will probably not provide the same sort of international drama and suspense of the Big Four of Eisenhower, Eden, Faure, and Bulganin (or should we say Khrushchev?).

But if the scientists can teach each other methods of saving lives, of broadening resources, of improving living standards, of helping people through the use of the forces of the atom, then indeed it will be one of the most fruitful conferences in human history.

It comes at a most propitious time.

It comes exactly 2 years since an announcement from Moscow spread dread and alarm throughout the civilized world—an announcement by the then Premier Malenkov that the Soviet Union had developed the hydrogen bomb. Subsequent events showed the Soviets had really done so. And after that, the cold war became infinitely more harrowing, for we had the knowledge that an aggressive force which hated freedom had the power to destroy whole cities of the world.

Just 10 years ago, on August 6, 1945, the world first learned of what the now old-fashioned Model T atomic bomb could do to destroy a city. Hiroshima in ruins was mankind's warning to find the way to peace, and to the use of this great force of nature for the improvement of civilization rather than for its destruction.

May I suggest that we all make room in our prayers this week for the devout wish that the scientists now meeting in Geneva can succeed where statesmen have failed—in bringing the wonders of science into a new focus for peace—and for people—rather than bringing in their wake death, destruction, and despair.

A Free Nation Is Grateful to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which first appeared in the Jerusalem Post, published in Israel, and was subsequently reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor. The publishing house is in the district which I am privileged to represent, as is also the mother church. The American people have been glad to do much for Israel, the new outpost for democracy in the Near East, and will be gratified by this sincere expression of appreciation.

It is only when we pause to reflect that we fully appreciate the extent of the United States contribution to the economic development of Israel. There have been contributions of individual United States citizens, predominantly but not exclusively Jewish, to the United Jewish Appeal, to other institutions and agencies working or supporting work in Israel, to individuals, friends, and relatives living in Israel and through purchases of bonds of the Government of Israel. Aside from all this, however, has been the economic assistance extended by the American people through their Government.

This assistance so thoroughly permeates the economy that we tend to lose sight of the extent to which our economic life is based on it, and of the extent to which its continuation will be necessary until Israel achieves a position of economic independence.

The simple listing is impressive. The first Export-Import Bank loan of $100 million in January 1949 went a long way toward supplying the construction equipment, the industrial equipment, the trucks, the pumps, pipes, tractors, farm implements, and other materials necessary for the launching of new agricultural settlements and the extension of existing ones.

The second Export-Import Bank loan in 1951 of $35 million contributed greatly to the continuation of the program of irrigation and agricultural development. In 1951–52, the first grant-in-aid was made in the amount of $63,500,000. Each year since that date successive grants have been made totaling, all told, by June 30, 1955, $226 million. The United States Government has also sold to Israel, at nominal cost, very substantial supplies of milk powder, egg powder, potatoes, butter, cheese, peanuts, and other food commodities.

From the beginning of the grant-in-aid program, there has been the accompanying program of technical assistance. Measured in dollars, this has amounted, up to June 30, 1955, to some $5 million. Expressed in what in this case are more meaningful terms, the contribution of technical knowledge and experience to Israel's young industry, agriculture, government, and other activities, the value of this assistance cannot be measured but is unquestionably far greater than its cost to the United States Government.

In the past 7 years, Israel's import surplus, financed by gifts, loans, German reparations, and private investment has amounted to a total of approximately $1,750,000,000, a little more than $1,000 for every man, woman, and child here. The greatest part of this has come from the United States. The United States Government itself has provided approximately $400 million, or almost one-fourth of the total. It is not to minimize aid from other sources, nor, of course, the achievement of citizens of Israel themselves, to say that without American aid, living standards in Israel today would be far below their present levels; the number employed in useful and productive work would be far smaller.

Assistance from abroad and from the United States Government will continue to be necessary for some years to come and in large amounts, although we expect and believe that we can move toward the eventual elimination of this aid. We trust that the United States Government itself shares our view. We know that it shares our objective.

Economic assistance by one government to another, contrary to some opinions, is no new phenomenon in world history. What is new and what is the special contribution of the United States to relations between peoples is the extension of such assistance without intervention in the political life and affairs of the country assisted and without an abridgment of the political independence of these countries. We have seen this new process at work in the relations between the United States and Israel. What is also new is the use of assistance for such planned construction, humanitarian and positive purposes as in Israel in the last 6 years. This is an achievement for which the Government of Israel can claim credit. (Economist in Jerusalem Post.)

Sunday Bargain Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the continued growing threat of making Sunday in Washington the big bargain day of the week.

This practice engaged in by a relatively few large stores is threatening to change the merchandising pattern in many lines of goods as well as posing a serious threat to the observance of the Sabbath in the Nation's Capital.

It becomes more than a local issue since the pattern set here has a national impact upon the business pattern of the Nation. If the respect and observance of Sunday is to be broken by several companies, competitive conditions help to create their spread.

I ask unanimous consent to insert two articles from the Washington Post, under date of July 23 and July 25, setting out the feeling of many of the ministers regarding this practice. It will be noted that they are asking the companies to refrain from these Sunday openings and are not advocating a return to blue laws.

It should be observed that the vast majority of merchants in the Washington area respect the observance of the traditional American Sunday and refuse to violate it. However, these merchants are placed at a distinct disadvantage by the violators. Their advertising in the papers which provide for regular weekday sales beginning Monday are at a disadvantage with the ads in the same paper shouting about great alleged bargains for Sunday openings.

The very idea that the sale is being held on Sunday has a tendency to give added urgency and sales promotion impact to the disadvantage of the regular adverttisers who observe the Sabbath.

It would appear to me that because of the dangerous precedents that are being set by these Sunday sales that the District Commissioners should act to see if they cannot be discontinued by voluntary agreement. Religious leaders, business interests, the newspapers, and other interested parties should be called into a full scale conference to search for ways of preventing this growing menace of the violation of the Sabbath.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 23, 1955]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PASTORS HIT SUNDAY DESECRATION

Ministers of leading Protestant churches here will make pulpit appeals Sunday not to patronize stores that open on Sundays.

The simultaneous plea is being sponsored by the Washington Federation of Churches, whose executive secretary, the Reverend Frederick E. Reissig, has been decrying for more than a year the growing commercialization of the Sabbath.

He says violation of Sunday as a day of rest is rapidly becoming more acute, with the "auto people, furniture dealers, and food stores" the newest offenders.

Stores that have traditionally remained open on Sunday, such as drugstores and restaurants, are not included in the criticism.

A year ago the Federation of Churches circularized its member churches on the matter of Sabbath violation. Last December 12, leaders of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths and representatives of the Washington Board of Trade, Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Merchants and Manufacturers' Association called on the merchants and public to respect the Sabbath.

Last Sunday Catholic pastors throughout the archdiocese of Washington asked their parishioners to refrain from unnecessary shopping on Sunday, and to refuse to patronize any store staying open.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, 1955]

SUNDAY SALES BOYCOTT URGED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PASTORS

(By Albon B. Hailey)

Pastors of leading Protestant churches in the District area urged their congregations yesterday not to patronize business concerns and shops remaining open for "business as usual" on Sunday.

Members of the clergy, heeding the call from the Washington Federation of Churches, noting that more and more stores are beginning to remain open on Sunday, emphasized that refusal to make Sunday purchases would check the tendency for commercialization of the Sabbath.

"One of the most regrettable and useless tendencies in the present day is the increased commercialization of Sunday," the Reverend Lawrence D. Folkemer, pastor of the Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street, told his congregation.

"It is regrettable because it cheapens and seriously weakens a religious institution so basic to the spiritual life of America; useless because it is not necessary. Furthermore, many business leaders who feel, rightly or wrongly, that they must keep their businesses open because of competition do not like it. They have repeatedly said so—privately and in small gatherings of interested persons."

TERMS PRACTICE "FOLLY"

"At a time in our history when spiritual values are so essential and when there is evidence of a genuine spiritual rebirth among our people, it is sheer folly to commercialize the day of worship which the Christian Church has established.

"Sunday was meant to be a special day of worship and rest for all men. If we take away from that day its unique and blessed character, we do it at our own peril," Dr. Folkemer said.

Most ministers pointed out that a return to the so-called blue laws is not desired and that drug stores, restaurants, and places which traditionally have remained open are not the cause for their alarm.

"Businessmen of both groups, those who open and those who remain closed are quick to say that the answer to this problem is in the hands of the consumer," the Reverend John F. McClelland, pastor of Christ Congregational Church, 9525 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, said."

NO CHANGE IN LAW

"We do not mean to change the present blue laws, but only to see that they are respected. Our refusal to make unnecessary purchases on Sunday would soon change the business practice of those who have been remaining open.

"With the arrival of summer and its inevitable relaxation on many fronts, may I urge you not to relax in your own keeping of the Sabbath."

The Reverend Henry C. Koch, pastor of the Concordia Lutheran Evangelical Church, 20th and G Streets NW., said that "people of all faiths are becoming increasingly disturbed over the flagrant way in which some business houses ignore the traditional respect for the day of worship.

IMPORTANCE OF WORSHIP

"In a time when American democracy is facing its greatest opportunity to lead the free world in moral and spiritual values, these institutions would attack the very heart of that democracy, namely, its religious life," Dr. Koch said.

"Observance of a day of rest and worship is a very vital consideration in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. No more serious problem faces our country today. We dare not allow ourselves to be weakened internally while we are dealing with a dangerous enemy on the outside.

"I believe that any business house that does business on a day of worship where it is not absolutely necessary is directly contributing to the moral and spiritual breakdown of our country and weakening our position among the nations of the free world."

Summary of Activities of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, 84th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the activities of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, 84th Congress, 1st session.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate has jurisdiction over legislation relating to flood control, improvement of rivers and harbors, public buildings, public roads, water power, bridges over navigable waterways, pollution of navigable waters, and public reservations and parks in the District of Columbia.

There were 144 measure referred to the committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress. The committee approved 42 bills, of which 34 were passed by both Houses. Hearings were held on many of them and on others that were carried over until the next session. Survey reports for flood control and navigation have been received and reviewed, and review of previous reports covering 35 basins and localities have been authorized by committee resolutions. Lease-purchase projects for 27 post offices and 26 General Services Administration buildings for courthouses, post offices, and Federal office buildings, aggregating a total estimated cost of $105,562,027, were approved by the committee. There were seven House-passed bills pending before the committee at the end of the session.

Bills and resolutions approved by the committee are as follows:

As of Aug. 4, 1955

ENACTED INTO LAW

Public law	Date approved	Title	Estimated cost
23	Apr. 11, 1955	Authorizing the Secretary of the Army to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for sale of water from Clark Hill Reservoir	0
34	May 13, 1955	Declare a portion of waterway, Fort Point Channel, in Boston nonnavigable	0
62	June 8, 1955	Amend sec. 2 of act of Mar. 2, 1945, Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg	$135,000
63	do	Provide for adjustment of tolls on bridge across Des Moines River at St. Francisville, Mo	0
71	June 15, 1955	Authorize preliminary examination and survey of New England, New York, and eastern and southern seaboards to determine means of protection from hurricane winds and tides	2,800,000
79	June 16, 1955	Extend time for construction of toll bridge across Rainy River, Baudette, Minn	0
97	June 28, 1955	Grant consent of Congress to States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to enter into compact on Arkansas River	0
99	do	Amend sec. 5 of Flood Control Act of 1941 pertaining to emergency flood-control work	0
103	do	Amend sec. 7 of act of Sept. 22, 1922, for installations of telephones in private residences at Federal locks and dams	30,000
106	do	Authorize construction of building for Museum of History and Technology for Smithsonian Institution	36,000,000
129	July 1, 1955	Authorize sums for completion of construction of Inter-American Highway	25,730,000
150	July 12, 1955	Provide for construction of Government buildings under lease-purchase in Southwest Washington, District of Columbia	0
159	July 14, 1955	Provide for control of air pollution by research and technical assistance	25,000,000
160	July 15, 1955	Modify Ferrells Bridge Reservoir to provide for cash contribution by local interests for water supply features	3,200,000
164	do	Authorize construction of highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex.-Okla	6,000,000
184	July 28, 1955	Authorize State of Maine to construct bridge across St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada	0

PASSED BY BOTH HOUSES

Bill No.	Title	Estimated cost
S. 56	Authorizing construction of flood-control improvements, St. Louis, Mo	$123,020,000
S. 1210	Amend Public Buildings Act to increase 1-year limitation on leases in District of Columbia to 5 years	0
S. 1340	Authorize conveyance of land to Brownsville Navigation District, Tex	0
S. 1577	Remove limitation on tolls on bridges over Connecticut River	0
S. 1899	Authorize flood-control improvement on Amite River, La	3,008,000
S. 2260	Granting consent of Congress to compact between States of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana on apportionment of waters of Red River.	0
H. R. 2866	Declaring a portion of waterway on Acushnet River in New Bedford, Mass., a nonnavigable stream	0
H. R. 4362	Authorize construction of flood-control improvements on Red River below Denison Dam	12,734,000
H. R. 1309	Provide for adjustment in lands acquired for Jim Woodruff Dam, Fla. and Ga., by reconveyance to former owners	0
H. R. 3235	Provide for adjustment in lands acquired for Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by reconveyance of interests to former owners	0
H. R. 6006	Modify flood-control project on San Joaquin River to permit construction of levees by local interests instead of acquiring flowage easements	0
H. R. 6417	Revive and reenact act authorizing Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission to construct bridge across Mississippi River at Friar Point, Miss.	0
H. R. 503	Convey land in Whitney Reservoir to State of Texas	0
H. R. 7628	Authorize appointment of Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon to civilian position in White House Office	0
H. R. 6634	Provide for conveyance of land in Grapevine Reservoir to city of Grapevine, Tex	0
H. R. 7195	Provide for conveyance of lands or interests in Belton, Benbrook, Garza-Little Elm, Grapevine, and Whitney Reservoirs, Tex., to former owners.	0
H. R. 6102	Change name of Garza-Little Elm Dam to Lewisville Dam	0
H. R. 4734	Amend River and Harbor Act of 1954 to extend time for reimbursement to local interests for work done on Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, Calif.	0

REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PASSED SENATE

S. 890	Extending and strengthening Water Pollution Control Act	$10,000,000
S. 1048	To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act by continuing authorizations	12,580,000,000
S. 1749	Authorize improvement of harbor at Rockland, Maine	710,000
S. 1851	Authorize conveyance of certain land to Mary Ann Aust	0
S. 2029	Change name of Hulah Reservoir, Okla., to Lake O'the Osages	0
S. 2093	Compensate certain property owners for damages in connection with reservoirs in Missouri River Basin	790,000
S. 2374	Authorize Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts to furnish municipal water supply from flood control and river and harbor projects.	0
S. Res. 70	Increase limit of expenditures by the Committee on Public Works	100,000

Projects under Lease-Purchase Act

LOCATION, PROJECT, AND ESTIMATED COST	
Point Pleasant, N. J.: Post office	$68,750
St. Marys, Ohio: Post office	82,500
Scranton, Pa.: Branch post office	60,000
Brooklyn, N. Y.: East New York station post office	270,000
Oxford, Pa., Post office	65,000
Atlanta, Ga.: Post office garage facilities	465,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa: Post office and courthouse	1,630,000
Green Bay, Wis.: Post office and Federal building	1,615,000
Lake Charles, La.: Post office and courthouse	2,075,000
Rock Island, Ill.: Post office and courthouse	2,000,000
Denver, Colo.: Post office terminal annex	4,335,000
Two Harbors, Minn.: Post office	66,250
Garland, Tex.: Post office	143,750
Hudson, Mass.: Post office	90,000
Grand Prairie, Tex.: Post office	175,000
Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Federal office building	6,227,300
St. Paul, Minn.: Post office and customhouse	5,235,000
Jamestown, N. Y.: Post office and courthouse	1,840,135
Kingsport, Tenn.: Post office and office building	1,013,000
Abington, Va.: Post office and courthouse	$543,210
Huntington, W. Va.: Federal office building	3,298,280
Kansas City, Kans.: Post office and courthouse	2,393,303
Grundy, Va.: Post office	50,000
Refugio, Tex.: Post office	78,125
West Memphis, Ark.: Post office	93,750
Cashmere, Wash.: Post office	54,687
Madison, Tenn.: Post office	78,125
Jefferson, Ohio: Post office	78,125
Camden, N. Y.: Post office	86,250
Houston, Tex.: Post office	7,100,000
Fort Mill, S. C.: Post office	49,800
New Richmond, Wis.: Post office	85,200
Toronto, Ohio: Post office	53,125
Newtown, Pa.: Post office	53,125
Skaneateles, N. Y.: Post office	79,875
Maplewood, N. J.: Post office	246,450
Burlington, Vt., Post office and courthouse	2,830,000
Burlington, Iowa: Post office and Federal building	1,328,987
New York, N. Y.: United Nations building	3,300,000
Richmond, Va.: Federal office building	7,410,000
Minneapolis, Minn.: Courthouse and Federal building	5,877,815
New Orleans, La.: Post office and Federal building	14,200,000
Ontonagon, Mich., Post office	61,560
Newkirk, Okla., Post office	$56,250
Atlanta, Ga., Communicable disease research building	12,330,000
Omaha, Nebr.: Post office and courthouse	9,579,823
Brunswick, Ga.: Post office and courthouse	1,431,000
Carthage, Tenn.: Post office and Federal building	272,000
Durham, N. H.: Post office and Federal building	433,600
Biloxi, Miss.: Post office and courthouse	1,110,000
Lafayette, La.: Post office and Federal building	1,095,000
Parkersburg, W. Va.: Courthouse and Federal building	1,722,841
Gainesville, Tex.: Post office and Federal building	645,036

The important legislation of national interest and effect that was approved by the committee is discussed briefly as follows:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

The committee approved a bill to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of Federal-aid highways for a period of 5 years, 1957 through 1961. The program for the regular Federal-aid systems would be increased to a total of $900 million for each of the 5 fiscal years, and continued on a 50–50 matching ratio and on existing apportionment formula.

Funds for the national system of interstate highways would be increased to $1 billion for fiscal year 1957, and increasing to $2 billion for fiscal years 1960 and 1961, a total of $7,750 million for the 5-year period. These funds would be apportioned to the States under existing law, with a 90–10 matching ratio.

The bill as approved by the Senate would permit 20-percent interchange of funds between systems, would continue the program on miscellaneous roads on Federal lands at existing levels, would permit reimbursement to utilities for a part of relocation cost in connection with Federal-aid projects, and limit weights of vehicles traveling on Federal-aid highways. The highway program would be financed from general revenues of the Treasury as at present.

A Federal-aid highway bill was defeated in the House of Representatives.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Public Law 159 provides for research and technical assistance to devise methods of abating air pollution. The act recognizes the primary responsibility of State and local governments, but provides Federal aid to those agencies concerned with air pollution and control. The Surgeon General would encourage cooperative activities, collect and disseminate information, conduct and support research, and make available to all parties the results of surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments. An appropriation of $5 million annually for fiscal years 1956 through 1960.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

S. 890 would amend the existing Water Pollution Control Act which terminates June 30, 1956. It reemphasizes the policy of the Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary rights and responsibilities of the States in controlling water pollution. It would provide a base for the cooperative program which the Public Health Service is carrying on with the States and interstate pollution-control agencies. The objective of these Federal activities is to support and assist State and interstate agencies. National research efforts in water pollution would be intensified, and a reasonable and equitable mechanism for Federal-State cooperation in resolving serious interstate pollution problems. Would authorize grants for each of 5 years of $2 million to States and interstate agencies, and provide means of enforcing abatement of pollution.

This bill passed the Senate on June 17, 1955, and was on the House Calendar at the end of the session.

HURRICANE DAMAGE SURVEY

Public Law 71 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to make an examination and survey along the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States, to secure data on movement of hurricanes, forecasting their paths, and investigating possible structural improvements which may be provided to prevent loss of life and property damages during the occurrence of such hurricanes.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Public Law 129 provides legislative authority for the necessary appropriations for accelerating completion of the inter-American highway within a 3-year period. The act makes the authorizations contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 immediately available for appropriation, and would authorize an additional sum of $25,370,000 to be immediately available for appropriation, all sums to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL

In general, the committee deferred action on individual flood-control and river and harbor projects, with the idea of including them in the next omnibus bill. However, due to the needs for certain localities, and emergencies that exist in others, several individual bills were reported favorably by the committee. These projects included one for flood control at St. Louis, Mo.; flood control on the Amite River, La.; and flood control on Red River below Denison Dam, Oklahoma, and Texas.

WATER SUPPLY

The committee approved a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts to furnish water for municipal water supplies, including water for domestic and industrial uses, in the operation of any flood-control or river and harbor project heretofore or hereafter constructed, with repayment of allocated construction costs to the United States over a period of not to exceed 40 years from the year water is first delivered, with interest at current average rates on long-term marketable loans of the United States.

Special Committee of Los Angeles American Legion Denounces Whitewash of UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a special committee of the Los Angeles Council, American Legion, Department of California, composed of Mr. W. Devore Walden, chairman, Mr. James G. Law, and Mr. P. A. Horton, have prepared an evaluation of the report by a special committee to the national executive committee of the American Legion.

The report, dealing with UNESCO, was submitted to the American Legion's national executive committee on May 4, 5, and 6, 1955.

The evaluation of that report follows:

This report, known herein as the Murphy committee report or as the Murphy report, is very lengthy, covering some 131 pages of typed material. One is struck with the lengthiness of this report as a typographical filibuster. The report contains much that is irrelevant and not the result of investigation. It is felt that it was made long deliberately in order to discourage study by the busy legionnaire.

On careful reading of this document, one is aware of a definite attitude of supercilious condescension. It implies that of all the membership of the American Legion, none but the members of the Murphy committee are competent to study and understand the problem of UNESCO.

Nowhere in the report is any recognition given to the vast amount of material gathered by other investigating groups from various departments, districts, and posts of the American Legion. There is no record of the Murphy committee having availed itself of the previously formed opinions and conclusions of any other American Legion group.

On successive readings of the Murphy report, one becomes more and more impressed with the apparent method of investigation used by the Murphy committee as having gone to the interested parties in the UNESCO organization and in the United States Department of State with a listing of the complaints against UNESCO and requesting instructions on how to answer.

BIASED REPORT

The result is a report which is biased, slanted in favor of UNESCO, and, in many places, not in keeping with fact.

In evaluating this report, care must be taken that we do not follow the lead taken by the Murphy committee and render another typographical filibuster. This report must be read and understood by delegates to the convention who are already burdened with many other important matters and are therefore pressed for time.

We shall therefore content ourselves with only the most outstanding evidences of bias contained in the Murphy report. We must adopt the premise that even one evidence of partiality or bias is sufficient to warrant a conclusion of the failure on the part of the Murphy committee to follow its instructions to examine impartially, but with an American viewpoint.

We must, on a point of personal privilege, first jump ahead to page 20 of the Murphy report to refute a base attempt at character assassination. The inferences contained on page 20 are utterly unworthy of any American Legion report much more so when it bears the signature of a past national commander.

On page 20, the Murphy committee infers that all opposition to UNESCO has a common source: Gerald L. K. Smith. It ties in, by inference, all those Legionnaires who disagree with Murphy to a character who is regarded by all as much an enemy to the American way of life as is UNESCO.

In the name of hundreds of good solid American Legion members from many departments who have spent many hundred hours of cumulative study of UNESCO this committee registers a protest and demands apology from the Murphy group.

The Murphy report opens with a lengthy discussion of the attack on UNESCO in Los Angeles. It quotes from numerous letters, resolutions, and reports, some of which quotations are seriously out of context. It speaks of the bitterness and recrimination of the Los Angeles fight with charges and counter charges and then by a method of thought known only to the Murphy committee comes up with the conclusion that it was all a tempest in a teapot; there was never any problem of UNESCO in the schools of Los Angeles. Therefore, a total of 67 civic organizations, 5 metropolitan newspapers, the members of the board of education, and the entire membership of Los Angeles County Council. The American Legion were all running around in circles trying to make noise. The fact that more than 100 newspapers and several national magazines featured the story of the Los Angeles fight on UNESCO did not register at all with the Murphy committee.

WORLD GOVERNMENT

The two principal objections raised in the Los Angeles exposé were the publications in use: "The E in UNESCO" and the series "Toward World Understanding." Both these objectionable publications are passed over by the Murphy committee as hardly worthy of its consideration. This despite the fact that in the Murphy report itself quotations from "Toward World Understanding" bear out the contention that they are designed to condition the minds of schoolchildren to an acceptance of world government.

Regarding the publication "The E in UNESCO" the Murphy committee points out that it was published by the curriculum division of the Los Angeles school system therefore it could not be charged against UNESCO. The Murphy committee did not recite the fact that the publication was distributed by the American Association for the United Nations; it did not recite the fact that "The E in UNESCO" recommended the series "Toward World Understanding" as a handbook series for teachers; it did not recite the fact that "The E in UNESCO" impresses on the teacher the importance of teaching and advocating the infamous international bill of rights. (The international bill of rights is the implementing tool of the entire con-

spiracy to destroy the sovereignty of the United States.)

The report did not recite the fact that "The E in UNESCO" carries a bibliography of recommended reading for teachers many books of which were authored by cited Communists.

No, the Murphy committee found no harm in this publication because it was published by the Los Angeles school board.

The series "Toward World Understanding" is likewise passed over lightly by the Murphy committee. On page 66 of its report, the Murphy committee says: "Your special committee holds no brief for the series, 'Toward World Understanding', and especially none for volumes IV, V, and VI. At best the latter are poor pedagogy, and in parts, volume V particularly, crassly stupid, and from an American point of view incredibly vicious." We join in any fair condemnation of it.

DESTROY SOVEREIGNTY

The Murphy committee then accepts the fact that those volumes of the series "Toward World Understanding" hides behind a disclaimer printed on the flyleaf. This disclaimer proclaims the opinions expressed as those of the authors rather than of UNESCO. Could the Murphy committee have been sincerely taken in by this device? Especially whe nthose same volumes, on the back cover bear the following: "Toward World Understandings," a series of UNESCO publications for teachers.

The Murphy committee also points out that in no instance could it find any evidence of the volume Toward World Understanding having reached the hands of children. The Murphy committee forgot that the entire series were designed not to reach the children but rather as handbooks for teachers.

For the most part the report of the Murphy committee is, rather than a report of its own investigation into UNESCO, an answer to charges made against UNESCO by the American Flag Committee in its letter 13, dated October 1951.

The American Flag Committee has no connection with the American Legion. The various investigating groups of several departments of the American Legion have, as far as is known, no connection with the American Flag Committee.

The many pages of the Murphy report which are given up to answering the charges of the American Flag Committee are, therefore, completely unwarranted and out of context. It would appear that the Murphy committee has well earned the thanks of UNESCO for having given up its time in the defense of UNESCO against the American Flag Committee, but it is not the concern of the American Legion, nor is it in keeping with the instructions to the Murphy committee.

The Murphy report lays stress on the use of a quotation from a speech of William Benton as evidence of world-mindedness. It quotes the entire speech and stresses the entire sentence from which the quotation emanates. The entire sentence follows: "We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty and of persuading the peoples of this world to study each other and to cooperate with each other."

The Murphy committee has evidently forgotten its study of English syntax; this is a compound sentence having a common subject with two separate ideas tied together with the conjunction "and." Proper rhetoric would eliminate the contraction, and the sentence would then read as follows: "We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty and we are at the beginning of a long process of persuading the peoples of this world to study each other and to cooperate with each other." The use of the quotation is, therefore, not out of context.

Benton said it; Benton was in an official capacity when he said it; we must believe that he meant what he said or else throw out every official act and statement of this man.

UNESCO FIRST

In this same vein, the Murphy committee defends others for similar utterances. Many words are used to point out that Mr. Milton Eisenhower did not mean what he said in a speech made as Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Continuing in the same vein, the Murphy committee did not find in its "thorough" investigation of UNESCO the speech of Mr. James Marshall, a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, as printed on page 207 of the records of the General Conference of UNESCO held in Mexico in 1947, volume 1, proceedings. The opening paragraph of this speech follows:

"Mr. JAMES MARSHALL (United States). Fellow delegates, as we examine this question, I hope we can join together in trying to decide what will be best for UNESCO. I may say for the delegation of the United States and for the National Commission in the United States, of which Mr. Milton Eisenhower is Chairman, that the constant effort of each individual is to discover and to determine what is best for UNESCO. The question we ask ourselves is never 'What is best for the United States?' but 'What is best for UNESCO?' It is the judgment of the United States Government, of the National Commission and of the delegation here that what is best for UNESCO will, in the long run, be best for the United States, even if seemingly against short-term interest. This is our attitude and I will testify personally to this conference that in my 2 years and more of responsibility for UNESCO on behalf of the United States Government, I have only once, in the case of one individual, heard the issue injected into the discussions on UNESCO of 'What is best for the United States?'"

Had the Murphy committee been conducting an investigation into UNESCO instead of a defense of UNESCO it might have found this speech. It is felt that Mr. Murphy and his committee would have been rather hard pressed to explain away this utterance which verges on treason.

CHARACTER ASSASSINATION

On page 78 of its report the Murphy committee again approaches character assassination. The following is a direct quotation:

"After 18 months of careful study and laborious research we find the evidence to be overwhelming that UNESCO is none of the things these good people fear, nor is it any of the things that evil and malicious men and organizations charge."

This can only be taken as a smear of the character of every member of the American Legion who voted approval in post, district, department, and national conclave of the mandated stand of the American Legion against UNESCO. This cannot stand and the Murphy committee deserves severe criticism for its insulting indictment.

Several pages of the Murphy committee report are given over to a recital of the fact that the United States Chamber of Commerce also had a national investigation into UNESCO which was followed by approval of UNESCO. The Murphy committee did not find that the method used in gaining chamber of commerce approval are the same methods and tactics as practiced by the Murphy committee. It did not find and point out that the chamber of commerce matter was directed by Mr. Harry A. Bullis. It did not examine into the background of Mr. Harry A. Bullis. It did point out that because the chamber of commerce found UNESCO pure, we, the American Legion, should do likewise.

Had the Murphy committee examined into Mr. Bullis it would have found, among other things the following organizations and associates: Member, national advisory board, United World Federalists, Inc.; associates, Sergei Koussevitzky, Einstein, Munford, Urey, Karl Van Doren, Isadore Lubin, etc.; member of Committee on the Present Danger. World Government Highlights, revised edition (UWF publication) quotes a letter Bullis write to UWF June 9, 1949: "We must strengthen the U. N. into a limited world government with a police force strong enough to maintain peace throughout the earth." It is felt that the above is sufficient to show that he is hardly the man whose lead should be followed by the American Legion despite the advice of the Murphy committee.

On pages 51–52 of its report, the Murphy committee discusses a charge which has been repeatedly made against William G. Carr. It has been charged that Carr advocated changes in the United Nations Charter to create a world government. The committee says that it has not read Carr's book, One World in the Making. (No mention is made of other books authored by Carr.) However, the committee feels that because he holds an executive position in the NEA and because the American Legion has a special committee in liaison with NEA therefore Mr. Carr could not possibly mean what is said in his various publications.

On pages 44 and 45 of its report the Murphy committee denies any connection or influence on UNESCO by either Hiss or Harry Dexter White.

ALGER HISS AGAIN

In a report of the proceeding of the Utrecht Conference UNESCO–U. N. seminar in London, November 1948 published by NCEA, is mention of a meeting at Adelphi College at which Alger Hiss was present and spoke at the meeting: his subject, Achievements of the United Nations.

Harry Dexter White, according to the Murphy report, had nothing to do with UNESCO, but rather with the establishment of ECOSOG (United Nations Economic and Social Council) which was a forerunner of UNESCO. What difference in name. The influence was there.

On pages 111 through 114 the Murphy committee rather unfairly compares the United States Constitution and the United Nations Charter. This in connection with the charge that UNESCO is godless and that the U. N. is godless. The Murphy committee finds that if the U. N. is atheistic because of the lack of mention of the Deity in its charter then the United States must also be atheistic, for the same reason. Consideration is not given to the fact that regardless of the omission of the Deity from the United States Constitution, all official gatherings of the United States are opened with prayer; Congress, the United States Supreme Court, even down to informal gatherings open with acknowledgments to God. The Declaration of Independence pays homage to God. Our coins bear the legend "In God We Trust."

As previously stated in this evaluation of the Murphy report it is conscientiously felt that the Murphy report is less the result of an impartial investigation into UNESCO and to too great a degree a defense of UNESCO against the attacks of the American Flag Committee. It is felt that a proper study of even a little of the mentioned material or even the short perusal of the herewith offered exhibits, 1 through 5, by the American Legion will prove conclusively that the Murphy report is false, vicious, and entirely out of spirit with the instructions to that committee. The following recommendations are made:

1. Passage of a resolution reaffirming the stand of the American Legion rejecting and condemning UNESCO as a propaganda tool leading to the loss of sovereignty of the United States. Resolution 13, August 5, 1952, Fresno convention.

2. Adoption of the resolution passed by Post 667 and the 17th District Department of California which calls for the discharge of the Murphy committee and filing its final report without action.

3. Passage of a resolution censuring the Murphy committee for its attempts at character assassination of all those who opposed it.

4. Investigation of those responsible for the release to the public press of confidential American Legion reports in such a way as to cause misconstruction of such reports.

5. A strong national program of support for the Bricker resolution for amendment of the Constitution of the United States in such a way as to prevent treaty law.

Record of Committee on Public Works in the 84th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I should like to submit a statement concerning the activities of the House Committee on Public Works during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

Our committee has jurisdiction of legislation dealing with the improvement of rivers and harbors and waterways for navigation, flood control, other water uses, and related purposes, and shore protection. It drafts the legislation for the protection and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States.

The Committee on Public Works handles legislation relating to the construction of Government office and post-office buildings throughout the country and lease-purchase agreements for construction of public buildings by private enterprise pursuant to Public Law 519, the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954—title I—and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954—title II.

The committee has jurisdiction in the matter of oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

All bills relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads must be referred to our committee for consideration.

The committee has made a good record in the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

The committee held its first meeting on January 25, 1955, to organize subcommittees and appoint staff personnel and held approximately 80 meetings and hearings thereafter, which I believe is something of a record.

Three hundred and eighty-six bills have been referred to this committee for consideration. In addition, the committee has handled several hundred survey reports on navigation and flood control. These surveys involve a study and review of previous reports of the Corps of Engineers, discussion with corps' personnel, public hearings, and subcommittee as well as full committee action. The committee also acted upon 38 lease-purchase agreements for public buildings. Forty-two bills had favorable action by the committee.

In addition to hearings on individual river and harbor, flood control, and bridge authorizations, river compact agreements, and so forth, public hearings were held on legislative proposals for a national system of interstate and defense highways; revision and restatement of the highway laws; the Niagara power project; amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act; the Inter-American Highway; a new building for the Smithsonian Institution; Lake Michigan water diversion; Great Lakes connecting channels; the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; Southwest Washington redevelopment project; and Mississippi River-St. Louis flood-control improvements.

In the accomplishments listed herein I have had the active cooperation and valuable aid of all committee members. I pay special tribute to Representatives GEORGE H. FALLON, CLIFFORD DAVIS, JOHN A. BLATNIK, and ROBERT E. JONES, JR., who served as chairmen of the subcommittees, and to Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, ranking minority member of the committee and former chairman, who cooperated in every way to perfect the legislation which has been offered to the Congress.

I want to give credit, too, to our efficient and hard-working staff. The committee is fortunate in having capable and experienced staff members and I welcome this opportunity to commend them for a job well done.

American Legion Members, Again Called Upon To Fight Endorsement of UNESCO, Should Demand Explanation of Why Report of Legion's National Americanism Commission Has Been Impounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, with 3 million members and a million members of its auxiliary, is one of the most potent patriotic organizations in the United States.

It is not surprising, therefore, that increasingly strenuous efforts over the past several years have been exerted to persuade the American Legion to put its stamp of approval on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, UNESCO, and to appoint a representative of the American Legion to serve on the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

For several years numerous resolutions have passed various posts and departments against UNESCO, and in 1953 resolution No. 33, censuring UNESCO, was passed by the national executive committee of the American Legion.

Since that time the Special Committee on Covenant on Human Rights, commonly referred to as the Ray Murphy committee because of the chairmanship of same by past national commander, Ray Murphy, has made 2 reports to the national executive committee, practically 100 percent favorable to UNESCO. On three occasions this Murphy committee has recommended the appointment of a representative from the American Legion to serve on the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

The American Legion has not yielded to this persuasion and is still on record against the iniquities of UNESCO and opposed to the appointment of an American Legion representative on the said commission for UNESCO. However, since the Ray Murphy committee presented a 2½-hour oral whitewashing report on UNESCO to the national executive committee at Indianapolis on May 5, 1955, which report was printed in the minutes of the meeting in full and has, I understand, been subsequently printed for a rather wide distribution, and since this report has been referred without approval or disapproval to the National Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion for a report by them at the forthcoming national convention at Miami next October, it seems important to me that the members of the American Legion and others, who are interested in that great patriotic organization, should have the privilege of reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a clear chronological statement of the various actions by the American Legion on UNESCO and its present position.

Furthermore, it seems important to me that the members of the American Legion, who will attend the Miami convention next October and who will be called upon to vote to sustain the present position of the American Legion or to follow the Murphy committee by approving UNESCO and appoint a representative on United States National Commission for UNESCO, should have the privilege also of reading a documented research report which was authorized to be published by the National Americanism Commission on May 2, 1955, but all known copies of which were impounded by the national officials of the American Legion on May 6 and which report has not since been released for distribution. I therefore extend my remarks to include the following:

CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE OF ACTIONS BY THE AMERICAN LEGION ON UNESCO

May 1953, national executive committee meeting:

The national executive committee passed motion to approve Resolution 33 censuring UNESCO. Later, on motion of William G. McKinley, New Jersey, the approval was reconsidered and on motion Mr. McKinley that the resolution was referred to the subcommittee on United Nations of the foreign relations commission for study and report later. (P. 47, digest of minutes, national executive committee, April–May 1953.)

May 1953, national executive committee meeting:

Upon motion of Thomas W. Miller, Nevada, seconded by Wm. G. McKinley, New Jersey, Resolution No. 33, which at an earlier session had been referred to the special com-

mittee on covenant on human rights and United Nations, was recalled from that committee and placed before the committee for consideration. Thereupon substitute or amended resolution was passed as Resolution 33, censuring UNESCO. (P. 123, digest of minutes, national executive committee, April–May 1953, exhibit I.)

September 1953, St. Louis convention:

At the St. Louis convention the foreign relations convention committee in their report provided the following:

"That the national executive committee direct its commission on foreign relations:

"To have its subcommittee on human rights and other agencies continue its study on UNESCO and other independent agencies in the United Nations."

This was in spite of the fact that there is no record of any resolutions concerning UNESCO having been referred to the foreign relations committee at that convention. (P. 40, proceedings, convention at St. Louis, 1953.)

May 1954, national executive committee meeting:

The special committee on covenant on human rights and United Nations made a report very favorable on UNESCO and very critical of the American Legion's established position as set forth in Resolution No. 33. The report was neither approved nor adopted but merely filed. (However, this "whitewashing" report was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD twice and was published throughout the Nation, particularly by the leftwing press as an indication of an about face by the American Legion.) (Pp. 189–193, digest of minutes, national executive committee meeting, May 1954.)

September 1954, Washington convention:

At the Washington convention, Resolution No. 322 was passed reaffirming the position of Resolution No. 33 of 1953 and urging the American Legion not to appoint a representative on the United States National Commission for UNESCO which had been the recommendation of the special committee report filed before the national executive committee in May of 1954. This resolution, No. 322, also provided for continued study of UNESCO by the said special committee. (P. 102, proceedings, convention, Washington, 1954, exhibit II.)

October 1954, national executive committee meeting:

Within less than a month after the Washington convention commitment in Resolution No. 322, against UNESCO, the chairman of the special committee urged that an invitation from the State Department to the American Legion to appoint a representative on the United States National Commission for UNESCO should be accepted and that such representative should be appointed.

October 1954, national executive committee meeting:

The Americanism commission passed Resolution No. 33 (1954) reaffirming the opposition of the American Legion to the teachings of UNESCO and urging that if an invitation to place a representative on UNESCO were presented to the national executive committee that the national executive committee reject it. National executives committee passed this resolution 51 to 6 as No. 33 (1954). (P. 88, digest of minutes national executive committee, October 1954, exhibit III.)

May 2, 1955, meeting executive section of national Americansim commission:

The executive section of the national Americanism commission of the American Legion authorized the publication of a carefully documented research report on UNESCO that had been prepared by the un-American activities research department of national Americanism commission and authorized that that report be delivered to the members of the national executive committee immediately and to the members of the national Americanism commission and for general distribution. Over 100 of these books were printed, assembled and bound on May 5, when the special committee on covenant on human rights and United Nations made its 2½-hour report to national executive committee (exhibit IV).

May 1955, national executive committee meeting:

Past National Commander Murphy made a 2½-hour oral presentation of his 150-page book reporting on UNESCO and it was all defensive of UNESCO or favorable to it. Said report was printed in full in minutes of said meeting. (Pp. 112–176, digest of minutes, national executive committee, May 1955.)

May 5, 1955:

On orders from national adjutant, the un-American activities research department of the national Americanism commission was ordered not to distribute any of their documented research report opposed to UNESCO.

May 6, 1955:

National adjutant's office impounded and took possession of all the 100 research reports that had been printed and bound, all of the extra printed copies not assembled and all of the type plates used in printing and presumably took all of this material back to the national adjutant's office, where it has remained impounded ever since.

May 13, 1955:

The news release of the national public relations section was a complete acceptance of the entire special committee report as though it were absoltuely authentic and documented, which it was not. National public relations section apparently made no effort to ascertain whether or not there was anything on the other side supporting the established position of the American Legion and apparently have not since made any effort so to do.

May 1955:

The national public relations section sent out a suggested speech to the thousands of speakers of the posts and departments over the United States which was singing the praise of the special committee, UNESCO, whitewashing report and giving no comment whatever contrary to the report as presented and indicating that it might result in a reversal of the position of the American Legion.

May 1955:

The American Legion magazine had a column on the Murphy report without any presentation of supporting material for the established position of the American Legion against UNESCO whatsoever, but accepting the Murphy report as though it were a documented fact instead of a self-serving declaration and magnificent defense appeal with the use of the common legal defense of confession and avoidance. (P. 32, the American Legion magazine, May 1955.)

June 1955:

The minutes of the national executive committee meeting of May 1955 printed in full the entire 150-page report—64 printed pages—extolling the greatness of UNESCO. The opening of the minutes on this subject made it appear that it might be uncertain whether or not such report was approved by the statement concerning withdrawal of substitute motion by William Stern, North Dakota, and no comment on admission by proponents that the report was neither being approved nor disapproved. (P. 112, digest of minutes, national executive committee, May 1955.)

July 1955:

The special committee report is running rampant in newspapers friendly and unfriendly to the American Legion all over the United States presenting its arguments and presenting the appearance of an about-face already by the American Legion, while the documented research report showing a few of the iniquities of UNESCO and supporting the present position of the American Legion is still impounded in the national adjutant's office and is not being permitted to be distributed.

NOTE.—It might be significant that 64 pages of digest of minutes, national executive committee, May 4, 5, 6, 1955, are given to printing the entire report of the special committee opposed to the present position of the American Legion and yet similar printed minutes of the national executive committee meeting October 1954, page 88, thoroughly "bollixed up" the incidents leading to the 51-to-6 vote of the national executive committee which passed the national Americanism commission resolution confirming the present position of the American Legion as opposed to any representative of the American Legion being appointed to the United States National Commission for UNESCO. (P. 88, digest of minutes, national executive committee, October 1954.)

EXHIBIT I

RESOLUTION NO. 33—UNESCO

(Passed by national executive committee, May 1953)

Whereas the American educational system since its inception has been used to educate America's youth for a useful, happy, well-ordered life; and

Whereas the teaching of love of God, love of country, and love of home has inspired our people to attain a height of greatness never obtained by any other people; and

Whereas the freedom obtained and guaranteed under our Constitution, together with our free institutions, have created a way of life that is exclusively the American way of life; and

Whereas in our generosity we have poured out assistances to people of the world under the United Nations; and

Whereas those determined plotters who wish to destroy our way of life, capture our wealth, and enslave our people have declared war against our Americanism; and

Whereas they have infiltrated into the United Nations and are using the UNESCO to corrupt the minds of our children by destroying their love of country, by issuing booklets containing statements such as, "Our children should be educated to prepare themselves for citizenship in a world society. As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only precarious results. It is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should, therefore, combat family attitudes that favor jingoism"; and

Whereas our great Americanism program of the American Legion was conceived for the purpose of building a love of country, and we have often been accused of patriotism and jingoism, which means nothing but our willingness to fight to preserve our free institutions, exactly as our fathers fought to establish them. Those who support the theory of UNESCO are at war with the principles of the American Legion. In our fight to defend at all costs our American ideals and our American institutions. It is a part of that same war for world mindedness and world domination with its headquarters in Moscow; and

Whereas in 1952 this war against Americanism was being subsidized by an appropriation of $8,500,000 from the Federal Treasury. You are paying taxes to print such statements as, quote, "Our country belongs to the United Nations, which is the most important organization that has even been created on this earth. You are now a part of it." Another quote, "The kindergarten of infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. Not only can it correct many of the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership, at about the age of seven, in a

group of his own age and habits—the first of many such social identifications that he must achieve on his way to membership in the world society."; and

Whereas for several years certain educational systems have given as their excuse for not teaching more of the fundamentals, such as American history, the three R's, etc.; the fact that there was a shortage of teachers in an overcrowded calendar. But still certain groups can find time and personnel to present the propaganda of these world-minded socialists which ridicule American history and builds a halo on internationalism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we deplore the use of material furnished by the United Nations educational, scientific, and cultural organizations for the use in our public schools; and be it further

Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., April 29–30, May 1, 1953, That we call upon all American educational institutions and upon boards of education throughout the United States to cease and desist from the use of the educational materials of UNESCO propounding world citizenship and adherence to a nebulous world government as a criteria of education of American citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the representatives of the United States to UNESCO to take appropriate measures to cause UNESCO to cease and desist from dissemination of such subversive educational materials.

EXHIBIT II

RESOLUTION NO. 322—OREGON UNESCO TEACHINGS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Passed by national convention, the American Legion, Washington convention, August 30–September 2, 1954)

Whereas the policy of the American Legion in regard to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization was clearly delineated by Resolution No. 33 of the national executive committee meeting in Indianapolis on May 1, 1953; and

Whereas some confusion now exists as to the present American Legion policy toward this same organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled at Washington, D. C., August 30–September 2, 1954, That Resolution No. 33 of the national executive committee, dated May 2, 1953, is hereby reaffirmed as to its resolving clauses: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we deplore the use of material furnished by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization for the use in our public schools; and be it further

Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., April 29–30, May 1, 1953, That we call upon all American educational institutions and upon boards of education throughout the United States to cease and desist from the use of the educational materials of UNESCO propounding world citizenship and adherence to a nebulous world government as a criteria of education of American citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the representatives of the United States to UNESCO to take appropriate measures to cause UNESCO to cease and desist from dissemination of such subversive educational materials; be it still further

Resolved, That studies by the national executive committee now in progress by the special committee on covenant on human rights and United Nations be continued.

EXHIBIT III

The following resolution, originated in the national Americanism commission meeting in Indianapolis October 4, 1954, was overwhelming approved by vote of 51 to 6 of the national executive committee of the American Legion meeting in Indianapolis October 6, 1954 as Resolution No. 33, said resolution as follows:

"Whereas the opposition of the American Legion to the teachings of UNESCO was clearly stated by resolution No. 33, passed by the national executive committee of the American Legion meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., April 29–30–May 1, 1953; and

"Whereas at the national executive committee meeting of May 1954 in Indianapolis the special committee on covenant on human rights and United Nations of the national executive committee filed a report on UNESCO with the national executive committee, on which no approval or other action was taken; and

"Whereas this report largely stated the good things that the United States State Department and the national commission for UNESCO, who are promoting UNESCO, had to say in favor of UNESCO; and

"Whereas this favorable report on UNESCO, though it was neither approved nor adopted by the national executive committee has been copied twice into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with inference of about-face by the American Legion, and has been quoted and referred to by the press of the Nation, both friendly and unfriendly to the American Legion, as an about-face of the American Legion, and as tacit approval of UNESCO by the American Legion; and

"Whereas to clear up this confusion the Americanism convention committee recommended and the Washington convention of the American Legion, August 30–September 2, 1954, passed Resolution No. 322 which reaffirmed the resolving clauses of resolution No. 33 opposing the teachings of UNESCO; and

"Whereas if the American Legion were to authorize the appointment of a representative of the American Legion on the national commission for UNESCO, it could serve only to be used by the promoters of UNESCO's world government program, and by the press as approval of UNESCO by the American Legion: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That should any proposal be made to the national executive committee of the American Legion for approval of the said report filed by the said special committee before the national executive committee, May 1954, or for the appointment or authorization of the appointment of a representative of the American Legion on the national commission for UNESCO, that the national Americanism commisssion hereby urges the national executive committee not to approve said report and not to appoint nor authorize the appointment of any representative or representation whatsoever of the American Legion on the national commission for UNESCO."

EXHIBIT IV

EXCERPTS FROM DIGEST OF MINUTES, NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION, EXECUTIVE SECTION MEETING IN INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 1–2, 1955

8. After some discussion, a motion was adopted that the Americanism commission report on UNESCO be distributed to the members of the national Americanism commission, members of the national executive committee, and be made available for general distribution (p. 5).

Mr. Speaker, it is my information that the impounded, official report of the American Legion's national Americanism commission, dated May 1, 1955, contains the following statements:

The organization known as UNESCO does not contribute to the ideals of 100-percent Americanism within the meaning of the constitution and convention mandates of the American Legion. On the contrary, UNESCO, through its propaganda media, has consistently endeavored to bring about a climate of international mindedness in the United States and a subsequent decay in patriotism, national pride, and national sovereignty.

It is the "present policy of the American Legion," as stated on May 1, 1955, according to the national Americanism commission's report, "that the American Legion in no way affiliate with UNESCO in accordance with resolution No. 33 of the national executive committee, October 1954."

The President's Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post of August 2, 1955, entitled "A Weak Figure in Ike's Cabinet."

This editorial calls for the resignation of the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, because of his woeful record in conserving and developing America's natural resources.

The Denver Post is the leading newspaper of the vast Rocky Mountain area. I think it is additionally significant that the distinguished publisher and editor of the Denver Post, Palmer Hoyt, is a leading Republican, a man who for many years prior to moving to Denver, was the publisher of the pro-Republican Oregonian in Portland, Oreg. Mr. Hoyt also is a supporter of President Eisenhower, so there is no partisan political tinge to his disgust and dissatisfaction with what has been happening to our resources under Secretary McKay's aegis.

I ask that the editorial from the Denver Post of August 2, 1955, appear in its entirety in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WEAK FIGURE IN IKE'S CABINET

Why doesn't Douglas McKay follow Mrs. Hobby in retirement from President Eisenhower's Cabinet? Mr. McKay has been anything but an asset as Secretary of the Interior. When the administration was battling hardest a few weeks ago to authorize two multiple-purpose water projects in the Rocky Mountain empire where was the Secretary? Well, he was making a sentimental journey to the Meuse-Argonne and the hill where he picked up German shrapnel in 1918.

Mr. McKay hasn't helped the Eisenhower administration articulate a water and public works policy that makes sense. He has been of little help in passing legislation that would strengthen the Republican Party's record in that field. Nor has he dramatized the national investment values of reclamation and the use and reuse of water for the benefit of the West, whence he entered high office, or the Nation he is supposed to represent.

The Eisenhower administration put up a fair fight for the Arkansas-Fryingpan and upper Colorado storage projects. But neither

was authorized by the 84th Congress' first session. The Arkansas-Fryingpan failed in the House a year ago, although the Republicans gave it more votes than the Democrats. But this year neither the Arkansas-Fryingpan nor the Colorado River bills got to the floor. The Republicans can blame the Democrats, or California or Governor Johnson if they so desire. But their own Department of Interior must share the blame.

The tide of non-Western opinion against reclamation and related public power, and the historic subsidy therefrom for agriculture, has reached a new high coincident with the Eisenhower administration. Why? The President himself has spoken several times in favor of "basin-wide river development," and the hydroelectric conversion of waterpower where "private industry or local interests," singly or in "partnership," can't do the job.

The President endorsed specifically the two Rocky Mountain projects. And his assistant, Sherman Adams, personally directed the White House staff in a vigorous effort to line up votes for the Colorado River bill in the closing days of the session.

But other than the prosecution of last-minute, bailing out procedures, the administration has pursued no dynamic selling job on western development. That has been, historically, the function of the Interior Department. And Mr. McKay has failed, either from ignorance, indifference, or a calculated compromise engineered by the United States utility industry and its many, many friends.

Mr. McKay's personal integrity, his patriotism, or even his general competence as a politician and public official are not questioned here. He is a likable, courageous, and candid little man whose views are, in most matters, sound and sober (even though, at times, grossly oversimplified). But he has no enthusiasm for the role of championing the economic expansion of a region which now as always relies upon the Department of the Interior for cooperation. And he evidently has been touted away from that feature of his responsibility by the slickest and best-heeled touts of that never-resting gang known as the Washington lobby.

A few weeks ago the Denver Post suggested that perhaps Mr. McKay's failures were not entirely his fault, but were also a reflection of higher confusion of thought and purpose. The Sacramento Bee, commenting upon that editorial, said "The Post may be letting the administration off the hook too easily."

"When the Dixon-Yates contract, anti-public power directives of the Interior Department and other similar documents and actions are considered," the Bee said, "one wonders whether there really is a confusion of thought and purpose. * * * One can wonder whether there is not a very unconfused purpose to stymie or even destroy public power."

That may, indeed, be the contribution for which Mr. McKay will be best and longest known. If that proves to be true, or (as we suspect) many believe it to be true, Mr. Eisenhower would be wise to send his Secretary of Interior out of the country for the duration of the 1956 election year. And he would be wiser still to name a Secretary who would and could use the prestige of a cabinetship to defend and promote the legitimate investment functions of the Central Government.

The people of the United States need a Secretary of the Interior who will act boldly in the demonstrated public interest—one who will not retreat behind the fatuous doubletalk about socialism, the preeminence of local interests, or that frightfully abused phrase "free private enterprise" which is touchingly symbolized by what the late Mr. Ickes aptly described as the barefoot boys of Wall Street.

Meeting Public Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I made at the 56th annual meeting of the American Hospital Association on September 13, 1954.

There being no objection the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING PUBLIC NEEDS

(Address of Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama, before the 56th annual meeting of the American Hospital Association, Chicago, Ill., September 13, 1954)

I should like to say how very happy I am to be here with you this afternoon. It is always a pleasure to meet and talk with old friends, and my friendship with the men and women of the American Hospital Association is an old one—a friendship of working together on common ground in a common cause for the common good.

And, speaking of old friends, permit me to say how good it is to see George Bugbee here, whose inspired vision and devoted labors contributed beyond measure to the development of a program to provide hospital facilities for our country. George Bugbee has exhibited rare statesmanship in the field of health. We wish him the best in his new responsibilities, and I know that in his successor, Dr. Crosby, we have another old friend whose dedication and gifted energies will prove a source of leadership and strength to us all in building the Nation's health.

As an old friend, I am going to talk about working together to build this country's health and our responsibilities as citizens for meeting our public needs. Certainly there is no one here who will dispute that today medical care is a public need of national concern. Indeed, it has been said that the building and maintenance of health must now be added to food, clothing, and shelter as one of life's basic human rights.

When we talk of the health of our people we are talking about the real strength of this Nation. The vitality we must have for survival in this mid-20th century is a matter of health. Health, then, is a subject in which the Federal Government must take a direct interest and have a considerable responsibility.

I do not need to remind you of the record of the rejections of men for the armed services during the last war for reasons of poor health, and the even higher rate of rejection during the Korean war. The record presents an absolutely appalling picture for a country with the natural and material resources at our command. Our security and survival as a nation, our very way of life depend ultimately not on any Federal stockpile program of critical materials or atom bombs, but directly and basically upon our greatest natural resource—human life, men and women of sound mind and body. The health of our citizens must be of grave concern to the Federal Government, as it is to all those associated with the voluntary health system.

What, then, should be the role of the Federal Government in meeting this public need of better health?

I am not unaware of the problems of Federal intervention in programs of medical care. Some people are afraid of the patient lest he overutilize the services available to him. Others fear the doctors—or at least the organized ones. Some even fear hospital administrators. And, of course, many people fear our Government, though it is still our servant, not our master. I do not fear any of these because I have faith in people and in their ability to work together to solve their common problems. Human beings are made for cooperation, not for conflict, and voluntary professional organizations like your hospital association have, and will, point the way toward such cooperation in the field of medical care.

It seems to me that there are three factors which determine the extent of the role of the Federal Government in fields which, today, are largely within its sphere of responsibility. These are:

1. The failure of local and State governments to meet responsibilities in the face of public need.

2. The mobility of our total population; the movement of people from one State to another.

3. The disparity in income and taxable wealth among the various States.

I think it would be interesting to hear what was said on this subject by the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Roswell B. Perkins. In a recent speech, Mr. Perkins said, "The suggestion is frequently made that the Federal Government should return to the States certain sources of tax revenues and terminate Federal grants-in-aid. However, study has shown that this solution is impracticable, at least on any broad scale. * * * There is no assurance that any tax or group of taxes which might be selected to be turned over to the State will provide revenues to an individual States which will be related in any effective way to the need for funds to replace the present Federal grants."

Thus, the present administration, having officially proclaimed its strong belief in decentralization of the Federal Government, has had to recognize the hard fiscal facts of life which have faced previous Presidents, administrations, and Congresses.

None of the three conditions which we have mentioned alters the fundamental relationships between the different levels of Government, but they do decidedly affect the leadership role of the Federal Government in meeting public needs.

Federal leadership in such ventures of national scope as the health of our people is no new event in our history. Soon after the American Colonies won their independence from Britain, the United States established tariffs to protect the infant industries of New England and the hemp industry of Kentucky. With the development of railroads, the Nation willingly gave land and tax exemptions to nurture their growth and make possible the opening of the western country to settlement and development. The establishment of the land-grant colleges, the opening of vast tracts of the public domain for homestead and settlement in the land-rush days, waterways, and harbor development—in all these the States and the Federal Government recognized the need for central leadership and planning if these natural resources were to be fully developed in the public interest.

Today the Nation faces a new phase, with the great issue of the development and use of its atomic-power resources. New ventures challenge the imagination and energies of our people.

As the problems of resource development have grown big in the technological world of science and the machine, so must the means of coping with them be expanded.

More than ever there is need for integrated action—extending through all levels of effort—Government and private, group and individual, with each making his own particular contribution.

But this does not mean that big government is inevitable or desired. It means planning with national results in mind, but the execution of these plans must and should be carried out through local authorities.

I use the TVA as an example. Under TVA, Congress set the national policy. It set the broad outlines of an integrated plan of flood control, navigation, soil restoration, and power production. But in carrying out the mandate of Congress TVA uses local agencies of Government and private organizations.

This is a distinction of, I think, major importance. Congress must and should determine national policy in certain fields. This does not mean, however, that administration of these policies must be on a nationwide or centralized basis.

This is true in the field of health.

The Federal Government, which provides funds, can reserve the right to lay down certain basic standards. But the administration of the program should rest in the hands of local authorities.

The fact is there is no other way to do the job. The task of harmonizing and periodically adjusting the intricate maze of parts that make up the integrated development of resources—human or natural—in a technological world simply cannot be done effectively from some remote government or business headquarters.

Alexander Hamilton, our country's foremost advocate of a strong Central Government, declared, "The more the operations of the national authority are intermingled in the ordinary exercise of government, the more the citizens are accustomed to meet with it in the common occurrences of their political life, the more it is familiarized to their sight and to their feelings, the further it enters into those objects which touch the most sensible chords and put into motion the most active springs of the human heart, the greater will be the probability that it will conciliate the respect and attachment of the community."

And in 1937, in a message to the Congress respecting regional authorities, Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

"It is not wise to direct everything from Washington."

The democracy of decentralized government, which protects the authority of State and local governments from centralized domination while enabling the people to benefit from Federal leadership, funds, and coordination, has long been a personal conviction. As you of the American Hospital Association know, we have, in fact, embodied this philosophy in the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

In 1946, when Senator Burton and I authored the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, we not only recognized the urgent need for more hospitals and better medical care, but we were convinced that the only way to defeat a compulsory health-insurance system was with an effectively functioning voluntary system. It seemed clear to us that the first step toward the goal of bringing the benefits of modern medicine within the reach of all our people was to make certain that hospital beds were available when needed. It seemed to us that hospitals and voluntary health insurance had to advance together. One could not proceed very far nor very satisfactorily without the other. Hospitals not only have to be paid for, they have to be maintained. Health insurance provides hospitals the means for a steady income. On the other hand, the extension of health insurance beyond the capacity of hospitals to supply beds when needed would only serve to aggravate the shortage of beds and increase the pressure for a socialized system.

I am in thorough agreement with the demonstrated philosophy of your American Hospital Association—a philosophy that believes the way to avoid the evils of socialized health care is to make sure that the voluntary system can do the job.

The forthright and inspired leadership of the American Hospital Association stands as a challenge to all citizen organizations dedicated to the good of the people.

You recognized that public needs had to be met and that there was little opportunity for bringing the benefits of modern medicine to millions of our population without adequate facilities.

As evidence of your association's vital role in meeting these needs, I recall that you scheduled a series of regional conferences held throughout the country last year. These meetings were designed to bring together individuals who had been closely associated with and were well informed on the operations of the Hill-Burton program, in order to determine what their thinking was about the program—whether they had major criticism concerning it and, in general, what their evaluation was as to its operation. The report of these conferences demonstrated that this program for the construction of hospitals and health facilities has been one of the most productive, best administered, and successful ventures into which the Federal Government has ever entered.

The program has been an example of Federal, State, and local community cooperation, and most important for us here, it derives its real strength from the fact that it is government and voluntary enterprise working together.

There are a number of important principles which were built into this program. They are not there by chance. They have had much to do with its success and can well serve as a basis for the expenditure of Federal funds for meeting public needs in other fields. These are:

1. A demonstrated need, substantiated by study and survey.
2. Local decision of greatest need and priority for expenditure of funds.
3. Maximum administrative authority given to the States.
4. Joint financing by all parties concerned.
5. General coordination and supervision by the responsible Federal Government agency.
6. Requirement that there be local responsibility for the operation of any facility.
7. A Federal council to review administrative procedures to insure that the Federal administrator does not act in an arbitrary manner.
8. A formula for the division of funds which recognizes the relative needs of different sections of the country and their ability to meet these needs.
9. Procedures which minimize political influence.

Perhaps more important than all of these principles is the incentive which the grant of Federal funds has given local and State bodies to take action to meet their needs. Our hospital program has demonstrated that when the Government helps to meet the need for hospitals and health facilities by providing assistance grants, the people—with their sense of local responsibility and local leadership—are eager to meet the opportunity and build their own hosptals and health facilities. The stimulus which the program has given to the building of hospitals and health facilities has carried over into many projects which have had no Federal or other governmental funds.

If we are to continue to improve the health of our people and build the strength of our country, we must strengthen the six pillars of health. These are:

1. Adequate numbers of well-trained health personnel—doctors, dentists, nurses, medical technicians.
2. A sufficient number of adequately equipped hospitals, health centers, and other health facilities.
3. Fuller understanding and practice of preventive medicine.
4. Continuation and increase of basic research in all fields of medicine and related sciences.
5. Education: It is the informed person who knows best how to take care of himself and preserve his health.
6. Conservation and enrichment of our soil. The minerals and nutrients which feed and make up our bodies come to us from the plants and products of the soil. Much disease and illness is attributed to deficiencies in our soil.

And I would suggest there is a seventh pillar essential to our health system. It is the newest one, and that is, the full use of voluntary prepayment insurance to finance the costs of needed health services. This instrumentality for easing the burden of the financial costs of illness, which through the years has weighed heavily on family income, can only attain its final goal through the support and participation of everyone, and this includes, I believe, the Federal Government. The voluntary health insurance bill, introduced on behalf of myself and several other Senators as a bipartisan measure, is aimed at bringing about the participation of the Federal Government, embodying the experience and philosophy of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

Other problems in the field of health remain unsolved. These have been studied by committees of Congress, the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, and most recently by the Commission on Financing of Hospital Care, sponsored by your association.

There must be an intelligent seeking for a sound basis of joint participation between local, State and Federal Government with the great voluntary health organizations of our country. The stimulus and incentive which the Federal Government can provide in these affairs does not weaken State and local government; quite to the contrary, it makes it possible for many States and local governments to discharge their responsibility, and thereby safeguards their rights.

If we do things in the voluntary way with a joining of hands and with each fulfilling its responsibilities, our American system of government is strengthened in all its parts, the vitality of our Nation is quickened and preserved, and we hold fast to the principles of democracy proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson:

"Where every man is a sharer in the direction of his government * * * and feels that he is a participator in the government of affairs."

In this spirit, let us move forward in the great mission to which you dedicate your labor and your lives.

The struggles of today are not for today alone, but for a vast future.

Misunderstood and Misapplied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial concerning current widespread misuse of the Attorney General's subversive listing appeared in the August 1 edition of the Detroit Times. I am sure that countless loyal Americans, who passionately believe in and pursue

the principles of democracy, who, like the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the United States court of appeals, are certainly not soft toward communism, are grateful for these warning against all too prevalent undemocratic and unjust practices.

THE SUBVERSIVE LIST: "MISUNDERSTOOD AND MISAPPLIED"

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, a group certainly not soft toward communism, has lately asserted that the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations has been "widely misunderstood and misapplied."

When the list was first circulated in 1947, it was intended primarily as a guide for helping to determine fitness for Government employment under the security program.

Supposedly, it still should be used in that manner. But in actual practice, by both public and private agencies, it has become a highly effective blacklist. Anyone who has been a member of a listed organization is automatically suspect until he can clear his name.

Under Presidential order, the Attorney General can, after appropriate investigation and determination, place an organization on his subversive list.

Until 2 years ago, listed organizations were denied opportunity to dispute the subversive label hung on them. Then, after the Supreme Court had thrown some doubts on the list, provision was made for a hearing procedure in contested cases.

To be sure, not many of the 263 organizations now on the list have bothered to demand hearings—probably because it could be so readily shown that they are somewhere in the pink-to-red spectrum.

But some of them have asked to be heard, and only now has the first of these been granted opportunity to defend itself. That is the Independent Socialist League. Its officers say they have tried 15 times in the past 6 years to get a hearing before the Attorney General so they can prove the injustice of the designation.

We don't know whether the league is a subversive organization. We do know that under American standards of justice the accused is entitled to his day in court—or in this case, in the hearing room.

And no matter how any subversive list organization comes out at a hearing, or even whether it asks for one, there is another factor to bear in mind in the matter of past membership in such groups.

It is the political climate of 1930, and in the years when we were military allies of communism.

Many an idealist, opposing fascism, or Franco's bloody role in the Spanish civil war, joined altruistic-sounding Communist-front organizations, only to resign in disgust and disillusionment when he discovered what he had gotten into.

There are reliable estimates that more than 700,000 Americans have left the Communist Party in the past 30 years. How many additional thousands similarly found they had made a wrong choice by joining frontist groups and quit them? Nobody knows, but the total probably is immense.

Over all these people hangs the knowledge that because they were once gullible or callow, and in either case much too dewy-eyed, they may at any time encounter serious—and sometimes publicly paraded—doubts as to their loyalty.

The subcommittee's words should carry at least some comfort to those who learned of communism's foulness by touching it—often without knowing that it was communism they were touching until too late.

So, too, should a recent ruling of the United States court of appeals in Washington. Refusing to evict two individuals from a Federal housing project because they refused to sign oaths of nonmembership in subversive organizations, the court cited two principles.

One was that refusal to take such an oath was not legal proof of the fact of membership. The other that even proof that they were members of such a group but knowing nothing of its character would be arbitrary ground for evicting the two.

It would be less than Christian not to go at least as far as the subcommittee and the court in making sure that the Attorney General's subversive organization list is not misused or misapplied as a measure of an individual's good citizenship.

Hardie Ranch Paces County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Ernest Kirsch, county agent in Gilliam County, Oreg., in reporting to the Portland Oregonian of July 24, 1955, has described the conservation practices of W. D. Hardie and sons, Bill and Earl, the winners of the Gilliam County title of "conservation man of the year" award for 1955. This describes a pattern that should be an inspiration to every farmer who is earnestly endeavoring to follow good conservation practices. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have Mr. Kirsch's article included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARDIE RANCH PACES COUNTY
(By Ernest Kirsch)

Trashy fallow—some 900 acres of it—in an area where this practice is rare earned W. D. Hardie and sons, Bill and Earl, the Gilliam County Conservation Man of the Year award for 1955.

Leaving a trashy blanket of stubble on the surface is the Hardies' main weapon in their fight to hold their wheatland on steep hillsides where erosion and gullying has been a bad problem.

STRIP FINALLY ADOPTED

On one 239-acre field where trashy fallow wasn't enough to stop soil washing, they use rotary subsoiling and similar practices, and now are farming the field with alternate strips of crop and fallow.

"I consider stripcropping a last resort, but this field needs it," Bill Hardie, Jr., told farmers during a recent conservation tour.

The Hardie farm is in the Trailfork and Lost Valley communities southeast of Condon. It includes 10,000 acres of range and 2,400 acres of cropland, of which about 1,600 acres is in wheat and the rest in hay, pasture, and barley.

To make their trashy fallow, the Hardies use the method suggested by Howard Cushman, Oregon State College, in a recent Extension circular. They use a sweep plow trailing a skew trader. Rod weeders are equipped with spiral attachments the first time over.

SOD PAVES WATERWAYS

More than 4,000 feet of draws in grain fields have been seeded down to form sod waterways that lead water gently down slopes. Extensive use is made of nitrogen fertilizer. This year anhydrous ammonia was put on 400 acres of summer fallow, and 300 acres of winter wheat also were fertilized. The Hardies say 30 to 35 pounds of nitrogen to the acre maintain high yields with trashy fallow.

Cross fences permit uniform utilization of rangelands. Other grazing land practices include spring developments and crested wheat seedings.

The Hardies operate as a team in running the ranch. As Bill told the selection committee:

"Dad is responsible for the trashy fallow and I insisted on the stripcropping. Earl looks after the range practices."

As Gilliam County winners, the Hardies will compete against winners from other counties for the State award. The conservation contest is sponsored by the Oregon Wheat Growers League and the Oregonian.

Why Is a Congressman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the July 31 edition of the Detroit Times, I think, expresses the general reaction to the failure of Congress to enact highway legislation during this session of Congress, because we were not able to resolve differences regarding the financing of this program. I fervently hope that the President will call a special session of Congress to consider this situation as soon as practicable. I am sure that others, in addition to the people of Michigan, have begun negotiations to proceed with new highway constructions under the assurance that Congress would enact legislation this session. The delay in this program can result in tremendous financial losses to States which have plans in process which might not be in accord with the program as finally enacted.

I am in agreement that this problem is of critical concern to the American people and that it should be resolved in Congress without delay.

WHY IS A CONGRESSMAN?

If you don't want to think about the traffic jams you'll be in today as you and your family try to take a ride in the country, you might think about Congressmen.

As you notice the ambulances and wreckers and State police cars heading toward the latest highway disaster, notice also what went on last week in Washington.

Congressmen of both parties, stampeded by lobbyists representing industries that make good money from the use of the highways, voted down any attempt to get you out of the traffic chaos or to make the ambulance trips unnecessary.

The lobbyists and our Representatives all piously agreed that better roads are absolutely vital.

They also agreed that it was absolutely vital that somebody else pay for constructing them and that it was absolutely vital that everybody get reelected.

Realizing what they had done, after they had made sure they had done it, the Congressmen pointed at the trucking industry lobby as the villain.

And the truckers, after the bills were well sunk, issued statements that Congress should never have acted like that; that President Eisenhower was right when he criticized Congress and demanded reconsideration of its failure to pass a bill.

The same people who caused 100,000 telegrams to flood into Washington demanding the defeat highway legislation, issued press releases that said the recipients of the telegrams must have misunderstood.

The 100,000 telegrams came from a tiny minority of the American business industry.

We wonder what might happen if the American people sent in telegrams themselves, preferably after a frustrating, dangerous day on the roads the Congressmen refused to improve.

In fact, why don't you do it right now?

We don't know whether you mean as much as a lobbyist does to your Congresman, but we're pretty sure a lot of you acting together mean more, much more.

Why not let your Congressman know what you think about the House action last week and tell him to start all over again right now and pass a bill?

And tell him to stay in Washington until he does.

Water Problems in My Soil Convervation District and on My Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, conservation is a broad subject. It has many phases. Those who subscribe wholeheartedly to the gospel of conservation are numbered in the millions. Realizing the fundamental feeling man has for the land, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts asked churches to observe Soil Conservation Sunday this year in May. Thousands of ministers reverently observed the occasion.

Further emphasis on the philosophy of conservation has been stimulated by NASCD through its annual speech contest. Last year's national winner was Clarence Rogers, Salem, W. Va. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his speech Water Problems in My Soil Conservation District and on My Farm, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER PROBLEMS IN MY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT AND ON MY FARM

(By Clarence M. Rogers, Salem, W. Va.)

(Condensation of winning speech, 1954 national speaking contest)

The power and usefulness of water were introduced to me in an unusual way. In 1943 I left the practice of law in the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., to begin three very interesting years of service with the United States Navy. As ofttimes occurred, the Navy did not need the service for which I had been trained. So they placed me in the growing and vital field of aerology—the Navy's name for the study of the weather. One of the most acceptable parts of my training, provided at the University of Chicago, was the study of cloud formations. This made clear to me the tremendous part that water plays in the energy transfers which occur in the atmosphere around and above us. I still stand in awe as I look at a towering cumulous cloud rising 30,000 to 40,000 feet above me, a sheer white mountain made of water suspended in air but containing enough pent-up energy to light a dozen cities a month or more. Rain to the aerologist was not nearly so much of a problem as fog, ice, or snow, but whatever its form, water causes us great concern.

After leaving the Navy I purchased a small farm about 1 mile from the city of Salem, W. Va. In was apparent to me from the first that water was going to be just as much of a problem on the farm as it was in the Navy, and I began to investigate ways and means for handling it. In this manner I came to know of the work of the West Fork Soil Conservation District and of the related services with which it cooperates.

"FEAST OR FAMINE"

Our major water problems appear to be basically two in number. First, how can the small tributaries of the West Fork River in Harrison and Lewis Counties, of Middle Island Creek in Doddridge County, and of the Little Kanahwa River in Gilmer County, be so controlled during periods of heavy rainfall that downstream flooding and soil erosion are avoided? Second: How can those same watersheds provide reservoirs which will supply the surface and subsurface water for periods of drought?

Since 1896 the city of Salem and lands lying along the banks of these streams have been subject to repeated floods. These floods occur more frequently in June than in any other month of the year. Seldom a year has passed during the last 58 when we have not had a flood. Damages over that period of time have been enormous. It is estimated that the annual loss of soil material is approximately 23,000 tons from that watershed alone. Sedimentation damage caused by the deposit of silt in the hay crop and the filling of stream channels is extensive. The 1950 flood alone damaged 73 houses and 65 business places within the city of Salem and caused a total damage of approximately $233,000. A small community cannot withstand such losses and survive. It becomes a matter of concern to every citizen to seek ways to prevent such catastrophes.

A somewhat similar picture can be painted of every community within the West Fork Soil Conservation District. Clarksburg and Weston, the two most populous areas within the district have been the victims of frequent and oftentimes very damaging floods. Hundreds of acres of bottom land have suffered too, and countless tons of soil have been carried downstream.

But let us return to our illustration. When it is not too wet in Salem, it is often too dry. The shortage of water for the city of Salem has been almost as much a problem as the floods. Water for the city has in the past been obtained from deep wells, and as the demand has increased the supply of ground water has diminished. During recent years the water supply has been so low during the dry periods that the householders have not had sufficient water for everyday use and a serious fire hazard has existed within the town.

This situation, too, is not peculiar to Salem. The city of Clarksburg only last year was considering the piping of water many miles from the Buckhannon River in order to alleviate a serious shortage caused by the drying up of the small streams throughout the watershed and an insufficient flow in the West Fork River to provide for the needs of the city. Farm wells and springs which have never been known to go dry, are year-by-year, in increasing numbers, ceasing to produce water.

SOIL CONSERVATION IS THE ANSWER

As a result of this condition throughout the watershed area, there has been a growing conviction in the minds of farmers and cityfolk alike that the answer to the twin threats of flood or drought is soil conservation. The West Fork Soil Conservation District, for many years now, has been working patiently, thoroughly, and democratically to bring about the feeling and the desire within the minds of the people that these perennial problems do not have to be—they can be beaten. This beating is now being administered by the West Fork Soil Conservation District in cooperation with many public and private agencies in the area and with the active participation of many cooperators.

There are again two main attacks to the problems. One is to work directly with the cooperators in the use of soil conservation practices. The other is to provide the public with effective information on the prime and basic importance of soil conservation to our entire economy. These have been initiated, planned, and encouraged by the supervisors of our district.

The first approach brought about within the district during the year 1953 not less than 35 different types of soil conservation activities carried on by the cooperators and the district, with the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service and the help of other agencies. Contour farming, strip cropping, tree planting, pasture improvement, building of farm ponds, digging diversion ditches and constructing open and closed drains—these are a few of the many scientific practices undertaken. Today in the West Fork Conservation District there are 4,000 active cooperators with more than 430,000 acres of land under a planned soil conservation program. This acreage represents 46 percent of the total area in the district. Although there is much, much more to do, this is no mean accomplishment and does not yet tell the whole story.

I should pause at this point to say a word about the individual employees of the Soil Conservation Service. Time after time, I have found them out in all kinds of weather, working from early in the morning to late in the evening, assisting the farmer and landowner with his problems in soil conservation and farm planning. It seems to be characteristic of their lot that each has a cheerful disposition, a keen desire to cooperate, and a willingness to be patient with the demands and eccentricities of the individual cooperator. As a group, these men seem to have caught the spirit of a democratic society, as few Government-employed groups have done in the past. Our district supervisors meet regularly and, though unpaid, spend many valuable hours in planning and directing the work of conserving our land and water.

The second approach to our water problems is through the activities of the soil conservation district in making known to people throughout the district the importance of soil conservation and the urgent need for constant and active endeavor to practice it wherever it is possible. This has been accomplished by planned tours of the pilot watershed project at Salem; by regular news articles in the daily and weekly newspapers covering the areas; by demonstrations made by trained Soil Conservation Service employees cooperating with the district planning committee; by the use of visual aids in schools, churches, civic clubs, and at other gatherings; by exhibits at fairs, schools, and at other public assembly areas; by use of the radio and the speaker's platform; by encouraging participation in soil conservation contests of both local and national scope; by contact with vocational agriculture classes and other special interest groups, as the Boy Scouts, 4-H clubs, and Future Farmers of America; by cooperation with Federal and State agencies and home

demonstration and county agents; and by enlisting the interest and support of community leaders.

MANY HANDS MAKE LIGHT WORK

At home, when we all get in the kitchen, to wash and dry the dishes, the children find that the work is done before they have stopped complaining about having to do it. We are beginning to realize that the same thing is true when we face the water problems of our area. The district has repeatedly made known to us that any undertaking is a voluntary one and that its chances for success on a community level are directly dependent on the degree of total participation of the community in the conservation practice or practices started. Leading the way, the supervisors of the district have tied together for us, on an area basis, the potential of the Hope Natural Gas Co., the South Penn Natural Gas Co., the Equitable Gas Co., the Monongahela Power Co., the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the Eureka Pipe Line Co., and other private agencies as well as many State and Federal services to aid in the soil conservation program in the district. As an example of how this works, let us return to the upper Tenmile watershed project. Several pipelines required removal and relaying before work could be completed on the first two dams—an expensive item. The expense was largely borne by the companies involved. It was also necessary to move an electric line. This was done gladly by the company. The expenditures by the city of Salem for the building of its dam and reservoir were approved by the people of the town, and even though started as an independent project, it has been dovetailed into the total watershed development program.

Lest you think that the Salem watershed project is the only work of the district, let me point out that the practices which are used in that project are listed separately from the regular district practices and are not included in its report for the first 6 months of 1954. This report shows that 73 farm ponds have been built, 14,625 lineal feet of stream channeled, 165 acres contour farmed, 1,277 acres pasture improvement, and 241 acres of trees planted. Many other practices could be cited which indicate that the cooperators on the rivers and streams in this district are contour by contour and tree by tree adding to the ability of the land to hold its own against the recurring rains. They are by the addition of pond and tree and grass and sod permitting the land to store more water for those sunny days when it will be needed. Each cooperator makes a contribution which may be insignificant in itself but which when totaled with all the rest makes possible the control of the lifeblood of a nation—its water.

THE GREATER BLESSING

Standing beside a small stream I have many times tossed a stick or piece of wood into the water and watched it lazily ride the moving water until it is lost to sight. I have always wondered, "Where will it finally stop? Will it some day follow the Monongahela River to its junction with the Allegheny at the industrial triangle of Pittsburgh, there to become a part of the great Ohio River and finally to meet the mighty Mississippi and move, twisting and turning with that great river until it is lost in the Gulf of Mexico?" Perhaps. And then I realize that it is likewise so with the rushing turbulent waters that come from our hillsides when heavy rains are here and the small, almost silent runs, become damaging torrents which grow larger and more frightening as they sweep downstream to be joined by others.

Have you seen a house or a store or an automobile, which by chance may not have been completely destroyed, but which has been flooded by silt and disease-laden waters of some river? It is not an encouraging thing to return to, and oftentimes the property or building may be damaged so extensively that it has to be razed. The owner starts again from scratch. Far more important is the loss of life which sometimes occurs when waters rise quickly and people are unprepared. The soil conservation practices advocated and planned by the West Fork Soil Conservation District are so essentially a part of the control of floods in the metropolitan areas of Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Parkersburg, Huntington, and Cincinnati that I feel bound to recognize and use the benefits offered me through the district. Not only do these practices help to protect thousands of people and countless millions of dollars of property in downstream cities; but these same practices provide during periods of drought a more steady, even flow of water in the streams and rivers for the use and benefit of those same people and many thousands more who depend upon the rivers for water supply and recreational use; for industry, trade, and commerce.

SOIL CONSERVATION STARTS AT HOME

Even though I really began my soil-conservation work in 1947, I feel that I have been a true conservationist for many, many years. If you were to take a look at my basement and attic you would have ample proof of the fact—everything I've had for the past 30 years is still there—if you can find it.

This past year the Salem watershed project undertook the construction of one of the flood detention dams on the small stream which separates my property from that of my neighbor. This assures me that the portion of my farm below the dam will, in all probability, never be flooded again, that there will always be a permanent pool of water above the dam to be used for fish and recreational purposes and which is also available for fire protection for those neighbors who are reasonably close. Five thousand evergreen trees have been planted on the hillside above the pond. These trees will help to hold the soil, decrease the silting of the pond, and provide my children 10 years from now with Christmas tree money to attend college. In addition there are 10,000 more evergreens now being set out to complete the reforestation of the hillside that is subject to erosion.

Conservation of natural resources can give us some helpful pointers toward conservation of human resources. Just as God has created a balance between the energy which this world receives from the sun and the energy which it discharges into the outer atmosphere, so a balance must be found in our conservation practices which will assure us that there is as much being replaced or held in the soil as is being taken out. In that accomplishment we will find that we must ourselves give out as much as we take in; that we must repay to society those years of loving care that were provided for us by our parents by giving such care to our children and others. We must acknowledge God's gift of land and water and life, by humble, sincere, and intelligent use of these resources.

Third Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared concerning the third anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Monday, July 25, 1955, marked the third anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It is a day of great significance, and of celebration and rejoicing for our 2¼ million fellow American citizens in Puerto Rico, and one of which the Senate of the United States should take cognizance, and in which all Americans can take just pride.

Mr. President, I am sure that most of the Members of the Senate will recall how the Puerto Rican people through their elected leaders submitted to the 81st Congress something new and unique to the United States political system when they petitioned for authority in the form of a compact to organize themselves into a Commonwealth Government, with all proper powers of self-determination except for certain powers reserved to the United States Government.

This petition on the part of the Puerto Rican people was something new and different. It showed political inspiration and political imagination in planning a new system of government within the American framework to meet the new and unusual problems posed by the truly phenomenal economic and cultural progress of the people of Puerto Rico in their half-century under the American flag.

As the Members of the Senate know, Puerto Rico is a land of long-established civilization in a character remindful of Old World customs and traditions. Ponce de Leon started its settlement before he set out for Florida on his legendary search. The first bishop in the New World was Alonso Manso, the first bishop of Puerto Rico. The oldest church under our flag today is the San Jose Church in San Juan.

While possessing unsurpassed beauty and charm, the island is deficient in natural resources. Two and one-quarter million people live in an area of 3,500 square miles, of which only a part is arable. So far, few mineral resources have been discovered. But the people themselves have compensated for their lack of natural resources in their spiritual, mental, and physical energy.

Today, still a long way from the ultimate goal of eliminating unemployment, Puerto Rico has made tremendous strides toward the more abundant life for her people. Everywhere in this tiny island in a large sea the signs of progress can be seen. You will find there hotels comparing favorably with any in the New World, roads rivaling our best highways, an airport second to none, modern new factories, efficient and productive, albeit tiny by continental comparisons. You will find sanitary conditions which have brought in an almost unbelievably short space of time a death rate (and this may surprise you) lower than that of the United States as a whole.

You will see also acres of sugarcane, coffee, bananas, and other crops. Almost every square foot of available land is in agricultural production.

Puerto Rico is handicapped both by the distance from raw materials and ultimate market. The people had to be trained, industriallywise. The community was a poor one in which substandard living conditions prevailed. There was a mountainous job to do in the field of education. Little by little, the problems are being overcome. They are being attacked on all fronts simultaneously.

What inspired this beehive activity in tropical Puerto Rico? It is, I think, the explosive energy of a happy people who do not carry the burden of colonialism. It is the minds and muscles of free men and women

aroused to their task by aggressive leadership. This activity will, I am sure, continue while these conditions prevail, until one day, perhaps not long from now, the children will go to school as long as do children in continental United States, and living conditions will equal those of their mainland brothers. In large measure, this depends upon the continued wisdom of this great body which is fomenting freedom, happiness, and an atmosphere of plenty for all throughout a free world.

But today, Mr. President, I want to commend both the people of Puerto Rico and the Members of the Senate for their achievements under 3 years of commonwealth status.

Massive Lodge on Mount Hood Reopened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Timberline Lodge, appropriately named and appropiately designed, is located on the slopes of Oregon's highest peak, Mount Hood. Like an inverted, frosty cone, this peak dominates the landscape that visitors to Portland find so impressive and unforgettable. These visitors, approaching Mount Hood, first sight the lodge, miles distant, from the highway that hangs like an asphalt strap across the south shoulder of the mountain. Arriving at the lodge in July or August, visitors see skiers descending the slalom courses on the summer snows that coat the glaciers. Malcolm Bauer in the July 11, 1955, Christian Science Monitor describes the unique lodge. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSIVE LODGE ON MOUNT HOOD REOPENED
(By Malcolm Bauer)

TIMBERLINE LODGE, OREG.—This massive structure of rough-hewn native stone and timbers, mecca for more winter sports enthusiasts than any other resort in the Nation, reopened to the public this July in a summer blizzard that was reminiscent of the February day in 1938 when it first opened its doors.

The lodge nestles on the southern slopes of Mount Hood at the 6,000-foot elevation where the thick stands of Douglas fir meet the barren stone and ice of the mountain. From its wide windows one can see the plateau land of eastern Oregon and the valley of the Willamette to the west. The nearby mountain slopes hold snow the year around, making the lodge one of the few 12-month skiing centers in the United States.

Because of this and because of its location (less than 60 miles by highway from Portland) the lodge area is visited by more skiiers than any other national forest hotel. More than a million visitors, a third of them skiiers, passed through Mount Hood National Forest gates last year.

But early this year Timberline lodge appeared near the end of its usefulness. After a succession of unsuccessful managerships, the United States Forest Service, nominal owners of the lodge, closed its doors and evicted its most recent lessors. That was in February. The lodge had been operated, except for the war years, since its completion in 1938. It was begun in 1935 as a Works Progress Administration project. There is none other like it in the Nation. Architect was W. I. Turner, and the great amount of hand labor made possible through WPA resulted in unique features that can scarcely be duplicated today for many times the $2 million cost in depression dollars.

A towering stone chimney rears itself through the center of the structure, each of its four faces containing a fireplace on both of the main levels of the lodge. Decorations and appointments are in hand-carved timbers. The entire structure of gray stone, wood, and wrought iron is built for the centuries. The ponderosa pine timbers which support the 5 corners of the lounge are 5½ feet in diameter and weigh more than 7 tons. There are 2,200 yards of stone in the rambling Alpine-type structure.

All this sounds as though Timberline would be a resort operator's dream. But this has not proved to be the case.

Since President Franklin D. Roosevelt dedicated the lodge during a visit to the Pacific Northwest, it has been operated by a number of independent corporations on permits from the Forest Service. No single management has continued more than about 3 years. But the February 1955 closing was the first other than during the war years.

The difficulty has been lack of revenue. Although hundreds of thousands of tourists and skiers move through the lodge's corridors annually, most just come to look around. There is no charge for admission to the building. The lessor is expected to make his profit from the renting of accommodations and from the food concessions. He is handicapped at the outset by the fact that Timberline Lodge has too few guest rooms and a good number of these must be occupied by resident staff members.

But there was optimism in the reopening of the lodge over the Fourth of July weekend after nearly 5 months of being closed. The new lessor is Richard I. Kohnstamm, who has extensive plans for refurbishing the lodge and building facilities to attract guests. A new chairlift with a capacity of 900 skiers per hour will be built in Pucie's Glade near the lodge at a cost of $100,000. A sno-cat taxi service will be instituted to carry skiers the few hundred yards to the Palmer snowfields, higher on the mountain, where skiers can perform throughout the hottest summer months. These facilities will be added to those already existing on the mountain, including several ski tows and the sky-hook aerial railway which runs from Government Camp, on the through highway route, over the Cascades, to Timberline Lodge.

Already Mr. Kohnstamm has provided permanent living facilities for his staff to free a number of rooms for guests, and he has plans for further construction. It is possible that a plan for the construction of a third wing, originally projected when the lodge was built, will be revived.

If Mr. Kohnstamm is as successful in his projected operation of the lodge as he was in providing atmosphere for his "opening" this month, he has nothing to worry about. He entertained several hundred invited guests during a July snowstorm that deposited more than a foot of new snow around the lodge, dressing it in the mantle it wears most of the year. Snow plows kept the roads open, as they do all through the fall, winter, and spring months, when the white walls hemming in the Timberline Lodge road rise many feet above the macadam. It was an impressive reenactment of the rebirth of the lodge that first opened to the public in a swirling snowstorm in February 1938.

Expanding the Civil Airport Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, announcement that the President has approved S. 1855, to amend the Federal Airport Act, is welcome news to all of those interested in the development of civil aviation in the United States.

The action of the President in approving S. 1855 assures a substantial 4-year airport construction program. It will not only permit expansion of civil aviation, but will promote safety by providing more adequate facilities.

In 1946, Congress enacted the Federal Airport Act to authorize $520 million in Federal grants for the development of a nationwide system of civil airports. That was sound legislation, needed to insure the development of civil aviation in this country, but as of today, some 9 years later, we must face the fact that we do not have an adequate airport system to permit the continued expansion of civil aviation.

One reason for this situation is that less than half of the amount authorized by the Federal Airport Act has been appropriated. Congress has appropriated for Federal aid to sponsors the sum of $256,221,154.

Federal funds made available varied from $45 million in 1947 to nothing in 1954. Last year the appropriation was $22 million and this year the budget estimate was for $11 million.

It is easy enough to see that developing a sound, long-range program was impossible on that basis. Sponsors of airport projects obviously could not anticipate with any certainty the amount of Federal funds which might be available in the future.

Early this year representatives of airport sponsors and users appealed to Members of Congress to work out some solution to this problem. The result was that on May 16 I introduced H. R. 6260 which proposed a new approach to the problem. My bill was a companion bill to S. 1855.

This legislation proposed to abandon the old system of making annual appropriations for Federal-aid grants and instead give the Department of Commerce authority to make contract obligations amounting to $63 million a year for 4 years for such grants.

The principle of allowing contract obligations for Federal aid is not new. It has been in effect in the Federal highway program for years with great success.

Before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House was able to hold public hearings on the legislation, the Senate passed S. 1855, with certain amendments.

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications, of which I have the honor of being chairman, held pub-

lic hearings on the legislation on July 6, 8, and 14. The subcommittee felt that the Senate amendments improved the bill and recommended favorable action on the Senate bill. However, subsequent to the Senate action on the bill, an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal year 1946 was made, and S. 1855 was amended to cut back the contract authority granted the Department to $42,500,000 for the present fiscal year. The provision for annual contract authority of $63 million for the 3 subsequent fiscal years was left unchanged. The Senate later accepted the House amendments.

In addition to making a substantial increase in Federal-aid grants available, the bill makes it clear that the Department of Commerce is not to consider ineligible for Federal aid the development of any class of public airports, the construction, alteration, or repairs of airport terminal buildings, or the accomplishment of any other type of airport development legally eligible under the Federal Airport Act.

The legislation was drafted to make it clear that the Congress feels that an adequate national system of airports must include small airports, as well as the large airports serving the air carriers. An adequate national civil airport system also must take into consideration the airports needed for business flying, agricultural flying, and all of the many other types of flying included in the overall category commonly known as general aviation.

It is realized that enactment of this legislation to amend the Federal Airport Act will not solve all of our problems in developing a national airport system, but I am sure that setting up a 4-year program by giving the Department of Commerce authority to make contract obligations for the Federal-aid grants is a great forward step in the right direction.

I am sure that all of those interested in the welfare of aviation in the United States are very grateful to the President for approving this legislation.

A National Inspiration Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very short article that appeared in the July 7, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram announcing to the Nation and the world that the Old North Church steeple in Boston has now been restored.

This hallowed skymark of American freedom and dramatic reminder of the immortal ride of Paul Revere was toppled last year, not by any enemy gesture, but by the fury of nature's uncontrollable elements.

The contributions from people all over the country enthusiastically desiring to have this shrine of liberty rise again is a convincing demonstration of American respect and devotion to the patriotic traditions and symbols of yesteryear. The summit of this spire displayed the light of yesterday's freedom. Let us pray that the meetings at other summits in this modern era will provide the light for a continuing free and peaceful world.

The editorial follows:

STEEPLE RESTORED

A word of congratulation is in order, surely, to those who have been instrumental in restoring the steeple to Old North Church in Boston. Hurricane Carol toppled the historic structure last summer. Now, thousands of contributions, big and small, have come in from all over the country to make the rebuilding possible, and this week the new steeple is being hoisted into place.

This is a fast age when people and messages are whisked great distances in almost no time. We find it hard to understand a quaint little war in which a courier on horseback waited for the sight of signal lanterns in a church tower in order to know what alarm to spread. But a young Nation's history was being written in that belfry that night, and in consequence Old North Church long since became a sort of shrine.

An Old North steeple will always be necessary to the symbolism of America's epic struggle for freedom. The whole Nation can rejoice that man has restored what a thoughtless and unseeing hurricane knocked over.

Members Should Be Proud of Record Made by 1st Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the end of the 1st session of the 84th Congress provides us with an opportunity to look back on the results of our labors for the first 7 months of this year, and a chance to look forward to the anticipated accomplishments in the 2d session.

While every Member of Congress has a right to be proud of the record made in the first session, I think the Democrats can take particular pride in the high quality of statesmanship they have displayed under very trying circumstances. Under the leadership of our great Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, and of our distinguished majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK, we have demonstrated for all to see that ours is the party of responsibility, the party of good government, the party of the people.

We have established beyond doubt that Democrats are not obstructionists; they do not carry on cold wars of partisan politics. On the contrary, our splendid record of cooperation with a Republican President in both the foreign and domestic fields proves that our sole objective is to do what we think best for the American people.

The Democratic record of supporting a nonpartisan policy in foreign affairs is unblemished. Our first major act in the last session was to pass a resolution, at the President's request, authorizing him to use the Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. Many held that the President needed no such grant of authority from the Congress, contending that he already had that power; but when the President sought affirmative action, Democrats voted to grant it to him.

We succeeded, over much Republican opposition, in passing a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, giving the President new authority to cut tariffs. The President had asked a Republican Congress to approve that recommendation last year, but the Republicans did not do it for him. We did.

We put through an extension of the foreign-aid program in substantially the form requested by the President, and we backed him to the hilt in his negotiations with our potential enemies. Criticism for carrying on these negotiations came not from the Democrats, but from Republicans. We on the Democratic side take considerable pride in the fact that the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy is, in the main a continuation of the foreign policies carried on under the previous Democratic administration.

Our support of a strong national defense has likewise been unstinted. We passed a law setting up a new Reserve program; we extended the draft; we insisted on the maintenance of a powerful fighting force despite the tendency in the Pentagon to put economy ahead of defense.

True, there were differences between the Democrats in Congress and the President on many domestic issues. The House, I am happy to say, passed a bill to restore the 90 percent price-support program on basic farm commodities. The Senate did not on this item in the last session, but I feel sure action will be taken next year. The income of the farmers continues to slide downward, while Secretary of Agriculture Benson stands idly by.

The Democrats put through in the closing hours of the session a housing bill which will do much to provide better homes for thousands of our citizens. We passed a new minimum wage law, setting the floor on wages at $1 an hour, compared with the 90-cent recommendation of the President and the 75-cent floor in the old law.

We raised the pay of Federal employees, going beyond the recommendations of the President to establish fair-pay scales for postal and classified Federal workers. We authorized a special commission to investigate the much-criticized Federal employees security program.

We continued the Small Business Administration and the Defense Production Act, and we voted to extend the corporation- and excise-tax rates at the 1954 levels. We tried to give the little fellow a slight tax break to offset the tremendous windfall given the rich by the Republican Congress last year, but a powerful campaign led by the White House was too much for us to overcome with our paper-thin majority.

We passed a law providing for a fair distribution of Salk polio vaccine. In the House we passed a bill providing new social-security benefits for women and for the disabled. The retirement age for women would be reduced from 65 to 62 years. House action came too late in the session for the Senate to put that bill through this year, but action on it is certain to come early in the next session.

Congress also will be ready to act early next year on a big school construction program. The House Committee on Education and Labor has approved this program, and it will be before the House early in the next session.

Whether we can get a fair and equitable highway construction program through in the next session remains a question mark. We tried to put through a pay-as-you-use highway construction bill in the last session, but it was defeated late in the session. I sincerely hope we can agree on road legislation next year for, as everyone agrees, we badly need a big highway construction program.

One of the last acts of the House was to approve a bill freeing natural gas producers from Federal regulation. It took a lot of work for us to get that one through, but I am happy to say it was done. The bill is now ready for the Senate to consider.

With a presidential election coming up next year, it is expected by many that politics will play a big part in 1956 legislative deliberations. It is my prediction, however, that when the record is written at the end of the next session, it will show that the Democrats in Congress have continued to conduct themselves in an efficient, responsible manner. The White House will continue to get the aid of the Democratic leadership when it is deserving of that aid; yet we reserve for ourselves the right to make the legislative decisions. For myself, I have no doubt but that the Democratic record will be a persuasive factor when we go before the voters next year.

The Voice of the Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely article that appeared in the July 8, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor which commendingly comments upon the patriotic activities of the Parent-Teachers Association and the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.

The editorial follows:

THE TEACHERS MEET AND SPEAK

Part of the genius of America is the gift of doing things by voluntary organization. One of the things that has needed doing has been to support the public schools. The Parent-Teachers Association and the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, for instance, have rendered yeoman service for the layman. The National Education Association, with its 612,000 members, is certainly the largest and probably the most influential organization of the teachers themselves.

Since most members are public school classroom teachers, the NEA knows what it means to grapple at closest quarters with the most extensive and most difficult problems that face American education. Some 15,000 have been assembled in convention during the last several days. And it is hardly surprising that, in their insistence that help is urgently needed for schools sadly outrun both by population and by economic competition, they are not being too fine-haired about how much of that aid comes from whom—from local or from Federal sources.

Help to provide quarters where burgeoning classes can meet. Help to pay better salaries, not simply as justice to those who have served but to encourage new recruits to enlist in an army of teachers that is falling short by 90,000 a year.

These needs are tangible. They are not easy to meet, but they can be handled in terms of dollars and cents. But the NEA sees other needs. The first is epitomized in President-elect John Buford's slogan: "Make teachers proud to teach." And that is not a matter of salary alone. It is also a matter of how important and how dignified a nation considers teaching as compared with other professions and careers.

And there is another need, a startling one, found by a study committee the most pressing facing classroom teachers: the need for discipline. The cause of this can be found partly in the failure to meet other needs, of course—in overcrowded classes, understaffed schools, and underexperienced teachers. But the roots of this problem reach deep in the whole of American life. And here is something that will take more than an act of Congress to solve.

Hope Springs Eternal in the Human Breast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the public utilities commissioner of Oregon may be at this very moment wrestling with the question as to whether the Southern Pacific should be permitted to discontinue its nightly passenger run from Ashland and Medford to Portland. Two months ago the lumbermen of the area served by this same railroad in southern and western Oregon were inundating me with wires pleading urgently for immediate assistance in getting the Southern Pacific to make available more boxcars for the shipment of lumber. Annually at the same season of the year, lumbermen have faced the prospect of slowing down or closing their operations because the inadequate supply of freight cars left lumber piled high on every foot of available storage area. One veteran lumberman wrote that his has been a familiar pattern in the industry for the 47 years he has engaged in the lumber business. Confirming his statement, Mr. President, is this amusing verse which appeared 40 years ago in a 1915 issue of the Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, written by the publisher, C. C. Crow. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, for its inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the verse was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE SPRINGS ETERNAL IN THE HUMAN BREAST

A poor old man with trembling limbs
And stooped decrepit form
Stood on a weather-beaten dock,
And faced a wintry storm.

He minded not the icy winds
That fanned his snow white beard,
But holding high a telescope
Straight down the track he peered.

The scene about the place he stood
Was one of desolation,
But patiently he took his stand,
Such was his occupation.

Off to the right there stood a mill,
The roof had blown away,
And where they once had piled the lath,
Now grew a crop of hay.

Grey timber wolves in howling droves
Were living in the stable,
Wood rats through the plant had eaten
All except the cable.

The pond which once had held the logs
And germs of typhoid fever,
Now formed a quiet breeding place
For several dozen beaver.

The boiler room was cold and chill,
The flues were full of bats;
The office with the windows out
Had been sealed up with slats.

Long moss upon the planer shed
In great abundance grew,
And from her nest on the old sidetrack
The timid pheasant flew.

Here and there, all weather worn,
And piled high on the dock,
Was what had in the bygone days
Been the ready-for-shipment stock.

The poor old man with his tottering frame
Through the tall grass trudged each day,
And he'd take his place with telescope
And he'd only look one way.

He would look 'way off t'ward the sunkist South
And his face was filled with sorrow
And the only thing that he would say
Was "They promised me some tomorrow."

A stranger passing by one day
Inquired of a native son.
"Who is that man who sits over there
With the antique vision gun?"

"My friend," the native answered,
As he wiped away the tears,
"You shouldn't speak of him that way,
For he's been there fifty years.

"Why that man's story to us here
Is as common as the stars.
He's a western Oregon lumberman,
Looking for S. P. cars."

(The above was originally written and published about 1915 by C. C. Crow, editor, Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest.)

Weep and Cheer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, over the past year there have been

numerous developments of great interest and value in the general field of civil liberties and Government security. Our Nation has been faced in the last 6 years with the difficult task of resolving a dilemma of how best to protect our Government from those who would destroy it from within, without sacrificing our cherished traditions of individual freedom as handed down to us by our forefathers in the Bill of Rights. There have been instances in the past where many believe damage was done to the reputation of Federal employees who turned out to be completely loyal. There have also been cases in the past where some individuals were allowed to gain or remain in positions in the Federal Government where they did great harm to our Nation's security. This administration has been and continues to be dedicated to finding a fair but firm middle way whereby our agencies and departments will be manned by loyal, efficient, and dedicated individuals, but where these public servants will be assured of fair and just treatment at all times. We do not want subversives in Government, but at the same time we want to prevent injustices to innocent public servants committed in the name of security.

Mr. President, it is indeed gratifying that our Government has within its ranks courageous and devoted men who are dedicating themselves to helping this administration find the answers to this problem of Government security, and individual rights. Very high in the ranks of those who are working on this problem stands the name of our good friend and former colleague in the Senate, Harry P. Cain. As a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, Harry Cain is making a great contribution to good government.

On June 27th of this year Senator Cain delivered an address on this all-important subject before a meeting of the American Civil Union in Los Angeles. I believe this interesting address should be given consideration by all Members of Congress, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEEP AND CHEER

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, a happy pleasure comes to me from being in your company and I shall remain grateful for your invitation.

It is an understatement for me to compliment the contributions which the American Civil Liberties Union has made and will continue to make to our American way of life. The essence of this life is your respect and mine for the right of every other citizen to be as free and unoppressed as we are. I gladly share your battles to keep all other citizens free and unoppressed.

I am here to benefit from your views and to pass along to you a justifiable excitement and satisfaction over what is presently being undertaken and accomplished, by public and private authorities and leaders, in your Nation's Capital, to reconcile and harmonize the contradictions which have historically existed between the requirements of internal security and the personal, individual rights to which every citizen, famous or in rags, is entitled.

In recent months, my voice has been but one of many which has given expression to the disquieting apprehension that in our Nation's determined effort to remain strong at home so that we may prevail and succeed against the world domination intentions of internal communism, we have borrowed, without being conscious of the development, from Communist and Fascist origins some of the weapons we now employ in this conflict.

Reactions to these observations have been as spontaneous and varied as they have developed a healthy and widespread body of public and private controversy.

As an outraged citizen who is a proud and loyal public servant, I went last January to Spokane in my home State to publicly explore the question: "Can freedom live with internal security?" My view was then and is tonight that freedom and internal security can be made to be compatible but not unless we make absolutely certain that American principles and good purposes are supported and advanced by traditional American procedures and methods.

It is becoming undeniable that from our recent fear of the Soviet philosophy and in our anxiety to fight communism, we have adopted some totalitarian methods to carry out American purposes. If we are to prevail, as I know we shall, we must rely entirely on those procedures which are the natural byproduct of our own American philosophy. The only method which will remain deserving of our confidence and respect is to utilize no weapon and follow no course which violates the freedom and dignity of any American citizen. This is the American way which may be the more difficult to consistently observe but it stands out as the only conceivable way through which we can stand firm and resourceful against all enemies while causing those enslaved to continue their yearnings for the day when they, like us, may be free.

There is good news to talk about tonight.

Official papers have been filed to annul what has been the polygamous and regretable marriage between internal security and both political parties. An announcement that an absolute separation has been agreed to by the several parties concerned can be expected before the Congress adjourns probably next month. I shall return to this invigorating news.

Do you share the depth of my appreciation over what the United States Court of Appeals said on last Thursday when it ruled that a denial of a passport application from any citizen must conform with the provision of the fifth amendment that "no person shall be * * * deprived of * * * liberty * * * without due process of law?"

A man by the name of Max Schachtman claimed he was denied a passport solely because he was the chairman of the Independent Socialist League, an anti-Stalinist organization, on the Attorney General's subversive list.

The appellate tribunal in remanding the case to the district court for a trial on the merits held that membership in an organization on the subversive list is not sufficient grounds in itself for denial of a passport.

Said Chief Justice Henry W. Edgerton, "freedom to leave a country or a hemisphere is as much a part of liberty as freedom to leave a State."

The jurist asserted that the State Department's action in the Schachtman case was not in accordance with due process of law for several reasons, including the fact that the "Attorney General's list was prepared for screening Government employees, not passport applicants."

The court disposed of a Government intention that a passport involves foreign relations and is in the exclusive control of the State Department by declaring:

"But the State Department's control of activities that involve both foreign relations and domestic liberties is not exclusive. If it were exclusive, the State Department could put an American citizen in jail and keep him there permanently on the mere request of a foreign government."

The appellate court's decision gives rise to speculation in which all of us should indulge.

If the Attorney General's subversive list was prepared for screening Government employees but not passport applicants, by whom other than the Government should that list be employed? A screen is something through which an object can pass; it is not a barred door. But the subversive list is being used by agencies other than the Federal Government to deny employment and to cause a deprivation of liberty, without due process of law, that a citizen otherwise would have.

It is encouraging that the court of appeals has denied a fashion in which the subversive list has been arbitrarily employed by the State Department. Now that the question has been scrutinized by a high court, we can expect other phases of the same important question to be explored by other courts in the future.

I ought to mention in passing that Public Law 176, the Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1954, includes this language:

"No housing unit constructed under this act shall be occupied by any person who is a member of any organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General."

Though an applicant for the Federal service may be employed after satisfactorily explaining his membership in a listed organization, this same person, if otherwise eligible, is flatly denied, if he seeks an accommodation in a public-housing project, any opportunity to explain his membership in any listed organization. The door, by law, is literally slammed in his face.

This contradiction does not strengthen our security posture at home; it adds to a confused public mind and imposes injustices which are as unwise as they are unnecessary.

I know persons who think they belong to a listed organization where an examination of the facts establishes that they do not belong. I know others whose membership dues, usually a dollar, have been paid without their knowledge. I know those who have joined as an accommodation to some personal friend or business acquaintance. Such persons have never attended meetings, belonged to committees and they couldn't tell you where the organization has its headquarters. The very least to be done is to examine the circumstances surrounding any membership before denying to any individual a job or a passport or a bed.

When I stated earlier that in our national desire to be safe we have adopted some methods which are unbecoming to every citizen, I was thinking partly and pointedly of the un-American way in which the Attorney General's list is being shamefully utilized.

There are many citizens who are inclined, I think, to confuse a determination to be fair and decent to other citizens with a softness on subversion. Permit me, please, to reflect on this question.

Have you ever heard of the special bar committee for legal aid in employee security matters? It was established on January 12, 1955, by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, with encouragement from the American Bar Association, and immediately after the President's January message to Congress in which he stressed the necessity of protecting the rights of workers in the employee security field.

The President's remarks were obviously directed at those who administer our several internal security programs but his admonitions were persuasive to the legal fraternity,

in your Nation's Capital, which has no connection with the Government.

This committee of truly public-spirited members of the bar does not concern itself with efforts to reform prevailing security systems. This task must be and is being assumed by the administration and the Congress. The committee deals only with public servants who are accused of being security risks by some branch or agency of the Government. It represents only public servants who are helpless because they are without funds or who otherwise are unable to secure qualified legal assistance.

In the first 5 months of the committee's existence, 11 of its members have volunteered and devoted more than 1,500 hours to explore and evaluate the entire life, activities, and associations of accused employees who have turned to them in desperation and as a final hope.

For as long as there remains a need for this committee, as there is now a pressing need, no thoughtful or fair-minded citizen must permit himself to believe that his Nation has yet established security systems which are as just as they are firm. In a republic, it is not to be desired nor should it long be allowed that public servants be forced to seek donated legal assistance from the outside in efforts to establish their innocence and loyalty to their country.

Our Government has a responsibility, or so I do believe, for seeing to it that those accused of being security risks are provided with every reasonable opportunity to clear themselves. Certainly it must be the hope of the Government to find that its servants are dependable and loyal rather than a determination, as flagrant abuses would imply, to find them disloyal and a risk to our security. In the absence of the fullest opportunity to establish their devotion and reliability, men and women who are totally innocent of any wrongdoing have imposed upon them a stigma which will hound and harass them and their families for as long as they live.

There is more to be said about what the committee has done in 5 short months. It has consulted with 285 present or former Government employees. For a small percentage of these nothing should have been done. They were quite apparently undeserving of the confidence of the agency for which they worked. For most of them, nothing could be done. A majority could not be helped for they had previously forfeited their rights by submitting resignations on request during or after a security investigation. Others had attempted to represent themselves without counsel and had been unsuccessful. But 22 security cases were set for hearing by the committee. Ten of these cases remain under advisement. Decisions have been rendered in 12 cases and the verdict in each instance was in favor of the person accused.

These 12 human beings would have been immobilized for extended periods or their reputations destroyed completely but for the availability of those dedicated practitioners who are willing to defend accused public servants who are unable to afford or know not how to defend themselves.

Some among you might consider 12 persons to be a small and perhaps unimportant number. Yet, in the future, you, as an individual, might find yourself in such a dozen. Among the dozen who have been saved by this committee since January, one or more may live to make outstanding contributions to the health of their Government and to your own welfare. The others may be unpossessed of any particular talent, but they are as important in being individuals as any among us.

In the week before the bar committee was established, the Civil Service Commission announced that some 8,000 employees had left the Government, during the previous 16 months, as being security risks. Of this total, about 5,000 quit. How many of this number resigned after being suspended, or resigned on request before being suspended, has never been disclosed. How many among the 5,000 might have been cleared of every charge had they been heard by a hearing board one can only guess. How many quit after being suspended because they had a family to feed at home and not a penny with which to employ counsel is likely to remain an unfortunate mystery. How many among the 5,000 might have been restored to their jobs and respected again by their friends and associates had the bar association committee been available to them in their time of agony we shall never know. We have every cause, however, to assume that a large number among these 5,000 would have been restored. How could you make any other assumption when the bar committee has yet to lose its first case?

But it has been stated officially too often that the security program under Executive Order 10450 is working well on the average. This kind of an average isn't good enough. When people are saved at the last moment by outside help, there is something basically wrong. No individual is so unimportant that he can be junked without solid cause and before he has been assisted to defend himself. A public servant isn't a number; he acts and looks and is just like you and me.

The experience and success enjoyed by the bar committee requires that I offer this advice to any public servant who is alleged by his Government to be a security risk: If this public servant believes that he is loyal and reliable, he should, under no circumstances, resign after being suspended or following an investigation which may result in his being suspended. This person should ask that he be heard before a security hearing board. If he has faith in himself and his conduct, there is always reason to believe that the hearing board will concur in his opinion of himself. Fully half, and probably more, of the cases which have been decided by security boards have cleared the person accused.

It logically follows that where an individual's entire future is at stake he can ill afford, unless he is unusually skilled as a lawyer or logician in the fields of evidence and conjecture, to represent himself. If he has the money with which to employ counsel of his own choice, that is a desirable course of action. If he is penniless or living from limited savings, he should take his story without hesitation or delay to the bar committee which has been so sympathetic and helpful to others.

There is something meaningful in that age old legal adage:

He who serves as his own counsel has a fool for a client.

I wouldn't urge a friend to act as his own counsel before a court of law where the admissibility of evidence is sharply defined and where the charges must be specific. Such rules are not in force before a security hearing board where an accused who is without counsel can be likened to a skipper of a ship which is without a rudder in a heavy sea.

Does this character of advice constitute a softness on subversion? Is it not rather in support of the January declaration by the President of the United States that the rights of every worker shall be protected? Those among you who feel as deeply as I do about the need for giving any person the benefit of the doubt until it shall have been established in fact that he is guilty of some act of disloyalty or unreliability have a continuing responsibility of our own. It is for us to convince the uninformed that firmness by any government in security prosecutions which is not accompanied by the fairest possible treatment of the individual accused leads only to tyranny and oppression. When fairness is joined with firmness, and only then, it becomes possible to distinguish intelligently and accurately between those who are faithful public servants and those who intend harm to our Republic.

Perhaps before this week is out, Senate Joint Resolution 21, which establishes a Commission on Government Security, will have been approved by one or both Houses of the Congress. If not this week, then next week, or the one after that, but surely the action will be taken before the Congress has adjourned.

As a citizen, and as one who is employed within the executive branch of the Government, I consider the intended action to be as splendid a step in the direction of equating the requirements of security with the rights of freedom as has been taken in my lifetime. It will, in fact, be the first real step so taken.

The Commission can be expected to be nonpolitical and bipartisan. Politicians, and I am one, will in the future have small and unpersuasive opportunity to talk about security and liberty from a foundation of political bias. I think it so that much of our sorrow and many of our mistakes have resulted from well-intentioned politicians playing politics with the precious reputations of individuals. All of this represents the annulment of the marriage between security and both political parties I mentioned earlier.

The Commission's function will be to study the entire Government security program, including the various statutes, Presidential orders, regulations, and directives under which your Government seeks to protect the national security, national defense secrets, and public and private defense facilities against loss or injury from espionage, disloyalty, subversive activity, sabotage, or unauthorized disclosures, together with the actual manner in which these statutes, orders, regulations, and directives are being administered, to determine whether the overall security program is in accord with the stated policy of the Congress that there shall exist a sound Government program—

(a) establishing procedures for security investigations and clearance for Government employees and persons privately employed or occupied on work requiring access to national secrets or affording significant opportunity for injury to the national security;

(b) for vigorous enforcement of effective and realistic security laws and regulations; and

(c) for a careful, consistent, and efficient administration of this policy in a manner which will protect the national security and preserve basic rights.

It has been said too often that those who attempt to constructively criticize existing security practices and procedures are giving aid and comfort to the Communist cause. When someone in authority offers such a nonsensical comment it is picked up, repeated and believed by many a citizen who knows absolutely nothing about the problem.

The Commission resolution is notice given by the Congress to every citizen in the land that there does exist an imperative requirement to integrate the 5 security and 2 loyalty programs which are now in existence and to adopt security standards, policies and procedures which are both uniform and consistent.

The resolution is the frankest sort of admission that our Nation has developed a security apparatus which is lopsided, unwieldy and capable of defeating the understandable purposes for which it was created.

In the years since the close of World War II, you citizens have had no part to play in formulating those security policies and practices which necessarily bear so heavily on your careers, freedoms and conduct. There has been no central place to which you could submit your views, advice or criticism.

When the Commission has been established, it will speak as much for you and freedom as it does for Government and security. Of its 12 members, 4 will be appointed from the Congress, 2 from the executive branch, and 6 from private life. The President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate will make the appointments. The Commission will elect its chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

I must restate my enthusiasm and conviction about the promise of good things to be expected from the labors of the Commission. Its primary and continuing function will be that of preventing license from running riot in the guise of liberty while preventing tyranny from oppressing citizens in the guise of authority.

I seldom deal in names but it deserves to be mentioned as a compliment that a companion resolution to the one authored in the Senate has been offered in the House by Representative WALTER who is the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He does not maintain that his committee is the answer to what plagues us.

When the Commission speaks, every citizen will, for the first time, begin to comprehend and understand the true nature, significance, and ramifications of internal security in the United States.

The Johnston committee of the Senate is currently endeavoring to determine the need for reforms in and the abuses developed under Executive Order 10450 which inquires into the loyalty and security status of the 2,300,000 men and women who are employed by the Federal Establishment. The work of this committee is exceedingly important but it has no authority to undertake a similar study of the industrial security program, where as many other persons are convered, or the Atomic Energy Commission program, or the maritime security procedures or the practices being followed by the military services. The Johnston committee is not wasting its time or squandering your money. Its obvious weakness is a narrowness of jurisdiction and a lack of time. But from its well spent effort you may expect a report and recommendations to stir and please you all.

Once the Commission on Government Security has been launched, it can look anywhere and everywhere with ample authority to pursue its work. There is reassurance in the feeling that we may soon be guided by advice from a Commission whose single mission is to lay down policies and approve methods which will help to keep us strong and free.

In the meantime, sizeable improvements in national attitudes and reforms within our internal security system can be brought about and all of us can help by talking about them.

We are constantly being told that the difference between us and our enemies is that they are slaves while we are free. We must insist that those who so declare act in accordance with their declarations.

Without premeditation, and despite such glowing declarations of support for man's dignity, we have taken the dignity and self-respect to which every human being is entitled and twisted it in thousands of post-war instances into forms which are as unrecognizable, when judged by historic standards of fair play and simple justice, as they are totalitarian in practice and result.

I do not know nor do I believe that a single Communist or Fascist can be found among the leaders in the Congress or the administration. It is very unlikely that many, if any, can be found who are leaders in States or municipalities or private life. Yet it seems apparent to me that we are permitting totalitarian practices to enter our American way of life.

In the years of the past, as a student in Germany and Italy, and as a soldier who saw some service by the side of the Russian, I was exposed to Communist and Fascist attitudes which I have since abhorred.

The Nazi wouldn't think first, let alone twice, about throwing a public servant out of government service on a mere suspicion resulting from undocumented allegations.

The Communist wouldn't think it normal or desirable that an accused public servant should be provided with an adequate defense.

I think we have become inclined to adopt such practices when we had no such intention in mind. No Fascist, Nazi, or Communist would think the following four hopes of mine to have any merit whatsoever. I think they go to the heart of our trouble.

1. Public Law 733 provides the authority from which Executive Order 10450 was written. The law requires that an accused public servant must be suspended before a hearing if the charges preferred may lead to his separation from the service.

Why shouldn't the law be so amended that an agency head could either suspend an employee summarily, if there is reason to believe that he is engaged in some subversive activity, or retain that employee on the job until his reliability for future service has been determined through a hearing?

To my knowledge, employees have been suspended where the agency head would have retained them on the job had the law permitted a hearing without first suspending the employee.

The percentage of hearing board clearances, which appears to be better than 50 percent, makes it too plain that far too many employees have been suspended without valid cause and that these persons have suffered needlessly and often tragically at the hands of their Government.

The period of suspension is for a minimum of 3 months and often staggers on for longer than a year. During his suspension the employee is often without income, unable to secure work, and suffers from the agony of being thought by his neighbors and erstwhile friends to be disloyal or a security risk.

Any likely act of treason is one thing but a question of reliability is a far different thing. By simply amending the law, we can summarily remove those assumed to be traitors while pursuing a far less drastic and inhumane course in examining questions of reliability.

The practice of suspending employees indiscriminately is totally repudiated for the Constitution, as amended, speaks out against cruel and inhumane treatment and promises a speedy determination of any allegation of wrongdoing.

It is possible and, I trust, probable, that the administration will recommend that Public Law 733 be amended and that the Congress will so agree before it adjourns.

2. The Department of Justice has urged Congress to adopt a public defender system for the courts so that indigent defendants can obtain full justice under the law. Who, may I ask, is more entitled to justice from his Government than the public servant?

Any Federal employee is more in need of competent legal advice before a security hearing board than before a court of law because the employee will be confronted with matters and questions which are often not admitted in a courtroom.

The function of a Federal security hearing board is to get at the truth. The purpose of the security program is to distinguish between those who are innocent and those who are guilty. I naturally assume that any hearing board is delighted and feels better when it finds reason to acquit the accused.

Is there not reason to agree that every employee accused of being a security risk should be provided with counsel?

As a taxpayer, I feel strongly that the cost of providing legal representation for those accused is a legitimate and reasonable charge to be borne by the Government.

We must not permit ourselves to be unimpressed by the large number of those accused who have been restored to duty. In every such case, the individual has suffered a financial loss of an unreasonable character.

Many accused persons have resigned before getting a hearing only because they could not afford to hire counsel. Can you think of this pitiful circumstance as being anything but unintended persecution by authority?

I have petitioned both the Justice Department and the Johnston committee in the Senate about this recommendation. I know they are giving serious consideration to the proposal.

3. Would it be in the public interest to provide hearing boards with the power to subpena witnesses whose appearances would not jeopardize the national security? I can think of no finer way through which the truth would prevail and the public's confidence in authority would be refreshed and enlarged.

The Attorney General recommended in March that every effort should be made to produce witnesses to testify in behalf of the Government so that such witnesses may be confronted and cross-examined by the employee. How can this well-intentioned effort be successful unless it is backed by authority sufficient to produce a reluctant witness?

Who are these witnesses the Attorney General wants to encourage to appear? The only way to find out is to clothe hearing boards with the power to call witnesses.

As matters now stand, hearing boards can piously request the appearance of an adverse witness. The complete decision remains with him as to whether he will come forward. Does this situation add to our national security? Does it prvoide jusitce or increase a citizen's trust in his government? It does neither for it actually weakens the former and destroys the latter.

This question is basic in our concern over the natural conflict between security and freedom. The Government says it wants to keep its undercover agents and paid informers undisclosed. They are a minority among adverse witnesses. Such other persons are often next-door neighbors or fellow workers. How could their testimony endanger the national security?

I would place the power for calling witnesses where it logically belongs, with the hearing boards. If the Justice Department has good reason to oppose the appearance of a given witness, let it so convince the hearing board.

One must take for granted that a number of separations from the Federal service have resulted from unsworn testimony taken from casual informers who never face the accused. Was such a practice ever dreamed of by those men of courage, faith, and vision who established a bold, exciting experiment in restrained government back in 1791? What gives us reason to destroy some individual with testimony which isn't willing to submit itself to cross-examination?

I hope I live long enough to see the day when any person who dares to accuse another is required to face and speak out in the presence of the one accused.

4. If our Government is to grow in health, strength, and intelligence it must create procedures through which is screened or evaluated the derogatory information which is provided by an applicant or filed against him.

There is no such common practice today. An outstanding exception is the Atomic Energy Commission, which has the greatest need for being secure, but where an applicant is advised of the nature of the derogatory information in his file and provided, if he so requests, with a hearing to clear it away.

The turnover in Federal employment is so large that 400,000 new employees were taken

on by the Government last year. How many more were turned away? How many of those denied employment might have made the larger public service contributions had they been given a chance to explain their past?

Can the Federal establishment continue to condone a system which leads to mediocrity rather than to excellence? Of course, it can, but only at the loss of vitality, stamina, and strength.

Would you say that these four sought-after fundamental improvements softens the firmness of the internal-security posture every American desires? Are these recommendations not in full support of the high principles we are constantly pledging allegiance to? Can you point to any sign of weakness in what has just been said?

These improvements would amount to a practical bar to persecution and they would make hasty, thoughtless, and obviously bad judgments less likely. They would better equip us to work together as a Nation in conquering the sometimes bewildering and always difficult problems of the future.

Will you let me, please, talk just a little about the past before I conclude.

Little has happened to us in recent years which hasn't happened to us before. A look at the past gives me renewed reason to be of good cheer about the present and to have a firmer faith in the future.

We are now concerned by the same basic questions which troubled and inspired those determined builders and dedicated dreamers who hammered out our Federal Constitution and blessed it before adoption with the Bill of Rights.

The Constitution was a sucessful attempt to establish order and protect the national security.

The Bill of Rights, without which there would have been no Constitution, were the guaranties that a law-abiding citizen need not be afraid or have his confidence in authority abused because the power of the State to oppress him was to be, forever and a day, restricted.

Those who pondered, late in the 18th century, over the needs of what was shortly to become a new nation wondered whether it was possible, most of recorded history to the contrary, to establish a free society in which there could be a lasting balance between the contradictory forces of national discipline and justice.

Our Constitution, as amended before ratification, became the best affirmative answer the world has yet seen.

Our forebears became convinced in 1791 that the rights of freemen were, in practice as well as theory, compatible with the requirements of national security.

We sometimes bypass the significance and importance of the obvious. As the Constitution has added immeasurably to our strength and the ability to act as a whole, the Bill of Rights has enabled the individual within that Nation to remain free and venturesome.

We should not assume, as many do, that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights represent one and the same thing.

Since the close of World War II, many Americans, including national, State, and community leaders, have been inclined to forget, not in words but in deeds, that the Federal Constitution, without the first 10 amendments, would have led inevitably to despotism in the United States.

The body of the Constitution speaks out in support of unrestricted government which must sooner or later result in tyranny wherever it is practiced.

The Bill of Rights when taken in the aggregate represent man's dignity and rights to be respected as an individual human being. Without these guaranties, no man would have a chance to protect himself reasonably against the arrogance, greed, fear, and unselfishness of unrestricted authority.

From the past and out of the present, there has been achieved what is called a free society. We pride ourselves that good fortune has enabled us to live in such a climate. The only tendency we must be careful to avoid is to take our free society for granted. We must recognize that a free society is not possible unless given principles and practices are rigidly adhered to.

To put it very simply, a free society is certain to lose its strength, prostitute its purpose and then wither away unless its atmosphere permits and encourages dissent and debate; welcomes criticism and controversy; assumes that the other person is innocent of wrongdoing, except as supportable facts prove otherwise; moves with considered relentlessness against those whose conduct represents conspiratorial or rebellious activity against the state; and maintains a mutual feeling of trust, confidence, and respect between citizens and those who speak and act in their name—the Government.

In this monumental ask of equating security with freedom so that our free society can long remain to inspire future generations, every citizen has a big contributing part to play.

Throughout the history of the world, where citizens have allowed their government to think for them, that government has been unsuccessful. A large part of the success of America lies in the undisputed fact that our Government permits the people to think for themselves.

That's what we've been doing tonight—thinking out loud about our heritage and of the ways in which we can pass it on untarnished to those free men and women who follow us.

I wish you well.

A Welcome Display of Patriotic Color

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of July 7, 1955, commenting upon the new color designs that will be used by our Post Office Department on their mailboxes and vehicles. This is one color scheme I feel sure the American people will welcome in their everyday observation. The editorial follows:

LONG MAY THEY WAVE

The United States Post Office chose Independence Day for a bit of justifiable flag waving which will operate to keep the national colors in the eyes of the public 365 days a year. Street letterboxes (pillar boxes to our English friends), which long have worn olive drab (used by the Army for camouflage), will be repainted in red, white, and blue, Postmaster General Summerfield announced.

They will not blossom out all at once in the new colors; it will take more than a year to get around to all of them. But one by one they will take on a new gleam—red tops, blue bodies, and white letters, "U. S. Mail." This not only will make it easier to spot a mailbox on an unfamiliar street; it will serve to distinguish the collection boxes from the postmen's storage boxes (which will retain the olive-drab uniform and the quaint legend, "Not for Deposit of Mail").

For all its gray pavements and walls, one cannot exactly say that the urban landscape needs brightening up—what with neon signs, theater marquees, orange fireplugs, and colored reflectors on traffic markers. But if anything will remind friends and relatives that servicemen on overseas duty or elderly people living alone like to get frequent letters, that will be like mail from home.

First Session, Eighty-fourth Congress, Has Constructive Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio address that I made over station WORL, Boston, Mass.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the 1st session of the 84th Congress, without fanfare or sensationalism, and without political bitterness has been a constructive one.

The Democratic-controlled Congress has enacted important legislation with a minimum of friction, bickering, or political conflict. This has been healthy, not only for our country but for the world.

As a passing observation, in the disturbed world of today, the most severe criticism of President Eisenhower has come from certain prominent or vocal Republican Members from both branches of the Congress.

The Democrats have legislated constructively, and criticized temperately. However, when there was Democratic criticism, it was justified and constructive in nature.

During the campaign of 1954, in the last days of the campaign, in his fervent and frantic desire and attempt to elect a Republican Congress, President Eisenhower while speaking in Denver on October 8, 1954, and calling for the election of a Republican Congress, declared that if the Democrats gained control, politics would "run riot in Washington and result in a cold war" between the Congress and the White House.

That somewhat reckless statement should never have been made. It was made in an attempt to put fear in the minds of the voters as to the motives of the Democrats if the people voted to give the Democratic Party control of Congress—and an attempt to have voters, through fear, and by way of reaction, vote for Republican candidates.

The people exercised their judgment and wisdom, and wisely elected a Democratic Congress.

The history of this session shows that the people used excellent judgment. The record of this session has also shown how intemperate the President was when he made that scarecrow charge, and how unsound his judgment was. Even on the ground of politics such a statement should not have been made, particularly by the leader of the Republican Party who is also the President of the United States.

For the people must bear in mind that as a politician, the President is the political leader of the Republican Party.

You will note that I say "political leader" because there are many other leaders in the Republican Party who are not elected by the people—certain big businessmen, bankers, and financiers, who pretty well determine the policies of the present administration. And the people are commencing to catch up with the fact that the present Republican admin-

istration is a "big business" administration. Certainly, the evidence already existing supports that statement, and within the next 16 months it will be disclosed further.

Before the present session of the 84th Democratic controlled Congress started (and we have only a 1-vote margin in the Senate) that great American, who is "Mr. Democrat"—Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, said, in substance, that the Democratic Party would be a constructive influence, a constructive supporter, when we agreed, and a constructive critic and proposer, when there was a disagreement.

That is the role of a party not in control of the White House—that acts consistently with the finest traditions of American political life.

The record of the 1st session of the 84th Congress clearly shows the Democratic Party lived up to that role.

In this session just closing there has been a tremendous amount of legislation enacted into law. In comparison with the 1st session of the 83d Congress, which was under the control of Republicans, this session has been outstanding.

While you have read articles and heard over the radio statements from commentators that there has been an absence of fireworks and lack of sensationalism, such statements are a credit to the Democratic Party in Congress. For it must be remembered that it is the duty of the Congress to legislate and not just to make sensational headlines that appeal to the emotions and not to reason.

And the Democratic Party has done its job well; it has given an exemplary example of party responsibility.

In keeping with Democratic tradition that foreign affairs stop at the water's edge, we have acted with vision and courage in meeting the world's problems created by the leaders of international communism.

The present Republican administration is following in this respect the sound policies of past Democratic administrations.

The quick passage of the Formosa resolution; the ratification of the German treaty and numerous other treaties; defense appropriations; the reciprocal trade agreements extension for 3 years, weakened by the President in the Senate after the bill had passed the House; the foreign aid or mutual assistance legislation and appropriations; the Inter-American Highway; and many other pieces of legislation are evidence of the fine work of this session in the field of foreign affairs under Democratic leadership.

In the field of national defense, in addition to necessary appropriations, the extension of the Selective Service Act; the Military Manpower Reserve Act, both of which are most important in our national defense and preservation; appropriations for research by the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies of the Government engaged in this field, so that we will remain in advance of the Soviets; in providing for a vast constructive program for our far-flung network of airbases throughout the world, are further evidence of the accomplishments of the first session of this Congress.

In the field of internal security a number of important bills have been passed. A special commission has been authorized to study the question of internal security so that the guilty will be vigorously detected and exposed and at the same time the reputation of the innocent will be protected.

There are many persons justifiably concerned with the large number of mergers taking place. There is no question but what some of them violate the Sherman antitrust law, and yet they are "getting away with it."

The Democratic Congress, recognizing the seriousness of this problem, has passed a law increasing the penalties of the violation of antitrust law; investigations are now being made by the Democratic-controlled committees of both the House and the Senate. The results will be disclosed later on.

And in other fields, such as the field of labor, the passage of the $1 minimum-wage law, the Democratic-controlled Congress has done outstanding work this session. And there is still another session of the 84th Congress to come, during which the people of the country will be assured that in the Halls of Congress the same kind of progressive and constructive action by the Democratic Party will continue in the best interests of our people. For the Democratic Party is truly the party of the people.

The National School Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, without question, one of the gravest domestic situations facing the Nation today is that of providing vitally needed educational facilities for the youth of America.

The educational authorities of the Nation are practically unanimous in their testimony that there is a deplorable lack of qualified teachers and a disgraceful lack of proper classroom space; the statistics backing up this testimony are so overwhelming that no sensible person even begins to think of questioning them.

It is only too obvious that the teacher shortage arises from the continuing low pay level and discouraging teaching conditions. It has been authoritatively estimated that only about 6,000 classroom teachers in the entire country are paid as much as $6,500 per year, and in a great many instances the starting salaries are lower than that of the unskilled laborer. In contrast, the attractiveness of industrial offers compel legions of those best qualified to forsake heartfelt teaching ambitions in order to provide for their own families.

In the matter of physical schooling facilities, the most conservative figures show that the Nation's public schools will require additions of more than 40,000 classrooms each year until 1960. This need develops, of course, from the unprecedented enrollment increase coming from our ever-advancing birthrate. The number of school-age children, 5–17, will rise by 13.6 million during the current decade, 1950–60. This compares with an increase of only 9.4 million in the preceding 50 years 1900–50. Those are the simple figures.

From the numerous reports of the various educational commissions and committees studying the subject these past few years, it becomes apparent that most of the States and school districts have demonstrated inability to cope with the increase in school population, a shifting school census and a teacher shortage.

Recognizing then, as we must, this schooling crisis that has come upon us, we face two very serious questions. First, it is a matter of Federal Government concern and obligation; secondly, if it is, then in what manner and to what extent should the Federal Government participate toward its solution?

As to the first question, surely the adequate education of all American youth is essential to the Nation's preservation. Unquestionably, the country's most fundamental resources and strength lies in its youth, rather than in the soil or in the climate or any other material thing. Certainly, every American child has a right to pursue and to have made available for such pursuit, an adequate educational opportunity. Undeniably, the Federal Government is charged with the obligation of promoting the general welfare and it would seem axiomatic that the promotion of the general welfare embraces assistance for the education of American children, more especially when the denial of educational opportunity is near to a national disgrace.

If we accept the principle of Federal obligation, as I believe in conscience we must, then we can find the ways and the means for the extension of reasonable assistance to States from the National Government. School financing naturally presents great difficulties as, indeed, does the financing of all essential services these days. There are in existence numerous financial plans and programs drawn up and suggested by experts in the field of both finance and education and they need no recitation here. I will be the last to pretend infallibility in pointing out the wisest and the best. I will be among the first to lend my modest talents but unrelenting efforts in persevering study and work for the enactment of a Federal legislative program to aid the satisfactory solution of this school crisis.

Properly educating our youth is the best possible investment the National Government and the individual States can make for the future of this blessed country. With Christian generosity we have poured our resources into hamlets at the ends of the earth for the rehabilitation of people less blessed than we are. We can surely, then, afford to reasonably pay for the education of American youth and provide higher teaching salary levels for the heroic group of men and women who would loyally devote their lives and their learning to the instruction of the Nation's children if they could decently live within that holy vocation.

Mr. Speaker, there are, indeed, many pressing problems still facing this Congress. In my opinion, the national school crisis is, perhaps, our paramount domestic challenge at present. I earnestly hope, therefore, that the Congress will stay in session until, at the very least, some temporary or emergency legislation may be passed to begin the fulfillment of the moral and patriotic obligation resting upon all American units of Government to insure adequate educational opportunities for the youth of America.

The Spirit of Freedom Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a draft of a statement issued by the Committee for Aiding the Defense of Bern Young Anti-Communists.

The struggle for man's mind has characterized the entire history of man. Yet the struggle was perhaps never as intense and extreme as in our own day and age. It is intense in the efforts of the free people to further the attainment of complete independence by the Communist-dominated nations; it is extreme in the efforts of the Communists to force their ideology upon millions of captured peoples.

Man has always resisted oppression and will continue to do so as long as the spirit of freedom shall live in even a single human heart. We have seen this demonstrated in the riots in Berlin; in the refusal of Polish soldiers to drive Soviet tanks and to fire on workers uprising against the Soviet regime; in the burning of the Communist banner and raising of the American flag in Pilsen; and in other open demonstrations of resistance against oppression within and without the Communist-enslaved nations.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Soviet captive nations and their relatives and friends on this side of the Iron Curtain will continue to speak and demonstrate against Red tyranny and oppression. These demonstrations should have our attention, and our sympathy must always lie with those who struggle for freedom and for the recognition of the dignity of man.

DRAFT OF A STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR AIDING THE DEFENSE OF THE BERN YOUNG ANTI-COMMUNISTS

The Soviets' barbaric tyranny in Eastern Europe and their ruthless subversive methods in the free world, have not yet been able to crush the spirit of anti-Communist resistance on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The slave-labor camps, deportations, mass massacres all over the Red prison of nations, the assassinations in the Katyn Forest and all the other crimes against freedom and human dignity, which are going on even today, have not extinguished that burning flame of resistance in Eastern Europe, nor has the new campaign, waged by the Soviets among the exiles, of intimidation through blackmail and murder, shaken the faith and determination of the refugees.

But this overwhelming criminal pressure brought to bear both on the captive peoples themselves and on the escapees, has driven them to the verge of despair. Two years ago the despondent people of East Berlin attacked with their bare hands the oppressor; this year young anti-Communist refugees rising in utter desperation raided a Communist Legation in Bern, Switzerland, exposing its subversive activities. These explosions of the strangled urge for freedom should be taken into serious consideration as they are warning signals of a general situation and not just isolated cases. In fact incidents such as that of Bern, are the expression of the deep instability, misery, and tension created by the Soviet aggressive intrusion in the free countries of the eastern part of Europe, and by the shortsighted indifference shown by the free world. After long years of Soviet despotism and Western abandonment, these people are reaching the end of their tether.

Moscow is at this precise moment waging a powerful propaganda campaign to recruit among the unsettled, bitter, and frustrated refugees, those desperate enough to accept "repatriation" with assurances of forgiveness and good jobs. The real aim of the Soviets in this maneuver is to get a corps of anti-Western, especially anti-American propagandists, as being direct witnesses of the failure of the West in dealing effectively with the problem of those who have chosen freedom. There is no doubt that the Soviets badly need new instruments of propaganda to keep down the fermenting discontent behind the Iron Curtain and kill the ever-renascent hope in the West. But neither is there much doubt that the program for handling the refugee problem is clearly inadequate.

There is therefore a most urgent need to strengthen the badly strained morale of both the enslaved and the refugees. We are upholding this cause as being of vital importance in the battle for men's minds. We must give comfort and encouragement to those who, fighting for freedom, are serving as well the best interests of the United States. Such are the young patriots in the Bern incident, who courageously tore off the mask of Red diplomacy. They are awaiting trial in Switzerland and we are sure that the Swiss courts will grant them a fair trial in accordance with their laws, products of a life of freedom and normalcy. But our purpose is especially to draw the attention of the public to the tragic background of the abnormal existence of terror and enslavement in which lies the motivation of their action.

The Soviet subjugated peoples have no longer the possibility to express their will, as they are the object of the most intolerant totaliatarian rule. The technically legal facade, such as Constitutions on the Soviet pattern, peace treaties, diplomatic relations, etc., corresponds in no way with the rights and free will of the people. As a matter of fact the people are deprived of all normal legal channels of expressing their feelings or defending their interests. As it has happened in the significant moments of history under such circumstances, the natural inalienable rights of man are asserted by the resistance to oppression. The people, seeing that all legitimate juridical ways of defending their liberties have been denied them, are making use of the means forced on them by the very slavery to which they have been reduced, namely, passive resistance, sabotage, and direct action. The incident in Bern is due to this tragic situation in which the victims of tyranny are compelled to make use of their sacred rights to resist oppression.

It is tyranny, persecution, and the fake legality of totalitarian conformism, which push people to insurrection, rebellion, and violence. It is indeed by now established that the "law" in the Soviet orbit is the mere instrument of absolute dictatorship. The American people, as inheritors of the Declaration of Independence, feel deeply that the honor and dignity of the captive peoples are not in their conformity to this fake Communist legality but in their very acts of revolt and violence against the oppressor. This is the real and dramatic background which caused the action of the young exiles in Bern. Aiding in their defense by giving them our moral support, we recognize the spirit of resistance and self-sacrifice which animates them and all their like behind the Iron Curtain.

We appeal to our public to give its traditional understanding to these brave young men who, in their fight for freedom, lost both home and country, and thus bring a message of encouragement and hope to all our secret allies, the captive peoples.

"Blind Spot" in American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a letter to the editor of the Washington Post calls attention to a most unfortunate and longstanding "blind spot" in American education.

Mr. Frederick D. Eddy, of the Institute of Languages and Linguistics, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., uses these words to describe the absence of foreign languages from the curriculums in our elementary schools.

Such courses, he says in the letter which follows, would "give an increasing number of our citizens the linguistic equipment to live with and to understand foreign peoples":

"BLIND SPOT" IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

News items such as President Eisenhower's appeal in Geneva for a free international flow of visitors, your July 20 article on Briefing To Mend Ways of Yanks Abroad and the report by Miss Emilie M. White on Languages in the District Schools in your June 13 edition keep bringing up a most unfortunate and longstanding "blind spot" in American education.

I mean a blind spot for the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools, for giving an increasing number of our citizens the linguistic equipment to live with and to understand foreign peoples.

Why, it may be asked, should foreign languages be started in elementary school? The answer, put very briefly, is that understanding and speaking a foreign language is not learned; it is blotted up with ease by youngsters under 13 or 14. After puberty it becomes increasingly more difficult to learn a new language well.

In other parts of the world, including the U. S. S. R., it has long been realized that putting off foreign language learning until high school is an obvious case of "too little and too late," and so outside our borders most spoken languages are started in grade school, and are continued for 6 to 10 years.

Inside the United States there is a young but rapidly growing trend in this direction, and Washington, D. C., can indeed take pride as Miss White says, in being one of the pioneer cities in the movement. Let's put it more accurately: Washington can take pride in having school personnel with the vision, competence, and devotion shown by the two heads of the department of foreign languages, by other administrative officers, and by some parent groups; Washington can take pride in a civic-minded and world-minded station like WRC-TV that has cooperated so effectively in the citywide grade school foreign language program.

But little pride can be taken in the facts behind some telling phrases in Miss White's report "the program * * * is being conducted without financial support; * * * regular elementary classroom teachers * * * offered to do the language teaching on a

purely voluntary basis * * *; we might hope for the kind of community support which would lead before too long a time to the inclusion of provision for a continuing program of languages taught by trained teachers in the regular school budget."

Commissioners of Washington, a world Capital, please take note. Citizens of Washington, speak up to your Commissioners.

In the suburban areas near Washington a situation exists that, far from arousing any kind of pride, should make world-minded citizens in these parts sit up and take alarmed notice.

In Maryland—specifically, in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties—there is no official plan whatever to introduce foreign-language study into the elementary schools—in spite of real personal interest in the matter shown by many school officials from the highest ranks to the lowest.

The Maryland State Department of Education committee report, The Place of Foreign Language in the Total School Program, offers a promising and forward-looking plan. A few tentative steps have been taken by the education department to explore ways and means of implementing it. In short, the blueprint for Maryland schools is there, but action on it seems to be very slow.

Action will almost certainly come faster if the citizens of Maryland, aware of the linguistic provincialism in their elementary schools, will make their voices heard by local and State school officials.

For further information on this subject, interested persons or groups may contact their District, State, or county education department, or the Office of Education Committee on Foreign Language Teaching, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C., or they may write to the Foreign Language Program, Modern Language Association, 6 Washington Square North, New York 3, N. Y.

FREDERICK D. EDDY,
Associate Professor, Institute of Languages and Linguistics, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington.

WASHINGTON.

Our colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has introduced a resolution which would eliminate this "blind spot." House Joint Resolution 305 would make it United States policy to encourage the study of foreign languages by citizens of the United States.

The present position of the United States in world affairs necessitates greater contact between our citizens and those of other nations. Increased knowledge of foreign languages will help our peacetime policy and will be invaluable in event of war.

Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 84th Congress has ended with a record in which most Members, I think, feel a sense of achievement.

It has been a Democratic Congress serving with President Eisenhower, a Republican. Not for generations, not since the 46th Congress in 1879 when Rutherford B. Hayes was President, has there been a session where both Houses were controlled by Democrats working with a Republican Chief Executive in the coordinate business of Government.

The record shows how wrong President Eisenhower was in the last campaign in predicting a "political cold war" unless the people followed his bidding and elected members of his own partisan group to control.

There has been no political cold war. The people's business has been handled carefully but without stalling. Under the firm and experienced leadership of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, House Floor Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, and Senator EARLE CLEMENTS, the necessary appropriation bills and many bills on basic legislation were expeditiously managed.

On foreign policy, Democrats in Congress gave Mr. Eisenhower support at many critical moments when he could not depend on his own Republicans.

On domestic policy, Democrats changed, corrected, and revised Mr. Eisenhower's programs. For this we have no apology. The President is surrounded by people from a particular group—big-business men and big-business men's lawyers—and he listens to no advice except the advice from this special-interest group. We in Congress have been forced to correct him.

There has been a vast difference between this Democratic 84th Congress working with a Republican President and the Republican 80th Congress working against former President Truman.

Mr. Truman got victory in vital foreign-policy matters in the 80th Congress by holding the solid support of Democrats and winning just a handful of Republicans. On domestic policy he was ruined; the Taft-Hartley law was driven through over his veto; the way was paved for other laws to go through over his veto.

In the 84th Congress President Eisenhower began on foreign policy with a badly split group of Republicans. The senior Republicans in the Senate—his floor leader, many ranking leaders in the GOP policy committee and the important Appropriations and Finance Committees—were against him. Democrats saved him.

Let us look at the record. If President Eisenhower had been compelled to follow the pressures exerted by his own Republicans, he would have attempted a naval blockade of Red China. He would have attempted atomic bombs or ground troops to save Indochina. He would even have rejected the idea of conversations at the summit with the Russians at Geneva.

It was the solid support of Democrats in Congress that enabled him to follow Harry S. Truman's policy in rejecting the idea of rash warfare in the Formosa Straits and the Far East. It was the wise words of a Democrat, Senator WALTER S. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that encouraged him, reluctantly, to go to Geneva for the conference at the summit.

In the field of foreign policy the official GOP congressional leaders were silenced, at last, and forced to abandon foolish talk about appeasement. Democratic support set the President free from the chains his own party tried to fasten on him. Is this the political cold war Mr. Eisenhower predicted? The President has reason to be grateful that the people ignored his requests and elected Democrats who have a sense of national responsibility in the field of foreign policy.

This Democratic Congress has not been a rubber-stamp Congress. There are five issues in which I disagreed with the President on domestic matters. In each of these five matters we in Congress have reversed and rejected the President's notions or he has belatedly confessed he was wrong.

He made a shocking departure from precedent when he named an Iowa Republican figure, Allen Whitfield, as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have no opinion about the matters brought out about Mr. Whitfield in a trustee's capacity, involving an estate. I know that the appointment was wrong for the Atomic Energy Commission because it was strictly a political appointment. Mr. Whitfield had been an active Republican partisan and had been urged on Mr. Eisenhower for partisan reasons. Mr. Whitfield finally asked the President to withdraw his name, and Mr. Eisenhower obliged. A place on the AEC is no place for a partisan, and I would be as firmly opposed to nomination of a Democratic politician as a Republican politician.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I disagreed with the President's proposals to take a go-slow policy on the Air Force and to chop down conventional military ground forces.

We were told, sometimes with something like contempt, that we in Congress should not question President Eisenhower's judgment as a military man. But we have our own responsibilities in Congress, and we may reasonably take account of the fact that although a soldier the President never before had the job of making decisions for the civilian high command.

Before the session ended, the Air Force admitted we were right in protesting the go-slow policy in equipping our fliers with modern, high-speed jet planes. The Russians surprised some of the self-proclaimed experts—but not our committee—by their show of modern airpower last May. The administration had to come to Congress and ask permission to spend more money to speed up procurement—the very money we had tried to give them and they insisted earlier they did not need.

The administration was forced to accept an authorization of a bigger Marine Corps than it recommended. We in Congress cannot compel the administration to spend the money; we could not save the Army from the slash in its size that General Ridgway vehemently protested. But we know that the administration was wrong about the Air Force and we have urged it to maintain at least

the present strength of the Marine Corps.

On the Dixon-Yates contract, I fought the President since the day the ill-fated private utility deal was anounced. Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, and I raised the first warning flags, last year, that an attempt to cripple the TVA through the Atomic Energy Commission was a gross abuse of the AEC, an independent agency, for political purposes.

The longer and harder the President pushed Dixon-Yates, the deeper he fell into trouble. His subordinates were shown to have falsified the record at least by omission; they were shown guilty of a lack of candor. The President himself repeatedly promised that the "full record" would be made public, but a special Senate subcommittee kept on revealing inconsistencies, deceptions, and improper interference by the White House itself with the independent agencies, including the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The President finally ordered the Dixon-Yates deal canceled, using as a lame excuse the determination of the city of Memphis to build its own power plant rather than buy Dixon-Yates electricity. The plain fact is that the deal had to be canceled because it had landed the administration in a mess. If the President had listened to Congressman HOLIFIELD and me last year, he might have got out of the mess more quickly.

One other matter I feel deeply about. I made the first public protest in 1953 when Mr. Eisenhower in his first state of the Union message, misrepresented and distorted former President Truman's purposes in sending the 7th Fleet in 1950 to guard the Formosa Straits. Mr. Eisenhower pretended that Harry S. Truman's orders had the effect of "shielding" the Chinese Communists from the Nationalists on Formosa. This was a gross misstatement of fact, and President Eisenhower has now admitted it.

What Truman did was to use the 7th Fleet to prevent the war in Korea from spreading southward to the Formosa Straits. He ordered the 7th Fleet to enforce a kind of cease-fire. And what is Eisenhower trying to get now? He is trying to get by negotiated agreement exactly the cease-fire that President Truman imposed. He has ordered a special ambassador to meet with a special Chinese Communist ambassador in Geneva to discuss first our prisoners in Chinese jails and then other subjects, including whether the Reds will agree to a Formosa cease-fire.

He began talking about a cease-fire as early as last January, at a news conference, and he has repeatedly indicated that he wants such a cease-fire. We Democrats do not insult Dwight D. Eisenhower by charging that this is appeasement, that he is "shielding" the Chinese Reds. I simply wish he had not distorted former President Truman's motives about the 7th Fleet.

Let me reiterate these matters. I publicly disagreed with the President on five issues—the Whitfield nomination to the AEC, the proposed Air Force cuts, the proposed cuts in military ground forces, the Dixon-Yates contract, the misrepresentation of Truman's orders to the 7th Fleet. As the Member of the House directly responsible to the people of the Illinois 24th District, I have no reason to regret or withdraw anything I said publicly on these items. I can point to the record to show that subsequent events have proven my position correct.

When we turn to the field of social legislation, domestic legislation for the general welfare, we Democrats again have proved ourselves something more than rubber stamps. Here we have a great group of issues—housing, minimum wages, social security, public health, highways, unemployment insurance, farm program, taxes. These are programs which Democrats nourished through the New Deal and Fair Deal years.

Very frequently we Democrats declined to accept the President's advice on legislation on such matters. We knew his advice arose from that narrow little group of inner-circle counselors. We broadened and liberalized Mr. Eisenhower's recommendations.

Minimum wages is a good example. The President proposed an increase in the minimum wage in interstate industry from 75 to 90 cents an hour. The Democratic Congress thought that was inadequate.

The new figure of $1 an hour was justified by increases in the cost of living and by increases in productivity of workers—the output of workers per hour. It was justified by the doctrine of supporting purchasing power so that the corner grocer, the corner druggist, has good customers who can pay their bills.

The only employers in interstate industry the $1-an-hour rate can hurt are sweatshop employers. The bill for $1 an hour seemed to us a fair compromise below the $1.25 urgently requested by both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I must add a word about the performance on this bill of Secretary of Labor Mitchell. He refused to endorse the $1-an-hour figure until after it had been voted by both the House and the Senate. He finally disclosed that he would recommend that the President sign the measure, but he coupled with this snide comments that it was only half a bill, because Congress did not widen coverage of protected workers as well as raise the minimum rate.

Secretary Mitchell was given every chance by our senior Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, to endorse specific proposals on broadening coverage. He ran away from the chance, and he has little excuse now to criticize what the Congress did in passing a better minimum-wage law than he recommended.

The House passed by an overwhelming vote a new bill to liberalize the social-security system. The chief provisions were to provide benefits to totally disabled workers at the age of 50—instead of making them wait until age 65; to make benefits payable to women workers or wives and widows at age 62 instead of age 65; to provide for benefits for incapacitated children beyond the present cut-off age of 18 years.

This bill did not get through the Senate this year. It did not get through because the Eisenhower administration opposed it. It failed to pass because the resigned Welfare Secretary, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, fought it in both House committee and Senate committee.

Secretary Hobby's technique was to complain that the changes had not been studied enough, and besides she had some 17 other proposed changes she wanted the committees to consider. The three major changes proposed by the House bill actually have been studied for years, and everyone's arguments and all the cost estimates are in the record. A bill to improve the social-security system undoubtedly will be passed by the Senate next session, and we in the House helped contribute by pushing the issue this session.

The housing bill was blocked until near the very end of the session by the opposition of all four Republicans on the House Rules Committee. The stalemate was finally broken only Thursday, July 28, when a few of the Republicans on the committee surrendered and agreed to let the whole House of Representatives vote on housing measures. The housing bill finally adopted was better in many of its provisions than President Eisenhower's proposals—and Republicans fought it both because of that and because of its authorization of 45,000 new public housing units this year. The Democratic Senate bill would have authorized 145,000 units per year, but the Republican opposition in the House blocked this figure. Even so, we boosted the President's request by 10,000 units—above the 35,000 he asked—and got rid of some old restrictions that had the effect of crippling execution of public housing programs.

The highways bill eventually fell by the wayside, but it will be brought up again next year in the second session, and I am sure a sound bill, with adequate provision for financing a great new highway network by pay-as-we-go revenues, will be passed.

The key fact is that both the House and the Senate this year rejected President Eisenhower's insistence on "gimmick" financing, through a 30-year bond issue outside the so-called national debt and with the taxpayers burdened with a tremendous interest load of $11.5 billion to carry the 30-year bonds. We in Congress were unwilling to authorize a so-called highway program in which 55 cents would have gone for interest charges in payment for every dollar actually invested in roads.

It is costing the people a great deal less to wait for a few months for new highways, unpleasant though the wait may be, than if Congress had adopted the "gimmick" financing proposed by the White House.

The record of Congress in the public-health field is spotty—but once again the results arise principally from the shortsighted proposals the administration insisted on. President Eisenhower's inadequate program of health reinsurance involving private insurance companies was firmly rejected. It never came out of either House or Senate committees.

A sharp issue was the handling of the Salk polio-vaccine program. Here again

the Eisenhower-Hobby proposals were inadequate and lacking in generosity and humanitarianism. Our great neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada, handled the inoculation of Canadian children with a minimum of fuss and error and a maximum of efficiency. One of our Atlantic neighbors, the small country of Denmark, gave all Danish children practically complete immunity from polio by using the Salk vaccine technique wisely. But Mrs. Hobby claimed that she could not possibly have foreseen the demand of American parents for protection of their children.

On unemployment compensation, a necessary part of our modern system to safeguard families from temporary industrial layoffs and to protect purchasing power, Mr. Mitchell's Labor Department opposed Federal action. But hearings were held which will form a groundwork for progress in the future by Congress.

The House passed a bill to repeal Agriculture Secretary Benson's so-called flexible farm price support plan passed last year by the Republican 83d Congress. We Democrats do not believe that the way to handle the problems of farmers is to cut their support prices ruthlessly by calling the new plan "flexible." I have no doubt that the Democratic Senate will move in the same direction as the House next year.

The House this year passed a bill to override the common Eisenhower practice of granting most tax relief to corporations and corporation stockholders. Corporations and stockholders deserve fair and equal treatment, but no more. The House tax bill, enacted after Speaker RAYBURN made a dramatic personal appeal, would have chopped a flat $20 a year from the payable taxes of everybody. If anyone thinks this is trivial, let him remember that even a well-paid factory worker with 3 children may make only $3,700 a year. To him, a tax benefit of $100—$20 each for himself, his wife, and his 3 children—would be a welcome gain in what he is able to spend for food, housing, and clothing. Once again, I have no doubt that the Senate will join the House in moving in this direction next year.

One other matter should be mentioned about the relations of President Eisenhower and Democrats in Congress. Most of us have given strong support to the President on many issues. I myself am listed by Congressional Quarterly, an independent research group dealing with Congress, as having supported Mr. Eisenhower much more frequently than the average of Illinois Republican Members of the House.

It is necessary to say frankly, however, that many Democrats were infuriated by President Eisenhower's stern schoolmaster attitude toward us after we had saved one after another of his foreign-policy programs.

The very day the President chose to pull out of his pocket an obviously prepared list of measures, and to complain to a news conference that we were stalling about these measures, was the day when his own housing bill was blocked in the House Rules Committee by the votes of all four Republicans on that committee. The Democrats voted 6 to 2 in the committee to send the housing measure to the floor; all 4 Republicans voted to stall.

It is all very well for President Eisenhower to pay frequent tribute to Senator GEORGE's kindness to him. Speaker RAYBURN of the House has also been kind—kinder than the President seems to realize. It was SAM RAYBURN who saved Mr. Eisenhower's foreign-trade bill in the House, against the opposition of most Republicans. We Democrats have no apology, I repeat, for liberalizing Mr. Eisenhower's domestic programs or at least blocking them in the shortsighted form he proposes.

As many of you know, much of the work of Congress is done in committees. That is how we divide up the tasks and try to become well-informed in the fields to which we are assigned. I am fortunate in my committees—Armed Services, which covers the defense of our country, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, which has jurisdiction over and responsibility for all our programs on atomic energy for defense and for peaceful use of the atom. I am chairman of the Atomic Energy Subcommittee on Research and Development.

All through a session of Congress, and particularly toward the end, the burden of the important committees is a serious one. On last Thursday, for example, when the House itself held a long session involving important bills, I was in five separate committee and subcommittee meetings.

My own Subcommittee on Research and Development was given the last-minute task of devising ways and means to end the stalemate over President Eisenhower's proposed atomic-powered merchant ship. The President's original proposal was not a sound one, and most of us on the Atomic Energy Committee recognized it—both Republicans and Democrats. But we also realized that we had a responsibility to work out the soundest substitute we could, so that we could both demonstrate America's good intentions regarding the atom and advance the development of practical atomic engines for merchant vessels. This is the kind of purpose for which our Subcommittee on Research and Development was created, and we accepted our job.

At the same time the work of the House as a whole is important, and we had to leave our committee work occasionally to go to the floor and cast our votes, on rollcalls, on measures of intimate concern to the people of our districts. I was present to vote against the natural gas bill, which would reduce Federal regulation of gas prices and eventually lead to the piling up of new charges to people who heat their homes and heat their water or cook their meals with natural gas.

As this report is written I am preparing to leave for Geneva, Switzerland, to participate in the first international conference on the creative, civilized use of atomic energy for the benefit of men everywhere. This conference will be held under the auspices of the United Nations.

I will be back in the 24th District of Illinois as soon as my duties in Geneva permit, and I will be available for many months, before the next session of Congress convenes in January, for reports to the people of our district.

Interview for Everybody's Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of the interview which I granted to Everybody's Daily and which appeared in the July 27, 1955, edition of that Buffalo newspaper:

AS MEMBER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI PRESENTED MANY ANTI-RED BILLS

(Exclusive interview with Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin)

Question. Undoubtedly, this has been one of the most interesting sessions you have ever attended. How many years have you been serving as a Congressman?

Answer. I am presently serving my fourth 2-year term in the House of Representatives. Prior to my election to Congress, I served two terms in the Wisconsin State Senate.

Question. Inasmuch as the important work of Congress is done through the committee system, of what committees are you a member, and what are their special purposes?

Answer. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is in charge of legislation dealing with our foreign policy—with such measures as the mutual-security program, the point 4 program, and so on.

Question. As one of the ranking more important members of these committees, and because legislation is always introduced through the committee function, what legislation have you been responsible for, and why?

Answer. That is a very broad question. I have sponsored, among others, bills calling for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy, for the investigation of Communist atrocities in Korea for the condemnation of the Soviet domination of Poland for the admission of Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for the creation of a Pacific pact union on the style of NATO, and a number of others.

Question. Undoubtedly you are planning to introduce other legislation. Would you want to tell us what it will be and the purpose of it?

Answer. I have no immediate plans for the introduction of new legislation dealing with foreign policy issues. As you know, the present session is rapidly approaching an end and for that reason it would not be feasible to introduce new legislation at this time. Further, I have a number of bills pending and pertaining to other fields, and I will try to secure consideration for those measures before Congress adjourns.

Question. Would you say that the present session, which is considered an off-year as far as elections are concerned, is going to be as productive of good work for the country and American people as some of the other ones you have been a member?

Answer. I believe that this session will go down into history as a constructive and pro-

ductive session. Congress has done a considerable amount of work on various important measures. A comprehensive defense budget has been approved; the reciprocal trade-agreements program has been extended; a number of vital treaties have been approved, the mutual security program is in the process of being continued, and so on. In addition, progress has been made on social security revisions, on increases on the minimum wage, on hospital and school construction assistance program, and the reorganization of the military Reserves, and on the housing legislation. This, in my estimation, is a considerable record of achievement in an off-year session.

Question: As a member of the majority party, would you say that the average Congressman is first concerned with the political significance of everything that comes before him, or is he more interested in the overall legisaltion to be considered, with the effect on his own constituents, or his country as a whole?

Answer. I would say—and I am very sincere in saying this—that by and large, the average Congressman is primarily interested in seeing that the legislation he supports is sound, and in our national interest. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule. In some cases, individual Representatives will fight for bills which would benefit some segments of the country and particular groups, even though such bills may not be consistent with the overall interests of the Nation. Generally, however, they look first to see if a particular bill will serve the interests of the country, and vote for the bill if that is the case—even though their vote may not be fully understood or appreciated by some of the people back home in their district.

Question. Inasmuch as your own constituents elected you to Congress, would you say your first consideration on all legislation, or the majority of legislation is to your constituents or your country as a whole? What are good examples of this type of consideration on your part?

Answer. Now to logically answer your question, I must first point out that what is good for our Nation, at the same time benefits each and every one of us. In other words, there is very seldom any clash between a local and a national interest. Legislation which is good for the Nation as a whole, is not harmful to the people of a given locality, because the people of that locality benefit from the healthy state of the Nation.

There are, of course, times when local and national interests do not appear to be identical. We had an issue of this type arise recently in conjunction with the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Now our trade program has definitely benefited our Nation during the past two decades. There is little doubt about it. Nevertheless, there are some firms which are hurt by foreign competition. In order to ascertain to what extent the people of the Fourth District of Wisconsin are affected by foreign trade, I asked the Library of Congress to conduct a thorough study of this subject. With the cooperation of my office, the Library of Congress for 8 months studied the impact of foreign trade on Milwaukee. The results of the study surprised many people. The study showed that the majority of our manufacturing industries, employing a vast majority of our industrial workers, are deeply interested in foreign trade and benefit from it to a large extent. To vote against the reciprocal trade-agreements program, therefore, would be against the interests of the majority of our workers—even though one company felt that it would not benefit from such a vote. For that reason, I voted for the program.

Question. What do you think is the most important legislation matter that has come before you in this session, and has it been worked out correctly and constructively?

Answer. I feel that some of the important pieces of legislation have not been worked out as yet during the present session. The issue of aid to school construction, the question of the highway program, the minimum wage increase, the subject of social-security revision—these and other vital measures are still being worked on. We will not be able to accurately evaluate the fruits of this session until final action will be taken on these bills.

At this point, however, I would say that the action on the defense budget, on the trade program, on the mutual security program, and the plugging up of the loopholes in the Republican Revenue Act of 1954, constitute constructive actions on the part of this Congress.

Question. Being a member of the opposition party of the President, would you say the present handling of the Far East and European situation has been in the best interests of the country. If not, what suggestions do you offer?

Answer. This again, is an extremely broad question, and it is difficult to answer it briefly. Generally, I would say that the present handling of the European situation has been much more constructive and sensible than our country's actions with regard to the Far East. In that area, we have been, in effect, retreating for 3 years. The Korean truce was not satisfactory, as the subsequent events have clearly shown. The Indochina truce gave the Communists a new conquest to boast about, and consigned several million peoples to Communist domination and slavery. In addition, it has imperilled the rest of Indochina and southeast Asia in general. Neither has much progress been made in resolving the critical issues between Formosa and Red China.

As to the suggestions that may be offered on this subject, I would like to refer you to the two reports issued by the Special Study Missions to the Far East, of which I was a member. Some of the actions recommended by my committee have been taken by the administration—unfortunately, these actions came late, and fell far short of our recommendations. The problem of doing "too little, too late" has been at the bottom of the difficulties which had to be faced in that area today.

Question. Do you agree with a recent survey that 91 percent of the Americans are willing to risk war, if all peaceful means of releasing our prisoners of war in China fail?

Answer. The thought of an all-out war is to borrow a phrase from one of the statesmen, of our times, "unbearable." A nuclear war may actually destroy our entire civilization. There is no doubt about this—the unleasing of the deadly weapons which we possess, as well as those which the Communists possess, may bring about such destruction that it may take centuries to rebuild the world.

Knowing this, I do not believe that our people would lightly recommend that our Government plunge our Nation, and the entire world, into an all-out conflict with the Communists. I firmly believe that we must leave no stone unturned to secure the release of our men held by the Communists in China. I have repeatedly urged that this be done, and I am confident that our Government is doing everything possible in this respect. Whether an all-out war should be started if these peaceful efforts fail, is something that cannot be decided on the strength of a public-opinion poll. This is an issue of the utmost gravity, and can only be resolved—if the occasion for it arises—by Congress and by our Chief Executive.

Question. Include all suggestions you may have that President Eisenhower should discuss at the forthcoming Big Four meeting concerning all of the captive countries.

Answer. In reply to this question, I wish to call to your attention the enclosed copy of the remarks which I have recently made on the floor of the House, urging the President to exert every effort during the forthcoming Big Four meeting to secure the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

In addition, I would like to mention that I have joined with other Members of Congress in urging the President to discuss, during the conference, the possibility of initiating an exchange of visitors between the free world and Communist-dominated nations. Such an exchange of people and of views could greatly help in lessening the tensions presently existing in the world.

H. R. 7000, To Provide for the Strengthening of the Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7000 is about to become law. When this bill is law then it will be my duty as a Representative in Congress to do everything possible to see that the law is properly administered. I believe that should be the attitude of every Representative and every American concerning any legislation that he or she might have opposed. After giving such a law our backing and a fair trial, if it is then found unworkable, we should have the courage to repeal it and substitute something more in the national interest. In a democracy such as ours, this should be the attitude of every loyal American.

However, it is proper as one of the small minority who voted against H. R. 7000 to give my reason for so doing. The bill has now gone to the President for signature. When he signs it, it will be the law of the land for the next 4 years. As a bill, it is satisfactory to no one, not to the Pentagon, which asked for something very different; not to the President, who wants a strong Reserve to make up for his weakening of the Regular Military Establishment; and not to the Congress, which passed this bill solely as a compromise. As a law, it will prove unfair, unworkable, and ill-timed. It will create confusion, breed resentment, and work great hardship on the Armed Forces.

The day of large Reserve forces is past. The very idea is becoming outmoded. The most effective Reserve forces would have been of no assistance on the day of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. If Japan had the same industrial potential that the United States possessed, she would have won World War II in 5 minutes at Pearl Harbor. There would have been nothing that the United States could have ever done to overcome the disadvantages of the Pearl Harbor defeat. We were saved because we had years to build bomber plants, train pilots, and again enter the war in the Pacific on

more favorable terms. But had Japan possessed the ability to come on and control the air over America, we could have never mobilized and the war would have been over with America the loser. The usefulness of unmobilized Reserves disappeared with the development of the long-range bomber aircraft and nuclear weapons. If Russia should attack us, only two forces would be of any avail: the Ready defense force, alerted by the radar warning system that we are building across our northern approaches, and the Ready strategic air forces, that can deal an immediate retaliatory blow. In an atomic war, the need for Reserves would pass before they could be mobilized. The Military Reserve Act of 1955 represents the sort of legislation that would have been useful in preparing us to meet the challenge of 1914, but not even the challenge of 1941. We are still thinking of Chateau-Thierry and of sending great masses of men over there with plenty of time to mobilize and train them.

We should be preparing for a war of the future. Philip of Macedonia and Alexander the Great developed something new—the Greek Phalanx. With this new development Alexander was able to conquer the world with a very small force. The Roman Legion was something new. It dominated the world for 500 years. Britain was a small island, a dot on the map of the world with limited manpower, but her leaders were farsighted and developed through science and skill a navy which controlled the 7 seas for 400 years. This my friends is the age of airpower, guided missiles, rockets, germ warfare, and scientific development. The nation that can plan ahead and excel in these military fields of endeavor, that nation will control the world for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you that in 1934 and 1935, one of the major courses taught at West Point was the horse calvary. While Hitler was building Panzer divisions and Stuka dive bombers, these great military minds, including that of our great President, were thinking too much in terms of the trench warfare of World War I. Had Germany been contiguous to the United States in 1940, we would not have lasted as long as France with our horse calvary, a few outmoded tanks and no air force.

I appeared on a national television show not long ago with a retired general who openly advocated a reactivation of the horse calvary. We must put aside this thinking and with imagination, determination and science prepare for a war of the future as the best means of preventing that war. I think I should say at this point that it was my opinion in 1944 and the opinion of many experts that World War II could have been won in Europe without the loss of a single infantry soldier wading across the beaches of Normandy and sloshing through the mud of northern France and the Rhineland. If the leaders of America at that time and before had possessed the imagination of the British when Britannia ruled the waves, they could have put the B–29 in operation over Germany and Germany would have been forced to capitulate. This plane, which later destroyed Japan, had been in the blueprint stage years before the Normandy invasion. We only needed leaders with the courage to develop it and put it in operation over Europe. Germany was a small country, highly industrialized and could not have long withstood TNT dropped by thousands of B–20's, much less thousands of atomic bombs from the same source. But our military thinking was geared to the Meuse-Argonne, so we lost nearly a million men, killed and wounded on the battlefields of western Europe.

Let us be realistic. Our only potential enemy is Russia and her satellites. She has overwhelming superiority in ground troops, tanks, and tactical aircraft. We cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, match on land, in numbers or in firepower, the overwhelming masses of Russia and China. Our only alternative is to balance this preponderance of strength, not by building an air force equal to Russia's but by building an air force many times larger and superior in technology to counterbalance her vast land superiority. The situation is too delicate, too precarious, to waste money on a vast, cumbersome reserve that could only be in action after months of mobilization and training.

America needs long-term enlistments, if we are to survive, for our mechanics, our airmen, our scientists, our radar specialists, and our technicians. We need a force ready to move this minute, this afternoon, for tomorrow may be too late. We need men with years of intense daily training. Six months of active duty with a night a week for several years cannot possibly give our national defense the highly skilled men needed. It takes 5 to 10 years of constant training to develop a good pilot, a good scientist, or a first-class technician in any category. Yet this is the type of man who will save America—not the ones who only know left-face and right-face.

Adequate national defense costs money. The United States is already hopelessly in debt. Every dollar must be made to count. After several years the Reserve program under this bill will cost huge sums of money. I believe this money could be better spent on a force in being ready to move at a moment's notice. I greatly fear that a tremendous retirement burden will be fostered on the American taxpayer under this vast Reserve program. Also, a retirement that might become unfair to those in Regular service. In other words, a man in the Reserve can build up and eventually draw retirement by being in the Reserve and at the same time continue his civilian occupation and provide for old age. For instance, men can be found today who draw Reserve retirement, social security, State retirement, possibly congressional retirement in some cases and at the same time amass a personal fortune. This is practically impossible for a Regular in military service. He does not have time to carry on a business on the side nor is his salary such that he can save up to provide real security. So, often a man in Regular service, after 20 or 30 years of such service, will find it necessary to get a job to support his family.

Many of those advocating this bill stated the necessity of having an organized group in every section of the country to keep order in case of an atomic attack. This is negative thinking. This is admitting failure in the first instance. This is tantamount to an admission that we are not making proper preparations to prevent such an atack. This is the thinking of prophets of doom. This theory is fallacious in the extreme and will lead to the wrong psychology. Our National Guard and civil-defense organizations will take care of any such emergency. Before the National Guard is inducted into Federal service a home guard should be organized as during World War II. On this point, Mr. Speaker, I think every citizen should be required to belong to a local organization to render first aid, do patrol duty, and things of this nature. This organization should function as a patriotic service without compensation. I do not believe that real patriotism can be bought. We owe something to America and to our way of life. It would be a privilege to serve in such an organization to prevent chaos at home in time of dire emergency.

Without adding this confusing bill, our national defense is cumbersome and clumsy to say the least. We have four Air Forces, the Regular Air Force, the Navy Air Force, the Marine Air Force, and the Army Air Force. In the interest of saving money and in striking power, theses should be consolidated into one force with a terrific punch. It would be absurd and ridiculous to further divide command by giving each field Army control of a certain number of tactical aircraft as advocated by some. Many of the technical schools of the Army could be consolidated and our ground forces in general consolidated into one highly skilled, highly mobile striking force with the same training areas and same uniforms, saving million of dollars. Attention should also be given to uniform lines of supply and a common warehouse system for all services. Likewise, I believe our lady organizations should be consolidated and reduced, as civilian help can be acquired more cheaply, or men inducted into service with minor physical defects. The hour is too urgent to continue to play politics with the taxpayers' money.

This bill comes at a time when we desperately need a highly skilled, thoroughly trained, mobile Army with emphasis on airborne troops. It comes in a hour when our great Navy needs long-term enlistments of technicians who can handle proximity fuses, radar, rockets, and Nike. This bill will furnish no branch of our service with the kind of men needed.

We, as representatives of the people, will not be able to escape the condemnation of history if we fail to meet this crisis with a streamlined 1975 national defense.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize again that if we dissipate our resources all over the world among doubtful allies and further scatter our striking potential among several air forces and many branches of the service, we will be inviting disaster. If Russia succeeds in her

initial attack on the United States and our industrial potential is destroyed, then the greatest reserve in the world would be of no avail. We must be able to repel this initial onslaught from the air, whether it be conventional aircraft or guided missiles, and instantaneously launch a counterattack through the air that will paralyze the heart of Russia.

This Reserve measure places emphasis on land surface forces. At one stage the legislation included the provisions of a bonus for individuals enlisting in the Army and the Marine Corps. The thinking that inspired the bill is the thinking of surface force adherents, who have so far failed to comprehend the role of air power in a modern Military Establishment. The thinking that dominates the bill, as enacted, is the thinking of men oriented to the land masses type tactics. The bill fails completely to recognize the needs of the Air Force, even that the buildup of the Reserve in certain categories will make it diffcult for the Air Force to enlist the men it needs for regular service. There is less comprehension of the requirements of airpower in this bill than in the President's budget message.

The bill is unworkable. Its provisions are complex, and many of them still are subject to legal interpretation. No one can yet be sure what final effect the bill will have upon our military structure. It is easier to be sure of the effect it will have on the young men whose lives it will overshadow for the better part of a decade. Abraham Lincoln is credited with the authorship of the statement that a house divided against itself cannot stand. This Reserve bill will divide this Nation into two groups: Those affected by it and those who manage to escape its provisions. This bill sets brother against brother.

I say this because this bill does not provide either for universality of service or equitable service. Some men will volunteer for 3 or more years' active duty. Some will be drafted for 2 years. Some will volunteer for 3 to 6 months active duty training. Some will serve their entire time in the Reserves with no extended period of active duty at all. Some will receive one rate of pay, some another, and some will not wear the uniform at all—either in active or Reserve service. Admittedly, it sets up alternative choices for young men facing the draft. Unfortunately, it requires nothing of young men who, somehow, miss the draft entirely.

The administration of this law will impose a very serious burden on the Military Establishment. New offices will have to be created to handle the personnel records of the men who serve under its various categories. I can anticipate that the law will also impose a very great burden on the Members of Congress. Parents will demand explanations; men affected by it will complain of the inequities; we will be asked to take steps to see that justice is done, and yet we will remain as confused by the complicated provisions of the compromise we have erected into a juggernaut as those who direct their questions to us.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the desire of my colleagues to insure the security of the United States. I do not question their eagerness to create a strong military force to augment the Regular forces of our 2½-million-man Military Establishment. But I do question the farsightedness of many who advocated this bill. I question whether they had the proper concepts of future war or were acquainted with the facts. I know the political pressure groups were active. Russia is talking soft these days. Were my colleagues so bemused by the coo of a mechanical dove that they no longer realize the need for Reserve service that strengthens the Armed Forces, and Reserve legislation that can be translated effectively into combat power as quickly as needed?

No, Mr. Speaker, I fear that many Americans failed to support adequate Reserve legislation because they fail to appreciate what is needed to guarantee the security of this country. They see armed soldiers on the land, tanks and guns ready for action, warships riding at anchor. They do not see the aircraft that fly out of sight; they object to the noise of jet aircraft crossing the sonic barrier; they complain of the necessity of placing air bases near centers of industry and population. They have not yet come to understand that air power and air power alone can defend the United States against attack that comes through the air. They neither realize that air power won the decision in World War II, nor that world war III may well be ended before any surface forces could be employed. Lacking thorough study, they would establish a Reserve Army, to be composed of a high proportion of green young men, with very short active duty training periods, who may well never be needed, or if needed, will be impotent to add strength to the Regular Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, an air force in being is not an air force in action, though it is ready for action. A strong air force ready for action is the strongest kind of a reserve force. It can do for our country what the Reserve force to be created by this new law can never do. It is a police force, to keep the peace. It is a riot squad, ready to meet an emergency. It is a guaranty that peace will be preserved or, if once disturbed, quickly restored. It is the only Reserve force we need to guarantee our security.

The money spent on spasmodic training of part-time participants is money down a rathole. The funds we will need to appropriate for this measure would build aircraft; they would provide air wings; they could stimulate research and development to give body to weapons as yet on the drawing board or in the mind's eye of a laboratory scientist.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that Russia is placing major emphasis on reserve training. Russia is building aircraft. We all know now of her new long-range strategic bomber, of her new jet interceptor, of her new all-weather fighter. We know that she has built these planes at a rate surprising to us, that upset all our expectations and calculations. We know that Russian technology is excellent. We know that Russia has an enormous, and an enormously strong air force in being. We can be sure that the masters of the Kremlin are pleased with the fumbling that has gone on, on Capitol Hill.

Reserve forces at any time are intended merely to occupy an important secondary role in our Defense Establishment. In the age of jet aircraft and nuclear weapons, regular, full-time professional forces, ready instantly to fight, must have the major emphasis and the highest priority.

It is ironic that while the overall size and the overall capabilities of forces are being reduced—with further reductions scheduled—this Congress should have passed a hybrid and unsatisfactory Reserve bill, satisfactory to none, questioned by all, and sure to plague this and future Congresses so long as it remains on the statute books.

The 10th General Assembly of the United Nations: Challenge and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to be appointed by the President, along with the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, or Arkansas, as a United States representative to the forthcoming 10th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, representing the United States Congress on the delegation. Heading the delegation will be the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who is the permanent United States representative to the United Nations, and the other members are Gov. Dennis Joseph Roberts, of Rhode Island, and the Honorable Colgate Whitehead Darden, Jr., president of the University of Virginia. I appreciate deeply the opportunity which this will present, and I shall strive to bring into the deliberations of the United States delegation the congressional point of view reflecting the public opinion of our people. I believe it is essential that those of us who represent the United States at the United Nations, and indeed before other international bodies and conferences, must always bear in mind the central fact that whatever we decide upon in such international bodies vitally affects every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is equally important that our people be kept as fully informed as possible on the activities of its Government, particularly those activities concerning the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, the organization that the people of the world have chosen as the primary agency for the maintenance of international peace and security is the United Nations. Over and over again the United Nations has been declared to be the cornerstone of American foreign policy. I am in full accord with this principle. Too often the organization has been attacked by those who have not had the facts. During the 83d Congress, I was privileged to serve as

chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Our subcommittee held extensive hearings covering the whole range of United States participation in international organizations, including the United Nations. Testimony was received from individuals and organizations representing a cross-section of American life and activity. These people and organizations are to be commended for the time and effort which they took in presenting their views to the subcommittee. I felt it was extremely important to make available these views to the American people and to our own Government officials. These hearings were printed, and the demand has exceeded the supply. During the course of the hearings, it became apparent to me and to other members of the subcommittee that while it was true that there exists certain shortcomings in the United Nations, nevertheless its record of accomplishment far outweighs its shortcomings. I believe firmly that we must put forth every effort to improve the organization in every possible way, at the same time recognizing that the organization has served mankind well.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well at this point to summarize the major accomplishments of the United Nations over the past 10 years. President Eisenhower, in a recent message to the Congress transmitting the ninth annual report on United States participation in the United Nations, stated:

> In a decade of trying years, the United Nations has developed from a blueprint for peace into a living, functioning organization.

It has done so in spite of such unforeseen and major problems as mankind's entry into the atomic age with all its potential for good or evil, and the Soviet inspired cold war which has attempted to frustrate international cooperation. The United Nations over the past 10 years has amassed this impressive record in carrying out the obligations assumed under the charter:

MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

In carrying out its obligations to maintain international peace and security the United Nations has established and maintained a truce between Israel and the Arab League. This continues to be an uneasy truce but one which has effectively prevented open conflict. United Nations intervention in the dispute between India and Pakistan over control of Kashmir has prevented the outbreak of war in that sensitive area. The United Nations successfully mediated between the Dutch and the Indonesians, and this mediation has resulted in the establishment of an independent Republic of Indonesia.

SUPPRESSION OF ACTS OF AGGRESSION

The United Nations played a key part in 1946 in ending Communist aggression and threats of aggression in Iran and forcing the withdrawal of Soviet troops in that area. Likewise, Communist hostilities and subversive activities against Greece were brought into the open by the United Nations and the threat against the independence of that country effectively stopped. The invasion of the Republic of Korea by Communist forces in 1950 was the most direct and serious challenge to the authority and power of the United Nations. This challenge was met by the united action of the free countries of the world with the United States taking the leading part and making the major contribution. The aggressors were thrown back beyond the point from which they started. This action proved that the United Nations, unlike the League of Nations, could take military action when necessary to resist unprovoked aggression. An important by-product of the Korean action was the passage of the uniting-for-peace resolution whereby the General Assembly is empowered to deal with acts of aggression when the Security Council is prevented from doing so by the veto.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The United Nations through the Economic and Social Council has developed effective plans for economic cooperation between nations to carry out the United Nation's responsibilities for creating conditions of well-being and raise standards of living. Regional economic commissions have been established for Europe, Latin America, and Asia and the Far East to determine the factors retarding the economic development of the areas and to make recommendations for improving these conditions. Because much international tension has economic roots, these cooperative economic efforts are effectively dealing with these problems at the point of origin.

The specialized agencies such as the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the International Labor Organization, to mention three, have established far-reaching programs to help underdeveloped areas raise their standards of health, nutrition, labor, and education. In general, the United States contribution to the work of these agencies, which we have strongly supported since the beginning, has been progressively reduced while the contribution of those countries which benefit directly is increasing. The work of these agencies is contributing importantly to an increase in political and economic stability with food production rising through the use of modern agricultural methods and debilitating diseases such as malaria being progressively eliminated.

In the fall of 1953 I served as chairman of a special study mission on international organizations and movements, which included the Honorable ALBERT P. MORANO, and the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY. The group made a study of seven specialized agencies of the United Nations in Europe and issued its report—House Report No. 1257, 83d Congress—on February 25, 1954. This report records the high degree of accomplishment achieved by the specialized agencies.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

At the initiative of the United States and with the unanimous cooperation of the United Nations, atomic energy is being harnessed to serve the ends of peace rather than war. The Peaceful Uses Conference convening in Geneva on August 8 is the greatest scientific conference of this kind ever called. It holds within it the potential for vast benefits to mankind. At the same time progress is being made toward establishing an international agency for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

WORLD FORUM OF PUBLIC OPINION

The United Nations, and within it the General Assembly in particular, has developed into a sounding board of public opinion which has served the interests of the free world well. In this forum the Communist cold war has been revealed for what it is, and the peaceful aims and cooperative endeavors of the free world have increasingly won the support of the majority. The recent release of the 11 American fliers illegally detained by the Chinese Communist is due in part to the pressure of world public opinion as applied through the General Assembly and carried out by the Secretary General.

DISARMAMENT

Effective disarmament under safeguarded controls is one of the major tasks which the United Nations has undertaken to achieve. While it has not yet succeeded in reaching this universally desired goal, there are increasing signs that the long-drawn-out negotiations under the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations are making progress. It is hoped that, faced with mutual annihilation in a modern atomic war, the powers principally concerned may come to terms in a program safeguarded by the United Nations.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

The United Nations has been effective in furthering important aspects of United States foreign policy objectives. This is particularly so in the various regional organizations which the United States has taken the initiative in establishing in our national interests as well as to insure the security of nations threatened by Communist aggression or subversion. These regional arrangements are specifically permitted under article 52 of the charter and they exist, so to speak, "under the umbrella" of the United Nations.

As I have indicated earlier in my remarks, the United Nations is far from a perfect organization and of necessity reflects within itself the many imperfections of our international society. However, it has proved to be a going and a growing organization which is working effectively for peace and for establishing conditions of well-being and security among nations. Its first 10 years have proved beyond doubt that there is universal recognition of the need for an international organization such as the United Nations. As far as I know, no member of the United Nations has threatened to resign and no member has been threatened with expulsion, while the waiting list of those desiring to join the organization is long. The elasticity of the United Nations Charter has enabled the organization to cope successfully with unexpected difficulties and it has become increasingly a source of strength to which mankind looks for harmonizing the action of nations.

This forthcoming session of the General Assembly of the United Nations may well be the crucial one in the history of the organization. It will call for steadfastness of purpose, adherence to principle and clear recognition of the best interests of the United States and of the United Nations. I look forward to the challenge it will present and realize full well the heavy responsibilities which will be ours.

Security and Peace Problems of 1953 Are Still With Us in 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a reply to a high-school student in my congressional district, who was concerned as to what was the greatest problem facing a Congressman today.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that my reply may be enlightening to other students, and those who review the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the public libraries and elsewhere. It has been written in language that is understandable to the average layman, one who desires to know and interpret this document in his everyday life in this great country of ours.

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Mr. SAM DICKSON,
Takoma Park, Md.

DEAR SAM: This will acknowledge your letter requesting my views on what I consider the greatest problems facing a Congressman today.

World peace is the most important subject today and while many of the problems involved are confined to Congress and the representatives of our Government at the present time, I feel that every young man and woman who will soon be taking an active part as citizens will want to do everything possible to contribute toward this end.

As I discuss this with you, I will mention some of my own experiences and observations to illustrate how I believe the United States of America, at this crucial period, can play a role that might solve the most staggering question of all time.

As I see it, the problem is how can this generation develop world stability that will take away forever the threat of war as a mechanism for the solution of international disputes. In this scientific and atomic age, the sphere of our world is rapidly becoming more and more confined. We must explore every possible means of settling our affairs in a peaceable manner.

My connection personally with the problem arose 35 years ago. After struggling hard to get through college, to get through law school, to get my law school debts paid, on January 2, 1917, I started practicing law in San Francisco, Calif. Within a few months the United States declared war on Imperial Germany. It was a terrible disappointment and shock to me that after all my struggles to get started in the practice of my chosen profession, a war should break out. Of course, as you and your classmates realize too well, the threat of war has never ceased since then, and the planning of your future must still include a period of service in the Armed Forces.

Following the outbreak of World War I, I decided to enlist and I was sent to the first officers' training camp at the Presidio in San Francisco. I took infantry training there and one of the first exercises we had was to learn to plunge a bayonet into a dummy hanging from a rod. This, of course, was to train us in the technique of killing an enemy soldier with a bayonet. The exercise, although it was in the interest of my own self-protection, repulsed me. I could stand the marching, the shooting, the sleeping out in the open, but to stab a human being was something that I rebelled against. I learned from some pals of mine that across the bay the Army was conducting a ground school for aviators. I contacted the commandant and asked him if he thought I could pass the examination and get into the course. He said he thought I could. I enlisted in the Signal Corps and in a few weeks I was attending ground school and in several months was sent to San Diego, Calif., where I learned to fly. When my training was completed, 67 of us were ordered overseas. We sailed out of New York Harbor on March 1, 1918, and by the 15th of March we were learning to fly Neuports, Spads, and other French planes. In August, I was sent to the front and early in September we were ordered to the St. Mihiel front. There I had my first flight on a military front and flew a few missions. We were then transferred to the Argonne front where I made the first flight for our group on September 26, the morning of the commencement of the final drive that won World War I. I flew all during the time of that drive, making the last flight for our group on November 10, 1918. I was more fortunate than some of my buddies. I lost one man in my plane who was shot in the arm and who died from the loss of blood.

During those flights, I viewed the devastation and the ruin that that war had caused to that portion of France. I saw the numerous cemeteries throughout the area and, when the armistice came, I saw the refugees coming through into our area looking for their loved ones and wondering if they were alive or dead. The terrible tragedy of war—the dead, the wounded, the ruined towns, and the sorrowing people—overwhelmed me.

Of all the nations involved in that war, France suffered the most. The cream of the crop of that generation went into early graves and today, France is still suffering from a lack of leadership by reason of the loss of young men during that period from 1914 to 1918.

President Wilson had said it was "a war to end wars" and in my youthful confidence I felt sure that the losses in the countries involved had convinced the people of the world that war was a futile, barbaric method of settling international disputes.

I was very anxious that the United States enter the League of Nations. To me this was a vehicle that would tie the great countries of the world together and formulate the public sentiment, as well as the necessary mechanisms to settle international disputes by peaceful means. As you know, the League of Nations was rejected by the Nation whose President had been the one who initiated its creation. This was a great disappointment, but I did not believe the consequences would be too great. I felt sure that the great nations of the world would never start another war. From the ruination I had witnessed, I was certain that no nation would be foolish enough to involve itself in another war which undoubtedly would be more destructive than the one we had just won.

Of course, you know the history—when we were just recovering from the many post-war problems, another war developed which almost wrecked our Nation from an economic standpoint. The depression struck us and Germany became influenced by a dictator who cried, "Follow me and I will bring justice to Germany. I will take the Reich into better days which Germany and the Germans deserve." Soon another war was upon us. Vastly more devastating. Tremendously more costly and much more prolonged than the first one. Inevitably we were drawn into it and it practically encompassed the entire earth.

During that war it was stated that we had learned our lesson and that means would be provided to safeguard the world against another catastrophe. The Atlantic Charter was promulgated. Many conferences were held at which various broad principles were adopted in the interest of unity among nations for the preservation of peace in the future. High, broad, noble principles were set forth by the leaders of the various nations to indicate that no longer would the world be afflicted with the curse of legalized murder, known as war.

Local autonomy in the selection of officials in each community had been practically guaranteed by ourselves and our allies. However, soon Poland held an election to select its officials and this was supervised by Russia. The government thus created by that election, was and now is, a Communist government, completely dominated by the Soviets. Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, Romania, Yugoslavia, all met with the same fate and are now, except Yugoslavia, dominated by Russia and each of those countries has Communist regimes. We failed to carry out the basic principle of local autonomy and freedom and it is now blacked out in those countries.

A conference at Cairo was held between Churchill, Roosevelt, and Chiang Kai-shek. China was assured that the rape of China by Japan would be avenged. China would get back Manchuria. She would get back Formosa. China was so important that in the organization of the United Nations in 1945, she was one of the Big Five that composed the majority of the Security Council. This was to be the group which would maintain the peace of the world. China today does not even have its own government on the mainland. Communists have taken over in China and the former President of China, Chiang Kai-shek, is now located on Formosa, hoping that some day he may recapture the government he once controlled.

In setting up the United Nations, high hope was held out to the people of the world, that here at last was created a nucleus for international protection of small nations against larger nations going to war. It is unfortunate to observe that the United Nations has not made much progress in this direction. To over 90 percent of the steps proposed that might lead to control of atomic weapons, the limitation of armaments, the reduction of military forces, Russia has exercised its veto. The United Nations Forum is a world soundingboard and no other nation has taken so much advantage of it, or gets as large results from it, as the Soviets. Men are getting discouraged as they look into the future.

It is recognized that some form of political organization, which would have the authority to see that its members abide by the rules laid down by the organization, must be formed. This is not new to the older Members of Congress. In 1915, under the leadership of William Howard Taft, and one of America's outstanding men and Presidents was organized a group known as the League to Enforce Peace. That group recognized that there must be some power that could enforce the peace. Just as behind our domestic law, we have the sheriff, the National

Guard, and those who can enforce the rules laid down by a court in a decision. It is seldom ever used in any part of our Nation. Why? Because our people have become so accustomed to respecting the law that when a decision is made, in the overwhelming majority of cases—probably 99.99 percent of the cases, the litigants abide by the decision. We are law conscious and therefore, we are respectful of the law.

In looking for a way to handle this problem, Congressmen and Senators took a look at history to see if there was any precedent for a situation such as we are in, where a change in legal technique might bring the desired results.

We found the precedent right near here—in Philadelphia. You remember that between November 15, 1777, and July 8, 1778, the Continental Congress drafted and adopted the Articles of Confederation. These articles gave the Thirteen Colonies the name "The United States of America," and the Articles, generally known as the First Constitution, remained in force until March 4, 1789, when the Constitution of the United States was proclaimed in effect. When I say "we" I mean, of course, the Colonies that fought and won the Revolution. The Articles of Confederation were loosely drawn. They recognized, in too large an extent, States' rights. The result was that after a trial, it was found that instead of being unifying, the government set up by the Articles of Confederation, was divisive. Shay's Rebellion occurred. Some States threatened to set up tariff barriers; interstate commerce was impeded. In other ways, instead of binding the States closer together, the States seemed to get themselves into more and more quarrels and to create suspicion among each other. Our young nation had won the war and the independence, but it was losing the peace for which our men had fought.

Then action was taken that I believe does not have a precedent in the entire world. The government in power actually voted to call a convention, the result of which could be and did happen to be, to oust that government. The Congress, under the Articles of Confederation, called a convention to determine what, if any, changes could be made in the Articles of Confederation. The foremost man of his day, the greatest hero in America, George Washington, was asked to, and did, preside over the Convention. This group sat, I believe, from April to September 17 of 1787. It wrote the Constitution of the United States, one of the great documents of the world. In the preamble it said that one of its basic purposes was "to form a more perfect union." When the Convention concluded its deliberations, George Washington was a little doubtful as to the outcome of its efforts. He was not certain in his own mind whether the new government that the Constitution created would be lasting. But he expressed the hope that it would. The two great dominant characters in that Convention were George Washington and Benjamin Franklin. The Constitution proved to be adequate, although it took a mighty devastating Civil War to finally determine that the United States was a Nation that could not be dissolved and one that had the possibility of lasting for all time.

As we look around us today, we are wondering if some type of world organization of the federal type, could not be organized for the limited purpose of getting the nations to agree to some type of unified effort that could prevent war. Owen Roberts, former member of the United States Supreme Court, one of the intellectual and legal giants of today, has taken the leadership in this work. One hundred and twenty-six Senators and Congressmen, including myself and then Senator, now Vice President, NIXON of California, sponsored a resolution requesting the President to call a convention to explore. I wish to emphasize the word "explore," the possibility and perhaps the feasibility of having a meeting of the free nations of the world with a view of organizing some kind of a federal group, primarily for the purpose of maintaining the peace and resisting aggression. It would make rules and regulations and provide means which would require nations to submit their disputes to some type of court or to arbitration. It would probably explore the possibility of how to implement the decisions of this type of court. They would consider means, which should be mandatory, that would require nations, before they went to war, to submit their dispute to the court, or other tribunal or the federal group. It would also consider the matter of pooling the resources and the manpower of the members to compel a belligerent to submit to a ruling in deciding a matter which might otherwise result in war. The concept is not new, but the idea of using it to settle today's problems is new and has the effect of frightening a great many sincere people. They are afraid such an organization might assume local authority in domestic affairs. Our immediate purpose is only to explore the idea. The federal principle has been operated successfully in a large nation like the United States and in a small nation like Switzerland. In Switzerland, as you know, four languages are spoken, yet they maintain their solidarity while each canton or province has almost complete autonomy in handling its own municipal affairs. This convention would explore the idea of also making a very limited type of world government, that would be based upon the basic principle of the United States Constitution; namely, our national central Government is a government of limited powers and all powers not expressly enumerated or necessarily implied in the Constitution are reserved to the respective States and to the people.

Through international organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, International Rotary, and the like, groups of men of all peoples pledge that men are brothers and that understanding one another is the greatest way to promote harmony and good will. That tolerance is probably the greatest virtue of an individual as well as of a nation.

I am convinced that you cannot stop wars by building larger and larger armaments. You cannot scare another nation or a group of nations into settling a dispute by merely threatening them with atomic warfare and other weapons of the kind. You cannot stop wars by talking about the economic cost, which is so staggering, that a modern war in this atomic age would practically bankrupt every participant nation. You cannot do it along the lines of merely using force to make people agree with you. You cannot scare a nation away from war simply because it is shown that war depletes the manpower of the nation and tends to disintegrate the economy.

Therefore, I have concluded that you can stop war in this world by organizing. I am confident that the organization of the free nations of the world into some type of federal union, with limited powers to handle security questions and to provide means of hearing and deciding disputes between nations, would bring about the peace that we have been looking for for generations. I emphasized limited powers, because it should be set up so as not to interfere with the domestic government of the individual nations, but at the same time it must be authorized to enforce international security.

The freemen of today have a challenge to perpetuate the freedom which they cherish so much. The free countries of the world have the challenge to unite to develop ways in the international field that will safeguard the freedom of the individual countries as these countries safeguard the freedom of their citizens.

War is out of date in a free world in the industrial and the atomic age. We must be courageous and ingenious enough to discard old orthodox thinking and prejudices and come up with some new approach if we are to meet the challenge that faces us.

Our forefathers did and I think we should be able to enlarge the principle to fit our modern world. The law of the jungle is too old for the age of science and Christianity. This matter is like all complicated disputed problems. But it can be settled by the commonsense, the tolerance, and the attitude of those involved. I simply cannot believe that the organization genius of the United States and other free countries cannot work out a plan that will promote the safety of each country against aggression and guarantee its sovereignty and independence, and automatically outlaw war forever.

Of course, the sovereignty which we talk about is not in the government, the sovereignty is in you, me and all the people who comprise the United States of America. We have given a part of our sovereignty to the National Government and set it down in writing in our Constitution and the 23 amendments thereto. The sovereignty of California resides in the people of California, who have given to their State government a certain amount of that sovereignty. In California we have local autonomy of cities, if they wish to have charters of their own, they may take the steps provided by the State of California and elect a board of freeholders to draft the charter. That charter becomes supreme law in the municipality and the State cannot interfere. We recognize that there are several layers of government. The cities have local autonomy, the counties have local autonomy. The State has a wider range. Then there is the Federal Government that controls the whole country to the limited degree provided by the Constitution. Is there any reason why this cannot be expanded to an international government to protect the interests of the free nations of the world?

I am sure that the young people, now graduating from high school, all over the world, would have a much happier outlook today if we could have found the solution to this problem by now. But we are learning by experience and perhaps the younger generation will be able to contribute a great deal to the final realization of this essential objective.

Because of the destructive effects of war, most of the nations of the world must look to us, not only for money, but for help, suggestions and as an example to follow. My travels into every continent during my service on the House Armed Services Committee have indicated to me, that while many nations want to take our money, want to get help that they may not be entitled to, they all basically respect the United States of America. They all know that America has no designs to take advantage or to take property from any other nation. We are able to handle ourselves and we have no so-called imperialistic designs to either take away or dominate any other nation of the world.

Therefore, I believe we are in a position to lead the way for such a discussion. Nothing can be harmful in it and it may be productive of good that will last on down through the generations.

I am enclosing copy of an article written by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Star on February 3, 1953, and which I asked to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If you and the members of your class have not had an opportunity to read this thought provoking article, I hope that you will do so.

With best wishes to you and the members of your graduating class for a happy and prosperous future, I remain

Sincerely yours,

LEROY JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

Congressman Dollinger's Report to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under the present Republican administration we have suffered 2½ years of broken promises. It is guilty of failure to correct immigration and labor laws, reneging on the tax relief assured wage earners and those in the low and middle income brackets, giveaways involving natural resources of our Nation, such as tidelands, natural gas, and Dixon-Yates.

The people must have learned by this time to distinguish between sincere promises and campaign oratory; they know now that the assurances given them by the President during the 1952 and 1954 campaigns were merely oratory.

Democratic Members of Congress have urged revision of the Taft-Hartley law and are anxious to reinstate the good labor-management relations which existed before enactment of the law. However, White House support has been completely lacking despite the fact that Candidate Eisenhower definitely assured members of the A. F. of L. and CIO at their national conventions that union-busting provisions of the Taft-Hartley law must be repealed and amendments adopted so that the law would be fair to both management and labor. When former Secretary of Labor Martin Durkin found that his efforts were futile, that big business brain trusters were guiding the policies of the Republican administration, and that promises to labor were being cast aside, he resigned. Since then, legislative proposals, appointments on the National Labor Relations Board, and every step taken by the administration affecting labor has been antilabor.

The best illustration that big business is truly in the saddle was the administration's successful opposition which prevented a $20 tax reduction to the small-bracket taxpayers. This fight was waged by the administration in spite of the fact that 90 percent of the tax bill which they enacted was a windfall to the high-bracket taxpayers who have been heavy contributors and supporters of the Republican Party. The public should know that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey engineered the excess-profits tax repeal which was approximately a windfall of $2 billion. This administration, under the runaway-plant program to big business through tax concessions, has given handouts of about $19 billion. Most of the $30 billion spent for new plants are in open-shop areas for the purpose of escaping union wages and union labor conditions. Hundreds of thousands of working men and women have been thrown out of jobs—mostly in Northern States.

The Republicans will try to take credit for a number of beneficial bills passed during this session. Remember that heretofore the Republicans branded as "socialistic" such beneficial programs as social security and public housing; they vigorously opposed the legislation in the beginning and tried to sabotage it through the years. In supporting such legislation now, they are only following the old Democratis programs, and they give their support grudgingly.

The President is, however, entitled to special credit for overruling some of his party leaders and following the foreign policy program of his Democratic predecessors. The President has been subjected to the same criticism by some Republican leaders as they directed against President Truman during the time he was the Chief Executive, in the matter of foreign affairs.

We have had a continuation of the Republican policy of "handouts to the greedy, brushoffs to the needy." Big business is helped at every turn, the vast majority of people have not benefited under the Republican program, nor have their problems been considered or their needs taken care of as they were led to believe they would be.

In this report, I shall try to cover major bills and problems so that my constituents may know of my efforts in their behalf.

GIVEAWAYS

Giveaways under the Republican administration again hold the spotlight. During the closing days of the session, the White House and the Republican leaders in Congress as well as some Democrats supported the so-called Natural Gas Act, exempting producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Consumers of natural gas face increases in costs which will put huge profits into the coffers of the very small number of producers who control the industry.

I fought in committee and on the floor of the House during debate, to defeat the measure. I stated:

> The issues of the bill are beclouded and confused to such an extent that intelligent action is precluded. The provisions of the measure would have such stupendous and immeasurable ill effect upon millions of consumers of natural gas that hasty and impulsive action on our part would be unforgivable and a betrayal of the American people.
>
> We have been told that the oil companies who are pushing the measure are spending $1,500,000 on their campaign. This is an indication of what they stand to gain, for they know they will get this investment back plus the estimated profits of the increase to consumers which is bound to come—a bonanza of anywhere from $200 million to $800 million a year. Those advocating passage of the bill refer to a 2 cents a day increased cost to consumers, but multiply this by the millions of residential customers and you get a huge profit running into the millions of dollars.

This bill is more or less of a duplicate blueprint of the famous tideland oil legislation which had the questionable distinction of being the first major legislation passed by the Republican Congress in the spring of 1953 and signed by President Eisenhower. It is another example of the administration helping big business at the expense of the consumer.

You are all familiar with the Dixon-Yates special-privilege grab. Due to Democratic watchdog tactics and vigilance, the Dixon-Yates contract has now been killed. The White House and the Republicans are trying to take credit for ending the controversial contract—they know what their scheming and manipulations are powerful weapons for the Democrats to use against them in the 1956 campaign. It is significant that the White House announcement came 3 days after the start of Senator KEFAUVER'S investigation of the financial inception of the contract. The Republican retreat is a victory for the Democrats who bitterly opposed the contract.

TAXES

The Republicans' promise to lighten the tax load of the American people remains unfulfilled. The heavy tax load is being shifted more and more to the shoulders of the low-wage earner, no relief has been given him, and he and his family continue to struggle for a meager existence.

Under the Republican policy of help the rich—forget the less fortunate the Republicans did help corporations and stockholders and gave them a nice present of liberalized tax deductions. Nothing was done for those in the low-and middle-income brackets.

Early in 1955 the Democrats proposed a $20 tax cut for each taxpayer and each dependent. The Republicans brought about the defeat of the tax reduction, basing their action on the argument that the budget had not been balanced. They inferred that it might be possible to afford such tax reduction next year. It is safe to predict that they will vote for such tax reduction legislation next year, whether or not the budget is balanced, because 1956 is an election year and they will expect votes in return for their much-delayed generosity. It would have been far more equitable to have cut the tax relief they gave to corporations and to have allowed the little fellow the benefit of a tax cut. I shall continue to press for individual income-tax reductions which the vast majority of our people must have if they are to maintain decent living standards.

I introduced the following bills in an effort to ease the tax burden: A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; a bill to grant additional income-tax exemption to taxpayer supporting dependent who is permanently handicapped; to provide additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to grant exemption from income tax in amounts up to $2,500 in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to increase deductions for personal exemptions.

I am hopeful that we shall be successful in our efforts to pass helpful and remedial tax legislation during the next session of Congress.

IMMIGRATION

The un-American, inhumane McCarran-Walter Immigration Act still remains intact upon our statute books—a blot upon our Nation. It contains more inequities than any bill ever passed by Congress.

The Presidential Commission of Truman, in January of 1953, reported that the McCarran Act discriminates against human beings on account of their national origin, color, and religion; is based on hatred and distrust of all aliens; contains unnecessary and unreasonable restrictions and penalties and creates second-class citizenship; is badly drafted, confusing, and, in some respects, unworkable. The law has been in effect long enough for us to realize its disastrous results, the grave disappointments to aliens who looked to us for haven and refuge and to their relatives here, the lack of protection to those threatened with deportation, and the threat to naturalized citizens regarding revocation of their United States citizenship.

We recall the promise of President Eisenhower that corrective legislation would be passed. That promise was ignored, despite the attempts of many, including myself, to have the law changed.

I voted against the law and voted to sustain President Truman's veto. Thereafter, I introduced bills calling for repeal of the McCarran Act and also introduced a measure to completely revise it. I shall not relax my efforts. I shall continue my endeavors so that we may have a fair and humane immigration policy and so rights of aliens, as well as citizens, will be fully protected.

When President Eisenhower signed the Refugee Relief Act of 1953—2 years ago—he pointed out that its purpose was to welcome to our shores and give asylum to over 200,000 victims of Nazi and Communist oppression. These political refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain were to be permitted to come to the American haven during a 3-year period ending in 1956. President Eisenhower said pridefully in August 1953:

> The law demonstrates again America's concern for the homeless, the persecuted, the less fortunate of other lands. This is a great humanitarian act.

Nothing could have been further from the truth. We have proof now that it was an immoral deception and a fraud. It has been called a phony refugee law which stands on our books as a national disgrace. Of the 200,000 aliens it purported to help, only 1,000 had been allowed to come here from the time the law was passed until early in 1955.

MINIMUM WAGE

As early as 1949 I introduced a bill to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage; in 1953 I introduced a bill providing for $1.25 and reintroduced it in 1955.

When the minimum-wage bill was being considered by the Committee on Education and Labor, I urged the committee to vote out a bill providing for at least $1.25. I said:

> The President of the United States has recommended a 90-cent minimum wage. This is grossly inadequate. Decent living standards cannot be maintained on less than $1.25 per hour.
>
> The low-wage earner has been staggering under an overwhelming burden of high taxes and ever-rising living costs and no relief by way of increased earnings has been given him. Low-income families have been suffering privations; they cannot afford adequate medical care or the necessities that we have come to take for granted as part of the American way of life. During the past 2 years, under the Republican administration, the rich have become richer while the poor man's lot has become more and more intolerable—low income families have had to battle for a meager existence.
>
> We must come to the rescue of the laboring people of the country. The wage earner should be adequately paid for his labors and efforts; this is only his just share of the profits reaped as a result of his labors. Justice demands that we set a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour. Anything less would be wholly inadequate, futile, and a betrayal of the workingmen who must rely upon us for protection.

The administration fought to limit the minimum wage to 90 cents. However, by strenuous effort on the part of the Democrats who wanted an increase to $1.25 per hour, we were able to get a compromise figure of $1 per hour. While this is inadequate, it is more than the President wanted to allow. The minimum-wage battle was another example of the Democrats recognizing the plight of the little fellow and wanting to help while the Republicans would give him as little aid as possible.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Democratic-sponsored bill liberalizing social-security benefits and enlarging coverage passed the House and awaits Senate action.

I introduced a bill providing that monthly benefits should be payable at age 60 in the case of men and at age 55 in the case of women.

The measure which passed, provided that women workers could receive benefits at age 62, instead of 65. The bill also provides additional disability benefits for workers, continues children's disability benefits in cases where children become totally and permanently disabled before age 18, expands coverage to include certain self-employed professional groups and others previously excluded, and will benefit millions of workers and their dependents.

I realize that there is still room for improvement in social-security legislation, but was happy to have the opportunity to vote for these benefits.

Let me repeat, the social-security program was started by the Democrats, furthered by them, in the face of Republican opposition. The Democrats have again acted to increase benefits in order that our older needy and disabled workers and their families may have the assistance and security they should have.

HOUSING

The Federal public-housing program was started under Democratic leadership. A critical housing shortage has existed for many years; millions of Americans are without homes or suitable housing. That our people do not have decent homes or shelter is a national disgrace.

The Republicans scuttled the program at the first opportunity, and building of new housing units as provided originally by the law came to a standstill. The Democrats, during the session just ended, did their utmost to force action on the proposed amendments to the Housing Act so that the original building program could be resumed.

The administration wanted 35,000 new units per year for only 2 years while the Democrats wanted far more in order that the needs of the people could be met. As usual, the bill met with stiff opposition by the Republicans, the measure was bottled up in the House Rules Committee for weeks due to the failure of a single Republican to vote it out. Finally, a compromise bill providing for 45,000 units for 1 year passed, over strong Republican objection.

This is far short of the goal originally set by the 1949 Housing Act passed under Democratic leadership, which provided for 810,000 units, 135,000 per year. So far, only 245,000 have been started and now we have provision for merely 45,000 more, which is totally inadequate and a great disappointment to all of us who wished to see the original housing program carried out. Since coming to Congress, I have fought for adequate Federal public housing and my efforts will continue.

I also introduced a bill to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income. I urged that the Federal Government take immediate steps to assist in alleviating the present situation by providing housing which is specifically designed for such elderly persons. There is a great lack of sufficient housing for elderly persons in the low-income bracket, those who must exist on social-security payments, small retirement annuities or other income. The health, safety, welfare, and comfort of the people are menaced, and they should be provided with housing at rents they can afford.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL PAY INCREASES

On January 5, 1955 I introduced a bill providing for an increase in pay of $1,000 per annum for postal workers.

Last year, when the postal and Federal employees pay increase bill was vetoed by the President, a grave disappointment was suffered by employees and Members of Congress who were anxious to help. The pay raise was long overdue and employees were entitled to it.

When the pay raise bills were being considered by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service this year, I urged that they grant a pay raise of $1,000 to postal and Federal workers. I pointed out that these employees were many years behind in catching up with the cost of living; that they could not meet their obligations or give their families adequate care or support on their pay; that they suffered real hardships and anxiety. I stated that there was no reason why the Federal Government should not provide its postal and Federal employees with a justified wage increase so that they could enjoy a decent standard of living. When the bill came before the House, I again made the plea that an increase of $1,000 be granted and stated that this sum would bring their pay only to the level of pay they would receive from private industry for similar effort on their part.

The bills as passed did not provide an adequate pay raise for postal and Federal employees, but they were the best we could get, and because of the stand taken by the administration, it was necessary to accept the compromise.

I also introduced a bill providing for merit promotion of employees in the postal service, and will continue to work for its passage.

I repeat my promise to keep the needs and problems of postal and Federal employees in mind and to continue to do all in my power to help them.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I reintroduced all my bills to prohibit discrimination and have continued to fight for civil rights at every opportunity. However, the Eisenhower administration again ignored its responsibilities and 7 of the 8 Government departments or agencies invited to testify on civil-rights bills pending in the House refused to appear. This apathetic and unbending attitude is deplorable.

The charge was made that the administration was afraid to come before the Judiciary Committee and approve proposals which it dared not oppose. By their unconscionable attitude, the Republicans have succeeded in obstructing progress on civil-rights bills which must be passed if we are to have true equality and freedom in our country.

Until the last vestige of discrimination is wiped out, countless persons cannot enjoy the democracy we profess to have in the United States.

FRAUDULENT RADIO AND TV ADVERTISING

I submitted to Congress a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the broadcasting of false, fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive advertisements by radio or television.

Such investigation is vitally necessary. Millions of dollars are stolen annually from the pockets of those who fall prey to fraudulent advertising. Although the big networks claim they do not permit fraudulent advertising, the fact remains that dishonest persons and companies do manage to get their ads broadcast or televised. So far, no real progress has been made in stopping the rackets, prosecuting the offenders, or fixing blame; there is confusion as to who is supposed to act, to whom those defrauded can look for redress, and where the responsibility lies to prevent such fraudulent practices from continuing.

Inasmuch as the individual stations, the networks, local communities, and authorities have not rid themselves of the frauds and dishonest practices of some advertisers, it is the duty of Congress to give the problem its attention so that the people can be protected against continuance of such frauds.

Under my resolution the committee would—

First, determine the extent to which the public is exposed to false, fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive advertising by radio or television;

Second, determine what steps licensees of radio and television stations have taken in order to protect the public from such advertising; and

Third, investigate and study the practice of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the renewal of radio and television licenses of persons who make no effort to protect the public from such advertising.

Upon receiving the committee report, Congress should pass necessary remedial legislation to prevent further injustices to the public. I shall continue to work for passage of this measure which would be beneficial to all.

GENERAL TOPICS

The Republicans wiped out the protection afforded consumers by price controls, and living costs have continued to rise. I again introduced my bills providing for a Consumers' Advisory Bureau and a Joint Committee on Consumers which would enable consumers to get full value for their money and would furnish information helpful to them when making purchases.

Another grave problem is that of our older, able citizens who are denied the opportunity to work, solely on the basis of age. An increasing number of people who are too young to retire are being told that they are too old to get jobs in business and industry. Employers are setting rigid age limits and a man of 45 and a woman past the age of 35 are being refused jobs because they are over the age limit arbitrarily set by employers. I reintroduced my resolution providing for a commission to study the entire problem, to the end that obstacles to the employment of available and qualified older workers may be wiped out, and so that their right to work and their right to the dignity and status of self-support may be recognized.

Air pollution continues to be a menace to the health and welfare of the people and represents a problem of increasing concern to the residents of many areas and communities throughout the United States. I resubmitted my resolution to create a committee to conduct a full and complete investigation of air pollution in the United States. Congress finally passed legislation authorizing a 5-year program of $3 million per year for research into the causes of air pollution, and I am pleased that this serious problem will now be tackled by the Federal Government.

Veterans received additional assistance under laws passed by Congress since January. GI education benefits were extended to those in service as of January 31, 1955; the VA direct-loan program was extended for 2 years; disabled veterans' were given assistance with auto purchases.

There are many other major questions and problems as well as additional efforts on my part, which I should like to discuss, but space does not permit.

BRONX CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

I continue to maintain a congressional office at 938 Simpson Street, Bronx, which is open daily. My constituents are invited to call there and discuss their problems, which will receive my best attention. I also urge my constituents to write me so that I may have the benefit of their views and suggestions regarding legislation.

I appreciate the confidence placed in me by the people of the 23d District of New York who have chosen me to represent them in Congress, and shall continue to render conscientious service and try to fulfill my duties to their satisfaction.

Un-American Activities Hearing, Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the responsibility of presiding as subcommittee chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Los Angeles County, Calif. The other committee members sitting with me were Hon. GORDON SCHERER, Ohio; Hon. DONALD JACKSON, California; and Hon. MORGAN MOULDER, Missouri. At the press table throughout these 5-day hearings was Mr. Rolph Fairchild, executive editor of the Daily Report, a newspaper published at Ontario, San Bernardino County, Calif.

I received the following letter from this newspaper editor in California, who, it will be noted, traveled a considerable distance daily from Ontario to Los Angeles to attend these hearings. He frankly told me at the time that he was coming to listen and to learn and to appraise what he saw and heard and learned throughout those hearings. Here is the letter:

THE DAILY REPORT,
Ontario, Calif., July 1, 1955.

Representative CLYDE DOYLE,
Twenty-third Congressional District Office, Post Office Building, Huntington Park, Calif.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: I have three objects to write to you.

1. May I congratulate you on your handling of your House subcommittee hearings in Los Angeles. While you expressed your awareness of the hostility to your committee in the hearing room, I believe you perhaps missed the silent but solid support of many others who were also present. The support was there. It was just that you did not hear much from these people, or have opportunity to listen to them outside the hearing room, as I did. They were a most effective damper upon the injured minority with whom you were dealing, with the result there were no speeches and few uncomplimentary remarks; there was no sympathy for that sort of stuff.

2. I wish to thank you personally for your courtesy in facilitating my coverage of the hearings, and particularly to mention the unfailing courtesy of Mr. Tavenner. I made some unusual demands upon him at a time when I knew he was under great pressure and tension. Although I felt these requests were justified in connection with covering the hearings, I do want both the committee and Mr. Tavenner to know I was well aware of this and appreciated his able assistance.

3. Enclosed is an editorial from the Daily Report on the opening session of the Los Angeles hearings which may possibly be of some interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH FAIRCHILD,
Executive Editor.

And here is the editorial referred to published in this paper which, by the way, is in the congressional district so long a time and so ably represented in this great legislative body by Hon. HARRY SHEPPARD, our distinguished colleague who informed me before I left Washing-

ton to go to the hearing that Mr. Fairchild, a newspaper reporter and editor, would be there from his congressional district:

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HEARING

The House Un-American Activities Subcommittee had 1 of each of the 3 major types of witnesses before it yesterday when it opened its hearings in the Federal Building in Los Angeles. Yet the most important fact revealed at yesterday's hearing was never mentioned by anyone, nor recorded in any of the news reports. That was the plain fact revealed by the whispered comments and suppressed groans in the audience that a good many hard-rock devotees of the Communist program in America quite definitely are still among us.

Second most significant fact, again untouched by testimony or committee comment, was the fact that 2 of the 3 witnesses called by the committee yesterday came from the staffs of two of southern California's institutions of higher learning. One came from the University of Southern California and the other from California Institute of Technology. Both of these were the fifth amendment witnesses, while the third was an FBI informant who had played her role so successfully she even had the committee fooled when it was here last year.

First to take the stand was what the average citizen considers the typical fifth amendment witness, a man named Paul Orr, supervisor of the biology department stockroom at Caltech. With a thin slit of a mouth and a face set like granite, he was accompanied by an attorney whose character acting was a sad loss to the motion picture industry. This man Orr fought off every effort of the committee to learn whether he was the same Paul Orr who wrote for both official Soviet Russian and United States Communist Party publications over a long period of years. He could not be dragged from under the fifth amendment to give the committee the slightest inkling of the opportunity he may have to affect the outcome or even sabotage either the classified or unclassified work for the United States Government that is being performed at Caltech.

The fifth amendment does not provide blanket cover for a witness who simply does not wish to answer questions put to him by elected representatives of the American people, two of them Representatives from California. It provides only that a witness need give no testimony which would tend to incriminate him in an illegal or criminal activity. This witness specifically said that it was to prevent incriminating himself that he took the fifth amendment. Then he refused even to describe his duties as biologic stockroom supervisor. That put him in the ridiculous position of taking the fifth amendment because Caltech was conducting some sort of illegal or criminal activity in the field of biology, and he would incriminate himself if we were to tell anything about his job there. He refused even to admit there was a signature on a Communist Party voter registration, let alone that it was his own.

While his monotonous reply, "I refuse to answer on the grounds I have already stated" may have seemed dull to the layman in the audience, every word this witness uttered etched deeper the clear fact that while the Communist Party record of the Paul Orr about whom the committee counsel was asking went back to 1932, the Paul Orr from Caltech was as determined to reveal nothing even of his activities today. The witness grew flushed—his only sign of emotion—when the committee counsel tried to establish that the Paul Orr of Communist Party affairs and the Paul Orr of Caltech were one and the same. But he did not deny it.

The second of the fifth-amendment witnesses was a completely different type, already all too familiar to investigators of subversive activities. His name was Andries Denium, a teacher of cinema arts at the University of Southern California. A tall, rather handsome man who spoke with a thick Dutch accent, he spread his hands in pleading gestures to the committee as he described his great love of his adopted country, his tremendous curiosity that led him into the Communist Party, and the disillusionment that brought him out again.

Yet with that curious, misguided loyalty that marks a definite stage in the return of the former Communist to the ranks of normal citizenship, Deinum refused flatly to tell anything about his activities in the Communist Party or of the people with whom he was associated in it. Deinum told the committee he knew exactly his legal position under the fifth amendment, that he knew it did not cover him with immunity on personal grounds, and that he had "faith in my position—I'm not dumb."

Then he turned around and told the committee that if even once he had heard or seen anything he considered subversive during his more than 4 years in the Communist Party, he would have "gone straight to the FBI." Perhaps it was weariness in the committee and its legal counsel that kept it from pointing out that either Deinum had absolutely no right to protection of the fifth amendment because he actually did not see or hear anything subversive during his years in the Communist Party in Los Angeles and could not incriminate himself by testifying, or else his plea that he would have gone to the FBI with any information regarding illegal or criminal activities by the party was utterly false.

Whether Deinum's almost desperate anxiety to convince the committee of his sincerity and the honesty of his declarations had its effect, no one could say. He did, however, arouse a rough sort of sympathy in one ex-Communist at the hearing yesterday. "The poor, dumb ———," the ex-Communist said softly as Deinum passed. "I went through the same thing myself—only it's something you've got to face. As far as the party is concerned, you're either for it, or against it. There's nothing in between, only he hasn't found that out yet. They'll teach him, though."

There is no middle ground. That lesson still has to sink into the minds of a great many Americans, particularly those who call themselves liberals. The ex-Communists know it. The Communists know it. The House Un-American Activities Committee knows it. The great question raised again here in Los Angeles yesterday, and still unanswered, is whether enough of the American people know it.

Champion of Plain Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Davidson Taylor, Reader's Digest vice president in charge of public affairs, and an article from the August edition of the Reader's Digest about Theodore Granik, creator of American Forum of the Air and Youth Wants To Know:

STATEMENT BY DAVIDSON TAYLOR, VICE PRESIDENT IN CHARGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, READER'S DIGEST

American Forum of the Air has become a national institution in the 27 years it has been on the air. Youth Wants To Know, launched in 1951, has already become established as one of broadcasting's most worthwhile undertakings.

Both programs are important elements in the National Broadcasting Co.'s public-affairs schedule. Both reflect our conviction that enlightenment is broadcasting's most meaningful task.

As creator of American Forum of the Air and Youth Wants To Know, Theodore Granik is a man to whom our industry owes a debt of gratitude. I am proud to bring to your attention the attached Reader's Digest article about Mr. Granik.

CHAMPION OF PLAIN TALK

(By Lois Mattox Miller)

Three years ago, Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the popular radio-TV programs, American Forum of the Air and Youth Wants to Know, was stricken by a heart attack. He was then 45 and still had a lot of things he wanted to do in life.

After a spell in the hospital, he went to Florida. His law partners and broadcast associates were sure he was in the first stages of retirement. But he fooled them. The next thing they knew, he had teamed up with local businessmen and started a television staion in West Palm Beach. Then the memos and phone calls began to pour into Washington and New York, and Ted was on the way back.

Today he is going stronger than ever. In addition to his two weekly forums and his TV station in Florida he has started three new programs. He is a successful Washington attorney and the friend and confidant of Government leaders.

"When I was flat on my back," says Granik, "I found wisdom in the doctors' bromide that a coronary is the greatest lifesaver of middle-aged men. I've learned to conserve energy and make it produce more than ever before."

Theodore Granik is a sturdy man with thinning sandy hair, an engaging smile and a mission in life that won't let him sit still. He got into radio on the ground floor in 1925, and for the past 30 years he has been the champion of plain talk on the air.

While still in law school, he was hired as secretary to Lee Adam Gimbel of the famous New York department store. To lure customers to bargain sales, Gimbel's had just set up a new radio station, WGBS. Granik was given the chore of keeping the station on the air between commercials with poetry readings and newscasts. Broadcasting fascinated him. He sensed its enormous educational possibilities. "There were so many things people ought to know," he says, "and no one was telling them."

He set out to remedy that by arranging a program called "Law for the Layman." With himself as interrogator, he lured his professors from St. John's Law School to the microphone to inform the public about wills, leases, contracts, debts, alimony.

When WGBS was sold in 1928, Granik was invited to bring Law for the Layman to station WOR. Prohibition was then a controversial issue, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, was scheduled to speak against the 18th amendment. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union demanded equal time for its representative to defend the amendment.

"Let's put them both on my show at the same time," Ted suggested. "Then we can present both sides of the issue."

That broadcast made radio history. Facing her angry opponent at the microphone,

the temperance lady let loose the charge that, in Washington, underground passages connected Government buildings with nearby speakeasies. The press took it from there, and next morning the Nation was aware of a new type of broadcasting.

Granik convinced the broadcasters that there was a place for controversy on the air so long as the proceedings were kept under control by an impartrial moderator. The program became the American Forum of the Air; its shelf of transcripts represents a lively history of the past 27 years.

Arranging and moderating the weekly forum could have been a full-time job; Granik managed it in his spare moments—with the help of his wife, Hannah. Then, with a sheaf of glowing letters from members of the bar, he applied for the post of assistant district attorney of New York County and got the job.

In 1937, when he was appointed counsel of the United States Housing Authority, he took the forum with him to Washington, where it became a network feature. With the New Deal controversies raging and a war brewing in Europe, Granik was able to bring to the microphone an increasing number of Congressmen and Cabinet officers who were willing to speak out on everything from social security and farm policy to neutrality and armed intervention. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinted the proceedings, and the program became known as the Unofficial Congress of the United States.

Sometimes the debates taxed Granik's adroitness as moderator. Once the late Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, an irascible ex-New Dealer, tried to beat Senator Claude Pepper over the head with a table microphone. During the bitter wrangles between the isolationists and interventionists in 1940–41, the American Forum was also the scene of some dramatic conversions. Clarence Streit, founder of Union Now, converted an isolationist Senator in the course of the broadcast. On another forum, Mrs. Irving Berlin, an ardent interventionist, persuaded her opponent to resign publicly from the America First Committee.

Granik retired from the United States Housing Authority in 1941 to enter private practice. But his impulse to give friends in Government a hand with their problems left little time for his clients. He helped Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey launch the selective service program. When Mario Giannini, president of the Bank of America, told him of the problems of small-business men of California were having getting war contracts, Granik went to California and organized scores of little firms into subcontractors' pools that became models for the entire Nation. This job so impressed the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that he was retained to help draft the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act. Meanwhile, the American Forum served a vital purpose in wartime information and morale.

After the war Granik's friends tried to persuade him to forget public service and concentrate on his law practice. Nearly 20 years of broadcasting had been carried on at a personal financial loss; his out-of-pocket expenses represent a fabulous sum. Ted rejoined: "Can't a man have a hobby?"

For a few years he concentrated on the law and the American Forum. Then in 1951 he had another broadcasting idea. When lining up speakers for the forum, he was frequently accompanied by his teen-age son, Bill. Often he was amazed by the clarity and directness of Bill's questions and the respect with which they were answered.

The result was Youth Wants To Know, which made its debut on the NBC radio and TV networks in 1951. On the first broadcast Senator Robert A. Taft faced an audience of Washington teen-agers who asked searching questions about the coming presidential campaign, General MacArthur's recall from the Far East and the liberal-conservative struggle within the Republican Party. After the broadcast, switchboards were swamped with calls from enthusiastic listeners. Senator Taft remained in the studio with the kids for 2 hours. Later the Senator told Granik: "I've never been questioned so intelligently in my entire public life."

The youth program gives Granik more satisfaction than anything else in his career. The youngsters' questions go directly—sometimes ruthlessly—to the crux of the matter. They are quick to spot evasions. One lad stopped a famous public-relations expert: "Please, sir, quit filibustering."

This year Youth Wants To Know attracted a sponsor, the General Dynamics Corp., which is considering sending it on a nationwide tour, enabling youngsters in many cities to participate.

With State Department blessing, Granik is planning a TV program which will take the public to a party in a different Washington embassy each week. He has another program planned with the Overseas Press Club, in which leading journalists will talk things over with foreign statesmen.

Last year Granik logged 100,000 miles of air travel, and 15,000 more by sea. Yet he seems calm and never in a hurry. The doctors say that he never has been in better shape.

Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, because Herbert Hoover has spent so many years as a servant of the people, I wish to pay special tribute to him on his coming 81st birthday, August 10, 1955. I think it is unnecessary to list here his many contributions to the United States of America. His life, as Linclon's, is another example of the opportunity that exists for every youth in America.

As the son of a blacksmith, he advanced to the position of greatest responsibility and honor in the world—the President of the United States. He has been criticized and accused of many things but his convictions have remained firm and his desire to further serve his country has never faltered. I am most grateful that his life span has been long enough that he has lived to see the time when his great service has become recognized and appreciated by the rank and file of the American people.

To further emphasize the public service record of this great American, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial appearing some weeks ago in the Topeka Daily Capital and reprinted later on July 5, 1955, in the Atchison Daily Globe:

HERBERT HOOVER

Herbert Hoover has retired after spending 41 of his nearly 81 years in almost constant public service. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government expired on the last day of June. The former President has twice served as chairman of commissions designed to improve efficiency. About 70 percent of the recommendations have been accepted, and 26 bills based on the Hoover Commission studies now are pending in Congress.

On his 80th birthday, August 10, 1954, Mr. Hoover spoke at his birthplace at West Branch, Iowa, where a great celebration was held in his honor. This bit of philosophy was typical of a great President and a great American:

"Eighty years is a long time for a man to live. As the shadows lengthen over my years, my confidence, my hopes, and dreams for my countrymen are undimmed. This confidence is that with advancing knowledge, toil will grow less exact; that fear, hatred, pain, and tears may subside; that the regenerating sun of creative ability and religious devotion will refresh each morning the strength and progress of my country."

As he now retires from public life, Herbert Hoover can look back on a post-Presidential career that has had much to do with restoring national checks and balances. Congress has twice adopted resolutions congratulating Hoover on his birthday. The first was in 1949 when he was 75, the second last year when he was 80.

Probably no man in American history has endured so much abuse and calumny from political opponents as ex-President Hoover. But no other man has had the respect and affection from so many of his fellow Americans. Even many Democrats who gloried in his 1932 defeat have since regretted their roles in a disgraceful episode.

Hoover, the only Quaker President, was the blacksmith's son who became a multimillionaire early in life. He was the first President elected from west of the Mississippi River and the first to have been trained in science. It is said that during his entire public career he has returned his salary checks to the Government.

In his birthday message in 1954, President Eisenhower said: "Few men in our country's history have been privileged to serve the Nation in so many important capacities as have you, and certainly none with greater brilliance and devotion."

Resolutions of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members of the House to resolutions addressed to me from the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U. S. A., Department of Massachusetts:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE DEPARTMENT,
POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN
VETERANS, U. S. A.,
August 1, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Whereas it has come to the attention of the American people that American citizens are being held prisoners in Red China, Russia, and other Communist countries: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States take effective and immediate action to obtain the release of American citizens imprisoned by the Communists; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

Whereas there have been many instances on the part of some legislators and other

individuals to cut back on veterans' benefits; and

Whereas there actually have been a number of cutbacks effected; and

Whereas certain veterans affected by these cutbacks of benefits have been hurt and have suffered hardships: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Massachusetts, Polish Legion of American Veterans go on record as opposing further cut backs in veterans' benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

Whereas by the terms of treaties with certain foreign countries, United States military personnel are tried by the courts of those countries for offenses committed therein; and

Whereas there have been instances where certain American military personnel did not receive justice as justice is known in the United States at the hands of those foreign countries: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Department, Polish Legion of American Veterans go on record as opposing the provisions of these treaties under which certain American military personnel are tried by foreign courts; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS R. DOBROWSKI.

Cargo Preference: Whipping Boy of the Uninformed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cargo Preference: Whipping Boy of the Uninformed," which I prepared for the August 1955 issue of Marine News magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARGO PREFERENCE: WHIPPING BOY OF THE UNINFORMED

(By Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

Attacking the cargo preference bill (Public Law 664 of the 83d Cong.) seems to be the fashion of the day on Capitol Hill. In repelling each assault upon the bill, the proponents of 50–50 have been able to graphically demonstrate its value to the taxpayers of this country, its importance to the American merchant marine, and its essentiality to our national defense.

Since 1948 nine statutes covering Government-generated cargoes have provided that at least 50 percent thereof be shipped on United States flag vessels. This principle, the roots of which go back approximately half a century, was extended in the cargo preference bill which I sponsored last year to cover all Government cargoes, including agricultural surpluses, financed directly or indirectly by United States public funds.

Such aid to American shipping is the most practical method by which we can maintain an adequate merchant marine. This is so because without cargoes—no matter the extent of monetary subsidies—American-flag vessels will not long sail the seven seas.

There is no doubt as to the identity of the group which is behind these wanton attacks on our cargo preference bill. Certain maritime nations, which have benefited enormously by our largess, not only want our aid—they insist that they have an inalienable economic right to carry our bounty from our shores to theirs, in their ships.

As a result of getting nowhere by frontal attacks on the cargo preference principle, this foreign shipping group has cleverly succeeded in getting certain well-intentioned but poorly informed American agriculturists to do their fighting for them. As a result of a complaint from the Department of Agriculture that the 50–50 provision was impeding the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee early this year held extensive hearings, and in its report, dated February 28, 1955, said:

"There was unanimity from among all witnesses from both Government and industry on one point: there is no basis in fact whatever for the charge that shipments to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities are being delayed by reason of the Cargo Preference Act. The plain truth is that the act could not operate as to have any such effect unless it were being administered improperly."

Public Law 664 provides that the 50–50 principle shall be observed only to the extent that United States-flag vessels are available. It also provides that whenever Congress, the President, or the Secretary of Defense declares that an emergency exists justifying a temporary waiver of the law, preference for American-flag vessels shall not apply. Therefore, it is obvious that the act cannot operate to impede the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.

There is absolutely no basis for the contention that the cargo-preference bill has impeded the surplus agricultural program. Approximately 70 percent of the 3-year authorization was committed in the first year, 17 nations having made agreements for the purchase of $468,800,000 worth of agricultural surpluses. Equally unfounded are the rumors that foreign nations will not purchase our agricultural surpluses if 50 percent must travel abroad on American-flag vessels.

Two other red herrings should be canned and filed away. In the first place, cargo preference does not increase the cost to the foreign country purchasing our agricultural surpluses at knockdown prices. This is self-evident in view of the fact that transportation costs are paid by the purchasing nation at world market rates regardless of the carrier's flag; the United States making up the slight difference where the cargo travels by nonconference American vessels. Second, since 80 percent of the agricultural surplus cargoes move on liners, they are transported on American ships at the same cost as if they traveled by foreign-flag vessels.

Now, here in the closing days of the session, the same foreign shipping groups have again persuaded various congressional leaders from agricultural communities to attack the cargo-preference bill. If the proposed amendments to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 which were embodied in Senate bill 2253 as reported by the Senate Agricultural Committee had been enacted into law, they would have scuttled 50–50. In doing so, 5,000 to 10,000 American seamen and shoreworkers would have been deprived of their jobs. In addition, the Maritime Administration would have been deluged with requests for permission to transfer approximately 60 to 70 additional American-flag ships to foreign registry. Fortunately, we were able to persuade the Agricultural Committee to voluntarily eliminate from its bill the anti-50–50 provisions.

While we expect further unfounded attacks upon the cargo-preference bill, rest assured that those of us who fought so hard for its enactment will fight with equal vigor for its preservation.

Bernard M. Baruch's 85th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on August 19 one of America's great elder statesmen of all times, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, will celebrate his 85th birthday. This is a milestone which few among us are destined to reach. In this respect Mr. Baruch is one of the few who was blessed by the Almighty, and he has utilized these bountiful years for a most constructive life and the welfare of humanity.

Bernard M. Baruch was born on August 19, 1870. As he reaches the age of fourscore and five, the people of this country know him as a stalwart American, a philosopher-statesman, a philanthropist, and a master mobilizer of our national strength. We know him also as an adviser and personal confidante of the last seven Presidents, both Democrat and Republican, and as the man who by his wisdom and patriotic deeds has influenced American life and American leaders for the past half century.

Of him, Dwight D. Eisenhower said in August 1952:

I was one of those who for the past quarter century has had the privilege of sitting at his [Baruch's] feet and listening to his words of wisdom, words that are still mighty. Beyond this, he is one of those who has shown to us that if a man forgets all else except service to country, then indeed the country will remember him with respect and affection.

The people of America, indeed, think of Bernard M. Baruch today with respect and affection and will always so regard him. He had endeared himself in the hearts of our people nearly four decades ago when he played such a major role in mobilizing our country's resources during World War I, and in subsequent loyal and unselfish deeds and services to our Nation in times of peace or in times of peril. He is one of the great architects of our Nation's strength who helped defend our freedom and preserve our national security.

Baruch was among the first to recognize and to warn against the danger of totalitarian aggression to the United States and the other democratic nations of the world. He has repeatedly made this warning, which contains a good deal of commonsense philosophy:

There is only one way to protect yourself from a possible aggressor. Be strong. Be so strong he cannot dare attack you without fear of self-destruction. In that way you achieve peace, and only in that way. There are certain people who only understand strength. They sneer at weakness, no matter how noble the aim of the seeker after peace.

"Peace through strength" was written about Mr. Baruch by Morris V. Rosenbloom. This is an apt and timely title.

On the occasion of Mr. Baruch's 85th birthday, I take this opportunity to extend to him my heartfelt greetings and sincere wishes. I consider it a great honor to pay public tribute to him as one who has made such a marked imprint on American life and statesmanship. His is the guiding hand of a great master, the tireless devotion of a great patriot, and the boundless enthusiasm of a great humanitarian.

May he continue to be with us for many more years to come. May he live to see the fulfillment of his noble ideals of a mankind truly at peace and enjoying the fruits of human freedom.

For a Department of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague, Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, of New York, introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a Department of Peace. This is a dynamic proposal, consonant with the spirit of our times and reflecting the aspirations of people throughout the world. I hope that this measure will be widely studied and discussed while Congress is in recess, and given early and careful consideration when we reconvene next year.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article about this proposal from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of Monday, August 1, 1955:

PEACE DEPARTMENT BILL BY OSTERTAG GOES TO CONGRESS

(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON.—A serious proposal was laid before Congress today to create a Department of Peace in the Federal Government.

Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG introduced a bill to establish the department as a Cabinet-rank agency in the Eisenhower administration in the light of developments at the recent Big Four Conference in Geneva.

OSTERTAG, a Republican, represents New York's 39th District, including a part of Rochester and Monroe County, plus Genesee, Orleans, and Wyoming Counties.

OSTERTAG said the new department and its activities should "provide a channel through which the plain people of our country can make known their yearnings for peace, and cooperate actively, and I believe effectively, in helping to realize them."

His bill stipulates that the new department should work through the United Nations and its specialized agencies "at all times and to the greatest extent consistent with the interests of the United States," but should "not be limited to such activities in achieving the purpose of this act."

Many proposals have been submitted in the past for a peace department. Some have suffered from poor sponsorship in Congress, or because the international situation at the time seemed against a successful peace effort.

OSTERTAG is a member of the highly respected House Appropriations Committee, and in particular of its subcommittees on atomic energy and the armed services.

His proposal for a new Government department to wage peace instead of war is in line with an idea which Frank Gannett, the publisher, has been championing for years.

As long ago as 1934, in a nationwide radio address before an international gathering of the Young Men's Christian Associations in New York City, Gannett said:

"Is it any wonder we have wars, when we consider the governmental setup of all nations? Every nation has its department of war, the business of which is to prepare for war and to make war. Has any nation a department of peace, whose business it is, not to make war, but to make peace?"

OSTERTAG's bill lists specific Government agencies and functions which would be assigned to the new department.

He wants to create with it a National Peace College, something like the existing National War College in Washington, but dedicated to the "grand strategy of waging peace."

The college would compile and consult a roster of nongovernmental organizations throughout the country, "with recognized competence in the field of international affairs," in the development of its program.

The bill was not introduced for immediate action with the thought of rushing it through in the closing days of this session.

Instead, OSTERTAG hopes that it may be considered throughout the Nation, and be before Congress next year for action in the light of whatever may develop from conferences to be held this fall between the Western Powers and the Soviet bloc nations.

Among existing Government agencies which he would incorporate in the proposed department are:

International Cooperation Administration—successor to the old Foreign Operations Agency—in handling the United States foreign-aid program. Its functions were transferred to the State Department on July 1, when FOA ceased to exist.

ICA has approximately 6,000 employees and an unexpended backlog of approximately $14 billion in funds for various foreign-aid programs. The funds include 2.7 billion in new money voted by Congress last week.

United States Information Agency: This agency, reporting directly to the White House, handles the United States information and education program overseas, including Voice of America broadcasts in 38 different languages.

It spends approximately $100 million a year, has more than 10,000 employees, and maintains 216 posts in 80 different countries. It uses radio, motion pictures, libraries, and distributes American newspapers and periodicals, in its program.

International Educational Exchange Program: This State Department unit supervised the exchange last year of more than 6,500 persons, both Americans and foreigners, with 76 countries of the free world, mostly under the Smith-Mundt and the Fulbright Acts. Persons exchanged include students, teachers, government leaders, and technicians and professional people, to broaden scientific, cultural, and educational contacts between America and the rest of the world.

In introducing the bill, OSTERTAG commented:

"We need to stop thinking of peace merely as the absence of war, and think of it in terms of the establishment of justice and freedom under law."

Status of Forces Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of concern over the so-called Status of Forces Treaty, under which American servicemen overseas may be subjected to the criminal jurisdiction of foreign courts. In my judgment, the treaty and the agreements which have been made collaterally with it, are a flagrant violation of the Bill of Rights. It is immaterial whether the men who run afoul of the treaty provisions have committed offenses in foreign countries. They are Americans, they are overseas in protection of American interests, and our country should not permit their constitutional rights to be abridged.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from a former serviceman who served abroad under the Status of Forces Treaty. It should dispel any illusion as to the effect of this international arrangement on the morale of American servicemen overseas.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of July 31, 1955]

MANY A GI IN FOREIGN JAIL THROUGH STATUS TREATY

Since I was directly concerned with the Status of Forces Treaty and since it is presently being debated, perhaps I may help some uncertain readers as to the nature of this treaty in practice and in particular, article 7 of the same.

From June 1954 to March 1955 I was stationed in Japan with the Army. During this period, I witnessed and was informed of several cases where American soldiers were victims of this viciously designed treaty.

In every weekly session of information and education class and on every payday, every soldier in every unit was reminded and warned of this treaty and the latest results of its wrath were passed on to us to serve as prominent examples.

Let me say here that when the shoe is on the other foot, so to speak, the actual practices of such a treaty are more frightening than we protected Americans here at home can imagine. This same treaty is as has been said many times, completely un-American, unconstitutional, and undeserving of our men overseas. It is no fun being in a foreign country in the first place for their protection. Being subject to their laws and type of justice, especially when the United States Uniform Code of Military Justice is so effective in dealing with crimes of any nature, is beyond my understanding.

For those who will say, "Defender or not, if a crime be committed toward the people of a foreign nation, the violator should pay by the design of the court of such foreign nation," I say "Fooey," I do not believe in kangaroo courts and that's precisely what they are, the majority of them at least. For example: a delinquent soldier in my overseas division frightened a Japanese cab driver into emptying his pockets without an inch of assault or physical violence. His yield was about 75 cents in yen. The Japanese authorities apprehended, tried, convicted,

and sentenced that soldier to serve 4 to 6 years in a Japanese jail. Many are the stories of the hardships and nauseating food in these jails. Relating them would seem to be gross exaggeration which I know they are not. Pick almost any case you will where the Japanese have exercised their terrible authority and the results in themselves would seem massively exaggerated.

I was lucky enough to conduct myself properly during my stay there and of course there were and will be many thousands of soldiers who will do the same. But situations exist over there that could easily send a conscientiously decent person to prison for many years unnecessarily and unjustly. Most Japanese girls love the money a GI gets each month and many times loves to get him into trouble when these finances dwindle or when he displeases her. They are not at all hesitant to call the always available Japanese police before the poor soldier can seek refuge with the military police lest she prefer outrageous charges. Granted many servicemen do deserve punishment for most of their acts that are criminal but why so shamefully? Regardless of the opinion of anyone, I believe in complete justice the American way for those who are overseas defending that very idea.

There are many more American soldiers in Japanese jails alone serving unfair sentences than in Red China. Let this be the answer to the administrative spokesman who claims that in most cases the nations involved waive jurisdiction.

ARTHUR R. INGUAGGIATO.

4554 CULVER ROAD.

Swiss Independence Day, August 1, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with Swiss Independence Day, August 1, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWISS INDEPENDENCE DAY, AUGUST 1, 1955

(Statement by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN)

The Swiss in their own land, and Swiss-Americans in ours, will celebrate again this August 1 the anniversary of Switzerland's Independence Day. Six hundred and sixty-four years ago the people of 3 small northern Swiss cantons struck a blow for freedom against their alien oppressors much as did the people of the Original Thirteen United States almost 5 centuries later. Today the Swiss nation includes 22 cantons. America has 48 States, and the citizens of both share a common devotion to the democratic way of life which has proved so beneficial to their development.

In the knowledge that the peoples of both nations shared common ideals and desirous of expressing this fact in the form of a written document, the Swiss and United States Governments signed on November 25, 1850, a treaty of friendship.

Five months before the signing of this treaty, United States Secretary of State Clayton sent a letter of instruction to his special agent in Bern which I would like to read excerpts from now since they so clearly and brilliantly expound the basis for the strong bonds which tie our two nations:

"We owe it to the character of our own free Government," Secretary Clayton said then, "as well as to the commercial interests of our country to strengthen, by all the means at our disposal, the ties which bind us to the Swiss Confederation, which like our own happy land is the home of the free. * * *

"We regard as brothers and benefactors of the human family those enlightened and inflexible patriots in continental Europe, who have continued steadfast in their purpose to give their countrymen such permanent institutions as Washington and his contemporaries gave to America. * * *

"You will renew that proposition [of 1847] as it was approved by the Senate, combining with it such stipulations of a commercial character as may be deemed just and liberal, and best calculated to strengthen the bonds of friendship and alliance between the two sister Republics."

Five months later, the plenipotentiaries of both nations, meeting in Bern, signed the friendship treaty, the very keystone of the amicable and mutually profitable policy we have pursued toward each other ever since.

I would like to read to you from this treaty, because I believe that it is especially important now. It is so important, because only a year ago its message was temporarily forgotten, and the policy of our Government unfortunately veered somewhat from the announced intentions so warmly and sensibly expressed over a century ago. For it was last summer that this administration approved a tariff rise against Swiss watch imports, a serious misstep which must be corrected.

I think the eloquent language of the treaty will help to set matters in proper perspective and encourage us to return once more to the path charted for us back in 1850 by wise and farseeing Swiss and American statesmen.

I will now read excerpts from the friendship treaty:

"The United States of America and the Swiss Confederation, equally animated by the desire to preserve and to draw more closely the bonds of friendship which so happily exist between the two republics, as well as to augment, by all the means at their disposal, the commercial intercourse of their respective citizens, have mutually resolved to conclude a general convention of friendship, reciprocal establishments, commerce, and for the surrender of fugitive criminals. * * *

"The citizens of the United States and the citizens of Switzerland, as well as the members of their families, subject to the constitutional and legal provisions aforesaid, and yielding obedience to the laws, regulations and usages of the country wherein they reside, shall be at liberty to come, go, sojourn temporarily, domiciliate or establish themselves permanently, the former in the Cantons of the Swiss Confederation, the Swiss in the States of the American Union, to acquire, possess and alienate therein property * * * to manage their affairs, to exercise their profession, their industry and their commerce, to have establishments, to possess warehouses, to consign their products and their merchandise, and to sell them by wholesale or retail * * * they shall have free access to the tribunals and shall be at liberty to prosecute and defend their rights before courts of justice, in the same manner as native citizens. * * *

"No pecuniary or other more burdensome condition shall be imposed upon their residence or establishment, or upon the enjoyment of the above-mentioned rights than shall be imposed upon citizens of the country where they reside, nor any condition whatever, to which the latter shall not be subject. * * *

"The Swiss territory shall remain open to the admission of articles arriving from the United States of America; in like manner, no port of the said States shall be closed to articles arriving from Switzerland, provided they are conveyed in vessels of the United States or in vessels of any country having access to the ports of said States. * * * In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the above articles."

Irresponsible Criticism of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from Mr. Carl P. Miller, president, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, in which Mr. Miller purports to speak for the membership of his organization in opposition to the social-security system.

The tenor of Mr. Miller's observations on social security are set forth in the first paragraph of his letter which reads as follows:

> The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has consistently withheld endorsement of the social-security system, and has, in the past, opposed broadened coverage, liberalized benefits, and a widened tax base. We are deeply concerned over fundamental defects of the system and the philosophy on which it rests.

Mr. Speaker, I view with some concern such attacks on social security based on unfounded and false grounds. The reactionary opposition to the system that has existed since the inception of the program has continually resorted to misinformation and unwarranted criticism in a futile attempt to defeat a program that 20 years of experience and careful actuarial study have proved is sound.

Because I doubt that Mr. Miller was expressing the views of all the members of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce in his letter and because I believe the time to set the record straight is long past, I answered Mr. Miller at some length.

I am, Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD inserting my reply to Mr. Miller and the text of Mr. Miller's letter to me for the information of any interested persons:

AUGUST 1, 1955.

MR. CARL P. MILLER,

President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I have your letter of July 14 in which you once again attack the fundamental concept and philosophy of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. Your letter repeats the absolutely false statements you previously have made regarding this great humanitarian endeavor.

It is positively incredible that you and the great business organization for which you presume to speak still do not accept the basic tenets of social security. Millions upon millions of people, young and old alike, look upon this great program as the solid rock upon which they can fasten their hopes for the future; yet the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce views it as fundamentally defective and philosophically unsound.

You are entitled, of course, to express your opinion regarding social security. However, I call your attention to the fact that even the Republican Party, including some of the most reactionary of the Old

Guard elements, has at last recognized in the social security system a sound program that is not only good, but is here to stay. President Eisenhower made this quite clear in a message to Congress in 1954 in which he described the old-age and survivors insurance system as "the cornerstone of the Government's programs to promote the economic security of the individual." The President further stated: "The system is not intended as a substitute for private savings, pension plans, and insurance protection. It is, rather, intended as the foundation upon which these other forms of protection can be soundly built. Thus the individual's own work, his planning, and his thrift will bring him a higher standard of living upon his retirement, or his family a higher standard of living in the event of his death, than would otherwise be the case. Hence the system both encourages thrift and self-reliance, and helps prevent destitution in our national life. In offering, as I here do, certain measures for the expansion and improvement of this system, I am determined to preserve its basic principles. The two most important are: (1) It is a contributory system, with both the worker and his employer making payments during the years of active work; (2) the benefits received are related in part to the individual's earnings. To these sound principles our system owes much of its wide national acceptance."

I trust that your constantly repeated criticism of this program will be to no avail. I assure you that I shall do everything within my power to see that social security continues to serve the great humanitarian purpose for which it was designed. It is operated at an administrative cost ratio of 2¼ percent (far less than that of any private insurance company) and provides protection against loss of income due to old age or premature death to 90 percent of the workers in this country, including not only employees but self-employed persons such as farmers, small-business men, and professional groups—7½ million elderly persons, widows, and orphans already are drawing monthly benefits (600,000 in the State of California). These benefits are coming not from the general revenue fund created by the taxpayers, but from the trust fund to which the self-employed and employees and employers alike have contributed.

I have served on the Committee on Ways and Means for 9 years. I participated in extensive hearings conducted by our committee for almost 6 months in 1949, during which many of these ridiculous charges were made and successfully refuted. I participated again in the consideration of the social security amendments of 1952. Once again, in 1954, I participated in consideration of social security amendments, and in 1955 I played a part in the formulation of H. R. 7225, which, incidentally, was approved not only by the majority but by all but four of the minority members. As a result of these many years of study of the subject I am convinced, as are most Americans, that the OSAI system is sound. As a Democrat, I share the belief that improvements in the coverage and benefits of the system can be made without impairing its soundness. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce is completely out of step with the times in being against social security.

As I have said, you are entitled to continue your opposition to social security, futile and misguided as it is. But I maintain you have no right to spread the fallacy that this great social insurance system is unsound financially. The facts on this are readily available to you, as they are to any American who is broadminded enough to seek the truth. Actuarial estimates presented to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, of which I am proud to be be a member, and to the Senate Committee on Finance, show that the contribution rates now in the law make the system wholly self-supporting. These actuarial estimates do not take into account the probability of a continuing rise in wage levels as has occurred throughout all American history. An increase in wage levels would have the effect of increasing income in relationship to outgo in the future.

There similarly is no excuse for your repeated fallacious assertion that there is no real reserve fund. This misstatement has been refuted time and again by such authorities as the American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, the National Association of Life Underwriters, the Advisory Council to the Senate Committee on Finance of 1938, the Advisory Council to the Senate Committee on Finance of 1948 (appointed by the Republican chairman of the committee, Senator MILLIKIN), and more recently by the Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey. Secretary Humphrey has specifically endorsed the investment of the reserve trust fund in Government bonds, saying "I'm sure it's a good way, and in fact I think it's the only way to do it." (NBC television program Meet the Press of May 24, 1953, and pp. 18, 19, and 20 of the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill for 1955.)

The bonds in the trust fund, like all other United States Government bonds, represent the safest investment in the world. In fact, they are the only practicable investment for the funds of the program. In this connection I hope that you and your colleagues will study carefully the section on Reality of the Trust Fund in the enclosed copy of the 15th Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which was signed by George M. Humphrey, the present Secretary of the Treasury and a former businessman. This report completely repudiates your contention. (S. Doc. No. 39, 84th Cong., pp. 7–9.)

The charge that benefits and contributions are badly out of balance usually rests on illustrations that in individual cases the value of the benefits paid may greatly outweigh the value of the individual's contributions, or even of those paid by him and by his employer in his behalf. It is, of course, true that for individuals near retirement age in the early years of the program, and for workers with large families, the value of the benefits paid may greatly exceed the value of the contributions. I'm sure you know that this is so, also, in retirement plans established by private industry. If it were not so in OASI, the program could not be effective in preventing need, and in relieving the general taxpayers of much of the burden of support of the aged and widows and orphans for many years. In general, the payment of benefits in excess of the contributions received in individual cases is possible because workers who are now young, and who will contribute to the program over most of their working lifetimes, will as a group very nearly pay for their benefits out of their own contributions. The contributions paid by employers with respect to their wages can therefore be used in large measure to finance the excess of the benefits paid to workers now old and those with large families.

I am proud to say that the Ways and Means Committee, in its consideration of social security, has always taken the position that the benefits provided should be based on a sound system of financing. In the words of the committee report on H. R. 7225, "Your committee has always very strongly believed that the system should be actuarially sound. Your committee continues to believe that the tax schedule in the law should make the system self-supporting as nearly as can be foreseen, or in other words, actuarially sound."

In 1955, as in all previous years, the committee was very careful to provide adequate financing for the new benefits provided. Actuarial testimony presented to the committee indicated that the system would be actuarially sound if the contribution rate was increased beginning with January 1, 1957. The committee nevertheless concluded that in order to be asolutely certain of the fund's actuarial soundness the increase in the rate should go into effect on January 1, 1956. As stated in the committee report on the bill, "the old-age and survivors insurance program as amended by this bill would be actuarially sound, and in fact its actuarial status would be improved since the cost of the liberalized benefits is more than met by the increased contributions scheduled (with such rise going fully into effect immediately with the inauguration of the new benefit provision)."

Since the contribution rates are being increased to pay for the additional protection, your statement is not true that funds committed to pay for the protection already provided are being diverted to another purpose.

With regard to your criticism of the current plan to provide benefits to the totally and permanently disabled and to reduce the retirement age for women from 65 to 62, my reaction is this: You have consistently opposed social security; it is to be expected that you would oppose any improvements. I predict that despite your opposition these improvements will be enacted into law next year, the House of Representatives having already approved them.

I realize that this letter will not alter your attitude with respect to social security; you will continue to preach your philosophy of "ragged individualism"; you will continue to argue that, as a wry humorist put it, everyone should be permitted to work out his own destitution. I must demand, however, that you desist in making false and misleading statements, which can only have the effect of causing needless worry for thousands of present and future beneficiaries of this great and beneficent law.

In my opinion the OASI system is specifically designed to prevent the kind of dependency and loss of initiative you fear. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce doesn't seem to recognize the facts of life that the social-security program helps to preserve our system of individual initiative. In this connection I would like to quote the findings of the Ways and Means Committee in 1949 as expressed in its report on the bill which became the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950:

"The time has come to reaffirm the basic principle that a contributory system of social insurance in which workers share directly in meeting the cost of the protection afforded is the most satisfactory way of preventing dependency. A contributory system, in which both contributions and benefits are directly related to the individual's own productive efforts, prevents insecurity while preserving self-reliance and initiative.

"Under social insurance, benefits are computed individually in each case, on the basis of earnings in covered employment. Because benefits are related to average earnings and hence reflect the standard of living which an individual has achieved, ambition and effort are rewarded; since they are also related to length of service in covered work, individual productivity is encouraged and the Nation's total production is increased.

"Because benefits under the insurance system are paid as a matter of right following cessation of substantial covered employment, the worker's dignity and independence are preserved."

The mistaken charge that OASI is not an insurance program generally rests on either the fact that there is no contract involved or the fact that there are differences between OASI and individually purchased private insurance. To conclude from this, however, that OASI is not insurance is not sound. It fails to take into account, for

example, the basic similarities between old-age and survivors insurance and private group insurance. It ignores the facts that the social-security insurance system, like other insurance systems, is a means of pooling risks; that the risks covered—loss of familiy income at death, retirement between the ages of 65 and 72, and attainment of age 72—are insurable; that, just as in group insurance, contributions are made by workers and employers and that they are made regularly and beforehand; that there is a definite overall relation between contributions and benefits.

I am convinced that the changes provided in H. R. 7225 are sound and desirable. I am proud to have been a member of the committee which saw the need for this additional protection and took steps to provide it. I am proud to have helped improve the social-security benefits for millions of persons. I hope that this explanation of the real facts about the program will persuade the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce to reexamine the provisions of H. R. 7225 and to endorse the bill. There are many Americans in the Los Angeles area who will benefit by the bill. I hope the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce will see the light and try to support measures for the betterment of our senior citizens of Los Angeles.

Since I have little confidence that you will actually cease presenting these falsehoods to the public, I am having this exchange of correspondence inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It then will be a public record for one and all to see—an unpleasant monument to what should be a great organization.

Sincerely yours,

CECIL R. KING.

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
July 14, 1955.

Hon. CECIL R. KING,
Member of Congress, Representative, 17th District, California, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has consistently withheld endorsement of the social-security system and has, in the past, opposed broadened coverage, liberalized benefits, and a widened tax base. We are deeply concerned over fundamental defects of the system and the philosophy on which it rests.

It is our opinion that the responsibility to provide for future personal needs rests primarily with the individual. This concept must be constantly fostered if the individual is not to become more dependent upon the Federal Government to solve all his problems—a trend which we believe could lead to the destruction of our tradition of individual initiative.

In addition, the entire social-security structure is based on unrealistic financial concepts. Major defects of the system are summarized as follows: OASI is not an insurance program; there is no real reserve fund and no program for protecting future excess income; benefits and contributions are badly out of balance, and future costs are sure to rise sharply.

With respect to the proposals under consideration which would broaden coverage, lower the benefit age for women, and add coverage for permanently and totally disabled workers, we wish to point out our belief that broadened coverage and heavier benefit commitments are dangerous and could well be disastrous to the system. Lowering the benefit age for women would result in unanticipated cost increases and, therefore, less adequate benefits for those in need. While we are sympathetic with the plight of disabled persons, we believe it would be wrong to divert to this purpose social security tax revenues and trust funds which have been collected for and previously committed to old-age benefits.

These changes would compel Congress to increase taxes on the productive workers and employers in order to protect the benefits now being paid to some 7 million individuals, as well as the many millions who look forward hopefully to receiving social-security benefits in their old age.

We believe sincerely that coverage and benefits should not be further liberalized until the commitments and implications involved are fully understood by all. We respectfully urge your opposition to these broadening amendments.

Sincerely yours,

CARL P. MILLER,
President.

Freight Cars Needed for Grain Harvest in Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana and the Midwest in general are having one of the most bountiful grain harvests that we have ever had. We are deeply appreciative of this; but we are sorry to say that the transportation necessary to move this grain harvest has proved totally inadequate. The elevators are filled to capacity and there is a shortage of available freight cars practically as great as during the war years. I have received numerous complaints from farmers and elevator operators. I have made many requests in an attempt to get cars into southern Indiana to meet the great demand. Although the railroads did cooperate, it was obvious that there was not a sufficient number of available cars, at least in the Indiana area, and I understand that the situation is rather general. I believe it is apparent that steps must be taken to bring in more railroad cars. I believe that the railroads are aware of this, and in time this condition will be at least partially alleviated.

However, I have found that there are steps that can be taken now to help solve this very serious problem. The Commodity Credit Corporation has contributed materially to this great shortage of freight cars at harvesttime. They apparently have not planned the movement of their grain at a time which would cause the least congestion in shipping. In the Grain Belt it is common knowledge that there is always congestion of shipping immediately after the harvest. It is also common knowledge that at times between harvests, there is relative inactivity in the shipping of grain. I personally checked the situation in my district and found that from one elevator the Commodity Credit Corporation shipped 19 cars of corn just as the first wheat moved into elevators. This corn was available in the elevators awaiting movement 6 weeks before, at which time there were sufficient cars in that immediate locality.

I have discussed this matter with various officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, and I have been assured that the Commodity Credit Corporation will take into consideration the general movement of grain in making their grain transportation plans. Everyone realizes that the Commodity Credit Corporation must ship their grain, and I do not want to be unduly critical of the situation in the past, but I do believe that the American farmers have a right to insist that they time their shipments so as to interfere with the general movement of grain to market as little as possible. There is going to be a large soybean and corn harvest in the Midwest, and the Commodity Credit Corporation should take that into consideration. The farmers and the people generally have a right to insist on this.

Appraisals of the High-Level Conversations at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, sharing as I do the fervent hope and prayer that the recent summit meeting will ultimately raise the curtain on an endless age of peace and good will for all men, I ask unannmous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorial appraisals of these recent high-level conversations at Geneva.

There being no objections, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 25, 1955]

WEST WINS MORAL TRIUMPH, BUT SOVIET RULERS GAIN A NEW PRESTIGE: EQUALITY WITH LEADERS OF THE NATO

(By David Lawrence)

There's one real disappointment about the Big Four meeting at Geneva—that the dramatic talks had to come to an end. The world would have been glad to see them go on. The pressure for peace is so intense that any amount of inconvenience to the statesmen involved—any delay in other official business—would seem to have been justified if there was a chance for worthwhile agreements.

But the sad truth is that the Soviet rulers, unlike their western colleagues, represented only themselves. They could not make agreements on substantive questions without confessing publicly to their peoples a certain responsibility for some of the evils they have wrought in the last 10 years, especially among the satellite states where they have imposed a system of slavery.

So far as the western governments were concerned, their representatives achieved a moral triumph. It was not a triumph merely because they helped to create an atmosphere or spirit of peaceful purpose. The Geneva Conference may be termed a success from the western viewpoint only because it concentrated the attention of the entire world for a full week on the issues that separate the East and the West.

This is no ordinary achievement. Not in 10 years has the Iron Curtain been penetrated so as to enable American and British

and French viewpoints to be printed at length in Soviet newspapers. Whatever the Soviet people have been told about the "warmongers" of the West must now seem untruthful to the readers of the newspapers and the listeners to radio broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain.

There were, to be sure, risks involved. What a mischievous use the Soviet propagandists can make now, for example, of those snapshots showing Ike and Bulganin and Khrushchev hobnobbing and smiling and fraternizing. They can display those photos all through the satellite countries as if to say to the oppressed peoples—"Don't depend on the United States and the West to help you out—they're playing ball with us now. Better accept your fate."

There were, on the other hand, to offset such an impression plenty of significant statements made by President Eisenhower in his addresses at Geneva to indicate clearly that the United States has not lost interest in what is happening to the peoples of the satellite states.

Analyzing the Geneva Conference—what Russia got out of it and what the West derived—the diplomatic scoreboard looks something like this:

WHAT THE RUSSIANS GOT

1. A new prestige inside Soviet Russia for her rulers—equality with the heads of the western states. A certain respectability was bestowed on the Kremlin group by President Eisenhower's conspicuous gestures of personal and official friendship. This is important to enhance the domestic position of the Kremlin as against the restless elements of the people who believe western charges that Communist imperialism has brought the world to the brink of a nuclear war.

2. A spectacular chance to restate the Soviet position for unification of Germany, which is whenever the Kremlin chooses, and on its own terms and conditions. This is important in future maneuvers inside both East and West Germany in attaining the main Soviet objective—detaching Germany completely from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

3. A widely publicized endorsement by Russia of the demand for admission of Red China to the United Nations. This together with defiant comments about Formosa assures the Peiping government that Moscow is still intent on challenging the position of the United States in the Far East.

4. A strategy of confusion to assist the Soviet propaganda machine in Eastern Europe. By putting forth the proposal for a 50-year all-European collective security treaty, the Russians meet head on the argument that they want only to break down NATO and to leave the satellite states as well as Germany unprotected against a future aggressor.

5. The raising of Soviet hopes that the United States arms effort will be slowed down so that Russia can catch up.

WHAT THE WESTERN ALLIES GOT

A. Worldwide publicity for the viewpoint of the West with a reiteration of basic principles originally proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter. This is important inside the satellite states where unrest admittedly can be the biggest headache for Soviet Russia and eventually be the means of breaking down the present regime in the Kremlin.

B. A dramatic rebuttal of the Soviet propaganda of the last 10 years that America is a warmonger and aggressor engaged in building alliances which encircle Russia with air bases just for the purpose of attack. Even the Russian spokesmen at Geneva had to say publicly many kind words about the peaceful purposes expressed by President Eisenhower. This alone was worth to America the entire trouble of a Presidential trip to Geneva. For the worldwide propaganda battle is more important than most Americans realize.

C. An effective manifestation of the moral force of the free world with a spectacular display of allied unity. This is of incalculable value in building a demand for peace that must inevitably overflow the borders of the Iron Curtain countries and seep through to the peoples beyond.

D. The decision to put the same issues as were discussed last week before another four-power conference of foreign ministers at Geneva in October. This means that the pressure for peace continues with intensity.

E. Relaxation of war tension for the time being. This is an advantage, but it also has its dangers. For if the West gives the impression that it will accept the Russian concept of peaceful coexistence it could be interpreted by the liberty-loving elements behind the Iron Curtain as an acceptance by the West of the status quo, a freezing of the existing condition of slavery in Eastern Europe, and a removal of all hope of liberation as the West may allow trade in strategic goods to build up the power of the Kremlin over the people.

American statesmen, however, can be expected to exercise care in the next few months to eliminate any such misunderstandings.

Based on what has been revealed thus far and assuming that there have been no promises made in private by the United States delegation, Geneva's conference on balance appears to have been more of a plus than a minus for the West.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of July 29, 1955]

How—

(By David Lawrence)

Assuming the sincerity of a Soviet desire for peace and not for just a breathing spell, how can such a goal be achieved?

The statesmen at the summit have struggled with that dilemma. They have tried conciliatory words. They have tried fraternization. They have tried earnest argument. The net result thus far has been little change on substantive matters from the fixed positions that have prevailed now for several years.

Why? The simple answer is that, while the desire for peace may be strong on both sides, the instinct for self-preservation—a defense against possible attack—is still stronger.

Try as President Eisenhower might to persuade his former comrade in arms, Marshal Zhukov, to see that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization could protect Soviet Russia against a rebirth of German militarism, the Russian Defense Minister can hardly accept such a thesis if he is convinced that behind NATO is a military alliance aimed at Soviet Russia alone.

Conversely, when Marshal Bulganin proposes a 50-year collective-security treaty for Europe which is based primarily on the abrogation of the North Atlantic Treaty and the Paris accords, the President and his western colleagues naturally brush it aside as devious.

What we are witnessing is a demonstration of the impossibility of negotiating any important agreements when there is basic distrust.

How, then, can distrust be removed and trustfulness substituted? The Big Four meeting would have made more progress had it engaged in an analysis of what brought about the present differences of viewpoint rather than a discussion of proposals which, however meritorious in themselves, cannot be accepted on a background of bad faith.

Doctors tell us that, before they can prescribe a cure, there must be a diagnosis. Can the statesmen bring out the facts and outline accurately the points of digression since 1945 so that both sides may see clearly why there is an impasse?

They can, of course, yet they have preferred to assume that by wishful thinking the past can be made to seem nonexistent.

But the past is there—before our eyes. So is the present. The satellites in Eastern Europe are there—oppressed and tyrannized—notwithstanding the pledges of the Atlantic Charter.

The situations in other vital areas are there—from North Korea to Indochina and from one end of North Africa to the other, where Communist subversion has stimulated uprisings and aroused national passions.

The situations inside Latin America and, indeed, inside the United States are there, too— plain to see as the Alger Hisses and the Klaus Fuchses and the whole Soviet espionage system have infiltrated our institutions.

These pages of history must be re-examined and the facts hammered home. We must acquaint the people of Soviet Russia with the whole background of Communist faithlessness which has brought us to the point where today we hesitate to accept the word of the Moscow regime.

How can we make worthwhile agreements with a group of evil men who run a police state and keep millions of persons in Siberian prison camps? A dictatorship can arbitrarily start a war of aggression without giving the people a voice in such a momentous decision. We can photograph each other's military installations to satisfy a world craving for steps toward preventing war, but nobody can photograph the minds of evil men who can conceal from the camera their satanic purposes. How can we negotiate effectively with rulers who permit no political opposition, no free elections, no guarantees of individual rights?

The answer is that we cannot achieve peace with such a government, and the sooner we acknowledge that fact the clearer will be the air.

We should, moreover, use every device of publicity and communication to analyze the causes of the tension of today between East and West and carry the case to the court of public opinion throughout the world—and this includes Soviet Russia.

Why not ask the Soviet regime to permit inside all countries a free discussion of the causes of mutual distrust? Why not urge Moscow to stop "jamming" the Voice of America and our radio broadcasts? It's a simple way to bring out the truth. And if the Soviet rulers aren't afraid of argument—if they think they can answer it all persuasively—why should they not welcome the chance for the moral forces of the world to pass judgment on the debate?

War is not a solution. Compromise with principle is not a solution. But the building of a bridge of trust with the Russian people is a solution. Governments come and go—but relations with peoples can be placed on a basis of enduring and understanding friendship.

[From the Wall Street Journal of July 25, 1955]

THE VALUE OF GENEVA

The meeting at the summit seems to have ended pretty much as it began—as little more than a breaking of bread between adversaries who will agree on nothing except that they would like to agree.

This has given to the Big Four meeting an air of futility. When the statesmen departed over the weekend, nothing was settled. Germany is still dismembered. The satellites are still under the Russian thumb. NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations still face each other as opposing military alliances. The armaments, East and West, are being piled up as rapidly as before.

And this is bound to make the return of the statesmen something of a disappoint-

ment. For in spite of all their efforts to caution against hope—in Premier Bulganin's words it was "naive to look for settlements"—some hopes nonetheless had been raised that when the statesmen did sit down face to face perhaps something could be done. Nothing was. What was proposed by one side was disposed of by the other. On any tangible scoreboard, the score was zero.

Nevertheless, we think, there was an accomplishment in the meeting at Geneva. And the fact that it is largely intangible does not make it less something of value.

There are three things we might have found at Geneva.

We might have found the Russians actually ready to agree. Or we might have found them as belligerent as ever with no desire at all to agree on anything. The first would have been a miracle; the second would have at least had the virtue of removing uncertainty.

Finally, there is what we did find—Communist leaders apparently desirous of agreeing on something, for their own private reasons, but unwilling to do now any of the things necessary to make agreement possible.

This may seem like no gain at all. Of what earthly use is agreeableness that comes to no agreement? Does it not lead to an even more frustrating kind of futility than more straight-forward obstinacy?

We do not think that is necessarily the case. Whenever an adversary in a struggle finds the struggle oppressive or frightening and wishes to lessen it, it does not follow that he will promptly yield everything. He will still seek the most favorable bargain. He might not yield at all because he may think yielding worse than the struggle. But certainly a gain has been made when he once reaches the point of considering how he might settle. Then there is a chance which before did not exist at all.

Geneva showed the Russians in this mood. They would agree to none of our proposals on Germany. But it was not so long ago they considered East Germany their permanent domain and the price of unification was adding West Germany to it. Today they demand all sorts of impossible conditions, but they have got around to talking about a unified Germany as a distinct nation. That the Russians would do this was unthinkable not so very long ago.

The pattern was alike on other subjects. They were seeking hard bargains. But they did propose—and counterpropose. They were seeking, nonetheless, to bargain.

The reasons for this are obscure. But we will venture two possible ones that have nothing to do with a change in Russian ethics or good will.

One could be an awareness that the cold war has been going against them; that communism, while perhaps still undaunted, is not after all the swift wave of the future. Men experienced in power have taken the measure of opposing power.

The other, and the one to be most devoutly hoped, is that these men may have taken the measure of modern war and found in it no victory. They would not hesitate to murder, slaughter, or enslave. They pause before a war that could gain them nothing and lose them all.

Indeed, the most heartening thing to be found at Geneva is the feeling buried among the debris of words that a world war no longer offers to conquerors even the promise of a prize. This may not banish wars, for there are other roots to them than greed. But it does hold hope that wars have ceased to serve as instruments of ambition.

It would have been happier, it is true, to have the statesmen come home from Geneva with the deeds all done. And it is true that the peace we reach for still lies beyond the grasp. But surely there is some value in finding, after all these years, that the reach can be extended.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 25, 1955]

SOVIET WANTS PEACE ON OWN TERMS—SIDETRACKING OF GERMAN UNITY QUESTION IS TIP-OFF ON REAL RUSSIAN ATTITUDE

(By Constantine Brown)

The evidence is plain now that the Russians really do want an end to the cold war—if they can have it on their own terms.

To be sure, there were a few apparent concessions offered in the Geneva talks, enough to set the Western world aglow with renewed hopes that the Communist chieftains had experienced a change of heart, that all the wickedness and stubborness, the aggression and subversion of former days was the fault of Stalin and Beria, both now happily deceased.

The first unmistakable tip-off to the real Russian attitude came when the question of German unity was sidetracked. Despite the new tactics of the Soviet strategists in allowing the question to remain open rather than abruptly slamming the door on it as in the past, the fact remains that there will be no German unity unless and until the West, or the Germans, themselves, meet the Soviet terms.

When Chancellor Adenauer journeys to Moscow, he will be told those terms. And his Moscow hosts will know that rejection of those terms will mean serious political trouble for the Adenauer coalition government. The Kremlin can afford to wait on the German question, since they can hardly lose in any event. The one thing the Soviet Union fears is a reunited Germany allied with the West and rearmed. Even the Eden plan, providing for a reunited Germany with the entire Eastern Zone demilitarized, was rejected by Molotov as it obviously had to be if the Russians plans for Germany were to be realized.

The smiling, jovial, informal manner adopted so surprisingly by the Russian delegation was simply putting a more graceful facade on the same old grim building. Of course, the new Soviet attitude of eased restrictions on travel, easier-to-get visas, cordial welcomes for foreign visitors and all the other startling departures from the usual Red police suspicions will ease tension, so far as they go. But the basic character of the Communist bear remains, and as our American national parks warn, it is not wise to feed the bear even when he appears friendly and harmless.

The Russians, of course, were unable to summarily reject President Eisenhower's surprise disarmament proposal. To do so would have been a damaging propaganda blow to the Red pose as the world leader in the fight for peace. But neither could they accept the proposal at its face value.

The Soviet Union as of today is known to be extremely well informed on the details of American military facilities and dispositions. Our security setup has never been strict enough to prevent their knowing almost anything they want to know. Communist traitors in our midst have fed the facts of America's Military Establishment very efficiently into the Kremlin's spy network.

Thus Russian acceptance of the President's plan would have meant great advantage to the United States, and very little to the Reds. Our Air Force would like nothing better than to get a good close look at the Soviet forbidden atomic areas in the Urals and in Siberia. And the Combined Chiefs of Staff could do their defense planning a lot more easily if they could know the military strength and dispositions existing in the satelite countries.

Oddly, the member of the Soviet delegation who appeared to most observers at Geneva as the real boss of the quartet was Marshal Zhukov. Although silent at official gatherings, his demeanor and obvious self-assurance at social gatherings set him apart from his sometimes-uneasy colleagues, who appeared to look to the doughty marshal for guidance. It was being speculated, of course, that Marshall Zhukov might well emerge as the successor to the Stalin mantle after the next Soviet purge.

Geneva has shown that the Russians have not really changed. They are only using a genial, almost capitalistic smile to mask the same old Communist intrigue. And, as usual, they have once again confirmed what all who deal with them have long known—that they are willing to settle any problem around a conference table, so long as the settlement is made on their own terms.

Wisconsin Dairy Farmers Are Making a Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, it was my privilege to participate in the annual picnic of the Jefferson County, Wis., Farm Bureau held at Firemens Park in Waterloo.

After sharing in a buffet-style luncheon for which the farm women of Wisconsin are so justly famous, I attempted to outline the significant legislative developments affecting the Wisconsin dairy farmer, as we approach adjournment of the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

My remarks, as reconstituted from the notes which I used, were substantially as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO FARM BUREAU LEADERSHIP

I am pleased to come here today as a member of your organization, a member of the farm bureau in your neighboring Waukesha County. I am proud of that membership, because in my opinion no farm organization in Wisconsin has furnished more responsible leadership during this period of rather difficult adjustment for the Wisconsin dairy farmer.

On this beautiful summer afternoon, and in this fine company, there is only one sour note to mar the pleasure of this occasion. That is the retirement of Art Graper as your organizational director. I was, indeed, sorry to read the announcement of his retirement in October. In a sense this is a rather informal farewell party for Art, but I hope that as the time for his leaving approaches you will arrange the kind of farewell ceremony that he deserves.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, A SIGNIFICANT DAIRY AREA

This week there came to my desk a copy of the 1954 preliminary census of agriculture for Jefferson County. It was most timely that this preliminary report for Jefferson County, the first such report among the counties of the Second Congressional District to reach me, should arrive just prior to my trip here. This census indicates that there are about 2,800 farms averaging approximately 115 acres in Jefferson County. Almost 90 percent of the land in Jefferson County is in farms, utilized for agriculture. Five-sixths of the farms in Jefferson County are operated by the people who own them. In 1954, Jefferson County had 43,000 milk cows, an increase of about 4 percent in the last 5 years. In that year, Jefferson County produced about 305 million pounds of milk. These figures will come as no particular surprise to you. They simply bear out what we

already know—that Jefferson County is a significant dairy area of comparatively small farms, largely operated by the people who own them.

AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION IN THIS SESSION

I had expected Congress to adjourn prior to my trip here, but we just didn't quite make the grade last evening. It looks now as if we'll adjourn within the next 2 days. The record of agriculture legislation is now complete, so it is probably appropriate to mention some of the legislation of this session of particular interest to farmers. Actually there hasn't been a large volume of legislation directly affecting agriculture in this session. Among the legislative enactments of the 1st session of the 84th Congress have been, first, the so-called Holland amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act was repealed. Through this repeal, agricultural conservation payments are now permitted even if the acreage allotment on any particular crop is exceeded. The so-called cross-compliance provision has been removed.

Second. The law authorizing emergency loans to farmers and stockmen was extended, with interest rates reduced from 5 percent to 3 percent.

Third. Construction loans and insurance for farm housing were authorized.

Fourth. The imports controls of section 22 were successfully protected. This is the authorization which President Eisenhower has used effectively for import quotas on dairy products.

Fifth. In continuing the Selective Service Act, Congress inserted a provision which prohibits the consideration of agricultural scarcities and surpluses in agricultural deferments.

There are now pending two measure of general interest to farmers. One of them is the bill to exempt wheat from marketing penalties if the wheat is used for feed. This is of particular interest to those of us in this area of Wisconsin where most of the wheat is used as livestock feed.

The other significant pending measure is H. R. 12, which would fix the price supports for the so-called basic commodities (wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts) at 90 percent of parity. Strictly for sugarcoating, the bill provided a section to increase the price supports for dairy products to 80 percent, increase the authorization for the brucellosis control program and increase the authorization for the special school milk program.

THE STORY OF H. R. 12

It is obvious that these extra provisions were added strictly for an enticement to get Dairy State Congressmen to support H. R. 12 for the benefit of the basic commodities. Actually, the increase to 80 percent price supports for milk would not put an extra dollar in the pockets of Wisconsin dairy farmers since the existing market level exceeds 80 percent of parity. The brucellosis and special school milk provisions do not belong in a price-support bill and should have been handled separately.

It is interesting to note that one of the chief witnesses in support of the 90 percent price support provisions of H. R. 12 was Walter Reuther, the national president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. He testified before the House Agriculture Committee at some length. During his testimony he was highly complimented by Chairman COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee, and then Mr. Reuther in turn highly complimented Chairman COOLEY. This pleasant exchange was then printed in a slick looking brochure by the CIO, and has, I understand, been mailed to thousands of people throughout the country under the frank of the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Along that same line, you will be interested to know that the Representative from the northwestern part of Wisconsin spoke about 3 or 4 minutes on the House floor this past week but then his statement with a great deal of embellishment, including complimentary statements by other members of his political party, appeared the next morning as a very complete and comprehensive statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This same Congressman then requested others of his colleagues to make flowery, complimentary statements about his efforts in behalf of Wisconsin dairy farmers and all these are being made up into a 16-page reprint to be broadcast among the farmers of the State of Wisconsin. Probably many of you in this audience will be receiving copies of that reprint, sent out under the frank, and I thought you ought to know the background of that falsified document before you receive it.

Between now and next January when the 2d session of the 84th Congress will convene, there'll be a considerable amount of propaganda in support of H. R. 12. During the month of November, hearings will be held by at least two separate subcommittees here in the State of Wisconsin, and I hope that the leaders of your organization will be alerted so that they can present the farm bureau point of view so that a balanced presentation of views of Wisconsin farmers will be made.

H. R. 12 WOULD BE A STEP BACKWARD

In my opinion the enactment of H. R. 12 would represent a serious setback to Wisconsin dairy interests. It would place Wisconsin dairy farmers in a less favorable relationship with those who produce the basic commodities. It would nullify many of the encouraging developments that have taken place in dairying in the past 2 years.

Early in 1953, dairying was a sick industry. Milk production was climbing rapidly. Government warehouses were bulging with dairy products. Consumption of dairy products through the normal channels of trade was greatly declining. At that time Secretary Benson, who had inherited this great problem from his predecessor, seriously considered reducing the support price of dairy products. However, he was prevailed upon to continue the 90 percent price supports for another year, to March of 1954, on the assurance of leaders of the dairy industry that a program would be developed during that time. During that year of extended 90 percent price supports from the spring of 1953 to the spring of 1954, the situation was not alleviated. In fact, it was greatly accentuated. The Department of Agriculture found itself with more than a billion pounds of dairy products in its warehouses. Production continued to climb. Consumption continued to decline. During that year, the consumption of oleomargarine exceeded the consumption of butter. In short, things got a great deal worse instead of getting better.

Accordingly, a year ago this spring Secretary Benson reduced the support price for dairy products to the minimum under the law, 75 percent. To many this seemed like a very harsh step. However, as we look back upon it now I think we recognize it as being comparable to other things with which we are familiar, steps that are less painful because of their suddenness. For instance, those of you who participated in athletics will recall that the total hurt is less if you remove adhesive tape with one sharp quick pull, rather than pulling it gradually from different angles. The surgeon, when he operates, makes the incision with one swift, complete stroke—so with the reduction to 75-percent support prices for dairy products. It may have seemed harsh but it reduced the total pain of the cure. I'm satisfied today that the worst is over and the dairy farmers of Wisconsin now face an encouraging future.

SURPLUS VANISHING

A most encouraging development has been the sharp reduction in Government holdings of dairy products in the last year. On June 30, 1954, for instance, the Government held about 440 million pounds of butter, 412 million pounds of cheese, 300 million pounds of dry milk. Contrast this to the picture at the end of last month, June 30, 1955. Butter holdings had been reduced to 171 million pounds, cheese holdings to 264 million pounds, dry milk holdings to 143 million pounds. Overall, the holdings of the Government of dairy products were about one-half of what they were a year ago. This was accomplished by the same means as you would reduce the supply of grain in one of your bins. It was accomplished by taking more out of the bottom and putting less in at the top.

INCREASED DISPOSALS AT HOME AND ABROAD

During the year just completed, from July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, the Government succeeded in disposing of approximately 445 million pounds of butter, 290 million pounds of cheese, and 740 million pounds of dry milk.

Of this, about 200 million pounds of milk was accounted for by the special school milk program. Quite appropriately, Wisconsin was the first State to participate and our neighboring community of Lodi was the first school system in the United States to become a participant. So effectively did the schools of Wisconsin cooperate with and participate in this program that the Department of Agriculture made a reallocation of funds for Wisconsin's benefit in the spring of this year. This permitted the expanded program to continue to the end of the school year, using funds unused by other States whose cooperation and participation had been limited.

Another 50 million pounds of milk during the 5 months prior to March of this year is accounted for through increased use of milk in the Armed Forces.

It is encouraging to note that just within the last couple of weeks that a substantial amount was sent overseas to Hong Kong where milk powder and butter will be used to reconstitute milk for the people of that British colony. Then too, a supply of Government-held stocks of dairy products have been disposed of to Japan, where the products will be used in the school-lunch program of that country.

LESS GOVERNMENT PURCHASES

This year, through the month of June, the Government price support purchases have been about 123 million pounds of butter, 75 million pounds of cheese, and 384 million pounds of dry milk. This contrasts with 273 million pounds of butter, 302 million pounds of cheese, and 452 million pounds of dry milk in the comparable period of last year. Thus the reduction in butter purchases during the first 6 months of this year, over the first 6 months of last year, has been about 60 percent. Reduction in cheese purchases have been 80 percent and reduction in dry milk purchases 17 percent. Overall the Government has purchased about one-half of the dairy products that it did during the comparable period last year.

SUPPLY HAS LEVELED OFF

The best available estimate we have is that there are now about 22.1 million milk cows in this country. This figure is down about 1½ percent from a year ago. Total milk production has continued high, about the same level as last year.

The reduction in the total number of milk cows means that there has been a higher rate of culling. The production of about the same amount of milk with less cows means that the production per cow has increased. Both of these things, higher culling, and greater production per cow, bespeak a greater efficiency in production with accompanying reduced production costs.

CONSUMPTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS UP

The most gratifying development of all has been the increased consumption of dairy

products. In the year ending March 31, 1955, butter consumption had increased 9 percent over the preceding year. Cheese consumption had increased 14 percent, and fluid-milk consumption had increased about 4 percent over the previous year.

The reports on June Dairy Month are now available. Your organization can take pride in the significant part it played in helping to make the American people conscious of quality dairy products. The figures on June Dairy Month indicate that the consumption of butter and cheese have increased about 14 percent over the month of June of 1954. This means that the American people ate 8 pounds of butter and cheese during the month of June 1955 for each 7 pounds of these dairy products which were consumed during June of 1954.

These three significant factors then, the increase in the consumption of dairy products, the leveling off of production, and the reduction of Government-held surpluses, are beginning to be felt in the place where it can do the most good for the dairy farmers of Wisconsin—in the market place.

In April of 1955 the price of wholesale milk was about 2 percent higher than it was during April of 1954. This is the first time since November of 1952 that the price of wholesale milk in any month has been higher than it was in the similar month during the previous year.

During May of this year, the price of wholesale milk was about 3 percent higher than it was during May of 1954. The presence of the three factors mentioned above, increased consumption, leveled off production, and reduced surpluses, give us reason to believe that this healthy improvement in prices at the market place will continue throughout the year of 1955.

OPTIMISTIC FUTURE FOR GOOD DAIRYMEN

As I see it the efficient dairymen of Jefferson County can look forward to the future with optimism. The end of heavy Government-held surpluses is in sight. Consumption is catching up with production so that with a balancing of supply and demand the price in the market place will supersede Government price supports as the measure of the dairy farmers income. In short, a healthy situation is beginning to succeed a very unhealthy one. In its report issued in June of this year, the American Dairy Association pointed out that nearly all leading agricultural economists are agreed that the end of the surplus of dairy products is in sight. The report states "the only major disagreement is whether the surplus situation will vanish in 1955 or 1956."

There are favorable prospects for greatly increased consumption.

The special school milk program, already in effect in 47,000 schools and accounting for 200 million pounds of milk in the last year, will help to develop the milk-drinking habit. Thus, its significance goes much beyond the number of half pints of milk that might be consumed in this year or next year. It will help to increase the per capita consumption of milk in the years ahead. It is something that we cannot discount.

During the past months, the trend of consumption of dairy products has moved steadily upward. In the year ending March 31, 1955, Americans consumed 6 million pounds more milk than they did in the previous year. Economists have credited about one-third of this amount (2 million pounds) to the increase in population. Another third has been credited to the more favorable prices of dairy products prevalent throughout the past year. The final third has been attributed to the effects of the intensive advertising program such as those sponsored by your organization.

If similar strides may be made during the next year, if Americans will consume 6 billion pounds more in this year than they did last year, the surplus of dairy products will be wiped out. We can anticipate that one-third of this increased amount, 2 billion pounds, will be consumed through the normal increase in population in America. That leaves a little over 4 billion pounds of additional dairy products to be consumed by the American people. What does that amount to? It amounts to about 26 pounds per person, or in terms of glasses of milk it means one glass of milk per week for each person in the United States. That really is not very much. A glass of milk a week more could be quite a bit if we were already consuming anything approaching a maximum amount. However, that is not the case, and there is plenty of room for increased consumption on the part of the American people.

INCREASED CONSUMPTION SHOULD NOT BE DIFFICULT

The per capita consumption of dairy products among the American people is less than one-half that of Ireland, the leader in this respect. We rank 12th in our per capita consumption of dairy products, behind nearly all of the countries which have a standard of living quite similar to our own.

This is an expanding, growing country. It has been estimated that our population in 1960, just 5 years from now, will be about 177 million people. Even if dairy farmers continue to produce at 1954 levels, we will need 9 billion pounds more of milk in 1960 to meet the demand. However, if pricing is reasonable and satisfactory, and a vigorous advertising program is continued, there is no reason why the market, and the per capita consumption, cannot be much more than what they are at the present time.

In fact, if the per capita consumption for the next 5 years increases in the same ratio as it did in the year ending March 31, 1955, and if dairy farmers were to continue at their 1954 level of about 123 million pounds of milk, there would be a deficit of 14 billion pounds of milk in this country in the year 1960.

In summary, this means that we will need some where between 9 and 23 billion pounds more milk in this country 5 years from now. By that year the problem might well be a shortage of dairy products rather than a surplus of them. I am satisfied that if Wisconsin dairy farmers, under the leadership of groups such as your own will continue a vigorous advertising program, will insist on a program which puts dairy products into the stomachs of the American people and not into Government warehouses, and will depend primarily on efficient production and increased consumption, rather than upon Government price supports, that dairying will soon be a growing, healthy, and free industry. In my opinion, dairying is on the way up, and I predict in the months ahead that dairy farmers everywhere will come to recognize their debt to the farm bureau for keeping them free from production controls and the heavy hand of Government.

Milestones on the Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the July 18 issue of Life there appeared an article entitled "The Peace We Fought for Is in Sight and We Can Win It" by Mr. Paul C. Hoffman in which the following accomplishments for bringing about permanent peace were cited and which serve as a reminder of our efforts in that direction:

MILESTONES ON THE ROAD TO PEACE

Forcing Soviet Army to evacuate Iran: May 1946.

Economic recovery of Europe through United States aid: April 1948 to date.

Survival of Yugoslavia outside the Soviet orbit with Western aid: June 1948 to date.

Breaking Soviet blockade of Berlin by airlift: June 1948–August 1949.

Armistice in the Jewish-Arab war: February 1949.

Creation of NATO: April 1949.

Defeat of the Communists in Greece: October 1949.

Settlement of Dutch-Indonesian war: November 1949.

Halting aggression in Korea: June 1950–July 1953.

Settlement of Kashmir war between India and Pakistan: August 1953.

Cease-fire in Indochina: July 1954.

Settlement of Trieste dispute: October 1954.

Agreement on rearmament of West Germany: May 1955.

The Report of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the recent excellent report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, dealing with Federal-State appositions, has provoked numerous editorials, most of a favorable tenor, some of which I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials are ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 29, 1955]

STATES RIGHTS VERSUS STATES WRONGS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The long-in-the-making report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations proves to be realistic and valuable.

It is realistic because it spurns the extremist views of two doctrinaire groups. The report gives no comfort to those whose instinct is to solve all problems by concentrating more and more power in Washington and those who want to see the Federal Government substantially dismantled and handed back to the States to do with as they wish. Based on past experience, this often would be nothing.

It is a valuable report because it points to the only practical way that a balance of political power between Federal and State and local government can be achieved; that is, by so improving and strengthening State and local government that they will draw to themselves functions which have gone to Washington mostly by default.

While there are some dissents over particular proposals, this basic, undoctrinaire, middle-road view reflects the unanimous thinking of a 25-man Commission which embraced governors, Senators, and Congressmen of both parties plus a number of citi-

zens outside the Government. As the Chairman of the Commission succeeding the controversial Dean Clarence Manion, of Notre Dame Law School, Meyer Kestnbaum, a progressive business leader who heads the Committee for Economic Development, obviously extracted the very maximum of agreement from his colleagues.

The Commission frankly recognizes that most of the enlargement of Federal power during the last 20 years has come about because of the vast industrialization of the Nation, because of the acute social and economic problems created by the depression, because of the population shifts from farm to city, because of advances in transportation and communication—that is, Federal power has grown out of necessity, not primarily out of political theory.

Federal powers have also been expanded because of the failure of the State governments to perform the governmental services which many of them now complain that the National Government should not be performing.

Nearly a half-century ago Elihu Root, a Republican and a conservative, put it this way:

"It is useless for the advocates of States rights to inveigh against the supremacy of the constitutional laws of the United States or against the extension of national authority in the fields of necessary control where the States themselves fail in the performance of their duty. The instinct of self-government among the people of the United States is too strong to permit them long to respect anyone's right to exercise a power which he fails to exercise."

When he was Governor of Illinois, Adlai E. Stevenson put the same view succinctly when he suggested that there would be less talk about States rights if there had not been so many States wrongs.

What they were both saying is what the Kestnbaum Commission is saying today: that self-government does not permit a vacuum, that if the States will not discharge the functions the voters require, the voters will turn elsewhere.

The Commission points to several vital reforms which the States will have to make if they are to begin to arrest the trend to Washington:

1. Restore representative government. In a majority of the States today city dwellers decisively outnumber the rural population and yet the rural population decisively dominates the State legislatures. Reason—refusal by the legislatures to obey their own States' constitutions to reapportion the legislatures equitably.

2. Give the Governors authority equal to their responsibilities. In 40 States as many as 5 to 15 of the Governor's administrative aids are elected and thus not subject to his control.

3. Straighten out the bewildering duplication and confused overlapping of the Nation's 109,000 local governing units—counties, towns, townships, and school districts.

The Kestnbaum Commission does not propose less government; it proposes a better distribution of the functions of government. Better State government alone will mean more State government.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 29, 1955]

STATES AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

None of the broad investigatory commissions which President Eisenhower set on foot after taking office held out in his mind greater promise than that dealing with Federal-State relationships. The resignation of the first chairman, Mr. Clarence Manion, was an unfortunate setback; but under his successor, Mr. Meyer Kestnbaum, the work has gone forward diligently and a 300-page report was issued yesterday. The document merits the most careful study; it deals with much that is basic in our American life.

The Commission (with Senator WAYNE MORSE dissenting on this broad, philosophical point) holds firmly to the view that our society is enriched, and our political system strengthened, in proportion as the States and localities have a vital role to play. Many modern developments have tended to decrease their role; but it is the basic assumption of the report that by forethought and planning the equilibrium can be reestablished.

It is hard to disagree with this. Political and social systems are made by men; they are the product of his underlying values and, in part at least, of his deliberate acts. Certainly the values inherent in individual participation and local responsibility are fundamental. Ans as a people we do not lack the social inventiveness which can keep these alive even amid the greatest technological changes.

One of the major needs, if the States and localities are to play their part, is an adequate financial base. Much had been expected from the report in this regard. State governors had hoped that as a result of its recommendations new ways of balancing their budgets could be found. But the report speaks only in general terms on this score. It accepts the burden of present-day taxation, realizing that there could not be a sharp delineation of fields left to the States and those left to the Federal Government without substantially reducing the total tax take. Yet its discussion of the taxes open to the States, many of them still unused, should help in securing financial resources comparable to responsibilities; and the general emphasis on Federal economy reiterates a healthy warning.

The report stresses the States—how to save them from undue pressures, how to make them more vital and efficient, how to help them get the means to carry on their work. But it is aware, too, that modern developments place on the Federal Government tasks which formerly did not exist and which cannot now be escaped. Particularly it insists that civilian defense and a program of urban decentralization rests with Washington. It sees duties for the Central Government in such fields as health and roads.

The President has taken the report under advisement, and many of its recommendations may subsequently appear in recommended legislation. Meanwhile it stands for every citizen to ponder, who cares about the fundamentals of his Government and the effects of that Government upon the welfare and happiness of his own life.

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 29, 1955]

THE PHILOSOPHY AND THE PRACTICE

Mr. Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, after a 2-year study of the proper functions of National, State, and local governments, yesterday set forth this philosophy:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

As a general and theoretical proposition, this philosophy is one with which only the crustiest advocate of central power and big government will disagree. Yet when the Commission attempted to put this proposition into practice in advocating reforms in the present relationships among the different divisions of Government, it found itself in the position of advocating, in many cases, continued aid by the Federal Government with less control.

Thus while the Commission "recommends that responsibility for providing general public education continue to rest squarely upon the States and their political subdivisions" and opposes a "general program of Federal financial assistance," where States do not have sufficient tax resources Washington is justified in assisting in assisting in financing construction of school facilities. At the same time the Commission recommends that Federal grants-in-aid be continued for State forestry, for management of fish and wildlife resources, for general health purposes, and for specific categories, though tapered off as their objectives are achieved; for construction of hospitals and other health facilities, and for certain welfare services. In most cases strengthened State and local supervision of funds is suggested.

If this seems a bit like supporting local level government responsibility in principle and ignoring it in practical application, there is understandable reason for the dilemma facing the Commission.

The nut of the problem is found in the comment the Commission makes on the fiscal problems of the Federal, State, and local Governments: "If State and local governments are to absorb additional functions or to take on an increasing share of emerging governmental responsibilities, the question arises whether they are financially able to carry the load."

Many of the States and local communities have restricted themselves in the use of taxing and borrowing powers and so their officials go to the Federal Government for assistance.

Yet it may be doubted whether the States could financially carry the load even if they lifted their restrictions on taxation and debt limitation. The answer to fiscal problems in the lower divisions of government hinges directly on the tax division of the dollar. There is a point beyond which the taxpayer must go into debt to meet all his different tax obligations. The Federal Government takes by far the largest share of the average taxpayer. There is little left with which to assume additional responsibilities.

The Commission didn't go into this question of tax dollar division nearly as far as we would have liked to see it go. The answer to the problem of responsibilities of the Federal, State, and local Governments lies only in less Federal spending. As long as Federal taxing and spending remains as high as it is, there can be no proper balance in State and Federal areas of responsibilty.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 9, 1955]

SOAP AND WATER FOR STATE GOVERNMENTS

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—In my clipping files I have an excerpt from the New York Times of October 11, 1953, telling how a circuit judge in Oregon ruled that a constitutional amendment providing for legislative reapportionment of the State the year before was valid. Thus, Oregon was about to have the first legislative reapportionment in 42 years.

I ran across the item in searching for a way to dramatize the meaning of a blue-covered, paperbound book that just came across my desk. It is the report to the President of the Commission he set up on intergovernmental relations. It was headed by Meyer Kestnbaum.

The report goes out of its way to give sympathy and encouragement to State government as against Central Government. But with the sad fondness of a mother for a favorite child that isn't doing so well at school, the report warns that improvements are in order. Big improvements.

Now let me go back to the Oregon clipping again, as an illustration. The Oregon constitution required the State legislature, the clipping said, to make a legislative reapportionment every 10 years. But the 10 years rolled around and the State legislators did nothing. The constitution said, Do this. The legislatures didn't do it. The last reapportionment had taken place in 1911, the clipping said. The voters had intervened and now a way had been cleared to get a reapportionment in 1961.

Everybody knows that urban areas are growing in the United States and rural areas diminishing. But State constitutions, in many cases, still allocate representation on a rotten borough system. Like Oregon, many ignore the requirements of their own constitution to equalize matters. In Oregon a third of the population now lives in the city of Portland, but Portland has nowhere near that representation in the legislature.

I cite this case to give a specific instance for the generalities of the Kestnbaum report: "The constitutions of 43 States call for some reapportionment in at least 1 house as often as every 10 years. In nearly half of these States, reapportionment lags behind schedule."

This is only the beginning of the detailed story of why State governments need a good scrubbing. Some State constitutions look like the cobwebby loft windows of an old barn that hasn't felt soap and water for 40 years.

There is an almost universal sentimental bias in the United States in favor of letting the States do it, if the States can do it. But the State governments, according to the Kestnbaum report, have been putting their own powers into straitjackets for years.

It seems good to one legislative session to impose a rigid limit on the amount of taxes, or the amount of debt, or the length of time a legislative session can meet, or the term of the Governor. Some constitutions earmark so high a proportion of tax revenues the report says, that the legislature's power to appropriate money applies to less than half the State's expenditures. Colorado is a good example of that.

The Kestnbaum report raises the suspicion that part of the drive for turning over troublesome social problems to the States springs from the knowledge that the States won't, or can't, do anything. But the report points out that you can't end matters this way. If the States won't act, Washington will. In fact, one of the big discoveries of the report is that big cities are bypassing the States already, and making direct cooperative arrangements with the National Government.

So there you have it. We all have a sentimental attachment to the States (as contrasted to Canada, where undelegated powers automatically belong to Ottawa). But Americans' instinct for self-government is so strong that no legislative power is likely to hang around loose for long without somebody grabbing it. That is already happening.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 30, 1955]

WATCHDOG FOR FEDERALISM

It is not surprising that the long-awaited report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations should have provoked a good deal of dissent. The subject with which it deals has been a source of controversy throughout our history. It will, of course, continue to be controversial in the decades ahead, but the Commission has found some substantial areas of agreement, made many valuable recommendations, and given the country a great deal of information that will be useful in discussing different facets of the problem.

In general, the report is a ringing indorsement of federalism. It finds that the Federal system invented by the Founding Fathers has given the National Government more power than it really needs to meet the changing demands of nationhood. At the same time, this system has retained within the States and local governments responsibility for a vast number of governmental services that are close to the interests of the people. Chairman Meyer Kestnbaum and his colleagues, with one possible exception, are most eager to see this relationship preserved.

It is when the Commission comes to applying this principle to specific policies that disagreement arises. For example, the Commission opposes any general Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary education. It believes the primary responsibility for education should rest squarely on the States, and it challenges the States to rise to their obligation. Federal aid, it says, should be confined to cases in which States are found to have insufficient tax resources to support an adequate school system, and this aid should be temporary. Similarly, the Commission wishes to transfer the school lunch program to the States, with the Department of Agriculture continuing to supply surplus commodities. However sound these recommendations may be in principle, they come at a time when emergencies in the schools forbid their acceptance in practice.

In the long run the most useful part of the report may be that dealing with the shortcomings of the States. Many of them are bedeviled by obsolete constitutions, outmoded governmental machinery, unrepresentative legislatures, and tax systems that do not adequately tap their resources for revenue. Failure of the States to supply the needs of their people is probably more responsible for the overcentralization of government than any grasping for power in Washington. If the people are eager to maintain the Federal system, with its great advantages in terms of freedom and home rule, they should concentrate more effort upon the improvement of State and local governments.

The commission offers no magic formulas or panaceas. It would continue, with some changes, the grants-in-aid principle. It would continue the present tax immunities, but urges Congress to make payments in lieu of property taxes to State and local governments, a recommendation of special interest to the District of Columbia. The commission does not believe it would be feasible to divide tax sources between National and State Governments, but suggests that Congress keep in mind the need for eliminating duplication of taxes when reductions are made. While the commission has attempted to define in general terms the area in which the National Government should operate, its most significant recommendation may be the creation of a special assistant to the President to give day-to-day advice on intergovernmental relationships and become a sort of watchdog of the Federal system.

[From the Business Week of July 9, 1955]

THE TREND: TO DECENTRALIZE GOVERNMENT

One of the most important investigations instituted by President Eisenhower when he took office concerned the pressing problems of Federal-State relationships. Now, after 2 years of study, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has issued a report and a series of recommendations aimed at improving the complex machinery of government.

The Commission's report is especially valuable because of its commonsense, undogmatic approach. It points out the expansion of Federal power over the past 20 years has been largely inevitable. We have been living through an incredible era of sweeping change—of industrial advance and agricultural decline, of depression and war and defense for peace. Under these conditions, the Federal Government has naturally expanded its functions and activities.

The report also states that expansion has been accompanied by encroachment and extravagance. It is convinced that Federal activity can, and should, be reduced. The Commission agrees with the administration's view that government should not be doing what private enterprise can do at least as well. And it holds that the fundamental objective should be to keep centralization to a minimum and State-local responsibility to a maximum.

It is the Commission's opinion that governments at different levels should not be regarded as competitors. Rather, they must seek to coordinate and cooperate. It is only through a concerted effort that all levels can operate most effectively.

THE FAILURE OF THE STATES

The greatest need is the development of State and local responsibility. Federal power has expanded in many areas simply because the States failed to do their job. It is not enough to criticize the concentration of Federal power, or to seek to reduce the programs now operated from Washington.

Most programs operated by the Government are, in fact, essential. And if Federal activity is to be reduced, the States must develop the capacity to handle a larger share of the functions of government. Unless they do so, Federal power is bound to continue growing, if only by default.

One vital area where the States have been remiss is in the field of taxation. If they take over functions now performed by the Federal Government, it will mean a cut in our Federal taxes. But this cut will largely be offset by increases in State and local taxes. Those States that are eager to assume increased responsibility without adequate financial resources are only courting disaster.

These general ground rules are applied to many specific issues involving the Federal Government and the States. For example, the Commission recommends that civil defense be shifted from the States to Washington, which is better equipped for the job. On the school-lunch program, it recommends that State and local aid should be expanded and Federal aid dropped, except for the donation of surplus foods. On public housing and slum clearance, it urges that the States take over full responsibility and lend financial and technical help to localities.

Undoubtedly President Eisenhower will incorporate many of the Commission's specific proposals in his legislative recommendations to Congress. But no real reduction in Federal activity can be achieved without careful planning on State and local levels. This is a basic tenet of the report. As such, it serves as a valuable guide to all citizens who are intent on increasing the effectiveness and decreasing the cost of Government at all levels.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 25, 1955]

MAKING FEDERALISM WORK

Proper adjustment between the posers of the States and the National Government has been at the heart of the tremendously successful experiment launched by the framers of the American Constitution. Of recent years many thoughtful citizens have been asking whether the balance was not swinging too far toward centralization of authority in Washington. One of the early major projects of the Eisenhower administration was to set an able Commission to studying this question.

Those who wish to find political devils in the situation may not be satisfied with the Commission's report recently issued. For it appears more interested in such causes of

centralization as the growth of an industrialized society and the failure of the States to meet the needs of their people. But when the group, led by Meyer Kestnbaum, sets forth a basic guide it should satisfy opponents of big government:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the national Government can undertake."

When it comes to application of this philosophy, the Commission finds practical difficulties. For instance, it recommends continuation of the present Federal-aid highway programs and financing with an increased Federal gasoline tax. Certainly Washington has a legitimate role to play in coordinating road building for a national highway system, but the success of toll roads proves that the States have not fully used means available to them.

Similarly with the question of schools. The Commission may appear reactionary to people who see only the need for schools when it says that Federal aid to education should be confined to States which have been found to have inadequate tax resources. But it seems to us that it is entirely sound to insist that education should be primarily a local responsibility.

This newspaper has for years campaigned for better public support of schools, particularly for more adequate pay for teachers. But we are convinced that the basic solution for this problem lies in the awakening of necessary appreciation for the schools. There is no magic in the travels of a tax dollar that is collected locally and goes to Washington to be trimmed and sent back home. Federal aid might level up school standards in some poorer States, but it should be hinged on the amount of effort they are making in their own behalf.

Indeed, in this field and many others one reason that the States do not supply some services demanded by the people is that so large a share of the citizens' taxes goes to Washington. But it is by no means the sole reason, and the Kestnbaum Commission renders a real service in pointing up deficiencies in State government. Those who believe that keeping government close to the people is a safeguard of democracy should give earnest attention to these findings and to the necessity for reform in local government.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of June 30, 1955]

BLUEPRINT FOR SOUND REPUBLIC

No perfunctory report emerged from the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations submitted Tuesday. This is the study authorized by the 83d Congress, the first official one of our National-State-local relationship since the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Of the 15 members appointed by the President, 5 are governors or former governors of States (1 is our own Allan Shivers) and all are men and women of exceptional experience in Government, industry, or education. The other 10 members include 5 United States Senators and 5 Representatives.

Initially it should be said that this is perhaps the most important report Congress will have before it for many years. It is a survey of the present in the interests of the future. It is the first serious proposal to take the field of government out of the area of dispute and make it the subject of permanent policy by defining clearly the boundaries within which Federal, State, and smaller governmental units will function.

Even Congress has noted that the problem of federalism must be faced and settled. It has become an issue of paramount importance as it was in the original Constitutional Convention. Whatever else may be argued about the verbiage of the Constitution, there can be no question from the debates that the majority decided against centralized Federal power. They believed the member States to be paramount against the Federal Government. The Constitution could not have been adopted but for the belief of the people of the 13 new independent States that this was true. The present and growing centralization of power in Washington has been made possible by a new clause. Whatever else they may argue, every jurist that has given that view his stamp of approval has been fully aware that he has held contrary to the opinion of the Constitutional Convention.

The report will be discussed on this page in a series of editorials dealing with various phases of it. It has offered an excellent blueprint for a sound republic summary of the boundaries that should be set up for our entirely logical theory of interrelated governments:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

Annual Appropriations and Congressional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, a continuing problem of major importance annually facing the Congress is proper supervision and control of the budget.

Many suggestions have been made as to how Members of Congress may develop a better knowledge and understanding of the complex features of our annual appropriations bill. As we all know, the experiment of one omnibus appropriation bill was tried a couple of years ago, but it appears that a majority did not feel that method accomplished its intended purpose. I personally do not believe the experiment was carried on long enough, and I earnestly hope consideration will be soon accorded the wisdom of reviving it.

Meanwhile, it is practically universally agreed that one of the most baffling facets of this whole appropriation business is the carryover problem, the granting of moneys to the various agencies for purchase commitment in the future and beyond the fiscal year period. In relation to that problem, I should like to include a very timely editorial entitled "Control of the Budget" that I think all Members would find interesting, which appeared in the June 21, 1955, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

The article follows:

CONTROL OF THE BUDGET

If Congress voted not a nickel more for foreign aid, the foreign-aid dispensers could theoreticaly spend something like $8 billion in the fiscal year beginning July 1.

Other Government agencies, notably the Defense Department, are similarly well fixed. Altogether, the Government could spend nearly $54 billion, as against the $62.4 billion it plans to spend, in the new fiscal year without another cent from Congress.

Clearly, then, Congress has abdicated a considerable measure of its control over the budget. Not all its control, for Congress can still determine the amount that will be spent over a given number of years. What it cannot effectively control is how much will be spent in any 1 year.

This has come to be known as the carryover problem. Congress authorizes money for Federal agencies for payment of goods that may not be delivered until a year, 2 years or 3 years later—and payment is usually made on delivery. Hence the huge backlogs of funds carried over from fiscal year to fiscal year.

The Eisenhower administration attacked the problem when it came to office, gradually reducing the annual carryover from around $80 billion to the current $54 billion. But the latter figure indicates how far the administration is from having licked the problem. Now the Hoover Commission urges a frontal attack on the carryover practice itself. It advocates that the Government convert to cost budgeting. Under this system, budgets would be constructed on the basis of money actually to be spent during the fiscal year, instead of on the combination of expenditures plus new obligational authority.

The unspent appropriations—the carryover—would be rescinded. An agency like the Defense Department, which must contract for planes and ships that won't be delivered until future years, could still submit planned expenditures over a period of years, but it would get only the amount that has to be paid out during the year in question. Both the administration and Congress would continue to review such programs every year.

That such a reform makes sense hardly needs saying. The way things are now, it is a little silly to talk of appropriations for the "1955–56 fiscal year" when actually they are for 1955–56 plus part of 1956–57, a hunk of 1957–58, and maybe a bit of 1958–59. This is not an efficient way of doing the world's biggest business.

The change would also result in more economical operation. The Hoover reports so far have been, among other things, studies in waste so monumental as to give pause to even the most resigned taxpayer. Part of that waste comes simply from the fact that so much money, so inadequately managed, is available to the agencies. It is true that the funds are under annual review now, but there is a world of psychological difference between reviewing something Congress has already O. K.'d and having to justify expenditures for which new congressional appropriations must be voted.

The Hoover Commission estimates the savings from the adoption of cost budgeting and related reforms could run as high as $4 billion a year. That alone would more than cover the estimated deficit for fiscal 1956. But important as that would be, the chief significance of the Hoover proposal is not that it might make possible a balanced budget in one particular year.

The greater significance is that by restoring to Congress its control of annual expenditures it would offer some hope of restoring the principle of balanced budgets as a rule rather than as an exception.

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include herein my seventh annual report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. In the six immediate preceding years I have prepared, and made available to my constituents, reports on my voting and attendance records for the sessions of Congress. This is a similar compilation for the 1st session of the 84th Congress complete to the date of sine die adjournment on August 2.

By means of newsletters and scheduled office hours for conferences throughout the district during congressional recesses I have attempted to inform my constituents and make myself available for questions relating to my work in Washington. This voting report is another attempt to keep the people of the second district as fully informed as possible on my stewardship in their behalf.

It is a complete official record. It is not a handpicked list of a few so-called committee votes compiled by some lobbyist, pressure group, or political campaign committee.

It has been my practice, and it shall continue to be my purpose, to furnish further information or explanation relating to any vote I may have cast, upon request.

My voting and attendance record for 1955, compiled from the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is as follows:

Voting record, 1st session, 84th Congress

Roll-call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
1	Jan. 5	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 5	Election of Speaker of House	Martin.
3	Jan. 25	H. J. Res. 159, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories in that area. (Adopted 409 to 3.)	Aye.
4	Jan. 27	H. R. 587, to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, with Jan. 31, 1955, cutoff date. (Passed 365 to 0.)	Aye.
5	Feb. 8	H. R. 3005, extending the Selective Service and Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years. (Passed 394 to 4.)	Aye.
6	Feb. 16	H. R. 3828, to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress. (Passed 283 to 118.)	Aye.
7	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
8	Feb. 17	Motion for previous question on H. Res. 142, providing a closed rule, prohibiting amendments, for debate on H. R. 1, to extend authority of President to enter into trade agreements. (Not ordered 178 to 207.)	No.
9	Feb. 17	Brown amendment to H. Res. 142, providing a closed rule for debate on H. R. 1, to extend authority of President to enter into trade agreements, which amendment would provide open rule to permit amendments to bill. (Rejected 191 to 193.)	Aye.
10	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142, providing a closed rule, prohibiting amendments, for debate on H. R. 1, to extend authority of President to enter into trade agreements. (Adopted 193 to 192.)	No.
11	Feb. 18	Motion to recommit H. R. 1, extending authority of President to enter into trade agreements, with instructions to strengthen the escape-clause provision by making findings of Tariff Commission binding. (Rejected 199 to 206.)	Aye.
12	Feb. 18	H. R. 1, extending the authority of President to enter into trade agreements. (Passed 295 to 110.)	No.
13	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
14	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
15	Feb. 25	Motion to recommit, H. R. 4259, to provide 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates and to provide a $20 credit against individual income tax for each personal exemption, with instructions to strike out the $20 tax credit provision. (Rejected 205 to 210.)	Aye.
16	Feb. 25	H. R. 4259, to provide 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and to provide a $20 tax credit against individual income tax for each personal exemption. (Passed 242 to 175.)	No.
17	Mar. 1	Conference report on H. R. 3828, to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress. (Adopted 223 to 113.)	Aye.
18	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
19	Mar. 10	H. R. 4720, to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Aye.
20	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
21	Mar. 18	Preston amendment to H. R. 4008, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1955, for an additional $4 million for United States contributions to United Nations program of technical assistance. (Agreed to 174 to 107.)	No.
22	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
23	Mar. 21	Motion to suspend rules and pass H. R. 4644, to increase rates of basic pay of postal employees by an average of 7.6 percent and authorize reclassification of positions. (Rejected 120 to 302.)	Aye.
24	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 21	Motion to suspend rules and pass H. R. 4951, directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year. (Rejected 260 to 151; ⅔ vote required.)	No.
26	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 22	H. Res. 170, declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of Government-owned synthetic rubber plants, as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. (Rejected 132 to 283.)	No.
28	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
29	Mar. 23	H. Res. 171, to disapprove proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic rubber-producing facilities in California, as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission report. (Rejected 137 to 276.)	No.
30	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 30	Conference report on H. R. 4259, to provide for a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates. (Adopted 386 to 8.)	Aye.
34	Mar. 30	Phillips amendment to H. R. 5240, independent offices appropriation bill for 1956 fiscal year, to limit to $1 per month the fee to be paid to education institutions for reports on veterans enrolled therein. (Rejected 156 to 225.)	Aye.
35	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
37	Apr. 20	Moss amendment to H. R. 4644, postal employees' pay increase and classification adjustment bill, increasing average raise to 8.2 percent, in lieu of 7.6 percent provided in the bill. (Adopted 224 to 189.)	No.
38	Apr. 20	Motion to recommit to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, H. R. 4644, postal employees' pay increase and classification adjustment bill (as increased by Moss amendment). (Rejected 125 to 287.)	Aye.
39	Apr. 20	H. R. 4644, postal employees' pay increase and classification adjustment bill (as increased by Moss amendment). (Passed 324 to 85.)	No.
40	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
41	Apr. 21	H. R. 4393, to provide specific authorization for the construction on conversion of the 1956 naval shipbuilding program. (Passed 372 to 3.)	No.
42	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
46	May 5	Green amendment to H. R. 12, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 by restoring 90-percent price supports for basic commodities, to eliminate peanuts from the list of basic commodities. (Rejected 193 to 215.)	Aye.
47	May 5	Motion to recommit H. R. 12, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, by restoring 90-percent price supports for the basic commodities. (Rejected 199 to 212.)	Aye.
48	May 5	H. R. 12, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 by restoring 90 percent price supports for the basic commodities. (Passed 206 to 201)	No.
49	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 9	Motion to recommit the conference report on S. 1, postal employees compensation increase averaging 8.8 percent, to the conferees with instructions to promptly report back a new bill. (Rejected 118 to 275.)	Aye.
51	May 9	Conference report on S. 1, postal employees compensation increase averaging 8.8 percent. (Agreed to 328 to 66)	No.
52	May 9	H. Res. 223, closed rule, permitting no floor amendments, providing for consideration of H. R. 2535, to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union. (Agreed to 322 to 66.)	No.
53	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 10	Motion to recommit H. R. 2535, to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union. (Agreed to 218 to 170.)	Aye.
58	May 11	Quorum call	Present.

Voting record, 1st session, 84th Congress—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
59	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
61	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
62	May 12	Vinson amendment to H. R. 6042; Defense Department appropriations bill for 1956 fiscal year, to delete language requiring congressional justification by the Department of Defense prior to disposal or transfer of work traditionally performed by civilian employees of the Department of Defense. (Rejected 184 to 202.)	Aye.
63	May 12	H. R. 6042, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the 1956 fiscal year in the amount of $31.5 billion. (Passed 382 to 0)	Aye.
64	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
68	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 23	S. 727 to adjust the salaries of judges of the District of Columbia municipal court of appeals, municipal court, juvenile court, and the Tax Court. (Passed 282 to 32.)	No.
70	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 25	H. Res. 244, creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission in connection with operation of bridges and approaches near New Harmony, Inc. (Adopted 205 to 166.)	No.
72	May 25	H. R. 2851, to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress. (Passed 343 to 1.)	Aye.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
74	May 26	Motion to recommit to the conference committee S. 727, to adjust the salaries of judges of the District of Columbia municipal court of appeals, the District of Columbia municipal court, juvenile court, and the Tax Court, with instructions to insist on the amendments adopted in the House. (Agreed to 170 to 165.)	Aye.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 26	Motion to recommit H. R. 5881, to provide Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects, and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal reclamation projects, to limit scope of bill to the 17 western reclamation States. (Rejected 62 to 229.)	No.
77	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
78	June 1	Motion to recommit H. R. 3990, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. (Rejected 79 to 278.)	No.
79	June 7	S. 2061, to increase the average compensation of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department about 8 percent, and provide reclassification authority. (Passed 409 to 1.)	Aye.
80	June 8	H. R. 5923, to authorize appropriation of $57 million in 3 years for completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway. (Passed 353 to 13.)	Aye.
81	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 14	Conference report on H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements. (Adopted 347 to 54.)	Aye.
84	June 14	H. R. 6227, to provide some control and regulation of bank holding companies as banks, and, after 5 years, limits holding companies to banking enterprises. (Passed 371 to 24.)	Aye.
85	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 15	H. Res. 210, authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to investigate the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board. (Rejected 178 to 214.)	No.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
88	June 20	S. 67, to adjust rates of basic compensation (average increase 7.5 percent) of civil-service employees of Federal Government. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Aye.
89	June 20	H. Con. Res. 109, authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentrary Conference. (Adopted 338 to 31.)	Aye.
90	June 20	H. R. 6295, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses for Government officials and employees. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Aye.
91	June 21	H. R. 4663, to authorize $225 million for construction of the Trinity River division, Central Valley reclamation project, California. (Passed 230 to 153.)	No.
92	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 22	Motion to recommit to committee H. R. 6040, Customs Simplification and Administrative Procedure Amendments, with instructions to strike out sec. 2, which changes methods of fixing value to which customs duties apply. (Rejected 143 to 232.)	Aye.
94	June 23	H. Con. Res. 149, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism. (Adopted 367 to 0.)	Aye.
95	June 27	H. R. 6992, to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit. (Passed 267 to 56.)	Aye.
96	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 27	H. R. 6829, to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations. (Passed 317 to 2.)	Aye.
98	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 28	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 3005, extending selective service 4 years, and doctor-dentist draft 2 years. (Rejected 171 to 221.)	No.
100	June 28	Conference report on H. R. 3005, extending selective service 4 years, and doctor-dentist draft 2 years. (Adopted 388 to 5.)	Aye.
101	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
103	June 29	Motion to recommit conference report on S. 727, raising salaries of judges in District of Columbia, with instructions to insist on lower House-approved figures. (Rejected 157 to 227.)	Aye.
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
105	June 30	S. 2090, Mutual Security Assistance Act of 1955, authorizing $3.3 billion. (Passed 273 to 128.)	No.
106	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
109	July 6	Motion to recommit H. R. 3210, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. (Rejected 74 to 316.)	Aye.
110	July 7	Conference report on S. 2090, Mutual Security Act of 1955. (Adopted 262 to 120.)	No.
111	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 11	H. R. 7224 making appropriations ($2.6 billion) for mutual security for fiscal year 1956. (Passed 251 to 123.)	No.
113	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 13	Conference report on H. R. 6766, Public Works Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1956. (Agreed to, 315 to 92)	No.
115	July 13	H. Res. 295, providing for consideration of H. R. 7089, to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. (Agreed to 376 to 24.)	Aye.
116	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
118	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
119	July 18	H. R. 7225, to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18 and to extend coverage and increase the contribution. (Passed 372 to 31.)	No.
120	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
121	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
123	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
124	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
125	July 20	H. R. 7214, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective Mar. 1, 1956. (Passed 362 to 54.)	Aye.
126	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
127	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
129	July 25	Conference report on H. R. 7000, providing for strengthening the Reserves of the Armed Forces. (Agreed to 315 to 78.)	Aye.
130	July 26	H. Res. 314, to provide for 3 hours debate on H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill. (Adopted 274 to 128.)	Aye.
131	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 27	Motion to recommit H. R. 7474, the interstate highway construction bill, with instructions to incorporate the bond-financing provisions of the Clay report. (Rejected 193 to 221.)	No.
133	July 27	H. R. 7474, the interstate highway construction bill. (Defeated 123 to 292.)	No.
134	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
135	July 28	H. Res. 317, the rule for consideration of H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. (Adopted 272 to 135.)	No.
136	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
137	July 28	Motion to recommit H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act, to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study. (Rejected 203 to 210.)	Aye.

Voting record, 1st session, 84th Congress—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
138	July 28	H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act to exempt producers of natural gas from public utility regulation. (Passed 209 to 203.)	No.
139	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 29	Wolcott amendment to S. 2126, Housing Act of 1955, which struck authorization of 135,000 public housing units. (Agreed to 217 to 188.)	Aye.
141	July 29	S. 2126, Housing Act of 1955. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Aye.
142	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
143	Aug. 1	H. Res. 229, to provide $35,000 additional funds for expenses of Select Committee on Small Business. (Agreed to 231 to 134.)	No.
144	Aug. 1	S. 2576, repealing franchise of Capital Transit Co., operating in District of Columbia, providing public operation, with District of Columbia obligated to make up deficits. (Suspension of rules failed 215 to 150.)	No.
145	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
147	Aug. 2	Conference report on S. 2126, Housing Act of 1955, including 45,000 units of public housing. (Adopted 187 to 168.)	No.

The Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a letter which I have written to several newspapers over the country:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read with interest your editorial in regard to the failure of the Congress to pass a highway program during the past session.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee who took an active part in the defeat of both the Eisenhower plan and the Fallon bill voted out of committee, I would like to call attention to several aspects of the controversy which you have overlooked.

Both plans would put all the major emphasis on Federal road construction on the interstate highway system, which currently carries only 14 percent of the Nation's traffic. Dissatisfaction with this procedure was evident in the Senate which provided for an entirely different accelerated highway program. The Fallon bill recognized the weakness of the Eisenhower plan in its failure to step-up the remainder of the Federal-aid program, but the $25 million increase per year which was provided was very minor in contrast with the vast interstate expenditures.

The major opposition to the Fallon bill, at least among Democrats, was this unbalanced aid program combined with a tax program which would have collected the greater part of the revenue from highway users who would have only indirectly benefited. These influences had greater weight with the Congress than the trucking lobby.

In addition, the Fallon bill approach as well as the Eisenhower plan, seemed to many of us to break an important constitutional precedent. With minor exceptions, Federal revenues are not earmarked, and all appropriations come out of general revenue. At first thought, linking taxes to any new expenditure may sound like fiscal responsibility, but actually it could lead to governmental chaos, as has been demonstrated in France. We would have no foreign-aid program, and a very limited defense program if this procedure were followed.

It should be obvious that there were factors other than the trucking lobby which defeated the Fallon bill. The Eisenhower plan, in addition to the above objection, was defeated because—

(1) The $12 billion interest charge involved.

(2) Creation of a corporation to conduct the program, largely outside congressional review.

(3) The freeze on Federal contributions to other portions of the Federal-aid highway system which would have been necessary to finance the plan.

The major obstacle to any compromise on the legislation has been the refusal of the administration and Republican congressional leaders to consider any plan which would recognize the highway expenditures as part of the public debt. Democratic congressional leaders are not going to accept the costly fiction of the Eisenhower plan, designed to get around the public debt limitation and to put more high interest bonds on the market. If the Republican leadership will accept regular Treasury bonds as the manner of meeting any deficit occasioned by highway spending, compromise highway legislation will be quickly approved in 1956.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent discussion of the Townsend plan on the floor of the House, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a series of three articles on this subject which appeared in recent issues of the newspaper, Labor's Daily. They were written by Mr. George B. Holcomb, Labor's Daily staff writer. The first article is as follows:

TOWNSEND PLAN MAKING A COMEBACK—LABOR-ENDORSED SOLONS APPROVE REBORN OLD-AGE PENSION PLAN

(By G. B. Holcomb)

(This is the first of a series of articles on social security and the Townsend plan proposals for its reform)

The commercial press paid little attention this month to speeches made by several Members of the House of Representatives in support of the Townsend plan.

Yet, they are among 60 cosponsors of a bill (H. R. 4471) to legislate the plan into existence—the Townsend plan is making a comeback.

The (labor-endorsed) Congressmen who discussed the plan were Representatives GEORGE RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, Democrat, of Idaho; JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; JOHN BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota; CHARLES S. GUBSER, Republican, of California; CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California; and JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Others among the backers also are on both sides of the aisle dividing Democrats from Republicans.

There are many new voters in the Nation who don't know what the Townsend plan is. Perhaps some among the older folks have forgotten.

It reached the height of popularity in the thirties, and its supporters were among the most ardent of the champions of pensions for retired citizens.

Many observers believe the present social-security system was used as a compromise to prevent passage of the Townsend plan.

NAME-CALLING WAS ROUGH

The Townsend plan was subjected to an organized campaign of name-calling the likes of which have killed a goodly number of welfare programs. The opprobrium "creeping socialism" so common today was mild compared to some of the things the Townsend plan was called.

One of the chief reasons for this is obvious: It would cost the United States industry a great deal more than the present social-security pension plan costs; it would cost United States workers a great deal less individually.

The Townsend plan, incidentally, was named after its founder, Dr. Francis E. Townsend, an old-timer who is still very active on behalf of a better deal for old folks.

The plan might be summarized as a universal, long-term, pay-as-you-go, Federal pension system, equal benefits from which would be paid under an escalator clause based on national expenditures.

In other words:

The Townsend plan would pay benefits to each of the Nation's estimated 14.5 million retired persons of age 60 and over.

The present Federal system pays benefits to about 9½ million persons of age 65 and over—7 million under old-age and survivors insurance and the others under the old-age assistance program.

(The House has passed a bill to lower the eligibility age for women to 62 years, which would add some 800,000 beneficiaries to the program as of next January 1. It also would extend coverage to some 220,000 professional, self-employed persons.)

EQUAL PAY FOR ALL

All beneficiaries under the Townsend plan would be paid an equal sum, to be found by dividing the number of beneficiaries into the monthly contributions into the plan. (The method of payment into the plan will be discussed in art. 2.)

Using 1953 national figures, the Townsend backers estimated the average monthly benefits for the year to each of the beneficiaries would have been $138.45.

Since then, the Nation's income has grown, so the benefit would be higher, for they are based on gross national sales.

But compare the $138.45 benefit to the average amount paid to a single retired worker in 1953—$48.20.

Under the Townsend plan, a retired worker and his wife would get upward of $250 a month.

PRESENT AVERAGE $84

Under the present system, the average amounts paid to a retired worker and his wife is around $84 a month. That's under OASI.

The average under OAA varies from about $7.81 in Puerto Rico to around $77 in New York, per recipient.

The Townsend plan would pay benefits to each of the Nation's estimated 2 million or more permanently and totally disabled workers over age 18.

The Federal Government now helps about 227,000 disabled workers.

(Another 300,000 disabled persons would be assisted under the House-passed bill.)

DISABLED PAY SAME AS RETIRED

The Townsend plan calls for payment to each disabled person that same as to the retired—around $138 a month, perhaps more today.

Aid now varies from about $15 a month in the Virgin Islands to as high as $106.67 in Colorado. This includes some medical-care payments.

Under the Townsend plan the number of widows and other dependent heads of families with children under age 18 who would be helped is estimated at some 1,300,000—the same as under the present system.

But the difference lies in the amount of the benefits paid.

Under the present OASI system, some 84,500 mothers with 3 or more dependent children get an average of about $100 a month. (The average for a divorced dependent woman with 4 or more dependent children to support is $90.10.)

There also are an estimated 2,226,000 children who are not covered by the OASI system but who get aid to dependent children. They comprise more than 617,000 families or about 3.8 children per family.

The average present monthly payment to these families is $83 or so, varying from an average of about $61 in North Carolina to about $140 in Wisconsin.

The Townsend plan does not consider each child as a separate beneficiary, but each family, which means that the widow would receive the regular monthly benefit received by all other beneficiaries—$138, more or less depending on national gross receipts for the month. In addition, the children might receive benefits under the aid to dependent children program in cases of larger family units in which needs beyond the value of the regular monthly benefit might exist. At present the Townsend backers do not propose that the ADC program be eliminated.

VETS ALSO COVERED

There are some 2,640,000 disabled veterans who receive Federal benefits. These too would be covered under the Townsend plan.

There are some 108,000 blind persons who get Federal aid—averaging about $54 a month apiece.

Each would receive some $138 apiece under the Townsend plan.

To summarize, there are at least 14½ million persons receiving Federal aid of some sort in the United States. The aid seldom reaches as much as $100 a month per person. It totals around $9 billion a year, perhaps more.

Under the Townsend plan, at least 18 million persons would be getting Federal assistance. The aid seldom would be as low as $100 a month per person. Usually it would be around $138 or more.

The total would be around $30 billion a year or more.

The amount would vary directly as the Nation's prosperity varies.

Resolution Adopted by the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Department of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution which was adopted by the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Department of Rhode Island, in executive session during its seventh annual department convention held in the city of Providence, R. I., on June 11 and 12, 1955:

Whereas the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States have long felt that certain rights, benefits, privileges, and prerogatives extended to certain other major veterans' organizations by the Congress should be bestowed similarly upon us; and

Whereas, despite the growth of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States in prestige, in numbers, and in prominence in increasing areas of our country, conveyance of such vital recognition is still to be effected; and

Whereas the failure of extending such recognition to the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States has worked a considerable handicap upon us, particularly insofar as our service and rehabilitation programs are concerned in that our service and rehabilitation officers are precluded from representing claimants before Veterans' Administration rating boards and boards of appeals; and

Whereas the efforts that have been expended in behalf of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States by the Honorable THOMAS J. LANE, Congressman from Massachusetts, to overcome this inequity by sponsoring and introducing legislation in the United States House of Representatives is a matter which merits particular consideration by this organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Department of Rhode Island, in executive session during its seventh annual department convention held in the city of Providence, R. I., on June 11 and 12, 1955, do hereby unanimously extend to the Honorable THOMAS J. LANE our sincere gratitude and appreciation for his interest and efforts in behalf of this organization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Representative THOMAS J. LANE and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the national adjutant of the Italian-American World War Veterans for presentation and adoption at the national convention of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States in September 1955 at Youngstown, Ohio.

JOSEPH LEONELLI,
Department Commander.

Attest:

EMILIO CAPOMACCHIO,
Department Adjutant.

Reluctance To Employ "Middle-Agers" Is Becoming a National Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing problems increasingly affecting our American society, from the humane as well as economic standpoint, is that of providing employment opportunities for our older citizens.

Paradoxically and unfortunately, although the blessings of advancing medical research and science serve to bestow longer lives in our times, we nevertheless have fallen into the custom, particularly in industry, of classifying men and women of 40 as "too old." When we realize that a wartime draft embraces men up to 42 years of age, it would be thought perhaps a little humorous to conceive the maturity of 40 as too old for ordinary employment, if it were not so tragic.

There are, of course, a great number of varied and practical reasons why business, industry and even the Government itself feels that those citizens entering middle age are too told to begin any new employment. Probably first of all, these older people, often with families, cannot support themselves and their families decently at a salary acceptable to a younger beginner; pension systems developed as modern blessings too often prevail upon employers to deny positions to the middle-agers; industrial insurance programs also often serve as a bar, as well as a host of other prejudices.

The closed employment door has developed through no fault of the great legion of mature Americans in the prime of their lives. It is pathetic to think that while the technological advantages of God's providence permitting ever-increasing machine production through replacement of human beings and the developments of modern medicine are adding fruitful years to the average life term, together with the greatest population increase in our history, we are, nevertheless, being unconscionably forced by bewilderment to visit severe and extreme economic hardships upon an age bracket, and their dependents, who could contribute the most to all phases of American development. The seriousness of this situation is further frightening when we reflect that we have not yet really entered into the promising era of peaceful production through the use of atomic science developments.

Mr. Speaker, our learned psychologists and psychiatrists repeatedly testify that experience and statistics clearly demonstrate that the best employee is one of maturity and stability and possessed of a high sense of responsibility. This is a summarized but exact description of the economic value of our middle-aged citizens without reference to their greater values.

This is not, indeed, the time and place to develop an extended discussion of this

grave problem. I will not pretend to have any complete solution. There have been many studies made and there are more being made now. The challenge is being increasingly recognized. It is my simple purpose here to emphasize the concern we must all have and the continuing thought we must devote to the solution of the middle-age crisis.

Ways and means to help these mature employable citizens, men and women, to find gainful employment to support themselves and their dependents must be found through encouraging the cooperation of industry, labor, and government units at all levels.

We call ourselves a Christian country. This is primarily a moral obligation upon all of us to insure that no group of citizens in this great country is denied the opportunity to work.

I would like to compliment those conscientious persons in the United States Department of Labor who are giving constant attention to this matter, as well as the great many religious, social, industrial, and labor leaders who are earnestly searching for the corrective answer. As a nation we have met and reasonably resolved many difficulties through our growing generations. We can and will find the right way to utilize the great productive resources residing within our middle-age brackets. We can only do it by persevering study and effort. Under God's guidance and inspiration, let us keep trying.

He Fights for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the current article in the He Fights for Conservation series in Sports Afield magazine is devoted to our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

LESTER JOHNSON is a fighter for conservation of land, water, fish, and wildlife. I am pleased to see this well-deserved recognition of his devotion and ability.

The article, by Michael Hudoba, Washington editor of the sportsmen's magazine, follows:

HE FIGHTS FOR CONSERVATION

(Eleventh in series of profiles of men in Congress leading fight for vital laws to help sport, conservation)

Representative LESTER JOHNSON, Democrat, from Black River Falls, Wis., has only been in Congress since 1953 but he's working hard for conservation of land, water, fish, and wildlife.

An original member of the growing bipartisan conservation bloc in the House, Representative JOHNSON studies the complex conservation issues, and is right on the frontline in hearings and on the floor when fights for these resources are impending.

He has introduced bills for land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation, and was the first to put in the measure for the multiple-purpose use of national forests to assure that all the public values would be protected and used wisely.

Representative JOHNSON dug deeply into the duck-stamp and waterfowl refuge program to come up with data on what has happened to the sportsmen's duck-stamp dollars. He used these facts in testimony before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on bills to make sure the duck-stamp money was used for its original purpose. He also carried this question to the floor of the House where he spoke at length to bring it into focus for Congress.

Speculation in Government Bonds Permits Big Windfalls for Gamblers Receiving Support of an Agency of Congress

SPEECH
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Government bond prices yesterday took a severe and drastic dip. The 3 percent bonds recently issued fell off 10 32s, which is considered 10 points. That is a drastic reduction in 1 day. All bonds fell in price.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What particular time is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. PATMAN. Yesterday, Monday, August 1. Now, that means that the bonds, the 72 67s, September and December, are down below 94. They are 93. There is no reason on earth why these bonds should be below par. The Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System can, without cost—remember this, please, without cost; it will not cost the Government 1 penny on earth—keep these bonds at par. And, they should be kept at par. Here is where the Congress has a responsibility. The people who are managing the bond prices are servants and agents of the Congress. They are our agents; they are our servants. And one of these days when they take a drastic step that is devastating and destructive to the interests of the people, we are going to be blamed for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, we just turned over the transit system to the Commissioners. Is there any distinct group that we could turn this problem over to?

Mr. PATMAN. This is national, and, of course, it applies to the 48 States and the District of Columbia. It is not a local issue, of course.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there a similar body that we could turn it over to?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. We turned it over to a similar body. Now, that is the trouble.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means the Federal Reserve outfit?

Mr. PATMAN. The Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve. There are five representatives of private banks on there, and they can look after their own interests on that board, which they are doing, and they are doing a good job looking after their interests, but while they are doing that they are hurting the public interest, and the Congress is letting them continue to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is an expert on finance.

Mr. PATMAN. I disclaim that part.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Supposing bonds were kept above par, would that be inflationary?

Mr. PATMAN. Not necessarily so. There are several ways to keep down inflation. They could raise the rediscount rate if they wanted to, or they could change the reserve requirements of the banks. There are several ways to prevent inflation. You do not have to reduce the price of bonds to prevent inflation. This is a cruel remedy. Now, one thing that is happening now that was not known until recently, they are actually selling Government bonds short, selling them short in a market that is unregulated, an unregulated Government bond market, selling the bonds short. It is something that should receive the attention of the United States Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, I do not have any bonds and I do not know anything about the market or selling, but what does the gentleman mean? Does the gentleman mean that the United States Government is selling its bonds for less than they are worth?

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Explain that to me.

Mr. PATMAN. The private dealers are selling them short.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Short bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. Government bonds. And they are being helped by our Government, the agents of the United States Congress, the agents of the gentleman from Michigan. They are aiding and abetting the short selling of these bonds. And, he is responsible. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Texas are responsible.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean I am responsible?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, the gentleman is responsible. They are your agents.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I do not own any bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. I know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I am not selling any bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is a very valuable and able representative of the people from Michigan——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, that I admit.

Mr. PATMAN. And the Constitution charges the Congress with a duty, and in charging the Congress with a duty the gentleman assumes a part of that responsibility when he takes his oath of office.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What I want to know is what this short business is.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it is selling them short.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know what the gentleman means when he says "selling them short."

FLUCTUATIONS IN GOVERNMENT BOND PRICES, 1953, 1954, AND 1955

Mr. PATMAN. The following table shows how long-term United States Treasury bond prices have fluctuated during the last 2 years of flexible-monetary and debt-management policies. June 1, 1953, represents the low point reached in the Government bond market following the tight credit policies of early 1953. July 16, 1954, marks the peak in bond prices reached during the recession in business and the Federal Reserve's temporary shift to easy money. August 2, 1955, represents the low point reached in the period of so-called mild restraint.

Bond issue	June 1, 1953	July 16, 1954	Aug. 2, 1955
2½s 62–59	98 8/32	101 14/32	95 29/32
2½s 64–69	90 23/32	101 12/32	94 6/32
2½s 67–72	90 4/32	100 23/32	93 30/32
3¼s 78–83	98 29/32	111 3/32	104

A change of one thirty-second in the price of long-term Government bonds is equivalent to $312.50 per million. The change in points in Government bond prices for the period June 1, 1953, to August 2, 1955, is shown in the following table:

Bond issue	Change in points	
	June 1, 1953, to July 16, 1954	July 16, 1954, to Aug. 2, 1955
2½s 62–59	+9 6/32	−5 29/32
2½s 64–69	+10 17/32	−7 6/32
2½s 67–72	+10 18/32	−6 25/32
3¼s 83–78	+12 25/32	−7 13/32

The 40-year 3-percent bonds were not outstanding in 1953 and, therefore, could not be included for comparative purposes in the table above. However, these bonds first issued in February of 1955 were marked down considerably as a result of heavy selling in July. As a result, the 3-percent bonds broke below their par price for the first time since their issuance. Between June 14, 1955, and August 2, 1955, the 3-percent bonds fell from 101 9/32 to 98 20/32 a loss of 2 21/32.

SHORT SELLING OF GOVERNMENT BONDS BY DEALERS

Sales by Government bond dealers for future delivery—so-called short selling—played a role in the decline of the 3-percent bonds. The American Banker, July 29, 1955, noted:

Last Friday the 3-percent bonds broke par and on Monday they were really weak and are reported to have sold as low as 99.19. This weakness was in spite of the Federal doing some buying for the Treasury trust funds; and a State fund also being a buyer.

The dealers who were selling 3's for future delivery at slightly under par have already done very well.

Smaller banks are getting a little worried by the fact that the market for their Governments is so much under the values on their books.

I have made inquiry of Chairman Martin of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as to the extent of short-selling of Government bonds by addressing a letter to him as follows:

JULY 15, 1955.

Mr. WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: It would be of great interest to me if you could let me know the extent to which the Government bond market may be characterized by short selling. I would be interested in knowing what the institutional procedures are for short selling of Government bonds, the volume of such sales, and the trend. I assume that the Open Market Committee in its dealing with recognized dealers probably receives regular reports on their financial position, and hence on their short- and long-inventory positions.

Very truly yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

An answer has been promised almost daily, but to date, no answer has been received.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Trucks and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a letter from one of our distinguished colleagues, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

TRUCKS AND TAXES

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

I have just read your July 21 editorial, The Truck Lobby in High. Not once in it is there reference to the arguments advanced by the trucking industry against the proposed method of paying for the new highway program through additional taxes on gasoline, tires, trucks, buses, etc.

Now I can say this with a great deal more force because I do not happen to agree with the case presented by the trucking industry, although I respect many of the facts and arguments they have advanced. Furthermore, I respect both the honesty and forthrightness of their position and I certainly respect their right, and I might add, their duty, to present their side of the case to the Congress as long as they do it fairly and factually.

I am disturbed about this method of paying for our highways because it breaches a basic constitutional Federal approach to taxation. That is, there shall be no earmarked taxes and all taxes must go into general revenue and all appropriations must come out of general revenue.

This basic approach has been breached twice in the past and, in my judgment, has led to serious fiscal troubles which are still with us and will be further aggravated. A third major breach might well mark an end to this basic approach to Federal financing.

Incidentally, I am even more opposed to the special revenue bond approach for financing the highway program proposed by the Eisenhower administration. This, in my judgment, would lead to even greater fiscal irresponsibility in the long run and will, as your editorial suggests, cost more.

THOMAS B. CURTIS,
United States Representative,
Second Missouri District.

WASHINGTON.

A Great Modern Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, those of us having high legislative responsibility perhaps realize the deepest how great and good a patriot and statesman was Cordell Hull.

I am pleased to include at this time a most appropriate editorial appearing in the July 26, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor most deservedly praising his life and work.

The article follows:

A TOWERING PUBLIC FIGURE

Cordell Hull could well serve as a model of qualities desired in a devoted and practical public servant. He had simple dignity, political discernment, commonsense, and fairmindedness. But probably the quality which most characterized him was a kind of bedrock integrity.

He had convictions—the kind men spend a lifetime serving. But he had also patience and consideration for an opposing view. Born in a log cabin of a Tennessee mountaineer father and product of a 1-year course in law, he fought many a wily political battle to win and hold a seat in Congress for over 20 years.

During that period he earned a respect which heightened with his service as Secretary of State to President Franklin D. Roosevelt during the controversial years of the New Deal and the crucial early years of World War II. Though he had been chairman of the Democratic National Committee from 1921 to 1924, he was able to chart a bipartisan policy in the struggle with authoritarianism.

He is said to have told a close friend that he wished to be remembered most for four accomplishments: his part in the creation of the United Nations, establishment of a nonpartisan foreign policy in World War II, development of the "good neighbor" policy toward Latin America, and authorship of the reciprocal trade agreements program for tariff reductions and freer world trade.

The last is probably his most distinctive monument. It is a direct outgrowth of the first speech he ever made in the House of Representatives, an espousal of the low-tariff policy of his party in 1908. It was also a gradual rather than convulsive method which has commended itself to the Eisenhower administration.

It is perhaps less widely recalled that he took a leading part in two inter-American conferences and that he guided the dis-

cussions at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington which laid the ground plans for the United Nations. But these things, too, added to his stature in history.

Resolutions of Outdoor Writers Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Outdoor Writers Association of America is an organization composed of 2,000 authors and newspaper, magazine, radio, and television outdoor writers and editors. They know the outdoors. Many of them are experts in the field of conservation. They know the problems on local, State, and National levels.

Therefore, conservationists everywhere will be interested in these resolutions adopted by the association in convention at Rangeley, Maine, June 19 to 25:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas the highways of America are travel arteries leading through our areas of scenic beauty; and

Whereas these said highways should be a part of this scenic beauty, not scars on the face of it; and

Whereas thoughtless people despoil these highways and, with them, this scenic beauty, by scattering obnoxious debris along them and over adjacent areas; and

Whereas some States have laws against this pollution, and commendably enforce them, while other States have laws and do not enforce them, while still others do not have such laws at all; and

Whereas the Outdoor Writers Association of America represents all sections of the Nation and possesses the means of reaching great numbers of people throughout the mass media of newspapers, magazines, radio, and television, with great opportunities for public education and action, so that our combined efforts would do much to eliminate this inexcusable despoilage of our roadsides: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers of America go on record as commending existing State and local programs and approving adoption by every State of laws against such littering and further, as demanding rigid enforcement of existing laws, and finally, as pledging ourselves to individual campaigns against such garbage dispensers and defilers while urging action upon other members of our State chapters, fully realizing that our educational efforts will in the end prove even more effective than laws.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas appropriation of public land under present mining laws is deterrent to sound management, in the public interest, of the watershed, timber, recreation, wildlife, and wilderness resources of the national forests;

Whereas there are frequent abuses of present mining laws through filing of claims for other purposes than mining;

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress S. 1713 by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, and H. R. 5891 by Representative ROGERS to prevent abuses of the national forests; and

Whereas enactment of this bill would provide a minimum acceptable level of safeguards for effective national forest administration by clearing up the confusion of overlapping, poorly defined claims and by removing much of the incentive for the abuse of the mining laws, while at the same time protecting legitimate mining operations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association of America urges the prompt enactment of the objectives of S. 1713 and H. R. 5891; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all such Members of the United States Congress and to all such other groups and individuals as may be interested.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas some 180 million acres of national forest lands form unposted hunting, fishing, and recreational areas for all Americans; and

Whereas H. R. 1823 by Representative LEE METCALF would provide for multiple uses of these areas, and provide funds for a stepped-up program for wildlife habitat and recreation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association of America urges the Congress to enact legislation embodying the objectives of H. R. 1823 thus implementing public use of these lands; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all such Members of the United States Congress and to all such other groups and individuals as may be interested.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress S. 890 to extend the Water Pollution Control Act to prevent or lessen pollution of the Nation's waters; and

Whereas failure of the Congress to enact such legislation would halt the progress that is being made in the fight against pollution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association of America requests the Congress to act favorably this session in order that the present water pollution control program may be continued without interruption; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress and to all such groups and individuals as may be interested.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas the Outdoor Writers Association of America recognizes that the national wildlife refuge system is of the utmost importance in the continued welfare of the many native species of game birds and mammals; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress H. R. 5306 by Representative LEE METCALF and S. 2101 by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY which would require the Secretary of the Interior to obtain the prior approval of the Congress before relinquishing any part of the national refuge system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association urges the prompt enactment of H. R. 5306 and S. 2101; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress and to all such groups and individuals as may be interested.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas there have been introduced in Congress S. 1079 by Senator GEORGE AIKEN and H. R. 4004 by Representative CLIFFORD HOPE which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell national forest lands; and

Whereas the wording of this proposed legislation is vague and subject to a broad latitude of interpretation which could be inimical to the public interest in a sound national forest program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association of America is opposed to the granting of such discretionary administrative authority to the Secretary of Agriculture unless the legislation contains all the safeguards which would adequately protect the national forest program in the public interest; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress and to such group and individuals as may be interested.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas the Outdoor Writers Association of America recognizes the need for wise use of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering various proposals for the development of such water resources; and

Whereas none of these proposals provide either protection for national park and monument areas or for wise development of the waters of the Colorado River: Then, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association of America in convention assembled, urges the Congress to defeat the pending versions of the upper Colorado River storage project; and be it further

Resolved, That the interim committee which made the preliminary survey and reported to this convention be duly designated as a permanent committee with the specific charge of preparing an alternate to existing proposals to be presented to the Congress at such time as the threat to Echo Park Dam and all other national parks and monuments permits impartial consideration of such alternatives.

As you know, H. R. 5891, subject of the second resolution, has become Public Law 167. The other legislation discussed here remains to be acted upon next year.

Continued Slander Against Free China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter recently received from Dr. Marguerite Atterbury, who is now on Formosa as one of the officials of the American voluntary relief organization, Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc. Dr. Atterbury has been a missionary in China since 1920, with work especially among rural people. She is a graduate of Wellesley College and received her doctor of philosophy degree from Columbia. The letter follows:

It is very agonizing to me to know the basic facts about the Far Eastern situation—at least as to the constructive record of the Chinese Nationalist Government, and the bloody crimes of the Communists—and not be able to shout these facts to the world. Representative POWELL at the Bandung Conference reported later that there was little support for the Nationalist Government of China there. Papers elsewhere stated that the arch-murderer, Chou En-lai, had been applauded by 5,000 people when he arrived in Indonesia, and when he took off. Yet Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai have been responsible for the most hideous chapter of torture and terror in the whole history of Asia; while the stanch loyalty of the Na-

tionalists to the principles of freedom is helping to protect the flank of the free world, and to maintain the independence of the threatened countries in the path of the Red menace. Yet not one single country in the Bandung conference expressed any appreciation of what the Free Chinese were sacrificing in order to stand on the firing line against the Red tyrants.

We have been translating sickening records of our refugees, in their sufferings under the Communists. The lists of sadistic tortures is simply incredible. We have a 100-page manuscript of a Chee-loo University biology professor describing at first hand the Communist takeover of the university, then his own experience in various prisons, and finally in a slave-labor camp from which he escaped by a miracle. The systematic enslavement and degradation of China's millions should unite the free, Christian world in a storm of protest against these hideous inhumanities. Every decent human being should be bracing himself to sweep these monsters from the earth. But instead, the apathetic "good" people of America, especially the clergy, urge sitting down to negotiate with the Mao-Chou villians, and clamor to hand over the free offshore islands to this appalling fate. How can loving, kind parents and idealistic young people in America sit idly by while millions are being horribly done to death in China? Especially since it was America's blunders at Yalta and during the Marshall mission which helped to topple our China ally into the abyss, while Japan and Greece were being faithfully protected from the same Communist menace that we aided and abetted in China.

The article of Herrymon Maurer in the April 4, New Leader, Formosa and Free World Policy, comes the nearest to acknowledging the cconstructive achievements of the nationalist government of anything I have read. But Mr. Maurer doesn't begin to go far enough in his assertions that the Chiang Kai-shek regime did accomplish something on the mainland, after all. Most articles on China manage to get in some nasty digs at Chiang Kai-shek, even when purporting to be anti-Communist. K. C. Wu's interview in the U. S. News & World Report last Februahy, I think it was, managed to get in the two statements that the Nationalist Government had been repudiated by the people on the mainland and didn't amount to much on Taiwan, along with a lot of obvious remarks about the Communist menace in southeast Asia. Not a word about the faithfulness of the Nationalist Government in resisting communism from the very beginning until now. The March Reader's Digest has a fine article about Dr. Jimmy Yen's rural reconstruction work in the Philippines. But it has two absolutely unjustified slurs on Chiang Kai-shek which help to confirm the carefully planted Communist stereotypes about him. Page 142 says: "Had that program been carried out on a wider scale, with more vigorous backing, it might well have saved China from its totalitarian fate. As it was, the effort reached its peak only in the 2 years before the Red inundation in 1950. Justice William O. Douglas is convinced, he writes in the book North From Malaya, that had this program been carried out a decade or even 5 years earlier, it could easily have become the counterrevolution that could have swept communism aside."

On page 148, this article, Jimmy Yen and the People's Crusade, says: "After V-J Day, Dr. Yen set the reconstruction of the rural population of the entire country as his goal. For this he needed top government support and sufficient funds. But Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek told him, in effect, that he was a soldier first and that his job was to exterminate the Communists. Only then could he take up such an ambitious program of present reconstruction."

Both the above quotations are entirely unjustified by the recorded facts. The abundant source materials of history establish that the Nationalist Government, from its very beginning, was heart and soul enlisted in the cause of rural welfare. It did a great job of relief and reconstruction during the flood of 1931, when as many Chinese farmers were involved as the total United States farming population. The dikes constructed would have built a wall about the earth at the Equator 6 feet wide and 6 feet high. The welfare pattern, when established, became the norm for the great agricultural extension movement of China. By 1945, a national commission of agricultural extension had been established, with organizations in 14 provinces, and 300 counties. The leaders, trained in America, were promoting better land utilization, and pilot projects in land distribution.

Hubert Freyn, in Free China's New Deal (Macmillan's, 1943) records the rural welfare work during the Japanese war. This book, of course, received no publicity in leading book reviews. Pearl Buck's booklet, Tell All the People, describes how Chiang Kai-Shek and Madame Chiang eagerly listened to Dr. Yen's account of Ting Hsien. Generalissimo Chiang sent his own cadets to train there. I know from my own 10 years' rural welfare experience how the Nationalist Government cooperated with our rural-improvement programs with great enthusiasm. I collected about 150 pounds of first-class primary source material for my thesis on China's rural reconstruction. But it has been impossible to get this vital historical material published. So the Communists and well-meaning but badly informed people spread the slander of the corrupt and inept Kuomintang. If everyone thinks the Kuomintang was a failure, the United States public says, what's the use of putting back a government that was thrown out by the people?

It is extremely important for the people of America to know the truth about their great China ally; so that the United States can support China's Valley Forge with the same faith and enthusiasm that Lafayette brought to our own Revolution.

One of the biggest assists that the free world could get would be just to publish the records which establish the truth about Free China's constructive achievements, and the criminal deeds of the Communists. I don't know any commercial publisher that will touch this material because the Communists would make him lose money. Geraldine Fitch's Formosa Beachhead is by far the best account of the China situation today, but it hasn't sold well, and has received almost no book reviews. Columbia wouldn't even put it in its university libraries when I was there, although I kept recommending it. The Ford Foundation is spending millions on anti-anti-Communist material; but no one will give voice to the authentic cry of freedom.

The magnificent schools here also need funds for libraries and laboratories, and for student scholarships. Everyone wants to go to school, and they study like mad. The schools aren't enough. One school I visited at I-lan has students coming by train from miles away. They get up at 5 and get home by 9 at night. The train was packed with these neat, alert boys in their khaki uniforms, studying their textbooks by the dim light of the car as they bounced along the tracks. The Foreign Operations Administration has given a good deal of equipment to the agricultural and industrial schools. But the students could use a good deal more.

Loyally,

MARGUERITE ATTERBURY.

Safety First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, we are all appalled at the tremendous number of deaths and the thousands of severe injuries annually occurring upon our crowded highways, but few of us ever take the time to think up constructive suggestions.

I am, therefore, the more pleased to include a very fine article appearing in the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, issue of July 18, 1955, explaining that the installation of seat belts would very probably greatly reduce this dismaying accident rate, according to the experts. This seems truly to be a most constructive suggestion, the adoption of which could very likely save the life of any one of us.

The editorial follows:

SEAT BELTS COULD SLASH OUR HIGHWAY TRAGEDIES

The year 1954 saw 36,300 Americans die in traffic accidents. Injured were more than 1,250,000. With more cars rolling off the assembly lines and onto the roads every year, this dismal story seems likely to get even grimmer in the future unless something is done about it.

According to an article in the current Saturday Evening Post, something may be done about it fairly soon. Appalled by the ghastly toll of death and destruction on the highways, the automobile companies, the National Safety Council, the armed services, and the State police of certain States are looking with interest at the seat belt. According to some experts, if seat belts were installed and used on all cars, traffic fatalities would plummet overnight.

The seat belt is, of course, standard equipment on practically all airplanes. Countless pilots have been saved from death and disfiguration by the fact that their seat belts made it possible for them to stay in their cockpits and decelerate their speed with their planes when they cracked up.

The same principle holds in automobiles. When a crash takes place, the occupants of the car are hurled forward, either through the windshield or into the lethal array of knobs and metal edges that adorn the dashboard.

According to the studies made by the automotive crash injury program at Cornell Medical College, properly installed seat belts would radically change this dangerous situation. Car interiors would automatically be transformed into "islands of safety" from the death traps that they are now.

So impressive are the tests of these simple safety devices, that more than 500 State police cars in California have been supplied with them. The Defense Department is seriously considering installing them in the thousands of military vehicles it owns. And 2 of the 3 largest automobile manufacturers are offering seat belts as optional equipment.

The biggest obstacle to seat belts, everyone admits, lies in the reluctance of the American people to change their habits, especially if the change involves even the slightest bother or expense. But there are signs that the public is waking up to the menace of the highways.

Misunderstandings and Distortions Regarding Doctors' Draft Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the House bill to extend for 4 years the Selective Service Act was amended in the other body to include a title amending and extending the doctors' draft law. In conference the conferees on the part of the House accepted this title, even though the House had been given no opportunity to discuss and debate this issue on its own merits.

During consideration of the conference report, many of us, I am convinced the majority, wanted to recommit the conference report to the conferees with instructions to strike out the title on the doctors' draft, in order that it might be considered as separate legislation. Our effort failed because many Members did not want to be put in a position where their vote might conceivably be represented as a vote against extension of selective service, when it was only a vote against improper inclusion of the doctor's draft law in the bill.

The unfavorable impression created by such maneuvers is portrayed in a letter received from a distinguished physician who was in the House gallery during the debate on the conference report, and who is familiar with the whole procedure by which the Armed Forces has been securing adequate numbers of physicians during and since the war.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his letter:

JULY 8, 1955.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: I tried to call you before I left Washington last week to express appreciation and commendation for the efforts you made to have the doctor draft bill recommitted to the conference committee.

I made it a point to be in the gallery to hear the debate and felt very depressed over the tactics that were used to force that bill through. It was certainly ruthless.

In fact, listening to some of the Members appeal for passage of the bill on the basis of statements that were wholly or partially misleading make one almost lose faith in our legislative process. Among the impressions which they obviously wished to create were the following:

1. That the American Medical Association proposes that the care of military dependents be discontinued, and that the failure to pass this bill would leave the wives and children of military personnel in oversea and remote areas without medical care. This, of course, is a completely false impression. The AMA has never suggested that dependent care be discontinued. What they have suggested and feel is right is that the civilian facilities and civilian physicians be utilized to provide this care wherever available.

2. That only 1 percent of the beds in military hospitals are occupied by dependents and the discontinuance of all dependent care would save only an insignificant number of medical officers.

3. That the military services will be several thousand physicians short of their minimum requirements if this bill is not passed. The figures he used are the inflated estimates of the Defense Department and include the needs of USPHS. The fact that the Medical Task Force of the Hoover Commission and the Health Resources Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization both stated that they are convinced that the Services can operate without the Draft Act was given no consideration at all by the chairman in charge of the debate.

4. That even if they are able to get enough physicians to meet their minimum numerical requirements, they would have only incompletely trained physicians right out of their internships. One of these speakers even asked the question, "If your boy needed an operation while in the military services, would you want him to be operated upon by a youngster just out of medical school?" They completely ignored the facts that approximately two-thirds of the regular corps officers are certified board specialists; that the military services have training programs which will provide them with several hundred specialists each year; and that in many areas they can obtain services of civilian specialists on a basis similar to the Veterans' Administration.

5. That failure to pass the bill would in essence amount to Congress passing a bill to draft the young men of the country for military service without providing them with essential medical care.

6. That failure to pass the bill would mean that the wives and other dependents of servicemen would not receive any checks for their living expenses after July 1; and that without this particular bill the selective service system would completely disintegrate and would go out of existence at midnight, June 30. Also, that "unless we pass this bill today, we imperil the safety of the Nation." Such statements are clearly untrue since in a few minutes the conference committee could have separated the general Draft Act and the doctor draft bill and obtained prompt action on them separately. In fact, the general Draft Act had already been passed by the House.

Incidentally, all three speakers for the passage of the bill stated that this law will not result in the drafting of a single physician who has had any military service. That statement, certainly, will not be true if the services are permitted to call by draft the number of physicians that they state will be needed over the next couple of years.

In the above comments I, of course, have not told you anything that you do not know far better than I, but to one who is not accustomed to this type of political maneuvering it is most disheartening to see legislation of real importance forced through Congress by such tactics.

Most sincerely.

Resolutions of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a communication, containing several resolutions, forwarded to me by Comdr. Francis R. Dobrowski, of the Massachusetts State Department of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, United States of America.

The letter follows:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE DEPARTMENT,
POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
August 1, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Whereas it has come to the attention of the American people that American citizens are being held prisoners in Red China, Russia, and other Communist countries: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States take effective and immediate action to obtain the release of American citizens imprisoned by the Communists; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

Whereas there have been many instances on the part of some legislators and other individuals to cut back on veterans' benefits; and

Whereas there actually have been a number of cutbacks effected; and

Whereas certain veterans affected by these cutbacks of benefits have been hurt and have suffered hardships: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Massachusetts, Polish Legion of American Veterans, go on record as opposing further cutbacks in veterans' benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

Whereas, by the terms of treaties with certain foreign countries, United States military personnel are tried by the courts of those countries for offenses committed therein; and

Whereas there have been instances where certain American military personnel did not receive justice as justice is known in the United States at the hands of those foreign countries: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Department, Polish Legion of American Veterans go on record as opposing the provisions of these treaties under which certain American military personnel are tried by foreign courts; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

Very truly yours,
FRANCIS R. DOBROWSKI.

Outstanding Service of Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution by the Committee on Armed Services relative to the outstanding services of Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge has been a professional staff member of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate from 1947 until the present; and

Whereas during this period of service he has demonstrated exceptional competence in assisting the committee under the chairmanships of Senator Chan Gurney, Senator Millard Tydings, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, and Senator Richard B. Russell; and

Whereas he has given the committee the benefit of his broad military experience while maintaining scrupulously a viewpoint of complete objectivity; and

Whereas by the energetic application of his talents General Mudge has contributed immeasurably to committee and Senate action on the many items of legislation affecting the Department of Defense and the national security enacted during the period of his service; and

Whereas he has endeared himself to the members of the committee and its staff by his outstanding ability, his wise and friendly counsel, and his loyalty to the members and staff of the committee; and

Whereas after 8 years of service, General Mudge is resigning from his position on the staff of the committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services expresses its profound appreciation to Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge, United States Army, retired, for his dedicated service of the highest quality, and extends its sincere wishes for his future health and happiness.

Conflicting Transportation Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 30, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, and the country generally, should be alerted to practices of certain agencies of the Federal Government which, contrary to sound national policy, are weakening the defense potential of the Nation's essential system of common carrier transportation.

While the Congress and those administrative agencies specifically charged by law with responsibilities for maintaining a sound transport system bend their efforts toward the development and preservation of strong carriers capable of meeting the needs of the national defense, as well as of the peacetime economy, other agencies of the Government are engaging in practices which undermine this effort. The military departments, in particular, are out of step. By their transportation procurement policies, their practices with respect to leasing aircraft, and by direct competition with common carriers, the military services increasingly deny essential support to the carriers which would have to form the backbone of the logistics system in event of war.

Defense transportation was placed in true perspective as an essential element of military strength by the late Gen. Brehon Somervell, who was commanding general of the Army Service Forces in World War II, when he said, in 1944:

We in the Armed Forces of the United States think of transportation as a military tool—a weapon as important as the very tank or gun it transports from factory to fighting front.

In 1944, the peak war year, this "military tool"—our transport system—handled 76 percent more freight traffic, in military equipment, material to support defense production, and goods for civilian consumption, than in 1940. The system handled 3½ times as much passenger traffic in 1944 as in 1940, much of it troop movements. Almost all of this additional traffic was handled by carriers which operated in 1940 to serve a peacetime economy. The railroads, which fortunately had maintained spare capacity, almost doubled their freight traffic, while their passenger traffic quadrupled during the period. This remarkable performance prompted Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, Chief of Transportation, Army Service Forces, in 1944 to say:

Without the railroads, the war might of our country could not be mobilized.

Our declared national transportation policy recognizes the importance of anticipating transportation requirements for defense. It prescribes Federal promotion of safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service, provides that sound economic conditions in transportation be fostered, and requires that reasonable charges be established and maintained, all to the end of developing and preserving a national transportation system adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. Although the Department of Defense is not specifically required as a matter of law to adhere to this policy declaration as contained in the Interstate Commerce Act, its principles are certainly no less valid with respect to sound military policy and practice than in any other direction affecting a sound and dependable transportation system.

Giving emphasis to this view the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization, in its report to the President in April of this year, proposed an effective transportation policy which would take defense requirements properly into account. The committee said:

While a general transportation policy should concern itself primarily with our developing national economy, it must also be concerned with potential defense requirements. In this latter context two primary objectives may be noted: (1) to emphasize the growth and development of the several forms of transport somewhat in accord with the proportional demands that defense will make upon them, and (2) to support their financial well-being to the end that they will be physically in excellent shape and possessed of a desirable flexibility and some degree of excess capacity. A policy under which the transportation enterprises generally live in precarious financial position is not a policy calculated to enhance our preparedness. Any policy which has the effect of weakening any form of transportation on which we must place major reliance in the event of war is not a satisfactory defense policy.

It is axiomatic that the basic function of the Department of Defense is to foster and protect the security of the United States. But this grave responsibility is not now being discharged effectively with respect to transportation. The military services are depriving the common carrier of traffic and revenues needed to keep them intact and strong.

For example, during the limited mobilization attending the Korean emergency, and continuing to date, the military services have made extensive use of the large irregular or nonscheduled airlines for transporting personnel. In the first half of 1954 these operators were given one-third of all organized domestic military passenger traffic, while the common-carrier railroads were able to obtain less than one-half. Yet in World War II the railroads transported 97 percent of all organized military traffic, and they would be required to handle most of it again in any other full mobilization. The nonscheduled airlines could not handle the mass movements which would be required in a large-scale mobilization. Moreover, the large four-engine aircraft of the scheduled airlines are earmarked primarily for military missions in long-range, over-ocean operations in an emergency.

My only concern is that we have in being and available for immediate use the forms of transportation which will be required in the event of mobilization or war. In the event of either contingency there will be neither time, material, or manpower to provide the same. What I have to say is not for the purpose of advocating an advantage for any form of transportation over another. My concern is solely and simply the national defense. The maintenance of such an adequate system need not do any violence to any other system.

As of the present time, and for a considerable time in the future, mass movements of troops and concentrations of heavy equipment within the United States must depend upon rail transportation. That this condition may change is probable and, I believe, inevitable. That such change is not yet here must be obvious to all. The Congress, unfortunately, at its last session, showed an unwillingness to provide a program for an adequate system of primary highway construction. Types and numbers of aircraft are surely not yet in being to handle this assignment.

If rails are to continue available for this purpose, roadbeds must be maintained and there must continue, in being, an adequate supply of freight cars and passenger cars. It cannot be contended that any of these facilities or equipment can be retained only on a standby basis. They can only be available if freight and passengers are provided in adequate quantity for profitable operation. The Military Establishment is the one agency of Government which should be alert to this situation. I doubt that it is. There is little evidence, if any, that military transportation of personnel and equipment is carried on with any idea in mind of the long-range necessity of rail transportation. There is no encouragement for individuals and organizations to bear this all-important subject in mind in any of their movements. Unless such is done we can hardly be content that this major mobilization requirement is receiving adequate atten-

tion. In each troop movement, each transfer of personnel, and each movement of freight there is more involved than the transfer of such from one place to another. Each such movement contains the element of maintaining the mobilization requirement. Whether the movement is large or small differs in degree only. All of these should be borne in mind by all of the services in all movements of persons and things. Surely prudence would dictate that a transportation system in being should be maintained in profitable operation at least until another is available to replace it.

We should not tolerate conflicting Government transportation practices which work at such cross purposes and in disregard of congressional policy. In urging that current practices be reappraised in the light of that sound policy, I will not attempt to improve upon the admonition by the Senate Appropriations Committee, which in 1954 said, in part:

While the declaration of policy by its terms is directed primarily at the establishment of principles for the guidance of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the administration of the Interstate Commerce Act and in the regulation of carriers subject to that act, other agencies and departments of the Government are expected to carry out their respective functions in relation to these carriers in such a way as to be consistent with the objectives of the transportation policy.

* * * * *

The same thing is true in connection with the exercise by the General Services Administrator or other executive department officials of the right to negotiate with carriers for transportation services at rates lower than those set by regulatory agencies for application to the general public. It has long been recognized that transportation charges may be unreasonable because of being too low, and any policy of bargaining for rates or playing one carrier off against another with the primary objective of getting the lowest possible transportation rate without regard to the consequences for the carrier is promotive of destructive competitive practices and fosters unsound economic conditions in transportation contrary to the national transportation policy.

Accordingly all Government agencies and executive departments are admonished to pay full heed to the national transportation policy in their dealings with carriers.

Military Life Is Not Proving Ground for Political Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in January 1948, one of our greatest generals wrote a letter to a New Hampshire newspaper publisher, in which the general said, in part:

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained, when lifelong professional soldiers, in the absence of some obvious and overriding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Politics is a profession; a serious, complicated and, in its true sense, a noble one.

In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership. On the other hand, nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces. At least this is true in my case.

Mr. Speaker, the great soldier who penned those words was the then Chief of Staff of the Army, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Silver: Monument to Inertia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on Monday, August 1, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles from the New York Times written by Edward H. Collins. At this time I wish to insert the third and last of the articles written by Mr. Collins, entitled "Silver: Monument to Inertia."

I believe these articles will be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER: MONUMENT TO INERTIA

(By Edward H. Collins)

Last week, in the second of 3 refresher pieces on the silver-purchase program of 1933–34 which the Green bill, now pending in Congress, proposes to repeal, the writer noted 3 factors that conspired to make possible the enactment of this iniquitous legislation. These were:

1. The power of that single-minded and narrowly self-interested Senate group, the silver bloc.

2. The widespread cultivated public confusion concerning the nature and importance of the white metal. A century and a half earlier it had been used to help stretch out the limited supply of gold in the monetary systems of the Western World, but in 1933, its only relation to the monetary systems, except for the single case of China, was the role it shared with copper and nickel in the fractional or token currency, whose circulation has nothing to do with the value of the metals it contains.

3. The fortuitous circumstance that the administration which came to office in 1933, whether from gullibility or desperation, had become fascinated by the Warren-Pearson theory, the essential principle of which was the naive thesis that by marking up the price of gold it would be possible to reflate the Nation's drastically deflated price level.

FANCIFUL ARGUMENT

Obviously, given an administration in office that was prepared to accept the Warren-Pearson gold-buying scheme, the task of selling it on the favorite of mythical arguments then in vogue of doing something for silver shouldn't have been difficult. This was the fanciful argument so painfully disproved later, that by raising the price of silver it would be possible to bring about recovery among the silver-using nations of the Orient.

By raising the purchase power of these people we would be reviving their demand for the goods of other nations (including not least of all those of the United States) and, for all anyone could prove to the contrary, getting the engine of world trade off dead center.

Whether this was the argument used by Senator Pittman, leader of the silver bloc, to win the support of the President for a silver-subsidy bill he had recently introduced in Congress, no one perhaps can say. Neither is it particularly important at this point of time.

As a matter of fact, paradoxical though it may sound, the fact that a silver subsidy did emerge before the end of that year is not the most important thing about this episode. Subsidies to organized minority interests are not exactly a novelty in American history. What made this one particularly reprehensible is that it was presented to the American people in the guise of an international agreement.

One can only speculate today as to whether the support accorded it by the administration would have assured enactment of the pending Pittman bill. At any rate, whoever had the decision to make on this question rejected the forthright course for one that was not only more spectacular, but thoroughly devious.

Instead of trying to push his measure through Congress Senator Pittman took it with him when he went to the London Conference that year as head of the American delegation. But it had now become, not the Pittman bill, but the administration's proposals for a silver agreement.

When it was announced on July 22 that 8 countries had entered into an agreement based on these proposals, it appeared that the silver question had taken on new dignity and a new importance. But disillusion was to follow quickly. Examination of its details revealed that the so-called agreement was really only an ingenious hoax—that beneath its dignified exterior lay the same old scheme for a new subsidy to the American silver mining industry.

The signatories to this amazing document were of two categories—countries known to hold sizable stocks of silver, and silver-producing countries.

The three countries that made up the first of these categories—India, China, and Spain—agreed not to sell silver during the life of the agreement, or at least not to sell more than certain stipulated amounts each year.

The countries in the producing group, for their part, made this same commitment, and also a second one. These countries—Mexico, the United States, Australia, Canada, and Peru—agreed to take off the market, among them, 35 million ounces of silver a year for the 4-year period.

But if one looked carefully at this agreement he soon discerned that, except for the United States, all that the signatories had committed themselves to do was something that either they could not possibly have done in any case or had not any logical reason for doing. To take a single typical example, consider India.

INDIA IN TRANSITION

India was in a state of transition from the silver standard to the gold exchange standard, and had been disposing of its stock of silver gradually since 1927. India was not asked to suspend these sales—she was asked merely to hold them to an average of 35 million ounces a year for the following 4 years and not to sell more than 50 million in any single year.

The hollowness of this concession by India becomes clear when we note that her sales had never reached the 35 million figure, even in 1929, when silver prices were 10 cents an ounce above the 44 cents then prevailing. Her average had been roughly 25 million ounces.

More interesting was the shadowy agreement under which the five producers committed themselves to taking 35 million ounces of silver off the market, but said nothing about the allocation of such purchases. Had allocations been based, as one might reasonably expect, on comparative production, Mexico would have been called on to underwrite roughly 19 million ounces, or some 54 percent of the whole, the United States 6,700,000 ounces, or 19 percent.

But this strange omission began to be filled in a week later when word was permitted to get out that the United States would charge herself with at least 24,400,000 ounces, or about 70 percent. One can only assume that the purpose of that report was to pave the way for what was to come later. At any rate, in a proclamation issued in December the President announced that the various United States mints were prepared to buy any silver that had been mined in the United States since July 22.

American output of silver in 1933 had been only 22 million ounces, so even with the Government pledged to take up the entire production this would still leave 13 million ounces to be bought up by the 4 other countries. Such a conclusion is a vast underestimate of the authors of this carefully planned maneuver. That contingency had been clearly foreseen. The missing piece is to be found in the price offered for the new silver, which was 64½ cents, or some 20 cents above the market price.

With that 50 percent bonus as a stimulus, production jumped immediately and rapidly. Indeed, by 1936 any newly mined silver was to come to 60 million ounces, and there have been times since when output has hit 70 million ounces, or well over 3 times the 22 million of 1933.

The writer has stressed the silver agreement here, rather than the Silver Purchase Act of the following year, despite the fact that the latter was a far more ambitious accomplishment. It directed the Treasury to buy silver, not only at home, but abroad, until our silver holdings reached a value equal to one-third our gold stocks. This agreement has been stressed because it is a particularly striking example of the degree to which the silver bloc is prepared to go in the tactics of deception, and because it is a perfect illustration of the fact that the more a subsidy-minded group gets the more it wants.

For Stronger Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Morning Call, Paterson, N. J.:

FOR STRONGER RESERVE

The Reserve bill which sailed through Congress a few days ago, while not as strong a bill as that requested by the President, nevertheless has its excellent features.

Economically the program is designed to decrease the 68 percent slice of the total budget now yearly spent for a standing army. By obligating young men to a minimum of 5 years and a maximum of 8 years of military service, the bill as well provides alternative methods for completing that service. A young man is free to choose among several combinations of active and Reserve duty. He may work from a Ready to a Standby Reserve status in fulfillment of his obligation.

Actually this service bill is a defense measure with teeth in it. The present selective service law which expires in 4 years requires 8 years of service. The 2-year active service requirement has in general been complied with. But the 6-year Reserve obligation placed upon every draftee is usually ignored, with the result that America's Reserve Army is largely an army on filing cards only. The new bill provides stiff penalties for neglecting Reserve duty.

The obligation to defend our system of liberties will no longer be the burden of a loyal few, but will be distributed, as it should be, more equally among the many who can offer military protection.

Radio Broadcast From London, England, by Eric Sevareid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following CBS radio broadcast from London by Eric Sevareid on Sunday, July 31:

The 1st of August is at hand, the beginning of the real holiday season for Europeans. Here in Britain Parliament adjourned on Thursday; the big bank holiday began Friday, with hundreds of thousands of Londoners crowding every train and bus to the country, the beaches, and to the Continent, where they have been engulfed in the tide of vacationers flooding out of Paris for the mountains and the sea. No one wants to worry about anything. The shops are full and jobs plentiful in nearly every corner of Europe. Geneva has ended the cold war, so they dearly wish to believe, and the wonderful sunshine continues to bless both islands and Continent, as if authority higher even than the four heads of government has encouraged the wish and endorsed the belief.

There are shadows—but only the dreary pessimists, the * * * wish to cool their heads and fervid hopes in the shadows. Men do see ahead a little more clearly if they shade their eyes from the sun—the sun of nature or the sunshine of Bulganin's smile. But very few in Britain right now are taking the trouble to do that—and very few in America, if what one hears and reads at this distance is correct. Still, it is the function of the honest observer and the honest man of politics to watch for the light when everything seems dark and to keep an eye to the shadows when everything and everyone seems blinded by the sun.

A few in the press and Parliament of Britain this week tried to do the latter, both as to the apparent prosperity of this country and the apparent success of the Geneva Conference. No economic crisis is at hand for Britain, but the threat of more inflation is a definite shadow. British prosperity operates on the narrowest of margins—and once again the Chancellor of the Exchequer is applying the brakes. He has had to restrict credit again, including installment buying, which the British call the never-never plan of payment. He is again forcing the people to buy less of life's good things in order to force British producers to sell more abroad to build up the cash reserves of this island. They have had too easy a time with the safe home-market for their wares. This economy must sell abroad to live, and it has been losing out in the fight for foreign markets with the hard-working Germans. This island, one vast bed of coal, must still import coal from abroad. This queen—or now perhaps princess—of the seas must have some of her ships repaired in German yards.

The bland belief that British workmanship knows no peer has been shaken by the figures that show German cars driving British cars out of the American market, now out of the Swedish market. The recent strike wave made things considerably worse. But the fundamental cause is the old, old cause; it is that British businessmen and labor simply prefer their traditional ways of doing things. They will modernize, they will make capital reinvestments for expansion, they will give up featherbedding, they will learn modern selling methods only with the greatest reluctance, and they will slip back the moment the pressure relaxes.

It no longer suffices to draw spiritual nourishment from the glorious past, to feel superior to America's crass drive and bustle, to America's so-called materialistic bathtub culture. Indeed, you don't hear much of that kind of talk in Britain any more. The Britons' hard problem is a material problem. If knowing how to make and sell materials is materialism—a doubtful proposition—then they will have to accept the ism if they are going to really secure this economy and lift its standard of life still higher.

This is the immediate shadow in Britain and in France as well. But the observer does not see it with a naked eye to the surface. The surface of these two countries is a quite different sight. It is a scene of sunshine, vast gardenlike stretches of burgeoning fields, of work and fun, of crowded resorts, millions of people moving incessantly, in cars, on bikes, on foot, tanned, healthy-looking people everywhere. To see this and to think back 10 years is to know again the unconquerable spirit of the human creature. Ten years ago West Europe was all but a wasteland. Millions were dead or mained. Most of the population was uprooted. Homes, stores, offices, bridges lay in ruins all over Europe. Today only dim mementoes of all that remain. The European population is greater than ever; there were homes than ever before. In many places like Britain and Italy life has not only returned to the prewar level but surpassed it. There can be no doubt of this miracle. For millions of Europeans life is better than they ever knew it, better than their fathers and grandfathers knew it. It is their own doing for the most part. But an American driving across these sunny lands cannot help thinking of the part his own people played in this restoration, cannot help being conscious in pleasure and pride that in the Marshall plan the United States executed history's noblest peacetime act in the relations of national states.

In 10 short years all this was done—and done in the midst of the anxious condition called the cold war between East and West. Indeed, it was the cold war that forced much of the doing and drove barely recovered European society into a hastily erected military alliance. Ten years of this, and then 2 weeks ago 4 men sat down at a table in Geneva. When they rose, 1 week ago, they uttered some cautiously hopeful words. Their press agents and their personal followers uttered many incautious and ecstatic words, and millions of people everywhere, weary of worries, have sent their hats and their cheers in the air, convinced apparently that peace has come and they need worry

themselves, or even inform themselves, no longer.

To one who followed at close hand the labors and results of Geneva this is astonishing. It is also disturbing. It is possible, indeed logical, to find a degree of relief in the Geneva proceedings, but a degree not even measured, not yet tested. Geneva has given the world something positive, but just what it is, how big it is, only fools or knaves can yet pretend to know for sure. Geneva surely was the strangest top-level meeting of all time. It was not only a meeting that settled nothing, but a meeting that was never intended to settle anything. It wanted to find a way to try to settle Europe and it did not even find that. The Big Four did not agree to agree in the future. They merely agreed once again to try to agree once again.

Geneva did not begin an era of better feelings between East and West. That had already begun months ago—however long it may last. Geneva identified for history this new period of relationships, giving it a neat chapter heading in the history books, and it intensified by the hopeful world opinion it aroused the immediate necessity of both sides making some concessions. In terms of settling Europe the nut is just as hard as ever, but Geneva means that the pressure behind the nutcracker will be a little stronger than before—and that is something.

It is also a gain, no doubt, that the East-West leaders got to know at first hand the workings of each other's minds. It is a gain, at least for us, that President Eisenhower had a popular public opinion success in Europe, for this has restored his own and his Government's prestige over here, where it had been sagging, particularly in intellectually influential circles. The importance of the President's feeling of personal trust in the Russian leaders and their reported feeling of trust in him is of no great moment. Russian leaders can change or disappear very suddenly, and a totalitarian regime like theirs calculates in the scope of decades, not presidential terms.

This being said, it may be well to step off a few paces and try to take the longest look at Geneva one can from this short distance in time. Geneva dramatized the idea of peaceful coexistence between East and West. Geneva also dramatized the diametrically opposing purposes of East and West where coexistence must meet—in Germany. In the directives to the foreign ministers the Russians gave away nothing at all, not even words. They proved at Geneva they will take any number of years, go to all possible lengths short of world war to prevent the kind of Germany we seek: an armed Germany allied to the West. Geneva proved the Russian fear of it to be almost pathological. They know they cannot get a Communist Germany, they know they cannot get a neutralized Germany, they know they cannot get, at least for a long time, a Germany allied to them. They are determined to get what remains: a Germany independent of alliances, with which they will have more bargaining power than we. The Russians believe we have all but exhausted our own bargaining power with the Germans, having given them nearly all they require already. Now the Russians think it is their turn. They have the greatest bargaining power of all—German real estate. They will take their time and they will make their deal for Germany directly with the Germans, not with the Western Powers.

And now the Russians, through their new manner, have brought about a great dramatization of peaceful coexistence. It was they who started the cold war and we who accepted it. Again, it is they who started this new phase and we who are accepting that. Of course, they wish peace in the world, for they too would be destroyed in war. But the great, so far unanswerable question is this: Will they achieve through peaceful friendliness further fruits of war? These are: an amenable Germany, an even more secure grip on the satellite, the weakening of the Western alliance, the disappearance of the American military from Europe.

The first probably depends on time and the Germans themselves, but the rest of it depends on time and the Western countries, including our own. We may hold up in the peaceful struggle for Europe as well as we have in the cold war struggle for Europe. But there is a small school of thought which is terribly afraid that Geneva will turn out in the end to have been a great Russian success, which has annoying apprehension that the President, or more properly the President's press agentry, has played straight into Russia's hands. Too briefly put, the argument goes like this: Relaxation of tension is bound to mean relaxation of effort and precautions—on our side certainly, on the Russian side only possibly. Russians are playing for time, for they understand the phychology of Europeans better than do Americans. They sense what some call the secret wish of Europeans—which is to leave well enough alone. The Russians know that only America is in a hurry to have Germany reunited, that the great mass of Britons, Frenchmen, Italians, Belgians, Dutchmen, in spite of their governments' statements, don't really care if Germany is never united. The Russians know that already the tide has turned against a unified Western Europe, the one thing that would give lasting counterweight to Russian-unified Eastern Europe. They know Western Europeans are ceasing to care about the eastern satellites. They know every western parliament yearns to reduce its military budget. They know the French desperately wish to detach soldiers from Europe for use in their troubled empire. They know powerful economy forces in Washington give fervent fiscal thanks for every American soldier we could send home.

So this argument runs: Has not Geneva in the dramatization of coexistence told the satellites that all further anti-Communist resistance is useless? Will not even the western broadcast cease trying to encourage them? Will the thawing effects of time and Russia's warm smiles not take the drive and the effort right out of the NATO alliance? Will not a weakened European effort be bound to mean a reciprocally weakened American effort over here? These are the fears of those few here who look upon Geneva with doubt, the fears of those convinced that Russia has far more to gain by a strategy of relaxation than by the old strategy of tension. They sense that in the European philosophy time is life to be lived, while in the Communist philosophy time is an instrument to be used. These fears can be wrong. Maybe we shall find the clarity and the stamina to use time as an instrument to our own ends. It may be that a real lowering of the Iron Curtain, if that comes, will weaken Russia's hold on the satellites, possibly even the Communist hold on Russia. It may be that peaceful coexistence will bring even wider prosperity, weakening Marxism still further all over Europe. It may be that we shall find wit and stamina enough to see that Russian power moves back out of Europe no more slowly than American power. It is our task now to see that what may be, shall be. For as the British Foreign Secretary told the Parliament this week, the democracies face a new severe challenge—and if they relax, he said, they will be lost.

Geneva has solved nothing. What it has done is to clarify the struggle that now confronts the Western countries. It is a struggle within ourselves as much as a struggle with the Soviets. We can afford to throw our hats in the air about Geneva only if we keep our heads.

This is Eric Sevareid in London.

Location of Jet Interceptor Base in Northwestern Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following communication from the Wexford Jet Base Committee, Cadillac, Mich. I hope that this very desirable site will be kept in mind by the Air Force and other Government agencies concerned.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF CADILLAC,
August 2, 1955.

HON. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WILSON: The location of a jet interceptor base in northwestern Michigan has been delayed for almost 18 months. Without a doubt, those of us who have worked in the various communities involved are sincere in our belief that all of our efforts were justified and that we are in no way responsible for the long delay.

The Wexford Jet Base Committee and the citizens of Cadillac who have worked on this committee sincerely trust that we have not, in any way, interfered with national defense or been the occasion of destructive action with reference to any national defense effort, any congressional group, or any individual.

Early in 1954, on learning that two sites at Traverse City had been made unavailable to the United States Air Force, we began our efforts to point out the advantages of a site at Cadillac. We have made a sincere effort to present our many advantages in a fair and factual manner. If we have not sold everyone else, we have most certainly sold ourselves on the fact that we have exceptional advantages for an installation of this type.

We were very pleased to learn in November 1954, that after having completed extensive surveys with the assistance of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Air Defense Command, the United States Air Force concurred with us that Cadillac was the proper place for this important installation. Secretary Talbott announced the selection of the Cadillac site by the United States Air Force on December 2, 1954.

We were greatly concerned when early in 1955 Congresswoman RUTH THOMPSON questioned the decision of the United States Air Force, leveled criticism at Secretary Talbott, and insinuated that there was something shady about the decision to utilize the Cadillac site. Our concern was greatly dissipated and our confidence that the base would be located here was increased when the House Armed Services Committee concurred with the USAF decision, and Chairman VINSON advised those seeking the assistance of the committee to protest the Cadillac site that his group would keep hands off the controversy and that they were not interested "unless someone has information to show that the Cadillac site would not serve the purposes of national defense."

Pressure on the committee continued, and eventually the matter came to a vote. The committee upheld the United States Air Forc by a decisive vote.

This, of course, was encouraging to this community, but we were not at peace for long as opponents of the Air Force selection of Cadillac concentrated their efforts on

the House Appropriations Subcommittee. Chairman CANNON, of the full committee, advised the Air Force early in January not to spend money for the Cadillac site or any other until the committee gave its approval.

Since that time Members of Congress have appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in behalf of the Kalkaska, Benzie, and Manistee sites. The Cadillac committee has requested the same privilege on many occasions but was not granted the opportunity. We have been very sorry that some of the presentations have not been confined to pointing out the advantages of the other sites but have been derogatory to Cadillac and, in many instances, false.

The activity to set aside the USAF decision to locate at Cadillac reached a high point last week. This community made a final effort to have its case presented to the House Appropriations Subcommittee. We were greatly disheartened at the obstacles we encountered. The desires of Members of Congress to adjourn, the controversy surrounding Secretary Talbott and Congresswoman THOMPSON'S continued determination (although USAF personnel have stated that the Cadillac site meets military requirements and is the best site) to oppose Secretary Talbott even though it meant locating the base outside of her district, resulted in this community concluding that it is not possible for us to reopen this matter without congressional investigation. We are reluctant to engage in the type of controversy this effort would necessitate.

On many occasions we have assured the United States Air Force of the ability and the desire of this community to assist them in making the proposed base as effective as possible. We wish to take this opportunity to assure the Kalkaska-Traverse committee of our support in that direction and to repeat to the USAF our desire to be as helpful as possible on all occasions.

There are many citizens of Wexford County who have earned the sincere appreciation of this committee, and we also have feelings of deep gratitude for friends in Washington, including USAF personnel, Members of Congress, and congressional committees.

We are still of the opinion that Cadillac has the best site and is more capable of assisting the USAF in accomplishing its purposes than any other community. This feeling is not because we believe our community to be better than any other community but because we happen to be the only community having adequate facilities in close proximity to a satisfactory site.

In conclusion we wish to say that we are confident that many obstacles will be encountered in the location of a satisfactory base at Kalkaska. Should those obstacles prove to be insurmountable either from an accomplishment, a cost, or a result standpoint, our site is still available, our commitments will still stand, and this community will continue ready to welcome the base and the personnel involved.

Yours very truly,

WEXFORD JET BASE COMMITTEE,
By FLOYD J. MCCARTHY,
Chairman.

Semper Paratus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Herald News, Passaic, N. J., extending birthday greetings to the United States Coast Guard on its 165th anniversary:

SEMPER PARATUS

One of the best known, but least understood, security arms of the United States will be 165 years old Thursday. It is the United States Coast Guard, spawned by Alexander Hamilton on August 4, 1790.

Millions of servicemen are familiar with its achievements in World War II. Thousands of boatmen acknowledge its value in water safety, lighthouse and buoy service, and weather tracking. All who cross the ocean in ships recognize the high standards of safety demanded of commercial ships by the Coast Guard.

And hundreds of smugglers remember and respect the Coast Guard for another reason.

It is this great variety of services that makes the Coast Guard a complex organization. It was organized under Hamilton to prevent smuggling at sea. In 1915 its rather formidable name of Revenue-Cutter and Lifesaving Services was merged into the more descriptive title of United States Coast Guard.

In peacetime it operates under the Treasury Department. In war, or national emergency, it is transferred to the Navy. But in war or peace, with the reassuring motto of "Semper Paratus"—(always prepared)—it is a firm friend of the seagoing man.

Free Haircuts to Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill authorizing the Army, Navy, and Air Force to give free haircuts to the men in service.

The armed services demand, and rightfully so, that servicemen be properly groomed at all times. Since this grooming is demanded of each serviceman, it would not seem illogical to allow the services to provide barbering service free of charge, just as medical and dental services are provided.

Free haircuts are already furnished in some instances, where the servicemen do not have a post exchange barbershop near at hand. The present system authorizes the post exchange to grant franchises for the operation of barber shops on military posts. The barber services offered to servicemen are not always of top quality, and the atmosphere of such shops is often incomparable to that of civilian shops.

I have received complaints about the present system not only from servicemen but from the operators of such post exchange barber shops. In many cases the post barber shops are not under the same sanitary regulations as civilian shops. The State of Indiana has one of the most rigid barber shop license and regulated sanitation laws of any State. The Fort Harrison Finance Center, however, does not allow the Indiana barber inspector to exercise supervision over barber shops on the post.

In many instances these shops, because of their cheap rates, compete with privately owned shops in the area for civilian trade, and create ill will toward the service installation. It is particularly irksome to town barbers to know the shops on the post are not held responsible to the same State regulations that they are.

I previously introduced legislation which I believe would correct some of these ills, but it was opposed by the Defense Department. Perhaps the present proposal will be acceptable. By providing free haircuts to men in service their continued good grooming will be assured, and by removing all civilian trade from barbershops on military and naval installations, this unfair competition can be halted and the ill will it creates be eliminated.

Good grooming is an important element of morale; we certainly want our servicemen to take pride in their neat appearance. Good barber service in a pleasant atmosphere should be available to them; and such can surely be made available to them without the dissatisfactions arising from the present system.

Record Federal Employee Benefits Voted by 84th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that we can look to the record of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, which has approved more Federal employee legislation than any similar session in history. This is a matter of great interest to the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania where a number of constituents are employed at some of the many Federal establishments in central Pennsylvania.

Here is a brief rundown of the many beneficial laws the Congress approved:

Pay raises: Most classified and postal employees, except the top executives were voted pay increases. We also approved funds which can be used to raise the pay of many per diem, or blue-collar employees.

Career status: We passed a bill to make an additional 50,000 indefinite employees eligible for career status.

Retirement increases: Two bills have been approved to increase the annuities of Government retirees. One bill boosts the annuities of 300,000 civil-service retirees and survivors, and the other increases the pensions of Foreign Service members.

Travel allowances, an issue for the past 5 years, have been raised by this Congress.

Postal job classifications: These were first advocated 20 years ago. Recommendations by Postmaster General Summerfield were controversial and granted him unlimited power. The protections written in by the Congress will, I hope, allow this program to go forward so as

to achieve maximum benefits, but protect postal workers against arbitrary actions.

Surety bonds: After considering the proposition for a dozen years, this Congress has approved a bill to authorize Federal agencies to pay for blanket bonds to cover their employees.

Dual compensation: Congress has raised from $3,000 to $10,000 the combined military annuity and civilian pay an employee may earn. This is particularly gratifying for it gives military installations the opportunity to employ Reservists who are 20-year career men.

Insurance: We have approved legislation to authorize the Government to take over the 135,000 life insurance policies held by employee beneficial associations for present and former Federal employees.

State retirement: The Congress approved a bill granting retirement credits to about 5,000 former State employees.

Uniforms: A new law that extends the up-to-$100 annual allowance to all Federal employees who must wear uniforms on the job was approved.

The United Nations at 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I request permission to insert in the RECORD an essay entitled "The United Nations at 10 Years," written by Greg Stephens, of Pueblo, Colo. Greg Stephens participated in the recent national United Nations essay contest. According to my information his paper tied for first place in the State of Colorado.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS AT 10 YEARS
(By Greg Stephens)

The accomplishments of the United Nations in the past show that the world needs an international organization. The United Nations was formed during the last weeks of the most horrible war ever fought on the face of this earth. Nations have realized the terrible misery and destruction caused by war. They realized also that nations could no longer afford to isolate themselves from the rest of the world. What happens in one part of the world is now a major concern in all parts of the world.

The main purpose of the United Nations is to promote peace, and to use the combined knowledge of 60 nations. Think of the unlimited possibilities of such an idea. The combined knowledge of scientists, chemists, doctors, engineers, statesmen of 60 nations. The knowledge of 60 nations could be an irresistible force in the prospect of peace or war.

When you look in a newspaper or magazine you are almost always able to find instances where the U. N. has made a costly mistake, or as some would say, completely failed. You hardly ever read about times where the U. N. has helped make a better world in which to live. The United Nations is making a better world by doing the following: Sending aid to farmers all over the world, thereby helping to increase the food supplies and enabling the farmer to produce more and better crops. Sending doctors, nurses, and tons of medicine and serum to areas where such diseases as typhoid, malaria, smallpox, polio, TB, cancer, and yaws thrive. By helping people in backward areas become more interested and educated in the health and sanitation problems, the U. N. is helping to insure a longer span of life for many people. The U. N. sends hundreds of teachers and educational supplies to areas where there is much ignorance. By helping these people become educated, the U. N. is aiding in making a stronger world where ignorance is no longer found. Other fields of help and aid are in communication, narcotics and their control, civil aviation, science, culture and its preservation, reconstruction and development, world trade, labor problems, and weather problems of the world.

The work that the United Nations is doing in helping people with their problems is perhaps the most important work the U. N. could be engaged in doing. When you concern yourself with the subjects mentioned above, you are dealing with problems that affect the people of the world. The United Nations is helping to eliminate most of the nonpolitical problems, thus allowing many new areas to become stronger, to have a higher standard of living, to even take their place in the family of nations as equal, independent members.

Communism and other enemies of democracy must have an area where there is much poverty, ignorance, ill health, lack of food, clothing, and shelter before it can breed its deadly disease upon human minds. The U. N., by working in these many fields, is erasing many such breeding grounds by making the people in these areas free and strong. Communism, then, will not be able to offer anything to these people. They will not be fooled into giving up their freedom. Naturally, all problems cannot be solved overnight. The United Nations will be busy for many years to come in its program of help and aid. But think of what could be done if all nations would forget their own selfish ambitions and truly work together for the benefit of all. Much of this work could be speeded up and brought to a final close much sooner.

The United Nations made accomplishments in the following:

1. The Palestine question—Israel against seven Arab States: Fighting concluded. The real and lasting solution to this problem must be made by those directly concerned, namely, Israel, Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Lebanon.

2. India against Pakistan over Kashmir: Fighting concluded. Future status of Kashmir still in doubt.

3. The Netherlands against Indonesia: Fighting concluded. Indonesia gained independence.

4. Unofficial war in Greece halted.

5. Some progress in atomic energy has been made. Several free-world nations have joined with the United States in pooling information for peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The atomic-energy problem cannot be solved until all nations possessing atomic know-how join together in a mutual undertaking to bring into general use atomic power for peace instead of war.

6. Korea: Proposed action of the United Nations vetoed by the Soviet Union in the Security Council. Practically all free-world nations, both U. N. members and nonmembers of the U. N., sent supplies, food, doctors, nurses, clothing, and other products. Fighting has concluded. Unification of Korea still unrealized. Sixteen nations supplied troops.

Often the United States has sharp disagreements with her allies. But in a test of loyalty and one where a solid front of unity is needed, the free-world nations rally together to place a stumbling block in the path of any would-be troublemaker.

The Soviet Union has its problems with the United Nations. They can't control it, and they dare not leave the U. N. The United Nations is not a tool of the Soviet Union. Rarely can the Soviet bloc (which consists of the following nations: Czechoslovakia, Poland, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), count on more than 5 votes out of 60.

In conclusion, the United Nations has had its share of successes and failures. In the end its up to the people to decide whether the successess outweigh the failures, or vice versa.

The United Nations is a symbol of hope. As long as hope exists, people will be willing to continue to fight for peace and freedom. If that hope is removed, the willingness to go on will be greatly reduced if not done away with completely.

The United Nations has not failed, and it shall not fail as long as the public is behind giving their full support. The people of the United States, yes, even the people of the world, have every right to be proud of their world organization—the United Nations.

Happy 10th anniversary. May you have many more such celebrations.

The President Should Appoint a Special Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange Now Because the Idea War Needs More Firepower—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the brilliant speech made by Theodore S. Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, at the Hotel Pierre, New York City, on June 30, 1955, at a meeting of the Advertising Council's board of directors and guests.

Mr. Repplier recently returned to this country after a 6 months' study of United States information and propaganda methods in the Orient, the Near East, and Europe under the auspices of the Eisenhower exchange fellowships. He is the first nongovernment American to study our information activities abroad.

The conclusion reached by Mr. Repplier as a result of his study was that our propaganda offensive needs to sharpen its ideas. Also, we need to draw into our propaganda program more of the skills and talents of America. Mr. Repplier is convinced that no group of professional propagandists, however able, can project a true image of the country, at an art exhibit, a trade fair, or anywhere else. "In America, we have private organizations—from the Philadelphia Symphony to the Advertising Council—whose weight must be added to the idea war," declares Mr. Repplier. I agree with him completely.

We can win the cold war. But we cannot win it in a walk. It is time we started running. As Mr. Repplier says:

The idea war needs more firepower. We are terribly outgunned. We now spend less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our military budget on propaganda. How can we possibly expect that truth can triumph over falsehood with that sort of niggardliness? The propaganda appropriation should be greatly increased.

In a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, urged the expenditure of up to $3 billion a year for the kind of propaganda offensive which Mr. Repplier has in mind. And, in an historic speech at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., said that our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected. He pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries—

Sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but to give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

The U. S. S. R. not only subsidizes its theater, music, and other cultural programs but it has spent nearly $2 billion on international theater exchange alone since the end of World War II. While other countries subsidize the arts the United States imposes discriminatory and burdensome taxes on our cultural programs.

Sending our artists abroad for the sole purpose of selling American culture and combating the Russian propaganda offensive has been decried by our cultural leaders who have urged, instead, the sharing of our cultural heritage with other countries. The growing recognition by Mr. Repplier and others of the great contribution which the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra and other leading groups and individuals in the cultural arts field can make in winning friends and allies for our country is heartening indeed. Perhaps this heralds a new period in our history when the poet, the dramatist, the painter, and the musician will be recognized as being as important to our civilization as the engineer and the scientist.

In his message on the state of the Union last January President Eisenhower said that—

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation.

The 84th Congress has taken more interest in the cultural arts than any previous Congress in our history. It appropriated $5 million for the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs. Through this new fund we have participated in some 15 trade fairs. We have also sent abroad such things as the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, the Symphony of the Air, the New York City Ballet, Porgy and Bess, and many individual artists. These have achieved results out of all proportion to the amount of money involved. Senator WILEY and I led the fight in the Congress for the continuation of this fund in which the President is so vitally interested. The Congress also established a 21-member commission to plan for a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital when it adopted Public Law 128.

The Congress also held hearings on H. R. 6874 and some 15 related bills which would, among other things, carry out the President's recommendations in the cultural field and make the President's Emergency Fund activities a permanent part of the armament of this country in this cold war period. It is expected that this legislation will be enacted into law early in the 2d session of the present Congress.

As a result of these concrete steps the conception held abroad in almost every country that the United States is undoubtedly a fabulously wealthy nation but that it lacks any of the cultural aspects of a great nation is rapidly disappearing. That this misconception has lasted so long as been our own fault, for until this year we have done little or nothing to put an end to it.

The New York Times of August 1 carried a signed article by Harrison E. Salisbury reporting that the State Department is preparing special facilities for handling the anticipated two-way expansion of cultural, scientific, and social contacts with Russia and her satellites. Five Republican and 4 Democratic Members of the House joined with me on July 7 in urging that President Eisenhower give serious consideration to discussing exchange visits between the United States and the Soviet Union at the Big Four Conference in Geneva. Earlier Senator KARL E. MUNDT had made the same suggestion to the President. President Eisenhower wrote me on July 11, 1955, that—

When Senator MUNDT made this suggestion to me a few days ago, I assured him that we would give the proposal our earnest consideration. To you and your colleagues I gladly give the same assurance, and am grateful to each of you for giving me your thoughts on this important matter.

It is my earnest hope that the President will take the initiative and appoint immediately the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange which he discussed in his message on the state of the Union on January 6 of this year. Such a special commission would be of incalculable assistance to the Federal Government and to the Department of State in the two-way expansion of cultural, scientific, and social contacts with other countries which is now developing. This expansion of cultural interchange was the most important thing that came out of the Geneva Conference. Every step that will assist this expansion of cultural interchange to grow as it must should be taken at this time. Leaders in the fields of the cultural arts would undoubtedly make a significant contribution to this expansion and should be appointed to a special Presidential commission so that full advantage can be taken of their special abilities, knowledge, and skills. Scientific leaders and representatives of the Advertising Council should also be members of such a special commission on the arts and cultural interchange. With leaders like General Sarnoff and William Randolph Hearst, Jr., calling for the establishment of a planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence now is the time to take bold action in this field. Delay can only imperil a unique opportunity for securing a significant advantage to our side in this cold war.

I include here the report by Theodore S. Repplier which may well prove to be a turning point in national recognition of the important contributions the arts can make in our relations with foreign countries. I also include a short report from the New York Times on a meeting of cultural leaders held in New York City on April 19, 1955.

[From the New York Times of April 20, 1955]

UNITED STATES POLICY SCORED ON ART MISSIONS—SELLING CULTURE DECRIED BY PERFORMERS AND ANTA AID—HERITAGE SHARING URGED

Sending performing artists abroad for the sole purpose of selling American culture and combating propaganda was decried here yesterday.

Such performances should be promoted rather to share our cultural heritage with others and to show samples of our talent, speakers said at a luncheon at the Women's City Club, 277 Park Avenue, on the assets and drawbacks of Federal subsidies for the arts.

The speakers were Blanche Yurka, actress; Isaac Stern, violinist; and Robert Schnitzer, general manager of the international exchange program of the American National Theater and Academy.

Asserting that a Government subsidy does not, as many fear, lead to Government control, Mr. Schnitzer described the independence of the French Comédie Française, and the Arts Council of Great Britain. He added that the judging panels of music, drama, and dance of ANTA, which chose those artists to go abroad under State Department subsidy, had not been coerced in any of their decisions.

Mr. Stern said that any pressure arising from Government subsidies would probably never exceed that kind of influence exerted by members of the boards of symphonic orchestras or opera companies.

"The era of great individual support for wealthy institutions is just about over and consequently the broad base of support has increased," Mr. Stern said. "We now look for a thousand persons to contribute $10 rather than one to give it all."

Discounting the merit of sending artists abroad to combat the effective efforts of another country, Mr. Stern suggested that art be used as a common meeting ground. The universal rapprochement of individuals in their sharing of art does not exclude the artist or place him above politics, Mr. Stern said. The artist, he observed, is automatically enmeshed in the international conflicts and tensions and must, therefore, accept his rseponsibility in understanding them.

The establishment of a Government-subsidized theater would come if the Government was convinced that the theater was as important as museums and libraries, Miss Yurka declared.

Only a few persons in the last 10 years have been able to produce good plays with-

out taking personal losses, she said. The financial drawbacks invariably oblige backers to invest in lesser works that border on the trivial.

"If we could persuade our Government that the theater is as important as museums or libraries, we would have a new and vibrant intellectual life," she added.

A national theater should start with a chain of traveling companies that would reach those sections of the United States not visited by existing road companies, Miss Yurka proposed, adding that traveling groups might later be replaced by subsidized theater chains.

TRANSCRIPT OF REPORT ON UNITED STATES PROPAGANDA OVERSEAS

(By Theodore S. Repplier, president, the Advertising Council, June 30, 1955)

Directors of the council and friends, I think the first thing I should tell you is that in the far corners of the world, for the past 6 months, come around 8 or 9 o'clock (because we continentals dine late), a toast has been regularly drunk to the Eisenhower exchange fellowship and board of directors of the Advertising Council.

Actually, I think I have returned just about the most grateful traveler since the invention of the nylon shirt. I am tremendously grateful to the Eisenhower exchange fellowship, and to the council for making this trip possible. I hope that some benefit will accrue to both organizations.

I think the best thing I can do, since it would probably be an undue burden to drag you screaming around the world in 30 minutes—you might emerge somewhat bruised—is to restrict this talk mostly to whatever I can tell you about Asia.

JAPAN

We left home the first of January 1955 and flew directly to Japan. We were fortunate to arrive at the time of the New Year's season, which apparently lasts in Japan from the 1st of January to about the 20th.

At this time we had a chance to see the famous Japanese courtesy in full swing. When a Japanese meets a friend he hasn't seen since the first of the year, he bows, and I mean really bows—a right-angle bow—and wishes him a very happy New Year. Whereupon his friend, Mr. B, also bows at right angles and returns the greeting. Thereupon Mr. A says that the chief joy of his life during the past year has been Mr. B's friendship. Mr. B then bows and says that his friendship is as nothing compared with Mr. A's. Then Mr. A bows again and says he hopes that in the coming year, Mr. B will continue to honor him with his respected friendship. This goes on for a period of 4 or 5 minutes. For the first several weeks I was there, I began to think the entire Japanese nation lived in a right-angle position.

I think the first thing a propagandist needs to do on arriving in a strange country is learn something about the people, something about their basic character in order to get himself oriented so he will be able to draw a few conclusions.

You notice at once that the Japanese are a very industrious people. Both officeworkers and the people in the country work terrifically long hours and seem to stop only long enough to get a few hours' sleep.

Japan also has an enormously paternalistic society. This paternalism goes to fantastic lengths. For example, the president of a large Japanese corporation actually gets a very small salary. But his house is usually provided by his company and a company car and chauffeur pick him up every morning. He gets a large expense account for entertainment. And, every so often, the company comes around and says, "Look, George, it's about time you got a new suit." When he is sick, his company takes care of him, and when he dies, his company buries him.

Excess employees are kept on the payroll even when the company is in the red. A firm will borrow money from the bank repeatedly rather than discharge anyone.

This paternalistic psychology is a part of the Japanese code, and takes a little special understanding on our part.

The most remarkable characteristic of the Japanese is, I think, their immense sense of responsibility, known as "on." A Japanese is born with an "on" to many people, and as he grows up, he acquires more and more "ons." In fact, there is a phrase: "So-and-so is my 'on' man" which means you have an obligation to him. You have obligations to teachers who have been particularly helpful to you, certainly to your parents, to the Emperor—though less so now than before—and so on.

The worst thing, perhaps, that you as an American could do in Japan would be, say, to rescue a stranger's hat from rolling under a car because the Japanese would then be under an obligation to you. Since you are a stranger and he can't pay the obligation off, he would have to stagger along under this debt.

It is significant that the word in Japanese for "thank you" is "arigato" which literally means "Oh, this difficult thing"—a reflection of an obligation. It is this extreme sense of duty which has led Japanese to plunge knives into their stomachs for generations, when they feel they have failed in their duty.

And, of course, the Japanese are a people who respect strength and authority, power and discipline.

As to what's going on in Japan—I think many of the changes taking place there at present are social changes.

For example, America's popular music has become popular in Japan as it has around the world. This means that the Japanese now occasionally go dancing with their wives, which is a staggering revolution in Japanese society. Men never did any such thing before; the wives always stayed meekly at home. The whole social system is changing.

Insofar as our propaganda in Japan is concerned, I think it has in the main, been quite successful. One of the things I tried to do in the course of this investigation was to interview anyone who I felt might have a useful opinion. I realized that I could have no valid opinions of my own on such a brief stay, and, therefore, that the best thing I could do was to become a collector of the observations of wiser men.

I soon found the American newspaper and radio correspondents around the world are a highly intelligent, well-informed group. They frequently know much more than the official crowd, they are trained observers, and they usually have valid opinions on political topics. I talked to many of them.

However, it seemed to me that their evaluation of our American propaganda program—and they all had a relatively poor or indifferent opinion of it—was not valid. I felt they were judging it on a wrong basis, and I believe this accounts for most of the criticism of the propaganda program which is given by returning tourists and other travelers.

Either consciously or unconsciously, both resident Americans and travelers tend to judge the success of the program by how well Americans are liked in a country. If America is liked, something else usually gets the credit. But if America is disliked, it is always because our propaganda program is a failure. To my mind, this is a completely wrong process of reasoning.

I soon came to the conclusion, which I am sure all of you have reached, that it is an absolute absurdity to try to buy love with propaganda. No amount of money is ever going to succeed in doing that, nor is it fair to American taxpayers to expect it to.

This misconception about the object of our propaganda accounts for much of the criticism of the propaganda program which you hear in many places.

Another things which accounts for it is that the average person has no way, really, to judge it. He gets a few fragmentary indications, and from these, leaps to a conclusion which is almost inevitably wrong.

For example, he decides that in Japan the Voice of America doesn't come in very well. He listened to it once or his local manager listened to it once, and if it didn't say what he felt it ought to have been saying—maybe it was playing some music—the whole thing, therefore, was no good.

I don't think the average person can form a true evaluation of the program. It is somewhat like an iceberg; there's more under the surface than can be seen. For example, considerable of the material that gets into the Japanese newspapers originates with the United States Information Service. It comes over the wireless file, and eventually appeals to an editor who picks it up and uses it. But people who read these stories do not connect them with USIS; there is nothing which indicates the connection.

I believe that the only test of our propaganda program, the only sensible basis of judging it, is: Is it helping to win the cold war? Certainly the supreme fact of our time is that we are engaged in a gigantic struggle, with one-half of the world against the other. We are staging a considerable propaganda program, although it is only a fraction of what it should be, and the only possible excuse for it is that we are in a crisis and are trying to use this instrument to help get us out of it.

With that test in mind, which I satisfied myself fairly early in the game was valid, and which I believe is also the sense of the presidential directive on this subject, I feel we are doing pretty well in Japan.

Actually, the percentage of Communists in Japan is quite law, according to a poll taken while I was there which asked: What do you believe in, which party do you favor, and so on? Communists and left-wing Socialists together amounted to less than 5 percent.

Now this, I think, is quite an achievement in an area where the standard of living is very low, and where life is pretty grim for the majority of the people. Despite its newness as a democracy, Japan has been kept safely in the free-world column.

I believe myself that in Japan the propaganda problem is really inside the economic problem. The supreme facts in Japan are economic ones.

Japan numbers 87 million people in an area the size of California. They can raise only 80 percent of their foodstuffs. They have to import most of their raw materials, including cotton, from high-wage countries, and they sell mostly to low-wage countries. It is true that they have cut down very considerably on their unfavorable balance of trade, and it isn't a hopeless situation.

But I came away feeling that if they succeed in solving their economic problems, we really don't have anything much to worry about in Japan.

From a propaganda standpoint, there are only two things that particularly disturb me there. As Ted Streibert (Chief, United States Information Service) perhaps will remember, I recommended that we should step up our work on two groups: labor and the intellectuals. Neither phase is good in Japan. The majority of the unions belong to a Communist federation called SOHYO. There is also an anti-Communist federation called ZENRO which has a smaller number of unions. And there is a body of unions which is sitting on the fence. I think we ought to go strongly to work on the fence sitters.

The other situation which bothered me was the extent to which the intellectuals are still what an old Japanese friend of mine calls "mystical Marxists." Although many

of them are not actual Communists, they are very close to it.

The largest Communist bookstore in Tokyo is right opposite Meiji University, and this follows a typical pattern. The Communists try to infiltrate the intelligentsia, usually with considerable success. They do the same thing with labor. They capture student bodies and use them as agitators. They infiltrate the organs of public opinion. The pattern is now fairly well known to us.

But on balance, I would say that we have done pretty well in Japan. The biggest hurdle of our propaganda program has been the achievement of practical things. One of these was to get the Japanese to agree to rearm. There was a tremendous pacifist sentiment in Japan at one point, and it took a good deal of hard work to bring the Japanese around to agreeing to rearm. However, a good job has been done there.

The President Should Appoint a Special Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange Now Because the Idea War Needs More Firepower—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the concluding portion of a historic report made by Theodore S. Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, of a 6 months' study of United States information and propaganda methods in the Orient, the Near East, and Europe under the auspices of the Eisenhower exchange fellowships:

HONGKONG

We are going to jump now to Hongkong, down in southern China. The principal value of Hongkong is that it is a listening post for Communist China. Communist China is about 15 miles up the Kowloon Peninsula. You sit at the bottom of this peninsula, with the island of Hongkong, a mountainous island, before you, and this purple water in between, and it is hard to believe that Red China is breathing down your neck.

Everybody in Hongkong knows that he is living on borrowed time. Everybody knows that the Communists could take the crown colony any Friday evening if they wanted to. But that doesn't prevent Hongkong from having a tremendous boom. Capital is flowing in there at a great rate. It is mostly scared money coming from Chinese merchants in other areas. It is a rather ironic commentary that Chinese merchants from Singapore and Indonesia are investing their money in Hongkong, which is 15 miles away from the Communist zone.

New docks are being built in Hongkong. Big new buildings are being built. Everybody is acting as though the situation were completely normal even though everybody realizes that it is going to end some day with a bang. The moment it becomes disadvantageous to the Communists to permit this little free island in the great land mass of Communist China to remain, it will disappear overnight.

COMMUNIST CHINA

As far as I can find out, Communist China is making real progress, and this, I think, is the most alarming fact of southeast Asia.

Actually, there have been a great many minor revolts. At one time, inside of China, anyone who had his window open was arrested, because it was assumed that he was going to jump out. And the executions have been terrific. There have been the usual police state methods of whipping people into line, but insofar as I can tell, they have been successfully whipped into line. Apparently the Communists are convincing the majority of the people that this is a revolution which is beneficial to China.

A great many people from other Asian countries go in and out of China, and over in the southeast Asia area you read a lot more about what's going on in China than you do here. I read a series of articles in the Illustrated Weekly of India, which is certainly no Communist paper, by an Indian named Jain who had just been in China.

This is a quote from it: "Through press, radio, movies, dance, drama, billboards, wall posters, and, indeed, through every conceivable means of mass communication, a single idea has spread. It is that a long, gloomy chapter in China's history filled with stories of a few exploiting the millions, of foreigners exploiting the nation, and poverty and filth, has ended, and a new one has begun, bespeaking an era when there will be no exploitation of man by man, and each person will get his due share."

Well, this sort of incessant propaganda is, of course, most effective, as I had a chance to see over in the East Zone in Berlin behind the Iron Curtain. You are exposed to propaganda on every side. You cannot go a block without seeing large streamers carrying slogans and messages. It is extensive and never ceasing, and it is bound to have an effect.

So I think that China is going to be a power to be reckoned with in southeast Asia, and this seems to me a fact we should not forget.

There is no doubt that the Chinese have been apt pupils. The propaganda which they send out is good. For example, the magazine which they edit on Red China, and which is distributed throughout southeast Asia, is a creditable publication. It is on good slick paper and is very well done. The Chinese propagandists know what they are doing. They have been going to Red schools since 1932. China is really on the march. This is something we will ignore only at our peril.

PHILIPPINES, SINGAPORE, LAOS, CAMBODIA

Down in the Philippines things are pretty well in hand, and a most effective job has been done in which the United States Information Service has played an important part.

Down in Singapore, where 80 percent of the population is Chinese, as are many of the populations of southeast Asia, the people are constantly subjected to a drumfire of propaganda from Red China. The result is widespread disaffection among the Chinese.

Some of the heaviest contributors to the whole Communist movement are the wealthy Chinese merchants. The Chinese are, of course, the merchant class of the Orient, and they are important either from a numerical standpoint or from an influence standpoint in most of the countries of Southeast Asia.

I think it is likely that communism will filter down into some parts of Laos. I don't know how Cambodia is going to go. There is still a chance that we will hold a part of Indochina. But it's a pretty good guess to assume that there is considerable danger of communism swinging westward toward India.

BURMA

That leaves Burma, which is largely an impotent power at the moment. It's a republic and has a very able, idealistic Prime Minister. But he is surrounded by a bunch of politicians and he has a hard job. His country is constantly subjected to the activities of Communist bands who delight in putting dynamite on the railroad tracks, and coming down into the teak forests, killing the elephants and stealing the teakwood. He needs a really good army to help him as General Templer, the British general, had in Malaya. But he hasn't got much of an army and he's having a difficult time. He sits at the bottom of that particular end of the continent with solid Communist territory north of him to the Arctic Circle.

INDIA

Now we come to India. I would like to add something to your understanding of the Indian problem in Asia because I think it is so terribly important.

The leading authority on this part of the world is Professor Brown, who, I think, has done the best book on this subject. It is called United States, India, and Pakistan, published by the Harvard University Press. He says that there are less than a hundred people in the United States who are really expert on one phase or another of this whole area.

I agree with his belief that lack of knowledge of the Asian opinion, and lack of sympathy with Asians brought about the downfall of the British Empire there.

India consists, as you know, of a land mass of over a million square miles. It has a population close to 400 million. It is largely flat with mountains mainly in the north.

India won its independence in 1947 after a long struggle during which its leaders made martyrs of themselves, going to jail for periods of up to 10 years—which is one up on George Washington.

The Indian Independence Act was passed about 30 days ahead of the actual date on which India won its independence. A month after that notice, 28,000 British civil servants walked out of India, leaving only about 500 Indians who were in any way trained to govern this vast subcontinent.

They found themselves with a country which was probably the most divided of any on record. There were then about 450 separate states in India. There were 25 different languages spoken. There were 5 separate castes and 2,000 subdivisions of these castes. The Hindus and Moslems were at each other's throats, and there was endless bloodshed and civil war.

All in all, if ever there was a country ripe for dictatorship, it was India. But it had the courage to become democracy.

This is a remarkable thing when you consider that most of the countries of the world newly freed from colonialism haven't dared to give their people the franchise. India is 85 percent illiterate, yet it gave its citizens the vote.

India's constitution starts with "We, the people." And most of India's people can't even read.

This resulted in a curious situation at the first election. The symbol of the Congress Party—Nehru's party and the leading party of India—is a pair of yoked bullocks. Many peasons voted for this symbol because they reasoned: The bullolk helps me with my work; therefore I will vote for the bullock.

Despite all obstacles, India has carried on as a democracy. It has probably made the boldest plans of any country in the world. A commission was established to draw up the first 5-year plan. It surveyed the landscape and decided that the primary job was to grow more food with the secondary job one of improving the transport. Some $440 million was appropriated to try to accomplish these ends.

Now 85 percent of the people of India live in about 550,000 Indian villages. These villages are scattered throughout the length and breadth of the country. Consequently, if anything were going to be done, the improvements had to start with these villages.

The villagers live in a state which is impossible to imagine unless you have visited

them. They live in mud huts, their streets are not paved, and they are surrounded by dirt and squalor. Women wander up and down collecting camel dung and making it into large pats which are put on the sides of the walls to dry. This becomes their principal fuel. By and large, things in the villages are pretty much as they were back in Biblical times.

Nevertheless, the thing which really typifies India is the city of Chandigar, the new capital of the Punjab, which is probably the most modern city in the world. Le Corbusier, the famous French architect, headed up its construction, and it looks almost freakishly modern rising up from the plains, with mud huts to the right and left of it.

I think, the net net of India is that it is trying to compress about 2,000 years into 50 and has made enormous progress at it. About 19 huge dams are being built, the biggest of which would make our TVA look small. A network of canals is being constructed, and most importantly, men are being trained, with the aid of the Ford Foundation, as "gram Sevaks" or "village servants." They are being trained in agriculture, public health, and so on, so that they can go to live in the villages and try to elevate the standard of living.

I walked through one of these villages after some of the improvements had been made and some of the dams had been put into operation. We were met by the village headman and escorted with much ceremony through the village. The inhabitants were terribly proud because they now had a tube well, run by an electric pump. It supplies a steady flow of water which formerly had to be drawn up laboriously by bullocks turning round and round an axis. As a result of the increased water, the people get 3 crops of wheat per year instead of 1.

The streets of this little village, which wind up these mud hills about 8 or 10 feet wide, are being paved with bricks by the villagers on their own time. They put up half the money themselves and the state puts up half, and slowly but surely the village is on the march toward better things.

I think the significant point is that India is the largest democracy in the world in terms of population, and that just to the north of it is the tremendous land mass of China. What really is going on in Asia is a great backward country sweepstakes, and this is the thing that all Asia is watching.

Which way of life can most quickly transform a backward country, and make it into something which gives its people a better break?

The Communists of China have made great headway with the theory: Go Communist and all your troubles will be over. Look at us. We have subdued the black market. We have honest government for the first time in ump-teen years. We are making enormous progress.

This argument carries tremendous weight with Asians because they too are Asians. They are all people of darker skins. Consequently, the influence of India as the democratic entry in the backward country sweepstakes is something we should never underestimate.

I myself feel that, regardless of what Mr. Nehru says, we must never forget that he is sitting virtually unarmed at the bottom of a continent which is Communist to the Arctic Circle. If Mexico were in the same position and we were inclined to be pugilistic, I fancy it would keep a civil tongue in its head also.

Consequently, I think that when you take what Mr. Nehru does instead of what Mr. Nehru says, you can be quite reassured. He is far from naive about communism. He has disinfected a zone south of Communist China. No foreigners are allowed into it. All traffic into Tibet is very carefully scrutinized for any material which might be of warmaking value. Inside of India, Nehru fights the Communist Party tooth and nail, and licks it. The Congress party badly defeated the Communists recently in the Andhra elections in the south of India.

So I feel that our propaganda in India needs to say over and over to the Indian peasant, whose life is very grim: Hang on, boys. Help is on the way.

On balance, I think you can add it up like this. In Japan, despite rather grim conditions, we've done better than hold our own. Communism has been kept down to a small precentage of the voters. In the Philippines we really have nothing to worry about at the moment; communism is contained in various pockets there. In the Malay Peninsula and on through to Indochina, it's touch and go. In India, the situation is as I have described, not forgetting that a considerable victory has just been won in the south of India.

Going on to Europe, the principal fact is, I think, that in northern Italy, communism is on the wane. I drove all through the Communist belt in the north. I talked to political leaders and people in all of the Communist-held towns and villages. I think communism has really reached high tide in the north. I don't think it has hit its high-water mark in the south of Italy, and about 15,000 Communist agitators have just been transferred from the north of Italy to the south. But in north Italy, I think we are over the worst of it.

In France, there is no visible decline of Communist voters as yet, but the signs are good. The circulation of the Communist newspaper is down. Their party membership is off, and their long-range outlook is not good.

Well, does that mean we can relax? I don't think so. I think it means merely that we are over the learning period and that we ought really to begin to have at it.

The ominous signs are still many. You cannot even relax in a country like Italy because there are too many factors there that are unsound and unfavorable. Their economic ideas are still not too modern, although they are beginning to show some glimmer about such things as productivity. But as long as you have largely family-owned businesses which want to hang on to everything they have, as long as you have the intermixture of church and politics, as long as you have the Democratic Christian party which is as indecisive and badly split as it is, it would be unwise to grow complacent.

I am going to close with a few observations which I have taken the liberty of writing out.

In hotel rooms around the world I had plenty of time to think about this baffling problem of the idea war in which we are engaged. For what they are worth, here are a few conclusions:

On the positive side, we are making progress. We are over the worst of the learning period, and have profited by our mistakes. Here and there we have developed some excellent field generals in the idea war—men who have some of the skills of advertising and public relations and who also know the host country and its people, and have experience in foreign policy. This is a new breed and we do not have enough of them.

If you take a cold war inventory, country by country around the world I believe our gains at least balance our losses.

There is reason to be encouraged. And yet there is also reason to be alarmed.

In far too many minds throughout the world—and some very important minds—communism is still the white knight and capitalism is still the dragon. Communism is still the wave of the future and capitalism is still the dying way of life.

We in America know it to be the truth that since World War II we have bound up the wounds of the world. Yet millions think of the Soviets as the idealists and the United States as the dollar-mad materialists.

Too often, in too many countries, the situation is looked at in an upside-down mirror by two key groups: labor and the intellectuals.

In short, our propaganda offensive, in my opinion, still has several critical needs.

First, it needs to sharpen its ideas. There still exists an urgent need to make clear that a new economic system has been born—a system which gives more benefits to more people than any yet devised—a system I should like to call people's capitalism. In my view, experts from various disciplines should define the ingredients of this system, and a popular writer should synthesize their conclusions in the free world's "Das Kapital."

Second, we desperately need a crusade. The lack of a crusade could cost us the cold war. To many, the Communists are the champions of the common man. America appears to champion nothing but its own safety. In those areas in which we have failed, I think this largely explains our failure.

Third, the idea war needs more firepower. We are terrible outgunned. We now spend less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our military budget on propaganda. How can we possibly expect that truth can triumph over falsehood with that sort of niggardliness? The propaganda appropriation should be greatly increased.

Fourth, we need to draw into our propaganda program more of the skills and talents of America. No group of professional propagandists, however able, can project a true image of the country, at an art exhibit, a trade fair, or anywhere else. In America, we have private organizations—from the Philadelphia Symphony to the Advertising Council—whose weight must be added to the idea war.

We can win the cold war. But we cannot win it in a walk. It is time we started running.

The President Should Appoint a Special Advisory Commission on the Arts and Cultural Exchange Now Because the Idea War Needs More Firepower—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, practically every major country in the world provides some direct aid in the form of subsidy to cultural programs. The United States, on the other hand, imposes discrimatory and burdensome taxes on these programs. This has provided a propaganda bonanza to the Russians who have busily spread the lie that while the United States is a fabulously wealthy nation it lacks any of the cultural aspects of a great nation.

That this misconception has lasted so long has been our own fault, for until recently we have done little or nothing to put an end to it. The Russian Government not only subsidizes its theater, music, and other cultural programs but has spent nearly $2 billion on international theater exchange alone since the end of World War II, an amount 700 times greater than the $3 million which the United States has spent on sending our cultural programs abroad.

It is becoming crystal clear that unless we do something concrete to aid our theater we will not have any cultural programs to export. The number of plays and concerts has declined sharply in recent years due to the high costs involved and, particularly, because of burdensome Federal taxes. Studies made by Actors' Equity Association and by Prof. O. Glenn Saxon, Yale University, show the extent of the serious unemployment existing among musicians, actors, and performing artists in general.

We have prided ourselves on having the highest standard of living in the world. In view of this standard of living we should be interested in what repeated surveys in the fields of the cultural arts show.

The 32 major symphony orchestras in the United States and Canada employ fewer than 2,270 musicians. These musicians work an average of only 22.4 weeks per year at an average weekly pay of $31, and an average annual wage of $1,814. Not more than 2,200 musicians in the 2,636 radio stations in the United States—less than 1 musician per station—enjoy a full year's employment. Dr. Howard Hanson, president of the National Music Council, testified at hearings held by the 83d Congress that—

There are some patrons of orchestras who prefer to support their orchestras without governmental assistance. They are, of course, entitled to their belief, but I say that in any situation where a skilled performer is guaranteed a $1,500-a-year salary that orchestra is supported not by philanthropists but by the idealism and devotion of the underpaid musician who serves them.

Over 80 percent of the membership of the American Guild of Musical Artists, the American Federation of Labor national union with collective bargaining and other contractual relations with all the professional opera and ballet companies in the United States as well as with the concert managements who present the concert artists appearing in our country, earn less than $2,000 a year. This union represents soloists, choristers, dancers, stage directors, stage managers, and choreographers in the fields of opera, dance, ballet, and the concert stage.

The employment picture in the field of the living theater is no better. According to the study made by Professor Saxon, professor of economics at Yale University, on a research grant from the National Theater Arts Council and Theater Arts magazine, the total employment of actors and actresses was only 991 in 1953. This was less than 15 percent of the number employed in the 1927–28 season. The average income of all professional actors and actresses for the 1952–53 season was only $800 per person. It is clear that incomes like this will puchase little food, shelter, clothing or the other necessities of life. It will hardly buy milk for the baby, let alone pay for his medical attention. It will certainly buy no Cadillacs, the favorite car in Washington these days.

The gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, and I have, after considering these facts, introduced legislation to repeal the 10-percent tax on concerts and legitimate theater productions. We believe that repeal of the tax is essential to the survival and growth of the living theater and concert stage in America. We believe that this is but one of a number of steps that must be taken to assist the arts in our country. We have introduced in this Congress a number of bills to encourage the growth of the arts in our country including President Eisenhower's bill to establish a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I include as part of my remarks the text of the bills, H. R. 7609 and H. R. 7851, we have introduced to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax. A short explanation of our bill is also included together with an article by Herman Shumlin, distinguished theater producer, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

A bill to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4233 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from the tax on admissions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) Fine arts program: Any admission to a program the principal part of which consists of—

"(A) a lecture;

"(B) an opera, symphony, ballet, concert, or musical performance;

"(C) a drama or theatrical presentation; or

"(D) any combination of the foregoing—performed in person within the place of admission. This paragraph shall not apply to an admission to a roof garden, cabaret, or other similar place, or to an admission to which paragraph (1) (C) of this subsection applies."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after the 1st day of the 1st month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act for admission on or after such first day.

MEMORANDUM ON H. R. 7609 (THOMPSON) AND H. R. 7851 (CELLER), BILLS TO EXEMPT FINE ARTS PROGRAMS FROM THE ADMISSIONS TAX

H. R. 7609 (introduced by Representative THOMPSON of New Jersey) and H. R. 7851 (introduced by Representative CELLER, of New York) would exempt from the 10 percent admissions tax any admission to a lecture, ballet, opera, or play which is presented in person. It would thus exclude the living theater and musical performances from the existing burdensome taxes.

The urgent need for repeal of the Federal taxes has become apparent in the light of a diminishing number of concerts and plays which are being presented in the country, and the serious condition of unemployment which exists among actors, actresses, musicians and other performing artists. In the field of the legitimate theater, the number of theaters and play productions has declined sharply since the 1920's. This condition has continued and has reached even more acute stages in recent years. In many parts of the country, legitimate theatrical productions have become a rarity due to the high cost of operations, including the 10 percent Federal tax.

Competition from tax-free television and radio places the living stage at a serious economic disadvantage. The present tax laws unjustly discriminate against live musical and theatrical productions performed in the concert hall or theater.

The number of actors and musicians employed in various segments of the theater, such as musical plays, operas, concerts, and ballet, has continuously declined for the past 20 years. Many members of the actors' and musicians' unions are employed only a few weeks out of the year in their professions. The majority of the performers are forced to supplement their income from noncreative fields in order to maintain a minimum standard of existence.

Certain fine arts programs, such as opera and symphony, have already received sympathetic attention from the Congress in the way of tax relief, but the present exemptions are confined to certain types of charitable organizations receiving funds from public institutions or soliciting contributions from members of the public. The bill recognizes the important fact that there is no proper distinction in the cultural field between programs presented by charitable organizations and other groups. The existing laws unjustly discriminate against those presenting plays and musical productions on a paying basis.

It is reliably estimated that the revenue from admissions taxes on fine arts programs at the present time does not exceed more than $7 million annually. A reduction in the admissions tax would be more than made up by substantially increased employment of musicians, actors, and others once the heavy burden of the admissions tax is removed.

The present tax on fine arts programs is a serious hindrance and impediment to the element of cultural life in many communities throughout the Nation. The tax is a substantial addition to the already high cost of presenting concerts, lecture programs, and plays. Removal of the tax would be of inestimable benefit to many community projects throughout the country which seek to become established on a paying basis. The increased employment of talented performers will also stimulate creative activity. The ultimate beneficiary, however, will be the American people who would be able to participate more fully in an important phase of cultural life.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

WANTED: OLD-FASHIONED PATRONS OF THE ARTS

(By Herman Shumlin)

(Today's columnist, Mr. Shumlin, is the producer of the drama Inherit the Wind. His subject is backers.)

I've got a million words I want to say. What subject should I choose? I could write a piece about my wonderful production, Inherit the Wind, and that would be useful to do. I could write a piece about the man I love, Paul Muni. And a piece about Ed Begley, gifted, sincere, clean-hearted Ed Begley. And a piece about the contributions of many, many people to the whole vast mural that is Inherit the Wind.

Or I could write something about the modern chautauqua stage, or, as it is now called, the Paul Gregory Theater. I could say something about the hollow impact of walking into a theater with the curtain up and then watching an actor in a tuxedo jacket craftily, cunningly, brilliantly, pick up a stool from one place and put it in another. What lecture hall memories it brings back to me. Isn't it artistic? And just look at all those microphones, hanging, standing, nestled in the footlights. How honest, how pure it all is. But I don't want to do that, because then I would be acting like a critic, and heaven knows I wouldn't want to do that.

A FEW WORDS ON CRITICS

I could do a piece about critics, too, of course, and that is very tempting. I have a lot to say about critics, about the good ones, the able ones, and the others. But then I ask myself if that is not the swift road to trouble.

And I answer that it is. And then I ask myself if that should make any difference to me, and I answer that it shouldn't. And it won't. (I have many such interesting conversations with myself.) But not today.

So what I am devoting this column to is this: Backers, and what they are not.

Last night on my way to the National Theater I stepped into a store on 42d Street that sold books for 19 cents. Any book in the store, 19 cents. The best I could come out with was a small book picturing some of the paintings of an early 16th century artist named Cranach. There is a picture of a naked woman with a dagger in her hand on the cover, but that had nothing to do with my buying it, of course.

And that's why I decided to write about backers. For in this little book there is some text which informed me that Cranach, who was born in 1472, got a job in 1505 with the Elector of Saxony, who was called Frederic the Wise.

HE WAS A BACKER

Frederic was a backer. He backed Cranach. He also started a university in Saxony, and he hired another fellow, a fellow named Martin Luther. Now, every one knows that Luther got into a peck of trouble. He said a lot of things that a lot of powerful people didn't like. The point about Frederic is that, and I quote: "He never withdrew his protection in spite of the immense difficulties it caused him as time went on." That's what I call a backer.

Down in Florida 2 weeks ago I found a perfectly beautiful library called the Johan Fust Memorial Library. And who was Fust? Well, Fust was the man who backed Gutenberg in his invention of movable type, which in importance is probably only second to the invention of the wheel. And when the experimenting didn't go so well, and Gutenberg quit for one reason or another, Johan Fust carried it through. Fust was a man of finance and a merchant. That's what I call a backer. And no royalties, either.

There used to be a fellow named Otto Kahn. He liked the theater, and he put up hundreds of thousands of dollars for Max Reinhardt's marvelous productions, and for Morris Gest, who produced great big musicals.

There are lots of investors in show business now; there are 49 of them, all very fine folks, in Inherit the Wind. Some of them put up their money regardless of the possibility of success, because they liked what the play said. But where are the real backers? The country is full of foundations; foundations for taking care of old sailors; foundations for preserving bird life, printing Bibles, teaching Yoga, helping musicians, sending missionaries to Africa; foundations for anything you can think of.

We have great big art museums and they're fine institutions. But why is it no one ever sets up a foundation for the theater? Will somebody answer that one for me? Americans did put up most of the money for the Shakespeare Theater at Stratford in England. I guess it means more when you do it in England. What art has contributed more than the theater? Does Beethoven come anywhere near Shakespeare? Does Goya?

Why aren't there some real old-fashioned backers in the theater? I don't mean to put up money for a show. I mean to set up, and build, and endow institutions. What art is more living, more meaningful? What a bang I would get from putting up the cash for a fine theater, the Herman Shumlin Theater, and cash to keep it going forever, nonprofit, a part of the community and national life. What greater joy while I was still alive, and what greater memorial after I have gone?

One fellow has struggled 7 years or so to set up a theater in Connecticut. No one believed he could do it when he started. And the Rockefeller money helped him. Langner is his name: Lawrence Langner. He broke the ice.

Let others emulate the Rockefellers. Let them do even better. Backers, that's what I'd like to see, like the backers of yesteryear.

Justice and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Potsdam agreement brings forcibly to mind the principle that there can be no lasting peace without justice.

Americans have always been particularly proud of our love of justice. We have manifested this pride in many ways in the organization and conduct of our Government. The principle of justice is enshrined in the hearts of our people. It is exemplified in our oath of allegiance, "One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Should we wonder, therefore, that hundreds of millions of people throughout the world look hopefully toward us to manifest and implement justice in our international dealings. Should we wonder, in the light of the various conferences during and after the war and some of the unjust agreements arrived at, that many of these people should feel a sense of disillusionment in the sincerity of allied professed ideals.

Many people aspiring to enjoy the fruits and blessings of liberty bitterly protest the Potsdam agreement. Even a brief survey of the consequences of this and other agreements vividly illustrates the opportunism, the compromise, yes, the appeasement of organized world communism that pervaded these conferences and agreements.

In Western Europe and in the Orient, most unwise and unjust concessions resulted in a Marxist Iron Curtain for millions of Germans, Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and oriental peoples, whose zeal for freedom and reliance on the principle of justice deserved a better fate.

Many reasons were advanced for these concessions but none of them exemplify spiritual or democratic ideals. The sad, stark fact is that world communism secured the real substantial advantages that came out of these conferences. In the intervening years we have witnessed, not only the tragic Iron Curtain, but the fall of China to communism and the growth of an international Frankenstein, suppressing human freedom and fostering and spreading Marxism in practically every nation.

I have never felt, and I do not feel now, that the Soviet is the formidable military power many would have us believe. I think that both in military strength and war potential—economic, political, and spiritual—it is not nearly so great and powerful as it has been represented by those who are seeking to intimidate the free nations into further appeasements. Its overall potential does not compare with that of the free nations. We should not, however, underestimate any potential enemy. Neither should we permit ourselves to be terrorized by threats of atomic destruction into further concessions.

We earnestly and prayerfully seek honorable peace and we seek to avoid war by every just and honorable means. Above all, we seek to preserve our freedoms and the freedoms of the free world, our beliefs in the Almighty, our spiritual values, our free enterprise, our way of life and culture, and our profound faith that human existence is inextricably related to the spirit and is something more than the fleshpots and technology of Marxist materialism. Our free society is based on belief in the Divine Master and freedom of the individual. We reject atheism and political tyranny.

The Soviet now has its chance. It can choose peace or it can choose war. If it sincerely wants peace based on justice, it can have it. But if it still seeks by subterfuge and design, trickery, chicanery, and force to carry out further ideological penetration of free nations, incite insurrection and revolution throughout the world, and threaten aggression against free men and women there can be but one result.

Such a result is certainly not sought by any thinking American or indeed by any thinking human. To those who love liberty, death is preferable to slavery. Though atomic war, if it comes, may bring widespread death and devastation, in the end Marxist communism will never triumph over human freedom.

Neither blandishments, nor threats, nor aggressive action will ever deter liberty-loving peoples from successfully defending their precious heritage.

I hope and pray that the Soviet leaders will choose the path of peace rather than the path of war because in the peaceful path lies a better world for all.

Twinning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the week of September 12—Fair Week—the people of the city of York, Pa., will be hosts to visitors from Arles, France.

York will be playing host to representatives of a city which itself was a host to visitors from York last year. The project for the exchange of visitors is known as twinning and is the result of a non-profit-making, nonsubsidized organization, the Bilingual World, with headquarters in Paris.

The idea behind the association of York and Arles is to further the understanding of peoples of different countries of one another, and to do this not on the national level, where most diplomatic

meetings take place, but on the community level, where everyday citizens can exchange culture and experience.

This is a splendid program, and I am proud that York, a community in the 19th Congressional District, has been the first American city to undertake a twinning project.

Local citizens have been working hard to prepare for the visit of the representatives of Arles. We have enjoyed excellent cooperation from the Department of State and the French Embassy officials in planning the itinerary of the visitors on the day when they will visit Washington.

One of those who has devoted untiring efforts to the success of this venture is a predecessor, the Honorable James F. Lind, who was a Member of the 81st and 82d Congresses.

John D. Faller, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when today's late news dispatches from Carlisle, Pa., reported the death of John D. Faller, Jr., a long-time personal friend, fellow attorney, and an outstanding citizen. John Faller was shot to death in the county courthouse when a litigant in a case in which Mr. Faller was acting as cocounsel, pulled a gun and fired wildly.

John Dysert Faller, Jr., was a member of the law firm of Faller and Faller. He was the son of the late John Dysert Faller, a member of the Cumberland County Bar Association and secretary and general counsel to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for a dozen years. He was graduted from Georgetown University and the Dickinson School of Law.

A member of the St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, Carlisle, Mr. Faller was general manager of the Mount Holly Water Co., a member of the Cumberland County Bar Association, the Pennsylvania Bar Association, and the American Bar Association. He was a charter member of the Knights of Columbus in Carlisle.

Mr. Faller was devoted to Carlisle and its people. He was a director of the Hamilton Library Historical Association. It was partly because of such interest that he offered to lead the legal fight for saving the market house for farmers by establishing their right to use of the site. Another community service was his acceptance of the presidency of the Carlisle Firemen's Relief Association, which deals with matters concerning compensation for injured volunteer firemen.

He was active in his church, in service club work, and in the Democratic Party. He was a citizen who will be missed in many ways.

Mr. Faller is survived by his wife, Mrs. Elizabeth Billow Faller; his son, John D. Faller III; his mother, Mrs. John D. Faller, Sr.; his brother, George B. Faller, Esq.; an aunt, Mrs. Ernest Gill, of Mount Rock, Pa., and an uncle, Dr. Constantine P. Faller.

I extend my deepest sympathies to his sorrowing family.

The President of the American Bar Association Supports Proposed Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909 by a Bipartisan, High-Level Commission—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a bipartisan, high-level commission to study the copyright law and make recommendations for its revision. I am happy to be able to say that my plan has been widely supported. Loyd Wright, president of the American Bar Association, for instance, is "of the opinion that in view of the frustrations that have attended attempted revisions in the past, a thorough study of the copyright laws by an impartial and qualified commission would do much to bring this subject to the attention of Congress for appropriate action." Support was also expressed for the plan I have in mind in a brilliant, hard-hitting speech at the April 1955 convention of the Music Operators of America, held at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago, by Hilmer Stark, general manager of the Billboard magazine's coin-machine division.

On June 7, 1955, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, requested an appropriation sufficient to undertake a 3-year study looking toward revision of the domestic copyright law of 1909 which they described as "archaic." This appropriation was voted by the Congress shortly before adjournment. Although the study has just been authorized, some industry spokesmen are already charging that the study, when completed, will be biased. The Billboard magazine of August 6, 1955, reported that—

> Telegrams protesting the (proposed) Copyright Office study as "biased" were sent to chairmen and members of the Appropriations Committee and subcommittee by top officers of Music Operators of America, George Miller and Hirsh De La Viez (Billboard, July 23). Other protests were wired by members of the industry and the Music Guild of America. A committee spokesman acknowledged receipt of the telegrams and said they had been called to the attention of the committee.

That the Music Operators of America, which lodged the protest, is one of the most powerful and representative organizations in the music field is shown by the fact that over 3,000 representatives of the music industry attended the fifth annual convention in April. Over a dozen record companies, 4 jukebox manufacturers, and approximately 80 distributors, leading recording artists in every category from both major and independent labels, song writers, song publishers, and other firms allied with the automatic phonograph industry got together with music operators from every State in the country to iron out common problems and discuss ideas to improve the business on every level. George A. Miller, national president and business manager, advises me that there are some 11,000 music operators in the Nation, plus many thousands of employees. Any charge of bias made by this organization must, therefore, be given considerable weight.

I hope that the Librarian of Congress will take steps to see that the 3-year study is not biased and that the fears expressed by the spokesmen for the music operators are unjustified. I can think of nothing that would be more disastrous both to the Library of Congress and the powerful industries involved than a "biased'" study of the very complex subject of copyright law.

I include as part of my remarks two of the many letters I have received, articles from Billboard magazine, and the text of my bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision:

[From the Billboard magazine of July 23, 1955]

COPYRIGHT OFFICE'S PROPOSED STUDY DRAWS MOA FIRE

WASHINGTON, July 16.—Strong objection to the Copyright Office's proposed study of the copyright laws with a view to revision was voiced by the Music Operators of America this week. In telegrams to CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and EARLE C. CLEMENTS, head of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, MOA's vice president, Hirsh de La Viez, characterized both Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyright, as biased. De La Viez added that the study could not be impartial.

In addition to wiring his own protests, the MOA vice president also stated that George Miller, president of MOA, is contacting the Phonograph Manufacturers' Association in Chicago in an effort to enlist further objection against the Copyright Office move.

The Copyright Office plan to conduct its study got quietly underway recently (Billboard, July 7), with a request for an appropriation for additional personnel to help with the proposed 3-year investigation of copyright law. The Fisher request followed on the heels of an exhaustive study of the history of copyright revisions which Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, New Jersey, presented to the House June 23. The THOMPSON 80-page report is background for his bill of January 20, which would set up an impartial fact-finding commission to investigate the whole Copyright Act and make recommendations for its revision.

Sections of the detailed history made by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, at THOMPSON'S request, are being read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in installments. The July 12 reading by THOMPSON included mention, without comment, of the Copyright Office request for funds, and added that the House had voted $20,000 for this study.

Fisher's original request for $40,000 was cut to half by a House subcommittee, and

has already been considered by a Senate Appropriations Committee. The appropriation request is not expected to meet opposition when it reaches the Senate floor.

De La Viez's telegram to the Senators on the Copyright Office study read: "I would like to voice my objection to the section of the appropriations bill (H. R. 7117) for the Library of Congress regarding increased appropriation for a study of the copyright law, as I feel that both Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyright, are biased. It could never be an impartial study of the copyright law."

LAW OFFICES OF WRIGHT,
WRIGHT, GREEN & WRIGHT,
Los Angeles, July 19, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is in response to your note to Loyd Wright asking whether he cared to comment on your three statements published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of your bill to create a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision.

Mr. Wright and I discussed your statements just before he left town last night. We are both of the opinion that in view of the frustrations that have attended attempted revisions in the past, a thorough study of the copyright laws by an impartial and qualified commission would do much to bring this subject to the attention of Congress for appropriate action.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD M. GOLDWATER.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *August 2, 1955.*

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR THOMPSON: With a great deal of interest, I have learned of your extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of June 23, 1955, pages A4586–A4590; June 28, 1955, pages A4713–A4716; and July 12, 1955, pages A5080–A5085. All of this material relating to copyrights is interesting, especially the text of the study of techniques employed in efforts at major copyright law revision since 1909, which was prepared for you by the Library of Congress. All of us who are interested in copyright legislation are certainly indebted to you for making this text available to the public through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wonder whether you have an extra copy of the pages containing your remarks. If so, I would be very happy to receive them, as I would like to preserve this material in my files for future reference.

Also, if you have any mailing list of lawyers interested in copyright matters, to whom you send material of this kind from time to time, I would be grateful if you would add my name to such list. Thank you very much.

Yours truly,
CHARLES SHEPARD,
Chairman, Committee on Copyrights,
American Patent Law Association.

H. R. 2677

A bill creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Copyright Laws (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 13 members appointed as follows:

(1) Seven persons appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Three appointed from the Senate by the Vice President of the United States; and

(3) Three appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) Of the first class of members specified in subsection (a), no more than four members shall be from the same political party. Of the second and third classes of members specified in subsection (a), no more than two members from each class shall be from the same political party.

SEC. 3. The President shall designate the member of the Commission who shall be the chairman, and the member who shall be the vice chairman.

SEC. 4. Seven members of the Commission (including at least three who are Members of Congress) shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 5. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members of the Commission from private life shall receive not to exceed $25 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 6. The Commission is directed to examine, study, and make recommendations for the revision of all laws pertaining to both domestic and foreign copyright.

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission, in carrying out its functions under this act, may appoint such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws, and shall fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services in accordance with section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $25 per diem for individuals. The Commission may reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

(b) Service as a member of the Commission (except service of a member appointed by the Vice President or the Speaker of the House or appointed by the President from the executive branch of the Government), employment of an individual pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (a), and service by a person pursuant to the second sentence of subsection (a), shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 512 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99).

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. (a) Within 30 days after the commencement of the first regular session of Congress convened more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

(b) Sixty days after submission to the Congress of the report provided for in subsection (a) of this section, the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 10. The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such times and places, within the United States or elsewhere, to take such testimony, and to make such lawful expenditures, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

[From the Billboard magazine of April 9, 1955]

WHY FACTFINDING: STARK MOA SPEECH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because of the unusual interest in the address made at the convention of Music Operators of America by Hilmer Stark, general manager of the Billboard's coin machine division, the complete text of his speech follows.)

Copyright legislation is one of the uppermost thoughts in your mind. Since I represent the Billboard, you will want to know why the Billboard has proposed factfinding.

Let me preface my remarks by stating that we on the Billboard cannot disagree with the stand taken by your MOA officers and by the phonograph manufacturers since obviously the current exemption, in effect since 1909, is a law which is on your side. And, equally obviously, to endorse factfinding or to take any other stand would be an admission that the law should be changed.

Why, then, does the Billboard propose factfinding? One good reason is that we believe it's time to settle this problem. We can and have placed ourselves in a position where a sincere and honest conviction may lead to a solution of this controversy.

It is interesting to note that the stand we have adopted has had two results:

1. We are charged by those who seek to obtain a performance right from the jukebox industry that we have instituted a delaying action—that a Presidential Factfinding Commission could take 2 or 3 years to study copyrights and reach some conclusions.

2. On the other hand, there have been charges that we seek to lead the jukebox industry down the primrose path to excessive performance royalty payments to ASCAP and BMI.

UNPOPULAR STAND

In other words, the stand we have taken is not popular with the leaders in either camp. By setting aside any commercial impulses to sell advertising, we prove we are sincere in the concept of solving this problem that I will unfold to you today.

Just why did the Billboard propose factfinding. Development of this policy came after years of study and deliberation. A policy for the good of our readers, not only jukebox operators, but every segment of the music industry—authors, composers, publishers, record companies, and others.

The Billboard believes that the 1909 exemption is wrong.

But two wrongs do not make a right. The Billboard recognizes that it would be an even greater wrong if the exemption were removed, exposing jukebox operators to the mercies of a virtual monopoly.

NO CHANGE

We do not believe that any change should be made in the existing law until such time as guaranteed safeguards have been erected so that you as users of music can deal as equals, individually or collectively, with the immensely powerful licensing organizations, and that these safeguards must protect you from indefinite and unreasonable fees, present and future.

That is an oversimplification of the thinking and the answering of a myriad of questions which led to our conclusion for factfinding.

Here's why, in capsule form:

1. While recognizing performance rights and, too, the unfairness of exposing jukebox operators to a monopoly, we also could not see how any conceivable solution could be reached by congressional committees who for many years have not been able to reach a solution.

2. We believe that the yearly battle is taking thousands of dollars which might more properly be devoted to building the jukebox business, and it certainly hamstrings your development into background music—music service without coin-operated mechanisms—which is subject right now to payment to the licensing organizations.

BITTERNESS OF FEUD

3. The bitterness of the yearly feud has made it impossible for either side to even recognize a valid offer by either side. The battle is waged along strict lines of either being pro- or anti-exemption.

4. We feel that while a copyright is a thing of value, it is equally valid to say that no jukebox operator should pay more for that music than it is worth to him.

If you're thinking this was a pretty big chaw, you're so right. In seeking the answers, we found that despite our years of contact with you and every other segment of the music business, we didn't know the answers. But we did have one opinion on how the answers might be found.

We don't believe that congressional committees can arrive at a conclusion that would satisfy all segments of the music industry—primarily the jukebox operators—because they are the smaller group, composed of individuals, who might well be subjected to attack as individuals by a powerful licensing organization.

OTHER SIMILAR BODIES

We believe that one form of investigation—that of presidential fact-finding committees—is probably the most free and unbiased way of seeking answers to problems of this kind. It has been done on tariffs, on juvenile delinquency, and on many other lively questions which faced even larger groups of contestants.

It is our sincere belief that such a group, composed of Congressmen, lay neutral persons, and economic experts might arrive at some way of settling this dispute, which, if allowed to continue, might damage irreparably the music industry, and I speak not only of jukebox operators and authors, but also of record manufacturers, music publishers and others in the music industry.

We hesitate to recommend anything beyond this one point to a fact-finding commission.

Find a way in which to solve this dispute; recognize not only the right vested in a copyright, but also the right of the purchaser to pay only in relationship of value. But, above all, find some way in which the user of music can deal on an equal basis with a virtual monopoly.

EQUAL BASIS

The last point is terribly important. If you and I were dealing in a tangible product which was made by 5 or 6 other producers, we would be free to tell 1 seller to go to blazes and buy from the other seller. But the product which you as jukebox operators use is pre-eminently currently popular music of which better than 90 percent is controlled by the licensing organizations, and you can't make money with Jeanie With the Light Brown Hair.

Yes; you could argue that you've fought it out for years and that there has been no change in the law. Here we enter into an area of opinion on whether this was the year in which the bill—this year called the Kilgore bill—might have passed—and still might pass.

Knowing you—and many of those authors who furnish today's popular music—we don't believe you are very far apart. Perhaps we have partially alienated both groups, but the role of peacemaker invariably finds that person in the way of the barrage. If we can in some small way help to end the copyright difficulty, we will be content. But, mind you, never until it is an equitable settlement that is mutually satisfactory.

PAY OR NOT PAY

Factfinding committee action could well find that you cannot pay additional fees, or that you can. It might find some way of coupling the mechanical royalty to a performance royalty, basing it on the number of records purchased, but it could be decided fairly. It is our contention that the jukebox operator has nothing to fear from such an appraisal of the situation.

I can promise you this: That just as we have called for stopping action on all proposals that seek to end the exemption—we're outspokenly and categorically against them—so will we maintain a vigilant watch over any straying from the path on the rights of the jukebox operator.

And if you should be thinking that the Billboard is risking your future, just hold these points in mind:

We were convinced all along that another attempt would be made by ASCAP to remove the exemption in this session of Congress. In this respect we were right.

We were mighty sure your leaders would fight this bill as openly and effectively as they have in the past. In this respect we were right.

ASCAP OFFENSIVE

But we have also been sure the offensive by ASCAP would be better organized than ever before, and thus the chances of passage were better in this session. Here again you can say we were right in view of the number of Senators sponsoring the bill.

Our proposal for factfinding does not in any way hinder your leaders in their defense. The Billboard is opposed to the Kilgore bill as strongly as they are.

And we sincerely feel factfinding may wind up your substitute safeguard if the Senate passes the Kilgore bill. It has already virtually assured your industry of fair hearings in the House, if not the Senate, whereas there was a danger that the Kilgore bill would be passed without a hearing.

The Billboard's proposal for factfinding is being heard in Washington. It may never seriously be considered, but it has already been effective in warning Congressmen and Senators alike that there is more to this problem than simple removal of the exemption.

We don't expect you to support factfinding as long as the law is on your side. Neither do we expect ASCAP nor BMI to support it. But factfinding pushed by the Billboard may very well be your refuge in case the Senate passes the Kilgore bill.

And we feel certain that you prefer factfinding to the Kilgore bill.

The President of the American Bar Association Supports Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909 by a Bipartisan, High-Level Commission—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks excerpts from a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909:

VIII. THE DUFFY BILL, 1936

Preliminary to considering the Duffy bill, S. 3047, 74th Congress, certain events which had occurred in the preceding Congress should be mentioned:

1. June 10, 1933, Senator Cutting introduced a bill in the Senate (S. 1928) entitled "To enable the United States to enter the International Copyright Union."

2. May 31, 1933. Mr. Luce introduced the same bill (H. R. 5853) in the House.

3. February 19, 1934. The President sent the Berne Convention as revised at Rome in 1928 to the Senate for ratification of United States adherence.

4. March 28, May 28–29, 1934. Hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Cutting bill and the convention.

5. Opposition to adherence to the convention developed at the hearing and some witnesses even urged that efforts to revise the law completely be renewed. It was suggested that the Secretary of State confer with the various conflicting interests, obtain their viewpoints and report to Senate committee.

6. Accordingly an interdepartmental committee was created composed of Dr. Wallace McClure and Mr. Joseph T. Keating, of the State Department, Mr. William L. Brown, Register of Copyrights, and his Assistant Register, Mr. Richard C. De Wolf, and Mr. James L. Brown, of the Department of Commerce, who was later replaced by Mr. L. G. Koebfle, of that Department. This committee drafted a bill which became known as the first Duffy bill.[1]

On April 1, 1935, in the 74th Congress Senator Duffy introduced the first Duffy bill as S. 2465. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Patents which appears to have held hearings on it which do not seem to have been printed. No further action was taken on S. 2465. On June 17, 1935, Senator Duffy introduced a revised bill as S. 3047. Senator Duffy described the background of the bill starting with the hearings on the Cutting bill and the convention in the 73d Congress:

"It soon became evident from the testimony before our subcommittee that there was a very decided difference of opinion prevailing among those who might be affected by such action. There was a very marked conflict of interest as it appears here today from the discussion so far had. If this committee were to join with almost 50 other countries and become a party to the International Convention of the Copyright Union it was generally agreed that some enabling legislation would be necessary in order to adjust the provisions of our law to the provisions of the treaty.

"It was generally recognized that for a quarter of a century there had been no comprehensive revision of the copyright law and that greatly changed conditions had occurred in the means whereby artistic works are communicated to the public. Almost everyone who has given study to the question agrees that many changes in our copyright law are highly desirable by reason of these changed conditions.

"Our subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee reported to the full committee. We reported that there was this wide difference of opinion. The entire committee then decided to request the State Department to organize an informal interdepartmental committee to confer with the various conflicting interests in an endeavor to reconcile as far as possible such divergent viewpoints. Such a committee was formed. I desire the Senate to know the membership

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

of this committee because it is very important in the discussion of this question.

"Two of the members of the committee were from the Department of State. Two of the members of the committee represented the copyright office itself. They would be certainly as well acquainted with this subject as any man who could be chosen. The fifth member of the committee represented the Department of Commerce.

"When the bill finally took shape as a result of these hearings I introduced it in the Senate and it was referred to the Committee on Patents. The Committee on Patents then held hearings and had conferences on it [committee hearings referred to are not available in the Library of Congress and it would seem that they were not printed]. The bill was cut up to a considerable degree and revised and I then, at the request of several members of the Committee on Patents, introduced into the Senate the revised bill which is now before the Senate for consideration."[2]

Senator Duffy also indicated that the treaty had been favorably reported to the Senate on April 18, 1935.[3] It was unanimously ratified by the Senate on April 19, but on his request and by unanimous consent such action was reconsidered and the treaty was placed back on the Executive calendar to await action on the revised Duffy bill.

The Senate Committee on Patents then considered Senate 3047 and reported the same favorably to the Senate (S. Rept. 896, 74th Cong.). After considerable debate on the Senate floor the bill was passed in the closing days of the session with an amendment, known as the Vandenberg amendment providing for design copyrights, and another restoring the manufacturing clause.

In the House the Committee on Patents held hearings during the second session on the Duffy, S. 3047; Daly, H. R. 10632; and Sirovich bills, H. R. 11420. These hearings were held on February 25, 26, 27; March 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31; and April 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, all in 1936. Some of the difficulties with which the House committee was beset are indicated by an interchange between the chairman and other members of the committee occurring during the first day of the hearings as follows:

"The CHAIRMAN. I have consulted with both the people who are in favor of copyright legislation, in favor of the Duffy bill, and other legislation, and those opposed to it, and we are giving every side an opportunity to present their side, either for or against. Every individual who is interested in copyright legislation will have his opportunity to present his side. Four or five years ago we gave every side a fair and square deal, and the opportunity to present their matter. In fact, the bill was reported out by the committee and brought on the floor. A few Members of the House objected that we had not given all the time necessary to people who wanted to be heard, and the bill was recommitted to the committee just for that purpose. We do not want to conduct the hearings in the way that the committee did 5 years ago, so we are going to give everyone an opportunity to present any views that they have for or against on the subject so that they can have a fair and square deal on both sides.

"Mr. LANHAM. May I say just a word there in explanation?

"Of course, my colleague, Mr. Church, is relatively a new member of the committee, as are most of the members. Many years ago we started in on this matter of copyright. We had 8 years of hearings, and after years of reconciliations that were effected among the divergent interests during that time, this committee was able to report a bill to the House.

"Mr. PERKINS. You refer to the Vestal bill?

"Mr. LANHAM. I refer to the Vestal bill, which passed the House with one very slight amendment.

"That bill went to the Senate. At that time the session of Congress adjourned on the 4th of March. The bill was under consideration at the time of adjournment and the filibuster with reference to another measure prevented the conclusion of the consideration of the copyright bill. The hearings during those 8 years were quite voluminous, and covered every aspect of this important subject of copyright. Those hearings are available.

"I understand that it is the desire of those who are sponsoring this legislation, the various bills, to try to get legislation at this session of Congress, if possible. From the experience we have had in this committee heretofore, knowing what a complex subject this is, if we should hear the proponents of this measure and then hear the opponents of the measure the bill would be dragged along indefinitely, because I know the ramifications of such a discussion by experience.

"My thought is, though I have nothing to do with the control of the procedure, that perhaps a more expeditious way of considering this is to hear those who object to this bill, assuming that the proponents of the bill are for it, and direct our attention to those features which are in conflict, giving the proponents the opportunity for rebuttal. It seems to me if we do not adopt some such policy as that, the hearings will just drag on and on indefinitely.

"Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the point I make is that the public who have come from so many miles to be heard ought to know generally from the chairman your plan of dates for their hearings.

"The CHAIRMAN. We have done that already.

"Mr. CHURCH. I certainly as one member would insist that persons introducing a bill be first heard, because you have the whole world to resist and oppose until you hear the promoter of a bill.

"Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see that it makes any great difference whether we start in the middle of the hearing or not.

"Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has intimated that I am not familiar with this procedure. I am familiar with the past hearings. I am familiar with the 16 years of legislative experience. I have never sat in a committee before where you hear the opponents first. I appreciate the statement in every way here today. There is no reflection against Mr. Buck for that information. But I do think that this committee should hear the people interested in the passage of this bill first.

"The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Mr. Perkins.

"Mr. LANHAM. May I say that I have interrupted to add that my suggestion was made merely in the interest of conserving time, because the reference in this bill is not objectionable to anyone. I think it is unnecessary to have long and tedious explanations of those passages.

"The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Mr. PERKINS.

"Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, several of the members of this committee, particularly Mr. LANHAM and myself, have been sitting on these hearings for the past 16 years. The matter of copyright legislation is now on the books. The bills before us propose changes in that legislation. I am inclined to agree with Mr. LANHAM that the more practical way is first to hear the objections to the changes and give the benefit of reply to those who suggest the changes.

"This is not exactly as if it were entirely new legislation where proponents would come in and make suggestions or would come in with a new bill. The bills before us are merely changes in the copyright law, and for the sake of conserving time and narrowing the issues and giving those who propose the changes the opportunity of hearing the objections, I think the method the committee is proceeding with is much better than to hear the proponents first.

"Mr. CHURCH. Let us hear the program of dates of hearings, then, at this first meeting before we go into the House.

"Mr. PERKINS. Of course, for the benefit of those who are here to testify before the committee and to save their time, it would be well if the committee could outline the days and the hours when the various witnesses could be heard.

"Mr. DALY. May I be heard on that, Mr. Chairman?

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Daly.

"Mr. DALY. I want to say in reply to Mr. Church particularly that as I understand the situation here, the copyright law of 1909 is not satisfactory to anybody. With the many inventions and various changes since 1909, I think everybody agrees there should be new copyright legislation. That assumed tangible form in the Duffy bill and was introduced and passed. There were a number of protests, particularly from the society represented by Mr. Buck, who are vitally interested in it. They have serious objections to the Duffy bill, they being of the opinion that it did not give the protection that should be given to various artists of various kinds.

"To endeavor to get really at the matter, two other bills were introduced in the House. Dr. Sirovich introduced one and I introduced the other. So we practically have before us first the copyright bill of 1909, second, the Duffy bill, and third, these two bills

"In order that everybody might get a hearing and the committee might be enlightened on all the aspects of this case, Dr. Sirovich outlined a program covering 4 weeks, 3 days a week for 4 weeks. All those who opposed the Duffy bill were asked to come here. All those who favored the Duffy bill were asked to come here. There may be serious objections to either the bill Dr. Sirovich introduced or the bill I introduced, before we get through. But he has, Mr. Church, outlined a program outlining the 4 weeks.

"Mr. CHURCH. I am familiar with that, as to the dates.

"The CHAIRMAN. You have been given the dates.

"Mr. CHURCH. You refer to the fact that we have hearings scheduled for 3 days a week for the next 4 weeks. But my people from Illinois cannot come down and spend their time here 3 days a week for 4 weeks, in addition to their mileage. I have asked the chairman to outline a plan whereby these people may get together today or tomorrow and determine the dates when they may want to be here.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let me explain that, if you will permit me to explain it:

"The program that we have outlined is to have the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, the Authors' League, and the Dramatists' League present their side. After they have finished, which will be within the next week or the following week, we are going to have the hotel owners, the department stores, the radio people, the motion-picture exhibitors and distributors, and the various other organizations who have come to our committee and who have received their turn. We wrote a letter to about 200 individuals and organizations, asking what time would be convenient for them, and we have had to establish the time that would be convenient for all.

"Mr. MCLEOD. Right there, all of these hearings and all of these dates are not centered on any one bill but on the question of copyrights."[4]

It would be too confusing to attempt to show the proponents and opponents of these

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

three bills. Needless to say, the witnesses were not in agreement on any one bill. The following is therefore based upon whether the witness was in favor of or opposed to the Duffy bill.

Those in favor of the Duffy bill were:

F. Ryan Duffy, United States Senator from Wisconsin.

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, Department of State.

James W. Baldwin, managing director, National Association of Broadcasters.

Sydney M. Kaye, attorney, National Association of Broadcasters.

Louis G. Caldwell, attorney, National Association of Broadcasters.

H. B. Somerville, chairman, national legislative committee, American Hotel Association.

Carl L. Cannon, Yale University Library.

Henry Jaffe, of the firm of Whitman, Ranson, Coulson, & Goetz, New York.

Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights.

Homer E. Capehart, the Automatic Musical Instrument Association.

John E. Dowsing, tariff council, United States Potters Association.

A. D. Haake, the National Association of Furniture Manufacturers.

Harvey Willson, general manager, National Upholstery and Drapery Textile Association.

Miss Mary Vendelari.

E. L. Kuykendall, president, Motion Picture Theater Owners of America.

William G. Viederman, the Christian Science publishing interest.

Those opposed to the Duffy bill or certain features of it were:

Gene Buck, president, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Deems Taylor, director, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

William Joseph Hill, composer.

Rudy Vallee, orchestra leader.

E. C. Mills, general manager, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

George M. Cohan, playwright, actor, and song wrighter.

Elmer Davis, vice president, Authors' League of America.

George Creel, manager, Authors' League.

Thyra Sampter Winslow, authoress.

Ben Lucien Berman, author.

Mary Heaton Vorse, authoress.

Manteel Howe Farnham, authoress.

Chester Crowell, author.

William Hamilton Osborne, the Authors' League.

Louise Silico, secretary, Authors' League.

George Middleton, playwright.

John Howard Lawson, playwright.

John G. Paine, Music Publishers Protective Association.

William Arms Fisher, Boston Music Publishers Association.

James Francis Cook, president, Theodore Presser Co., and editor of Etude.

Francis Gilbert, attorney, the Music Publishers Protective Association.

The Honorable Karl Stefan, Representative in Congress from Nebraska.

H. A. Huebner, the Brunswick Record Corp. and Columbia Phonograph Co.

R. W. Ultschuler, president, American Record Corp.

Isabell Marks, Decca Records, Inc.

Fulton Brylawski, Motion Picture Producers.

Fred Waring, president, National Association of Performing Artists.

John O'Connor, National Association of Performing Artists.

Samuel Tabak, Local No. 802, New York City, American Federation of Musicians.

Frank Crumit, singer.

Louis James, member of the Revellers Quartet.

Arthur Bryant, composer.

Gen. Samuel T. Ansell, general counsel, American Federation of Musicians.

Guy Lombardo, conductor.

Maurice J. Speiser, general counsel, National Association of Performing Artists.

Miss Mary Bendelari, National Council on Design.

Marvin Pierce, the National Publishers Association.

Melvin H. Coulston, Eastern Railroad Association.

Edward A. Brand, attorney, Tanners' Council of America.

Harry Leeward Katz general counsel, Music Users Protective Association.

R. B. Fletcher, counsel, the Association of American Railroads.

Karl Fenning, patent attorney.

S. G. Nottingham, patent attorney.

Sylvan Gotshall, attorney.

Weil Gotshal and Manges, attorneys.

Miss Irene L. Blunt, secretary, the Industrial Design Registration Bureau.

Irwin C. Fox, National Dry Goods Association.

U. Forest Walker, R. H. Macy & Co., New York.

Henry W. Carter, the Glass Container Association of America.

Charles Ballon, the Popular-Price Dress Manufacturers' Group Inc.

Mr. Golby, executive secretary, Fashion Originators Guild.

William Cheney, eastern managing director, National Retail Furniture Association.

Hugh F. Hall, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Charles E. Boyd, the Retail Merchants Association.

Milton Tibbetts, vice president, Packard Motor Car Co.

Louis Rothschild, the Retailers National Counsel.

Henry D. Williams, attorney, the firm of Williams, Rich & Morse.

Thomas E. Robertson, formerly Commissioner of Patents.

Frederick G. Melcher, National Association of Book Publishers.

William O. Tufts, Rand-McNally Co. and National Association of Book Publishers.

Hon. Conway P. Coe, Commissioner of Patents.

Edwin P. Kilroe, attorney, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation and Movietone News, Inc.

Fulton Brylawski, counsel, Copyright Committee of the Hays Organization.

Gabriel L. Hell, general counsel, attorney for Hays Organization.

Henry C. Harding, the Independent Songwriters of America.

Nathan Burkan.

R. S. Ould, patent attorney.

The fact that the hearings ran to some 1,560 pages and that the Vandenberg amendment for design copyright had brought in many commercial firms as witnesses made the picture even more confusing than usual. In fact, the situation generally would appear to have been summed up at the beginning of the testimony of Federick G. Melcher, the National Association of Book Publishers:

"We are appearing in this hearing to comment on the Duffy and other bills, and in doing so I am aware of the long years of discussion in which many of the opinions we might express are already recorded and have been studied by ourselves and other members of the committee, and we do not want to take your time to repeat on things which do not need new emphasis. We are aware, also, that as the years go by it does show, shall I say, our national incapacity to legislate on a very important fundamental issue. This incapacity to legislate, which is clear in my mind, having represented this industry for a dozen years and because my partner was active in the hope of our making such progress for many years before—Mr. Bowker—is not due to the partisan character of the legislation, which I think we all appreciate, as we have had equal consideration under the different administrations; and it has not been due to any lack of application on the part of the legislators, but has been due to our inability to compose urgently expressed points of view, particularly from the point of view of our new entrants into the field of copyright, and not so much on the part of book publishers, who even precede, I think, the authors in point of protection."[5]

The inability to compose urgently expressed conflicting views as indicated by Melcher seems to have been the stumbling block in each of the several attempts by legislative committees to achieve a major copyright revision. The committee did not report any of the bills to the House and they died with the close of the 74th Congress.

---

[1] Cf. U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings on revision of copyright laws, 74th Cong., p. 1175–1176.

[2] Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Ex. Rept. E, 73d Cong., and Ex. Rept. No. 4, 74th Cong.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79, p. 12188.

[4] Hearings, revision of copyright laws, op. cit., pp. 23–25.

[5] Hearings, revision of the copyright laws, op. cit., p. 966.

The President of the American Bar Association Supports Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909 by a Bipartisan, High-Level Commission—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the concluding portion of a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the Copyright Law of 1909. Charles Shepard, chairman of the Committee on Copyrights, American Patent Law Association, has written to me in support of this brilliant study saying:

With a great deal of interest, I have learned of your extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of June 23, 1955, pages A4586–A4590; June 28, 1955, pages A4713–A4716; and July 12, 1955, pages A5080–A5085. All of this material relating to copyrights is interesting, especially the text of the study of techniques employed in efforts at major copyright law revision since 1909, which was prepared for you by the Library of Congress. All of us who are interested in copyright legislation are certainly indebted to you for making this text available to the public through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In include here, also, a letter I have received from Charlotte E. Gauer, executive secretary, American Patent Law Association, expressing the gratification of the members of that organization for the information made available in the able study made by Freeman W. Sharp, American Law Division, Library of Congress:

AMERICAN PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1955.
Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Your comments which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with respect to the creation of a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for the revision thereof were referred to our committee on copyrights, of which Mr. Charles Shepard, of Rochester, N. Y., is the chairman. As a result, I am pleased to advise you that the members of this association who practice in the copyright field show great interest in this study and wish to commend you for making the results of this study available to the people through its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is the sort of information that is not generally available in one package and it is very gratifying to have it in this form.

We will, of course, follow these matters with interest.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLOTTE E. GAUER,
Executive Secretary.

IX. THE SHOTWELL COMMITTEE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, 1937–40

One final attempt at copyright revision was made during the period under discussion, this time by a private organization, the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation. This committee was formed by the League of Nations in the early twenties. Since the United States failed to join the League at the conclusion of World War I, the committee was an unofficial body with respect to the Government of the United States. The League established an International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation under which a number of regional committees functioned. The national committee was one of the regional committees.[1]

A subcommittee entitled "Committee for the Study of Copyrights" was established by the national committee for the purpose of solving the various existing problems in achieving international copyright protection. The subcommittee also attempted to solve the United States domestic legislative problems respecting copyright protection in order to facilitate its entrance into the Berne Convention or a modified form thereof. Prof. James T. Shotwell, of Columbia University, then chairman of the national committee, also became chairman of the Committee for the Study of Copyright.[2] Professor Shotwell was succeeded by Dr. Waldo G. Leland,[3] director emeritus of the American Council of Learned Societies. Through the courtesy of Dr. Leland, permission has been granted to quote from a manuscript history of the National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation, written by Edith E. Ware, who was executive secretary of both the national committee and the Committee for the Study of Copyright.[4] Miss Ware describes the copyright revision effort:

"Until 1938, the national committee had never made any attempt to understand the copyright situation. It had accepted the opinion of Herbert Putnam in 1926, and in 1933 had received a memorandum from Llewellyn Raney, director of the University of Chicago libraries, protesting the manufacturing clause of the United States copyright law and urging adherence to the International [Berne] Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. In 1935, after asking for a specific provision in the Duffy bill designed to facilitate the use of microcopy for purposes of research, the national committee, without specific knowledge of all the issues involved, went on record as prepared, to testify in support of the Duffy bill and the Berne Convention. But in December 1938, the national committee had another story to tell. Its committee for the study of copyright, which had been in existence for a little less than a year, had formulated a program whose influence persisted for over a decade.

"On January 1, 1938, when the Committee for the Study of Copyright began its investigations, the International Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works was on the Senate Calendar, and several bills to amend and consolidate the copyright law, including the Duffy bill, reintroduced as S. 7, were before the Patents Committees of both Houses of Congress. But there appeared to be little likelihood of any action being taken on the subject of copyright protection, national or international. Two interesting facts appeared to be responsible for this stalemate. First, on account of an inherent opposition to legislation by treaty or to the obligation to legislate according to terms of a treaty, there was universal demand that revision of copyright legislation must precede any affirmative action in relation to international copyright protection as embodied in the Bern Convention. Second, there was quite general and determined opposition to a number of important provisions in the bills then before Congress, which were designed to amend the existing copyright legislation of the United States with a view to entrance into the Bern Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. In addition, there was divergent opinion as to the merits of the Berne Convention itself, and a shocking absence of information and interest in inter-American copyright relations.

"In view of this situation, the Committee for the Study of Copyright, at its meeting with experts and consultants on February 22, 1938, committed itself to the principle of universal protection of literary and artistics works. It did not, however, define its position in relation to proposed conventions designed for international copyright protection. Instead, it proposed to study existing laws and treaties.

"This was imperative in the face of the domestic situation, the forthcoming conference at Brussels for the revision of the Bern Convention, and the draft conventions which were being circulated to American States preparatory to their discussion at the inter-American Conference at Lima in December 1938.[5]

* * * * *

"However, in view of the forthcoming Brussels Conference which hoped not only to revise the Bern Convention but to draft a universal convention, the Committee for the Study of Copyright, as a subcommittee of the National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation and therefore within the International Cooperation Organization, sent a representative to the meeting of the committee of experts that was to confer at Paris and Brussels, October 19 to 21, 1938, on the agenda for the Conference for the Provision of the Bern Convention. Francis Deak, because well informed through the good offices of the Committee for the Study of Coypright concerning opinion in the United States with respect to the Bern Convention, and because of previous association with the institutions sponsoring the meeting and with its individual members, was able to clarify reasons for the nonaffirmative action on the part of the United States with respect to the Bern Convention and to win restatement of certain important proposals. His Report on the Status of International Copyright Protection and on the Brussels Meeting of the Committee of Experts, published by Columbia University Press in 1938, was an important contribution to the understanding of the work of the committee of experts.

"The chairman of the national committee, at its meeting on December 10, 1938, informed the members present that Edith E. Ware, the executive secretary of the Committee for the Study of Copyright, and the committee's consultant on Latin American Copyright Relations, William Sanders, chief of the Juridical Division of the Pan American Union, were at the Eighth International Conference of American States at Lima, Peru (December 9–27, 1938), on behalf of the recommendations of the Committee for the Study of Copyright with respect to inter-American copyright relations.[6]

* * * * *

"The Committee for the Study of Copyright also attempted, in 1938, to resolve the domestic legislative problems of international copyright protection. Representatives of authors, publishers, labor, motion-picture producers, broadcasters, mechanical recorders, libraries, and scholars were invited to roundtable consultations, where in daily meetings of small committees and later of the committee of the whole that continued through 1939, a new copyright bill was drafted. It was introduced into the Senate, as S. 3042, on January 8, 1940. France fell in May.

"The Brussels Conference for the Revision of the International Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works was postponed because of the war. When it did meet in July 1948, it did not attempt to draft a universal convention, for in 1947 UNESCO had begun a study of international copyright laws and relations with a view to improving international copyright relations on a basis more inclusive than that of the Berne Convention."[7]

During the course of 1938 and 1939, many studies were made by the Committee for the Study of Copyright, and a considerable number of meetings and conferences were held with the various interests concerned in the problem of domestic copyright revision. At these meetings the following were represented:

Authors' League of America: Mrs. Louise Sillcox, Mr. John Elliott.

Labor: Mr. Michael J. Flynn, Wage Earners Protective Association; Mr. Clyde Mills, Typographical Union; Judge J. Raymond Tiffany, general counsel, Book Manufacturers Institute.

The American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers: Mr. John G. Paine, general manager; Mr. Gene Buck, president; Mr. C. E. Mills, chairman, board of directors; Mr. Schwartz, general counsel.

Book Publishers Bureau: Mr. Frederick G. Melcher, chairman of the Copyright Committee Book Publishers Association (magazines); Mr. Marvin Pierce, chairman of the copyright committee; Mr. George Lucas, radio (National Association of Broadcasters); Mr. Sydney M. Kaye, Motion Micture Producers and Distributors; Mr. Edwin P. Kilroe, chairman of the copyright committee; Mr. Gabriel Hess, general counsel; Mr. Robert W. Perkins, general counsel for Warner Bros.

Scholarship: Mr. Robert C. Binkley; Mr. Richard Manning, small committee (originally invited), chairman of the copyright committee which already existed; Mr. Melcher, book publishers; Mr. Kilroe, motion pictures; Mr. Pierce, magazine publishers.

Radio: Mr. Sydney M. Kaye.
Ascap: Mr. John Payne.
Labor: Mr. Michael J. Flynn.
Authors: Mrs. Louise Sillcox.

The Committee for the Study of Copyright worked very hard to achieve a general revision. Its papers, now in the possession of the Copyright Office, Library of Congress, occupy some seven file drawers. It should be

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

noted that the Register of Copyrights did not participate in the work of the Shotwell committee. In fact, he later expressed his opposition to many features of the bill drafted by that committee. The committee completed its final draft of a proposed bill on December 18, 1939. This bill, known as the Shotwell bill, was introduced in the Senate on January 8, 1940, by Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, as Senate 3043.[8]

The text of the bill together with an explanatory statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. No action was taken on the bill during the year 1940. The outbreak of World War II in Europe during 1939 had focused attention on other and more pressing problems. At the conclusion of World War II the League of Nations expired and the United Nations was established. Dr. Leland liquidated the remnants of the national committee and the Committee for the Study of Copyright. Thereafter efforts to secure universal cooperation in copyright were continued under the UNESCO organization of the United Nations.

Since World War II the effort to secure a new international copyright convention has been successful. No general revision of the United States copyright law has been undertaken, and efforts to have the United States adhere to the Bern Convention were abandoned. Instead, the United States participated in preparing the Universal Copyright Convention which was completed in 1952 and signed by the United States and 39 other countries, including both members and nonmembers of the Berne Union. In 1954 the United States ratified the convention and implementing changes in the copyright law were enacted by Congress in Public Law 743, 83d Congress.

In reporting the bill, H. R. 6616, 83d Congress, for compliance with the Universal Copyright Convention the House Committee on the Judiciary explained its effect on the present copyright law:

"The principal amendments to the United States copyright law which are necessary are the relaxation, as to foreign works, of the requirement of United States manufacture, a slight modification of the form of copyright notice, and the elimination of the requirement of deposit of two copies of foreign works in the United States Copyright Office.

* * * * *

"The Universal Copyright Convention, in order to overcome the objections of the United States and other nonsignatory nations to the features of the Berne Convention, is based on the concept of national treatment. In other words, instead of seeking to establish uniform international standards of copyright, or, in effect, establish an international copyright law, this convention merely seeks to guarantee to works first published in any signatory nation the same copyright protection in other signatory nations as is given to works first published in such other nations or of nationals of other signatory nations. It does not seek to eliminate differences in copyright theory which exist throughout the world or to harmonize national laws, but instead recognizes existing differences. Also, it has no retroactive effect on works already in the public domain in any contracting states and does not provide for automatic copyright without formalities which rendered the Bern Convention incompatible with American copyright law." [9]

In order for the Universal Convention to become effective 12 countries must deposit their ratifications. Ten have done so to date, including the United States. The necessary additional deposits of ratifications are expected to be received soon.

Since the statement, supra, concerning the ratification of Universal Convention was written the following information has been received:

"UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION RATIFIED

"Word has been received from the Director General of UNESCO that the Universal Copyright Convention will come into force on September 16, 1955, by virtue of the deposit of the ratification of the required 12 countries. The principality of Monaco deposited the 12th ratification on June 16, and the convention comes into force, according to its terms, 3 months thereafter.

"Public Law 743 (approved August 31, 1954), the recent amendment to the copyright law that implemented the United States ratification of the treaty, also becomes effective on September 16, 1955. Accordingly, on and after that date, works first published in the following countries or works by nationals of these countries will receive the benefit of the new law: Andorra, Cambodia, Chile, Costa Rica, German Federal Republic, Haiti, Israel, Laos, Monaco, Pakistan, and Spain. In essence, such works will receive automatic copyright protection in this country without the necessity of complying with the formalities of the United States law. Likewise, works by United States authors, or those first published in the United States, will receive protection in these 11 countries merely by the fact that they were published in the United States." [10]

X. CONCLUSION

The foregoing résumé discloses a variety of methods employed in the attempt at copyright revision. Briefly, they may be characterized as follows:

1. The first attempt, that of the Dallinger bill, might roughly be termed the "employment of counsel method" in that after many conferences by an industry group, one of the interested parties retained counsel to draft a bill which was then introduced by a sponsor, Representative Dallinger.

2. The second method might be termed the "expert method" in that the Register of Copyrights, Mr. Salberg, as a one-man expert drafted a bill, then introduced by Representative Perkins.

3. The next effort might be termed the "agreement within industry method" in that one of the groups within the industry attempted by conferences with interested parties to draft an acceptable bill (the Vestal bill).

4. This was succeeded by what might be termed the "legislative investigation method" in that the congressional committee, without considering a specific bill, held hearings to determine for itself the views of all the interested parties, and on the basis of these hearings drafted a bill (the Sirovich bill).

5. The next effort might be termed the "interdepartmental committee method" in that an interdepartmental committee attempted to draft a bill (the first Duffy bill) with limited objectives. Opposition, however, forced an extension of the objectives to greater areas of revision resulting in the second Duffy bill.

6. The final effort might be termed the "private party method" in that the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation through its subcommittee, the Shotwell committee, drafted a bill (the Thomas bill) which attempted to reconcile the various conflicting interests.

It should be borne in mind that while our entry into the Universal Copyright Convention did not involve a comprehensive or even a major revision of the American copyright laws it did constitute an important achievement in copyright procedure. This was done by treaty and implementing legislation. The details for the United States were worked out by the Librarian of Congress, the Register of Copyrights, and the State Department in a series of conferences involving all major interests.

Instead of utilizing any of the techniques or methods utilized the Thompson bill (H. R. 2677) proposes a Federal Commission—comprising as already indicated, both Presidential and congressional appointees—to "examine, study, and make recommendations for the revision of all laws pertaining to both domestic and foreign copyright."

---

[1] League of Nations, Secretariat, Information Section. Essential Facts About the League of Nations, 10th edition, revised. Geneva 1939, p. 265 etc. "As soon as the league was founded efforts were begun for improving the International Organization of Intellectual Workers. On December 18, 1920, the first assembly requested the council to associate itself as closely as possible with all such efforts. The assembly had in view the possible setting up for this purpose of a technical organization attached to the league."

This organization now exists in the Intellectual Cooperation Organization of the League of Nations, which forms one of the league's four technical organizations side by side with the Health, Communications and Transit, and Economic and Financial Organizations. Its constitutions received the formal approval of the assembly on two occasions, in 1926 and in 1931. It is composed as follows:

1. International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation. An advisory organ of the council and the assembly. It consists of 19 members appointed by the council. It directs the work of intellectual cooperation.

2. Committees of experts to answer special questions. Some of these are permanent while others exist only for a limited period. This organization has three working bodies (a) the Intellectual Cooperation Section which is its administrative secretariat and the (b) International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (Paris) which is its executive organ. The institute pepares for meetings of expert committees, it arranges for inquiries that have been ordered and publishes the results. There are 44 national committees established in various countries including the United States where the committee is known as the National Committee of the United States of America for International Intellectual Cooperation.

[2] See Who's Who in America, vol. 28, 1954 through 1955, p. 2438.

[3] See Who's Who in America, vol. 28, 1954, through 1955, p. 1580.

[4] Ware, the National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation, 1926–48.

[5] Ware, op. cit., pp. 79–80.

[6] Ware, op. cit., p. 81.

[7] Ware, op. cit., pp. 83–84.

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 86, pp. 68–78.

[9] H. Rept. 2608, 83d Cong., pp. 1–2.

[10] Library of Congress, Information Bulletin, vol. 14, No. 25, June 20, 1955, p. 7.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Governor Harriman Visits Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following news item which appeared in the July 22, 1955, issue of the Israel Digest:

GOVERNOR HARRIMAN VISITS ISRAEL

JERUSALEM.—New York Gov. Averell Harriman expressed his opposition to the arming of the Arab States as long as there is no peace in the Middle East and urged the United States Government to "continue its persistent efforts to bring about peace between Israel and the neighboring states."

The Governor and Mrs. Harriman, during their 3-day stay in Israel, met with President Izhak Ben-Zvi, Prime Minister Moshe Sharett, and Defense Minister David Ben Gurion.

Governor Harriman showed special interest in the projects carried out by the United States operations mission in Israel. Twenty-five specialists from the State University of New York are participating in the technical assistance program.

While touring northern Israel, Governor Harriman noted that Israel had directed United States aid into improving the water supply at the Arab village of Tira, was building a health center there and had established a tractor station to aid Arab farmers mechanize their field work.

In Nazareth, the Governor visited the Christian shrines and in Haifa toured the new campus of the Technion (Israel Institute of Technology). He also visited the Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovot and laid a weath on the grave of the late President Chaim Weizmann.

A special flight provided Mr. and Mrs. Harriman with a bird's-eye view of Israel development as the New York Governor viewed the historic reclamation of the Huie Valley from the air.

In Jerusalem, Prime Minister Sharett presented Governor Harriman with an album of Israel photographs bound between hand-beaten copper plates.

Taking Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by H. B. Quoyoon, which appeared in the July 25, 1955, issue of the Long Island Commercial Review, is deserving of our attention:

TAKING STOCK

(By H. B. Quoyoon)

LET THE BUYER BEWARE

Despite all the recent talk in newspapers concerning Senator FULBRIGHT's bill to further regulate unlisted securities and foreign issues—a bill which would offer greater protection to all investors and speculators—the fantastic rashness of stock promoters continues unabated.

Recently, a large investment service recommended the purchase of an issue selling well under $1 a share. In so doing, they sent out several hundred thousand copies of their favorite report on this penny stock. It is interesting to note that these reports were sent not only to subscribers—reportedly less than 20,000 in number—but to lists of names of nonsubscribers, some of whom had previously been subscribers of other investment services, while others were merely people who were recorded as being shareholders of various companies.

Despite the fact that these reports were sent out within a very short period of time, the stock failed to advance. Interestingly enough, not too many weeks before these reports were sent out, a group of people were permitted to buy close to a million shares of unissued stock at very low prices per share from the company recommended in the report.

It is not difficult to assume that the shares they purchased were sold at substantially higher prices than they paid when the investment service sent out its report shortly thereafter.

Even the scantiest degree of security analysis will reveal that the purchase of this stock by the people who received the report was more speculative than shooting craps with loaded dice blindfolded.

STRONGER SEC NEEDED

If you believe in the outmoded theory that the purchaser of any commodity must take upon himself all of the responsibility for finding out about its inherent or theoretical value, this type of stock promotion will not be disturbing.

If, however, you ascribe to the modern civilized theory that no man can be an expert in all matters—a problem which becomes increasingly difficult in the field of securities—it is plain that further protection is absolutely necessary as soon as possible.

Founded in the 1930's as a result of various congressional investigations into the fields of finance and securities, with high hopes that unethical and fraudulent practices would be greatly reduced, the SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission) has consistently shown in recent years a basic unwillingness to strengthen its powers and scope of action.

Fully realizing that the purchase of any security reveals a desire for speculative gain, that people will very often buy certain stocks despite experienced and sound judgment, and that some people will always find ways of defrauding themselves and others even if a whole new mass of laws concerning stocks were enacted, I feel that in buying unlisted securities the average investor does not even get a bare minimum of protection.

Senator FULBRIGHT's bill is a step in the right direction. Passed into law, it would provide almost the same safeguards to purchasers of unlisted securities as have purchasers of stocks traded on leading exchanges such as the American Stock Exchange.

The bill would essentially require that over-the-counter issues of companies having more than 500 stockholders and over $5 million in assets file financial statements and annual reports with the SEC, comply with existing proxy regulations, report monthly trading in that company's stock by officers, directors and shareholders owning more than 10 percent of its stock, and make the purchase of these stocks subject to the same margin requirements of listed securities.

It is almost unbelievable that some financial leaders are opposed to this minimum protection. What these people are actually recommending is that shareholders of unlisted securities should not be given the same amount of news and information about their companies that is afforded to holders of listed securities.

SOME IMPROVEMENT NOTED

It is only fair to note that the SEC has just recently started to take some cognizance of the wide demand for better regulations. Two rules it has adopted in the last 4 weeks restrict trading activity of people participating in the distribution of securities, and govern price stabilizing of a stock. (A common practice in the offering of a new issue to absorb downright price fluctuation.)

At recent congressional hearings concerning Senator FULBRIGHT's bill, Edward T. McCormack, American Stock Exchange president, stated that he endorsed FULBRIGHT'S bill (S. 2054) and said that the ASE has for many years been fostering "the idea that investors should receive from management the maximum feasible amounts of information concerning the corporations they own. We believe that, to the extent that this bill fortifies and enforces this principle and thereby removes in part the existing gap in Federal securities legislation, it is in the public interest and should be adopted by the Congress.

"Regulation of the type here proposed has been tried for many years in the field of exchange trading and has proved sound and workable. No responsible person doubts that it is here to stay."

Resolutions Adopted by the Sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the groups in our country which opposes aggressive Communist imperialism and represents the aspirations of a people for freedom is the Ukrainian Congress of America.

Its national chairman is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is also a professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University.

From May 28 to 30 of this year, the Sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent was held at the Hotel Commodore in New York City. This congress adopted a series of resolutions bearing on a wide range of significant subjects which deserve the consideration of the United States Senate.

At the request of Dr. Dobriansky, I ask unanimous consent to make the text of these resolutions available to my colleagues by inserting them in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

We, the delegates representing over a thousand Ukrainian-American organizations, fraternal associations, political and citizens' clubs, veterans' organizations, religious communities, women's clubs and societies, youth clubs and leagues, sports and athletic groups and civic associations—all of which are organized into local and State branches of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—have assembled at this time to discuss and deliberate upon problems which are of direct concern to this great and democratic Republic of the United States of America and to us as its citizens, and of a like concern to the great nation of Ukraine and to us as having ties of blood with her people. This is a particularly significant occasion, as it marks the 15th anniversary of the inception of this unique national organization which held its first convention in the Nation's capital exactly 15 years ago, in 1940. During this entire period, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America never deviated from its chosen path of exposing the true face of the universal and growing menace of world communism directed by the Kremlin and its Russian Communist gang of aggressors.

Our organization strongly supported our Government both in war and in its postwar efforts to secure peace, asserting without surcease that a lasting peace could not be achieved without granting freedom and independence to nations enslaved by the forces of Russian Communist imperialism.

This unshakable belief of the Ukrainian Congress Committee in the indispensability of freedom for all nations, including Ukraine and other enslaved nations of the Soviet empire, was maintained throughout the course of the 15 years' activities of this organization, as attested to by its congresses and adopted resolutions in 1940, 1944, 1946, 1949, and 1952.

Today, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is a strong national organization consisting of branches and affiliates in over three-fourths of the States of the Union, and representing 1½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent, has, of necessity, come to assume an extremely important role in disseminating the truth about the imperialistic and aggressive designs of Russian communism. This fact has been brought out with particular clarity in connection with hearings and recommendations of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress. This unique and united organization is continuing in the task of forming enlightened and realistic policies with respect to the Soviet Union.

A most fitting expression and recognition of the magnitude of the task performed by this organization is contained in the large number of statements and messages made by leading United States Senators and House Members assembled in a brochure recently published by the UCCA on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1918, and in the messages of Presidents of the United States to the Congresses of Americans of Ukrainian Descent.

I. NATIONAL SECURITY AND PEACE

Whereas the contemporary international situation, cancered by the aggressive, atheistic forces of Russian Communist imperialism and its worldwide conspiratorial network, is fraught with mortal danger to the independence, sovereignty and the free and democratic institutions of the United States which in the current power context stands as the ultimate bastion of freedom in the world; and

Whereas the maintenance of peace punctuated by the absence of global military conflict is primarily necessitated by the envisioned horrors of nuclear destruction; Be it

Resolved, That the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America extend and intensify its expenditure of resources in the continued furtherance of general public knowledge and understanding of the concrete nature of Russian Communist imperialism, of the perils posed by its criminal international conspiracy, and of the propaganda techniques of imperialist Moscow toward the prime ends of fortified internal security, moral nonappeasement, and peace coupled with the advance, not the costly retreat, of freedom.

II. POLICY OF PEACEFUL LIBERATION

Whereas the captive nations, both within and without the Soviet Union, have clearly shown by their heroic acts of resistance and just aspirations to constitute a powerful array of natural allies in the cause of freedom and justice toward all nations; and

Whereas the shortsighted policy of containment, narrowly pursued, is not only discredited by the record of Communist successes but also by its own void of moral content and sound political principles; and

Whereas by logical definition any policy other than a policy of liberation belongs to the containment species: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America redouble its efforts in the advancement of a steadily implemented policy of peaceful liberation which alone perceives the illusion of "peaceful or competitive coexistence" where Iron Curtains exist to divide nations and peoples, which alone extends to the captive peoples throughout the Russian Communist empire our fixed moral commitment toward their eventual liberation and national independence, and which alone provides the hope and encouragement necessary for all the captive nations to persevere in their resistance and political opposition to the present genocidal consolidation program undertaken by Moscow as the basic requisite in its calculus of world conquest. We strongly urge the adoption and implementation of the policy of peaceful liberation by our Government in a declared spirit of a universalized declaration of independence, directed especially at the captive nations in the Soviet Union.

III. ORGANIZATION AND POLICY OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

Whereas the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is in function and structure a national American institution which, independent of any foreign political connections or involvements, is founded on a unique unity of all anti-Communist organizations and groups of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and in its national representation is expressive of the basic convictions and sentiments of a million and a half American citizens; and

Whereas the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America bases its general policy entirely on the complete identity of just interests and aspirations in promotion of the forces of freedom that exists between our country and the valiant and strategic Ukrainian nation, as well as the other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America views its dedication to the sacred cause of freedom, as embodied in the crowning objective of a liberated and independent Ukraine to be in the prime and vital interest of the security and freedom of our Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the entire membership of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America intensify its moral and financial support of the expansive activities of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, uphold by local example the cherished unity of our combined strength against all divisive influences, and extend its local activities and participation among all circles of American life to advance further the dominant truths on the natural alliance binding our country and Ukraine in the struggle against the concrete enemy of Russian Communist imperialism.

IV. ENSLAVED UKRAINE

Whereas the sufferings of the Ukrainian nation have been largely due to the ruthless policies of enslavement of Soviet Russia, which fact is recognized by all save the Communists, fellow travelers, and die-hard Russian imperialists;

Whereas mass deportations and executions of Ukrainian patriots, ruthless destruction of all Ukrainian churches, russification of Ukrainian culture and language, the unrestricted genocidal policy of Moscow toward the Ukrainian people and other crimes express the fundamental and traditional Russian policy aiming at the elimination of the Ukrainians as a separate ethnic entity; and because Ukraine, by virtue of its geographical position, its numerical strength and its natural resources, has been and continues to be a natural springboard for aggressive Russian imperialism, its full and unqualified liberation from the brutal rule of Moscow would contribute to the strengthening of international peace: It is

Resolved—

(1) To support fully and unswervingly the aspirations of the 45 million Ukrainian people in their efforts to regain their political freedom and national independence. We call the attention of the United States Government and the free world at large to the fact that the Ukrainian people had achieved their full freedom when, on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence, and on January 22, 1919, they united all the Ukrainian ethnographic territories into one independent and sovereign Ukrainian democratic republic, established through a due process of democratic elections and endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian people.

(2) To call the attention of the United States Government and of the free world at large that in Ukraine there exists in opposition to Russian domination an indomitable Ukrainian underground resistance, which opposes rule by Moscow and strives for the attainment of a free, independent and democratic Ukraine, and for a world free of the menace of Communist aggression.

V. KERSTEN COMMITTEE

Whereas the Select Committee of the House of Representatives (83d Cong.) on Communist Aggression (known as the Kersten committee) has performed extremely important work for the defense of our country by bringing to light the Communist aggression against once free and independent nations; and

Whereas the work of this select committee is by far not yet complete, nevertheless it has already provided unrefuted historical evidence not only of uninterrupted oppression practiced by Soviet Moscow, aggression and genocide of nations enslaved by Moscow, but also clearly indicates that similar plans exist against nations as yet free, including the United States; and

Whereas in order to forestall these criminal and highly threatening Soviet practices and plans, immediate countermeasures are indicated: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent to appeal to the Congress of the United States with a pleading recommendation, That (1) the existence and work of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression be continued for as long as circumstances shall demand; and (2) the findings and recommendations of the select committee heretofore made should not be permitted to gather dust, but should be transmitted to the United States Government with a recommendation to start direct and indirect action to forestall this threat, so pointedly indicated by the results of these investigations. The Sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent particularly warmly supports the proposition already made public, that the United States delegate in the United Nations make a motion, on the basis of material already available, that the Soviet Government be officially named an aggressor and guilty of genocide, and that as a result of such motion the Soviet Government be appropriately censured by the General Assembly.

VI. VOICE OF AMERICA AND UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICES

Whereas in relation to the enslaved nations in the Communist empire the goals of our United States Information Agency and its Voice of America are clearly to maximize in the common cause of freedom our appeal to the peoples of these nations and to weaken the chains of bondage by which the tyranny of imperialist Moscow shackles them; and

Whereas to preserve freedom and a way of life and that of the captive peoples to regain their freedom and self-government is the natural spirit of patriotism and enlightened nationalism predicating the ends of national independence and sovereignty; and

Whereas overwhelming masses of evidence exist for ready demonstration of the predominant fact that nowhere in the world can there be found a form of imperialism and colonialism that could even be compared with the criminal and savage proportions of Russian Communist imperialism: Be it

Resolved, That the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America continue to exert its

efforts in the attainment of a maximally efficient Voice of America, especially in the Ukrainian division; also in the realization of worldwide distribution of scholarly works supporting the just cause of Ukraine and the other colonial non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R.; and in the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on United States Overseas Information with structure and function similar to the joint committee in the field of atomic energy.

VII. UNITED NATIONS

Whereas at the present stage of civilization the fate of nations and their development is strictly dependent on mutuality and excludes any kind of isolationism; and

Whereas peace and security based on morality, law, and justice, dignity of men and rights of nations is possible only under conditions of orderly cooperation among peace-loving nations that subscribe to democratic principles; and

Whereas the greatest enemy of morality, law, and justice, and freedom of man and nations is Russian communism, continuing the traditions of Russian imperialism through Communist Parties and fifth column activities, which utilizes all available opportunities in order to undermine institutions dedicated to free international cooperation; and

Whereas the liberation movement of nations enslaved by Soviet Russia is a powerful factor in the fight of the free nations against the aggression of Russian Communist imperialism bound on world conquest: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, through its executive organs will give support to the efforts of the Government of the United States to make the United Nations an effective instrument of international cooperation based on democracy and freedom of nations and against aggressive tendencies of undemocratic regimes, and in particular of the chief enemy of world peace and international law—Russian Communists imperialism; and be it further

Resolved, To direct the attention of the Government of the United States and of American public opinion to the fact that the presence in the United Nations of representatives of Communist regimes tends to undermine the high aims and purposes of that organization, wherefore the delegations of the United States and of other democratic and peace-loving nations in the U. N. should, within the charter provisions of the U. N. proceed to eliminate all Communist representations from the U. N. on the basis of the violations by their governments of the U. N. Charter and International Treaty provisions—as contained in the testimony of Dr. L. E. Dobriansky before the United States Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter on April 22, 1955, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 1955, under the extension of remarks by the Honorable LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin, the testimony referred to including a number of concrete recommendations on U. N. Charter revision which this Sixth Assembly of Americans of Ukrainian Descent hereby fully endorses.

VIII. THE FAR EAST

Whereas the conference of nations of reawakening Asia and Africa held in Bandung last month by its deliberations has proven to the world that the patriotism of liberated nations makes them the best actual and potential allies of the free world and of the United States, as well as a bulwark against the aggression of communism: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we voice our approval of such American policy in the Far East which cooperates with the liberated nations of Asia and Africa and promotes the cause of anti-Communist China, Korea, and Vietnam.

IX. COMPULSORY REPATRIATION OF REFUGEES

Whereas the Soviet Government recently attempted to impose upon the parties to the Austrian State Treaty a provision which would have resulted in the forced repatriation of some 30,000 anti-Communist displaced persons in Austria; and

Whereas the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America participated significantly in urging our Government to oppose so inhumanitarian a provision; and

Whereas there is now pending before the House of Representatives, House Resolution 137, introduced by Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH, calling for the creation of a select committee to investigate the entire problem of forced repatriation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America will continue to exert its efforts and influence to oppose, overcome, and precent further attempts on the part of the Soviet Government to effect forced or compulsory repatriation of refugees anywhere, in any manner, method, or form; and be it further

Resolved, more specifically, That we strongly urge the Congress of the United States to adopt the said House Resolution 137 so that such an investigation may establish once and for all the responsibility for the forcible repatriation of millions of anti-Communist refugees who met death at the hands of the Russian Communist oppressors.

X. IMMIGRATION

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act, known as the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for a system of numerical restriction of immigrants based upon the national origins of the peoples contributing to the population of the United States; and

Whereas the said national origins quota system is based upon the Federal census of 1920, which is not a true and/or accurate reflection of the number of persons of Ukrainian stock residing in the United States at that time inasmuch as the Ukrainian immigrants were required to list as their country of origin such countries as Poland, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and others, rather than Ukraine; and

Whereas the quota area was and is definitive of a country or other independent governmental unit rather than a nation or nationality; and

Whereas the governments of such quota areas from where Ukrainians originate are and have been hostile to the Ukrainians and their aspirations, and therefore the likelihood of Ukrainians participating in and taking advantage of the national origins quota system is remote indeed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America make known to the Congress of the United States that the national origins quota system of the Immigration and Nationality Act as it applies to the Ukrainians is inequitable and results in their exclusion and that some other formula or base be created to apply to Ukrainians seeking to immigrate to the United States by an appropriate amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

XI. RELIEF ACTIVITIES

Whereas in Western Europe there are at present thousands of Ukrainians, displaced persons, and recent refugees and escapees who, until such time as they will be able to emigrate to the United States or Canada, will be in need of legal and material aid; and

Whereas among them there are thousands who, by reason of incurred physical disability in Ukrainian armed units or by reason of advanced age or orphan status, are ineligible for emigration; and

Whereas among the Ukrainian American community there are also numerous instances when social service aid is required for the aged or orphans: Be it therefore

Resolved by the general assembly of the UCCA—

(a) To call upon the Ukrainian Americans in the United States to make contributions for the benefit of resettlement of our brothers and sisters from Europe;

(b) To call upon all individuals and member organizations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to support all Ukrainian relief organizations, and in particular the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee;

(c) To recommend to all bodies represented in the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and their membership that they make contributions to the relief and aid of those left in Europe; and

(d) Give systematic support to the activities of an organized social service in the United States.

XII. THE CAPTIVE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN U. S. S. R.

Whereas perpetuated ignorance invariably equips Moscow with a powerful weapon for successful aggression and notions identifying the Soviet Union with "Russia," the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. with "national minorities," the population of U. S. S. R. with "200 million Russians," the Soviet Union with "a monolithic state" reflect such ignorance; and

Whereas the 115 million non-Russian people populating the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Turkestan, and areas of the Soviet Far East constitute a tremendous centrifugal force for liberation and freedom; and

Whereas the independence and self-government of these separate and distinctive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. would contribute most to the liberation and freedom of the majority of the Russian people from centuries-long tyranny and absolutism primarily sustained by the imperialist dynamics of political Russian totalitarianism: Be it

Resolved, That the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America extend further its educational campaign on the guiding concept of the captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. and advance its existing relationship with groups and institutions recognizing the moral and expedient values of this concept to the traditions and political strategy of our country, respectively.

XIII. OBJECTIVITY IN INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING

Whereas during the period of the Czarist Empire, Russian pseudoscientific theories and teachings infiltrated the Western World, including the United States, with the objective of proving that the Russian Empire was a monolithic nation; and

Whereas subsequent Communist teachings have largely been following and affirming the propaganda formerly disseminated to the effect of an inherent "Messianism" and superiority of the Russian people over subject peoples of the Communist empire (such as, e. g., the incessant drumming into the ears of the Ukrainians that the Russians are their "elder brothers"); and

Whereas many remarks of the aforementioned pseudoscientific theories still pervade some American institutions of learning: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America appeal the the presidents and faculties of American universities and institutions of learning to restore in the teaching of the history of Eastern Europe, of the Russian Empire and of the Soviet Union, true scientific objectivity.

XIV. EDUCATION

Whereas Ukrainian courses and schools play an important part in the formulation of viewpoints and ideologies of American citizens by virtue of introducing a wealth of assets into the cultural treasury of America—a fact pointed out and admitted by American leaders in education: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the UCCA direct its organs and members to pay more attention to the field of culture and education, and in particular to give more active aid to the educational council of the UCCA.

XV. FALSE INDIVISIBILITY OF RUSSIA

Whereas the policy of promotion and support practiced by some private American circles in behalf of Russian emigre groups, which propagate the indivisibility of Russia as a great power, which should not be divested of its supremacy and rule over a number of non-Russian nations, including the Ukrainians, is based on an erroneous assumption of history and practicabilities of political solution, and as such plays into the hands of the present Communist rulers of the Soviet Union by weakening the chances of unification of anti-Communist forces: Be it therefore

Resolved by the sixth assembly of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, To call the attention of the United States Government's Department of State and responsible American political leaders that a policy of ignoring the just demands and aims of Ukraine and other enslaved nations of the Soviet empire by offering them a continued status of enslaved nations in a non-Communist Russian empire is detrimental to a victorious pursuit of the present cold war against Soviet imperialism and aggression.

XVI. RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Whereas it is a notoriously known fact that the red rulers of Moscow conduct a policy of godlessness and antireligious propaganda, and, like the former Czars, deny unto the Ukrainian people the right of freedom of religion; and

Whereas the Russian Communists have destroyed the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church and more recently following the termination of World War II, also the Ukranian-Greek-Catholic Church by physical extermination, exile, and imprisonment of the hierarchy of both churches: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the sixth assembly of the Ukrainian Congress Committee implores the Government of the United States to intervene with the Soviet Government and the Assembly of the United Nations calling for release from unjustified imprisonment of the clergy of Ukrainian churches and, in particular, the removal of restrictions upon the ecclesiastical duties of the Metropolitan Archbishop Joseph Slipyi and those bishops who are still alive; and be it further

Resolved, That the sixth assembly of the Ukrainian Congress Committee calls upon all Ukrainians to foster a spirit of religious tolerance on the pattern of religious freedom and tolerance under the Constitution of the United States.

XVII. UNION LABOR

Whereas wage-earners with their families constitute a majority of the population of the United States of America; and

Whereas in the world of labor the union movement representative not only of the factor of defense and representation of labor, but also of a social order and coordination in a democratic system; and

Whereas the labor union movement is a particularly important factor in the fight against subversive elements; and

Whereas the labor union movement is an equally important factor of peaceful international cooperation: Be it therefore

Resolved by the general assembly of the Ukrainian Congress of America, To (1) welcome the unification attempt of the A. F. of L. and CIO; (2) through a specially established labor board to maintain close relations with central bodies of the labor union movement of the United States and to give support to their beneficial community activities; and (3) call upon the members of all organizations united in the UCCA to support the labor union movement and cooperate with it in its struggle against undemocratic and subversive Communist elements.

Congress and Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following very interesting article, written by Gerald W. Johnson, which appeared in the August 1, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine:

CONGRESS AND GENEVA

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

It is now almost 40 years since Woodrow Wilson, in 1918, started for Europe borne along by such a strong following wind of popular good will as this country has not felt since, until Dwight D. Eisenhower started for Europe on July 16, 1955, with the same sort of wind filling his sails.

The striking similarity of the two departures invites speculation as to how much further the analogy will be drawn. In the case of Wilson, we have the testimony of Corinne Roosevelt Robinson that before he had landed on the other side the majority leader of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge, visited the hospital where the actual if not the titular leader of the Republican Party, Theodore Roosevelt, lay on his deathbed, and there and then the two plotted to employ Senate reservations to destroy any treaty that Wilson might bring back from France.

Their belief was that if the Democratic Party got credit for making a good peace, it could not be defeated in 1920. Therefore it must not be allowed to make peace. The Senate must stall along until after the election of that year, so that the Republican Party could make the peace.

All the world knows how hideously that conspiracy backfired. It destroyed Wilson, all right, and it beat the Democratic Party; but it also destroyed the peace. Three years later, on July 2, 1921, President Harding signed a joint resolution by a Republican Congress ratifying every damnable clause of the Versailles Treaty, including the war guilt clause, and repudiating every decent clause, including the League of Nations. From that moment the Second World War was inevitable. The price in sorrow and loss that the world paid for the spite of two malignant old men is beyond human computation.

With this dismal story in mind it is inevitable that men should turn an apprehensive eye on the majority leader of the Senate and the titular leader of the opposition party. Fortunately, they are in plain sight. By a sad mischance the majority leader is in a hospital, although not, the country hopes, on his death bed. But Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON has not been conspiring with Mr. Adlai Stevenson to wreck any settlement that Mr. Eisenhower may bring back. On the contrary, both are publicly pledged to support any reasonable move the President may make to relieve the existing tensions.

So there is no trouble in that direction. If the President's work is sabotaged, it will not be by the formal opposition; yet he is an optimist indeed who assumes therefore that it will all be plain sailing. The resolution offered by Senator MCCARTHY just before Mr. Eisenhower's departure was actually a call for a vote of no confidence. Only 4 Senators supported it with their votes, but never believe that only 4 Senators favored it secretly.

The Conference at Geneva is an attempt to reach a settlement by negotiation, and negotiation in the nature of things entails give and take. But if the President gives one iota to the Russians, the extreme isolationists will instantly be clawing at his back. In that case, is it likely that the minority leader, Mr. KNOWLAND, will haul them off? There is nothing in his record indicating that he has any disposition to do so. On the contrary, he has himself repeatedly and publicly expressed skepticism of the President's program of international comity.

By the time these lines meet the reader's eye the conference may be over, but the trial of the Republican Party will be just beginning. Thirty-seven years ago it failed calamitously and there are still some men in the party as completely blinded by hatred and prejudice as were Theodore Roosevelt and the elder Lodge. The question is, do such men still dominate the party? If they do, the outlook for the Nation and the world is not encouraging.

There is a chance, of course, that Geneva will be a complete fiasco and that the President will bring back nothing requiring the attention of the Senate, but it is an eventuality that patriotic men will refuse to anticipate. It will be hard enough to accept it if it is forced upon us. The serious question is the capacity of the Republican Party to take advantage of an opportunity if one is presented. Has the experience of the tortured generation that has lived and suffered since 1918 taught it the rudiments of statecraft, or is it still the party of the Bourbons, who learn nothing and forget nothing?

It is definitely a Republican responsibility. In the Senate, in the absence of Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CLEMENTS will certainly do what he can, as Mr. Stevenson will do what he can outside; but theirs is only a secondary responsibility. Even if their joint efforts save the President's program, as they have saved it time and again in the past, they will not acquit the Republican Party. If any considerable number of their members—one is justified in saying that if more than four Republican Senators—evince a disposition to do to Dwight D. Eisenhower what their predecessors did to Woodrow Wilson, the party will have demonstrated its incapacity to exercise power and will forfeit all claim to the confidence or even the respect of the country.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials and articles that have been written in various newspapers throughout the country about our great majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of July 8, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS ROBS DEMOCRATS OF A CANDIDATE

Even if he survives his serious illness, LYNDON B. JOHNSON may be lost to the Demo-

crats as majority leader of the Senate. It has been announced he will be out for the rest of this session. Since he first began service in Congress at a Member of the House in 1937, he had been known as "one of the hardest workers in Congress" and that may account in some measure for the heart attack with which he has been stricken.

In the Senate his stature has grown steadily and he was widely regarded as a possible mediator between the southern and northern wings of the Democratic Party.

He recently displayed his skill as a parliamentarian by forcing a vote on the McCarthy resolution, aimed at embarrassing President Eisenhower at the Geneva conference. Every effort of Senator MCCARTHY to obstruct a vote on his own resolution was frustrated by JOHNSON and in the vote the Wisconsin Senator was flatly repudiated by the Senate.

Democrats also got satisfaction out of Senator JOHNSON'S answer to the President's assertion that the Democrats could have done more than they have done in passing administration measures. Senator JOHNSON said Senators were not second lieutenants to be given orders on what they should do.

LYNDON JOHNSON was a Roosevelt New Dealer even to the point of supporting President Roosevelt's Supreme Court reorganization plan.

As a Senator he has been counted among those opposing the civil-rights program and as a Texan his attitude towards expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority has not always been as clearly defined as some Midsouth Senators would like.

However, the sudden reappraisal of the Dixon-Yates contract ordered by the President brought forth statements from LYNDON JOHNSON which were comforting to the Tennessee Valley. He urged that the Senate itself pave the way for cancellation of the contract. He especially opposed appropriating money for the transmission line across the Mississippi River. The Democratic leader said, "This amounts to asking us to lay out money—the taxpayers' money—to carry power from a plant that probably will not be built to a city that doesn't want it."

Senator JOHNSON'S ability is recognized by Democrats and Republicans alike and it is possible his illness has removed a potential presidential candidate from active political life. He will be only 47 at his next birthday on August 25, and while not in the presidential picture for 1956, he still has time for advancement so as to be in line for "the summit" in a future presidential race.

The unfortunate blow dealt this stalwart by illness should disabuse many minds of the notion that the duties of a Senator are not arduous and wearing. "The hardest worker" among them all has been incapacitated and parliamentary government suffers a loss thereby. (Chattanooga Times.)

[From the Pittsburg (Kans.) Sun of July 10, 1955]

LOSS TO THE COUNTRY

The sudden and serious illness of Senator JOHNSON of Texas will be considered a blow to the Democrat Party whose leader he is in the Senate. But a more important truth is that the removal of the young Texan from active Senate leadership is hurtful to the Republican administration and to the country. JOHNSON'S leadership has not been of the type which made some of his predecessors famous. His record has not suggested that he has placed his party above his country. He has not shown the extreme partisanship which admits of no friendly relations with the opposing party.

When the Senator was rushed to a hospital, colleagues commented on the smoothness with which the Senate had been operating under the floor command of JOHNSON. It was apparent that the Texan had been able to organize his party forces in such a way that they could have the cooperation of the almost equally powerful Republican minority. A change of only a couple of Senate seats would shift the control of the Senate. There is no record that JOHNSON thought any changes might be brought about by death when he framed the program which he has been carrying through. It is more likely the young Senator, looking into the future, was more concerned with writing a record as a statesman than as a politician.

It must be apparent to all that a leader of more extreme partisanship and not so broad-minded could have created a very different situation in the Senate. He could have thrown obstacles in the way of the administration creating a situation that would be very harmful to the country's interest.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Morning Democrat of July 9, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON HAS BEEN GAINING STATURE

The post of party majority leaders is not often one that leads to political advance. Senators McFarland, of Arizona, and Scott Lucas, of Illinois, found being Democratic leaders in the Senate put them on the spot so much that it led to defeat. Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, saw interparty squabbles with which he had to deal as Republican leader rise up to haunt him and deny him a presidential nomination.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, who suffered a heart attack this week which will keep him on the sidelines during the rest of this session, had been gaining stature as Democratic Senate leader in recent months in spite of these precedents. His patience and political skill was beginning to pay dividends to his party.

JOHNSON'S leadership was most effective. He succeeded in a difficult assignment, directing Democratic forces in the Senate under a Republican President.

In this respect, JOHNSON followed a policy of constructive opposition to the Eisenhower legislative program. He supported a considerable part of this program and rallied his Democratic colleagues behind it. On and off the Senate floor, he was a deft manipulator who got restults with a minimum of fanfare.

JOHNSON'S absence from the political scene will hurt the cause of the Democrats. The Texas Senator was accepted as a standard-bearer by all wings of the party, including the several factions in his home State. He was adept at healing differences in the party and bringing unity to it.

Senator EARLE CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, his successor, may be counted on to continue the policy of constructive opposition in the few remaining weeks of the session this summer.

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press of July 11, 1955]

NATION NEEDS JOHNSON

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas Democrat, who has been the Senate Democrat leader during the present session, is reported to be making satisfactory progress, but still in a serious condition. Senator JOHNSON, who suffered a heart attack, has had to take a recess from the Senate for time to recuperate.

Physicians have declared that the Texas Senator may be able to return to Congress in the next session, but that for the present he will have to take rest and time for recuperation. What he is able to do later will depend upon his degree of recovery.

The Texas Democrat has been a very important factor in making a divided Congress work with reasonable harmony. With both Houses holding narrow Democrat majorities, it would be possible for both Houses to work as a political obstruction to any program presented by President Eisenhower. But the Senate has not done so, and in a large measure, the House has also refrained from creating political opposition simply for partisan ends. The two parties, and the Democrats in Congress and the Republican President, have not agreed on all programs and measures, but there has been a lack of antagonism, and legislation has largely been measured on the basis of its real importance.

Much credit for maintaining at least a working harmony between Congress and the White House despite partisan differences must go to Senator JOHNSON. He will be gravely missed in Congress during his absence. His recovery would prove to be of tremendous value to the Nation. We join with his friends and colleagues in wishing him a speedy and complete recovery of his health and that he may return to fill his important place in Congress.

[From the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune of July 13, 1955]

BIPARTISANSHIP AT NEW HIGH

President Eisenhower will take with him to the Big Four Conference at Geneva opening July 18 a very unsecret weapon—an almost unparalleled United States bipartisanship in foreign policy. A preliminary conference at the White House with congressional leaders serves to emphasize the foreign policy support the President has been getting at this session from Democrats and Republicans alike.

Neither President Eisenhower in the two sessions of the 83d Congress nor his two Democratic predecessors had enjoyed such uniform support on foreign policy. Only one major administration proposal on foreign affairs has been defeated thus far—the President's so-called atoms-for-peace ship—and that perhaps only temporarily, and only by a one-vote margin in the Senate.

Chairman STYLES H. BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, of the Senate Republican policy committee on July 7 was full of praise for the work of ailing Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas. He predicted that JOHNSON'S incapacitating illness would only increase bipartisan cooperation and speed the adjournment of Congress.

JOHNSON and Senate Republican Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, California, had worked together to obtain a smashing administration victory in regard to the Geneva meeting. That was the 77 to 4 margin by which the Senate on June 22 rejected the resolution of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, demanding that the President call off the "summit" meeting unless the U. S. S. R. agreed in advance to discuss "the present and future status" of Communist-controlled countries. Only three Senators—WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana, GEORGE W. MALONE, Nevada, and WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, all Republicans and all generally regarded as isolationists—voted with MCCARTHY.

[From the St. Marys (Pa.) Press of July 7, 1955]

HOPING FOR BEST

People from all over the country are hoping for the speedy recovery of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, Democrat, and Senate majority leader, stricken seriously ill last week and at present confined to Bethesda Naval Hospital.

This Texas gentleman has proven himself a most dynamic leader in the Senate and no doubt has overworked himself as is the case of many Members of Congress where the annual death toll is generally much higher than is the normal rate in men in other walks of life.

It is doubtful that he will return to Congress before the session that will open next January. Although of the opposite political

faith of President Eisenhower the two men are close personal friends and JOHNSON has been successful in getting much of the President's legislative program through the upper House.

Senator JOHNSON has been the type of man who inspires confidence from men of all parties and creeds, a typical American, doing a fine job in his Senate role.

All America wishes him speedy recovery.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) West Virginian of July 8, 1955]

JOHNSON STRICKEN

All Americans who are aware of the fine leadership of Senator JOHNSON in the Senate will pray for the early recovery of the personable Texan from a heart attack. The whole country owes Senator JOHNSON a debt for his statesmanship. President Eisenhower is particularly indebted to this broad-minded Democratic leader.

[From the Bradenton (Fla.) Herald of July 8, 1955]

ACROSS THE EDITOR'S DESK

JOHNSON: For some time after his election as Democratic leader of the Senate at the beginning of the 1953 session, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, was widely criticized as not being vigorous in his leadership. But in recent months there has been a considerable change in opinion about the Texan. Former critics have praised him, and observers in general have recognized his ability.

Now that he is sidelined by a heart attack, favorable appraisals are multiplying. For instance, Newsweek magazine reports that political strategists believe JOHNSON "deserves more credit than any other Member of the Senate for the collaboration between President Eisenhower and the Democratic Congress which, though certainly not perfect, was far better than most people expected."

"In guiding this policy," Newsweek adds, "the 46-year-old Texan has become next to Mr. Eisenhower the most influential man in the Government. And he has done as much as any other Senator to keep the Democratic Party from splitting into warring factions during the 2½ years the GOP has been in power."

Kentucky's Senator CLEMENTS, party whip and acting floor leader, generally agrees with JOHNSON's policy of cooperating with the Eisenhower administration. But the Kentuckian, 12 years older, lacks JOHNSON's influence, political agility, moderation, and energy. And that, as Newsweek points out, could make an enormous difference.

Texans: Despite the fact that he has been in Congress since 1937, LYNDON JOHNSON is young in both years and seniority to have held such responsibility. He was only 29 when first elected to the House, 40 when he advanced to the Senate, and he is just beginning his second term as Senator. He ranks no better than 26th in length of continuous service, and shares that rating with 9 others. But until the heart attack he seemed well on the way to long service, for Texas seldom fails to reelect its Senators and Representatives. Witness "Mr. SAM" RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, who has spent 42 of his 73 years in Congress.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register of July 10, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON

Just as the Republican Party suffered an irreparable loss in the death of Senator Robert A. Taft, the Democratic Party has been dealt a severe blow by the incapacitation of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

In his role of majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON has displayed a caliber of statesmanship sorely needed in Washington in these days. In the ticklish position of representing the congressional majority in an administration in control of the opposition, Senator JOHNSON has resisted the temptation to resort to political sniping, to practice obstructionist opportunism for the purpose of partisan advantage. At the same time, he has maintained a vigorous policy of opposition to policies inconsistent with his party's principles. As a result, the Democratic Party has gained both cohesion and stature under his leadership in the Senate, demonstrating that this Nation is capable of a basic solidarity while differing on means to a common end.

It is unfortunate that Senator JOHNSON was afflicted right at a time when more and more responsible Democratic leaders were coming to view him as presidential timber. Before his illness, it seemed a reasonably safe conclusion that LYNDON JOHNSON was first choice among thoughtful Democrats for the vice presidential nomination next year, with the end in view of grooming him for the top post in 1960. Coming from Texas, he would be a natural to heal the party wounds down south.

We hope it is immature to write LYNDON JOHNSON off as a future political factor in the United States. His physical impairment happily may prove but temporary. He may be back again in harness as fit as ever. If so, the Nation will be the gainer, however the political winds of the future blow. We need men like him in public life.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star of July 10, 1955]

SAY "WATCH JOHNSON"

Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, is fast becoming one of his party's most influential and powerful figures. The Texan, who won his first term in the Senate in 1948 by only a razor-thin margin, is now recognized as being in the driver's seat as far as congressional Democrats are concerned.

His skillful maneuvering in welding together a harmonious united front of both northern and southern Democrats has represented one of the best leadership jobs either party has seen in recent years.

JOHNSON, who got his political tutelage from House Speaker SAM RAYBURN when he served in the House, already has become the subject of presidential speculation.

Those who know him closest feel that he won't try for either the Democratic presidential or vice presidential nomination in 1956 but in 1960 he may well make his move for the top spot. For the moment, Washington political observers are keeping a close eye on his rise from the ranks.

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of July 9, 1955]

DOING WHAT'S RIGHT

There is a reason, and a very good one, why many nonpartisan prayers went up in Washington for the speedy recovery of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the stricken Senate majority leader. The Senator himself supplied the reason in an interview not long ago in which he said he has sought to live by the advice of his mother, who told him to "do just what's right."

Doing what's right as a substitute for the jungle law of politics made Senator JOHNSON a national figure at 46, considered even as presidential timber. It is a reason he has been called one of the best liked politicians in Washington.

The philosophy of doing what's right motivated the popular Texas Democrat in backing that part of the Eisenhower program he regarded as constructive and for the best interests of the country, regardless of politics, even though as a partisan he must have been pained at times by being called pro-Republican. He chose the term "constructive opposition" for his leadership and the results indicate its wisdom.

What the future will hold for Senator JOHNSON is uncertain, but doing what's right will always pay dividends.

[From the Romney (W. Va.) Review of July 6, 1955]

LYNDON JOHNSON

(W. S. A., for the Hampshire Review)

Sunday morning's newspapers carried the distressing news that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, had suffered a heart attack. Although not yet 47 years old, Senator JOHNSON had behind him a distinguished career in the House and Senate and ahead of him a political future without limit.

He had been Democratic leader in the Senate in the previous Congress, had been reelected by a comfortable margin in 1954 and since then had served as Senate majority leader in the new Democratic controlled Congress.

The job JOHNSON has done as majority leader has been tremendous. There is a unity in the Democratic Party in the Senate that seldom if ever has existed before. In part it is attributable to the fact that JOHNSON persuaded senior Democrats to forego some of their seniority claims so that every Democrat no matter how recently elected could serve on a major committee.

With Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House, Senator WALTER GEORGE in the Senate and others, Senator JOHNSON has felt that the Democratic Party was under an obligation to provide more than mere opposition during this period, and that the national interest had to come first. The record in this regard speaks for itself and is generally regarded as a product in major part of LYNDON JOHNSON's resourcefulness, tact, and untiring efforts.

During the last 4 years, there has been a growing realization that JOHNSON possesses rare qualities of leadership, and in recent months, his name has been mentioned with increasing frequency as a possible presidential candidate. On the day the news of his illness appeared on the first page of the Washington Post, the editorial section of the paper carried an article entitled "JOHNSON Boomlet Is Fulminating."

These achievements have not been brought about without effort. Conscientious Members of Congress are under an awe-inspiring workload and strain. The leader's burden is even worse and particularly a leader who sets out to do the job which JOHNSON has done, and who leads by preparation, patience and persuasian, and by personally seeing and talking with a great number of people.

Coney Island Hospital To Open in Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the August 2, 1955, Brooklyn edition of the New York World-Telegram and Sun. This is the story about another improvement of great value to my constituents.

CONEY ISLAND HOSPITAL TO OPEN IN FALL—550-BED, $15 MILLION BUILDING TO BE FINISHED IN OCTOBER—PATIENTS GO IN FOLLOWING MONTH

Construction of the new 550-bed Coney Island Hospital is expected to be completed

sometime in October, according to hospital officials.

Barring last-minute delays, the first patients will probably be transferred to the new building in November.

The new hospital, costing about $15 million, will be H-shaped. One arm of the H will be 10 floors high, the other 14 floors. It is on a 10-acre site, next to the old 6-story hospital at Ocean Parkway and Avenue Z.

FACELIFTING JOB

The old structure, built in 1910, will get a facelifting job, included in the construction contract. Its 250 beds will be used for chronic cases.

Officials estimate it will take up to a year to buy and install new heavy equipment. In the meantime, they say, the old equipment will be used.

Ground for the new building was broken June 30, 1953. Difficulties caused by boggy ground were met by a special building foundation which won for the hospital the hospital of the month award last August.

VIEW OF OCEAN

The exterior will be light gray glazed brick, with limestone and polished granite trim.

Most bed patients will have a view of the ocean. The outpatient department is designed to handle more than 600 cases daily.

The hospital will also have small tuberculosis and contagious disease units, an auditorium, television for operating room purposes, a central records room, and a central oxygen system with pipes leading to outlets in the wards.

States Rights and States Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a most timely and excellent address by the Governor of the State of Washington, the Honorable Arthur B. Langlie, at the 61st annual conference on Government of the National Municipal League held July 25, 1955, in Seattle, Wash.:

STATES RIGHTS AND STATES DUTIES

(Address by the Honorable Arthur B. Langlie, Governor of Washington)

Ever since the founding of the Republic the division of powers and responsibilities between the National Government and the States has been the cardinal question in our Federal system. The great debate before and during the Constitutional Convention aimed to find a balance between the necessary central authority and the greatest amount of individual freedom and local self-determination. It continued and is far from ended. The creation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is proof of the increased interest in this question in recent years.

Inevitably the debate starts out or comes back to the words of the Constitution. Nothing testifies more to the wisdom and the foresight of the Founding Fathers than the fact that the blueprint of a more perfect Union they drafted in 115 days of painstaking labor during the sultry Philadelphia summer of 1787, still has the undivided enthusiastic support of the Nation. It is now more respected, admired, revered, more firmly embedded than ever. It has proven sufficiently flexible to fit rapidly changing conditions for the past 168 years, yet strong enough to remain unchanged in basic concept. We know that under the system it created, more people have enjoyed more of the fruits of liberty than during any similar period in the annals of the human race.

The Founding Fathers never intended to freeze for all future the allocation of governmental powers. They envisioned the Constitution as a living document to be adjusted to the changing needs of the Nation in the course of history. It is proper that from time to time we take another look at its provisions to see whether they are still adequate to serve the ends of government in today's world.

At times some of us may be perplexed by doubts whether the system of dual sovereignty, of keeping power diffused and poised among several independent governments, fits the exacting and urgent requirements in these fast-moving days. We may grow impatient when some States do not live up to our ideas of necessary standards of public service or seem remiss in caring for unmet human needs. We may feel frustrated when some of our cherished plans or favorite projects which call for prompt action are insufferably delayed or bog down in the necessity of securing the approval of several levels of government. We may resent the seeming duplication in political and administrative processes, balk at having to pay overlapping taxes to several governments, without being able to fix responsibility nor knowing whom we are paying for what.

We may then wonder whether we should not follow the example of most other countries in the world, to concentrate authority in one central government. Before we pursue such thoughts too far, it might be well to remind ourselves of the compelling reasons for the broad dispersal of powers that characterizes our system of government. Let me name just three:

1. We all know Lord Acton's famous statement that "All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." The system of checks and balances which we accept as essential to the maintenance of our liberties requires that the powers be divided not only functionally among branches of government but also geographically. It is a natural tendency among the group forming the National Government to develop among itself a sense of omniscence and omnicompetence. The existence of strong government in the States acts as a brake on the temptation of a national government to impose its will in all matters, to enforce compliance, and to attain uniformity in extent and standards of activities which could gain by permitting diversity, local experimentation, and self-determination. A majority at the national level will be less able to attain an unconquerable position as long as a minority controls some of the State capitals.

2. Popular participation in activities and decisions of government is part of our American heritage. Only few can satisfy their aspirations in the National Government. State and local agencies provide opportunity for many more to learn about the working of government, to make themselves heard and their influence felt, to accept responsibility and train for broader duties, to understand the balancing of conflicting interest groups, and keep plans within the comprehension of the people and their willingness to support them.

3. The position of leadership of the free world which the United States had thrust upon it, overwhelms the President and Congress with problems of unprecedented magnitude and involvement. These globe-spanning questions affecting national security require, in this atomic age, knowledge of almost limitless scale and scope which taxes the ability of any man or group of men to study, comprehend, and coordinate. To select the right solutions is so vital to our very existence that the President and the Congress should be permitted to concentrate their attention and best thinking on them and be left unencumbered with other chores; they should not be called upon to make decisions on subjects which others are competent to judge. The division of fields of interest in our Constitution thus acquires added importance under today's conditions. Why in this time of specialization should we expect our overburdened Federal officials to be experts and make vital decisions not only in fields that concern national security but also in regard to everyday services to the people in the various States which can as well or better be judged in the areas where the services are rendered?

The States are well suited to perform the job assigned to them. A famous political scientist once said that if we did not have States, we would have to invent them. To be sure, the powers of the States cannot simply be justified by reference to the provisions of the Constitution. The purpose of the Constitution was not to guarantee States rights but to secure human rights.

Madison stressed in the Federalist that "the public good, the real welfare of the great body of the people, is the supreme object to be pursued; and that no form of government whatever has any value than as it may be fitted for that attainment of this object * * * as far as the sovereignty of the States cannot be reconciled to the happiness of the people, the voice of every good citizen must be, let the former be sacrificed to the latter." All grants of power to a government are only conditional, they must be earned by satisfactory performance every day and every year. The justification of the States and States rights lie mainly in two factors.

1. The existence and multiplicity of State governments prevents the accumulation of a monopoly of governmental power in one place.

2. States are able to serve the legitimate needs of the people for most domestic services in the long run better and at a lower cost than a central government.

To the degree to which the States fail to perform their duties satisfactorily, they forfeit States rights.

We all know that during our living memory a major change has occurred in our Federal system, that the tremendous growth in size and importance of the Federal Government has somewhat eclipsed the historic role of the States. This did not come about by a change in the Constitution. The 10th amendment still stands and declares that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." But it has lost most of its effectiveness by the broad interpretations of the commerce and welfare clauses of the Constitution adopted in the past two decades. We may be reminded of John Randolph's famous statement, "You may cover whole skins of parchment with limitations, but power alone can limit power."

The real force in the march of power to Washington has been the expansion of grants-in-aid to the States for a multitude of their activities from a paltry $3 million at the turn of the 20th century to $3 billion in the current year. Grants-in-aid have enabled the Federal Government to buy authority and control in any field of activity is wished.

I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to Federal grants-in-aid as such. They have done much good, accomplished many worthwhile purposes. There is a legitimate place in our Federal system for stimulation of State functions and for assistance by the National Government. Nor do I believe that irreparable harm has resulted so far from

the transfer of decision-making power. But I wonder whether the States can go on taking more and more Federal money and expect to retain control of their own activities. It is naive to expect that more than a mere appearance of autonomy can be preserved by a body which subsists increasingly on subsidies from a central government.

The expansion of the grants-in-aid system and of Federal authority is often attributed to a failure of the States to provide by their own initiative and under their own powers the services and facilities which the people demanded. The charge is not without substance. The States have not always adequately exercised the powers they have. More than once the Federal Government stepped in because the States had failed to act under their own initiative.

Sometimes it is asserted that the States are financially unable to raise the necessary funds at home. That claim is patently without substance. All the income and wealth which can be taxed by the Federal Government is located within the 48 States and subject to their taxing powers. Grants-in-aid come either from taxes which the Federal Government collects from the citizens of the States and redistributed—less a brokerage fee and with strings attached—or from Federal deficit financing which is paid for by inflation.

Until the early part of the 20th century, State governments were largely lawmaking and law-enforcing agencies. The idea of the service state was barely known. Few of the hundreds of services which the States now perform were then in existence. States took little or no responsibility in the building or maintenance of roads, they did not participate in public assistance nor other public welfare services; activities for the conservation and development of natural resources—of fish and game, forests, water, agriculture—were at best nominal; industrial safety, industrial insurance, pollution control, and many other functions were unheard of. States generally maintained insane asylums that were a far cry from the mental treatment centers they operate today; they ran State prisons and a few small normal schools and colleges; they contributed little to the support of common schools. Regulatory activities in the professional and utility fields were rudimentary. Technical service and advice to local areas was nonexistent.

The need and demand for a multitude of public services skyrocketed in the first half of the 20th century, largely because of problems created by industrialization, urbanization, the greater mobility of our population, more rapid communications, and in general the progress in technology. The eradication of many once dreaded diseases with the help of public-health services lengthened the human life span by 20 years, which in turn created problems of support and care. The vast increase in productivity and higher earnings led to standards of living that were beyond the wildest hopes half a century ago. The income of the average American family reached a level of $6,002 in 1953 and is going up further. The family car, television set, electric range and refrigerator, washing machine, and hundreds of other conveniences accustomed the American people to a form of living no nation on earth had ever known.

The change in income and in the cultural and economic pattern has had its effect on our attitude. We tend increasingly to look to government for the solution to our problems. As levels of personal consumption rise to new heights, demands for expanded public services of higher standards multiply. We now expect that society not only protect us against the adversities of life but also indemnify us from misfortune, that it increasingly relieve family groups of part of the responsibility for their dependent members, for the young, the old, and the afflicted.

What has been the response of State government to the challenge of the 20th century?

Let me give you a few data on the changes that occurred between 1902—the year of the census of governments closest to 1900—and 1954.

The population of the United States doubled.

Prices tripled.

If State governments had maintained their services at the same level they would now be spending a little over six times as much as they did in 1902. Actually State governments spent in 1954 for the support of their many and diverse services just 99 times as much as they did in 1902. They were helped in 1954 through Federal grants-in-aid to the extent of 14 percent; in other words, $6 out of every $7 the States spent came from their own sources. Not counting Federal funds, State expenditures multiplied 86 times between 1902 and 1954; that is 14 times faster than the rise in population and prices.

During that period the national income multiplied 20 times. But State services—measured by expenditures—grew 4 times faster than the national income. In 1900 there was 1 State governmental employee (not including school employees) for every 950 persons in the population; by 1955 there was 1 for every 195 persons.

In no comparable time in history has any government expanded at such a rate nor adjusted its activities as rapidly to changing economic and social conditions. State government admirably responded to human needs and readily accepted the many novel duties of the new day. It was restrained only by a reluctance of the people to increase their tax burden as a faster rate.

State activities did not grow at an even pace. They rose much faster in the first 30 years of the 20th century than they did subsequently. Between 1902 and 1932 State expenditures—not including those from Federal funds—multiplied 9 times in dollars of constant value; since 1932 they multiplied 3 times. Between 1902 and 1932 State expenditures grew 4 times as fast as the national income; between 1932 and 1954 State expenditures barely matched the growth rate of the national income.

Depression and war had something to do with that. For 15 years now war and the recurring threat of war have forced the Nation to give precedence to the demands of defense, to devote a greater share of its products to military purposes, and to accord a lower priority to the domestic consumption of goods and services, both public and private.

Federal taxation has been a major influence in shaping State fiscal policies. Between 1902 and 1932 the Federal Government claimed between 3 percent and 5 percent of the national income—(except during World War 1). During the middle 30's the Federal tax take started rising; it reached 10 percent of the national income by 1941 and has been running between 20 percent and 25 percent ever since 1944. This heavy load pushed the total tax burden to the limit which the American people were willing to bear in peacetime or which the economy was able to sustain in the long run without losing its capacity for expansion. It made it economically and politically impossible for State and local governments to increase their share of the national income. The States' share of the national income dropped during the war, and has only in recent years regained its prewar position; the local government share is far below its earlier levels. In 1932 State and local taxes claimed 12.4 percent of the national income; in 1954 they took only 7.3 percent.

Progress of the States has been uneven. Some activities have advanced faster than others. Some States have acted as pace setters, others are lagging behind. Some States have strained their fiscal resources and others displayed only modest efforts. It is undeniable that in certain respects the States have not lived up to their responsibilities, that some of them have been slow to recognize the urgency of needs, and have not provided the services or facilities which their citizens expected.

Let me review briefly a few of the accomplishments and shortcomings in education and highways, the two largest areas of State activity which together account for about half of all State general expenditures and half of all State employees.

Probably the most important service rendered by the States—and the most costly one—is in the field of education. Until 1900 States discharged their responsibility for common schools largely by creating local school districts or other local units with taxing powers and by modest subsidies. Between 1902 and 1954 State contributions to public schools rose from $45 million to $3 billion, local contributions from $200 million to $5 billion. Between 1900 and 1954 the number of school-age children (5–17) rose 67 percent, daily attendance in public schools 150 percent; we are now spending 6 times as much in dollars of constant value per pupil. A greater percentage of our youth is attending school than ever before in history or in any other country; the educational opportunities available to our boys and girls are on a scale unknown elsewhere in the world.

We are painfully aware of critical shortages of teachers and of classrooms all over the Nation, caused partly by a lack of funds. In some areas conditions are deplorable and call for drastic action. Many States are catching up but others leave much to be desired. It is clear that the Nation cannot look on indefinitely while part of its youth is attending school under conditions which most Americans would not regard as acceptable.

States have maintained colleges for a long time. But only in recent years have they been called upon to shoulder the major burden for higher education in the United States.. States' contributions to higher education rose from $13 million in 1902 to over a billion in 1954. Around the turn of the century about 1 youth in 25 attended college; this ratio still prevails in Great Britain and other European countries. At the present time about 1 American youth out of 3 enters college. We have about one-fifteenth of the world's population; but enrollment in our institutions of higher learning almost equals college enrollment in the rest of the world. In a few years our colleges will face the tidal wave that is now moving through our elementary schools. It is well that we lay plans in sufficient time to meet the problem, lest the Federal Government be asked to enter this field with a major program.

There were virtually no State highways in the United States at the turn of the 20th century. Since then, the States have constructed by far the greatest highway system in the world, 600,000 miles of State highways besides 2½ million miles of local roads or streets. In each of the past 5 years State highway departments have built over 50,000 miles of roads. In 1946 State governments spent $1 billion on highways, in 1948 $2 billion, in 1954 more than $4 billion. State and local governments together spent in 1954 $6 billion on roads. They raised 90 percent of these funds and derived 10 percent from Federal aid.

In spite of this spectacular increase we must all agree that our roads are sorely inadequate. Thirty-six thousand people are killed, 1¼ million injured each year in motor-vehicle accidents, billions are lost in delays, nerves are wrecked in frustration, largely because of overcrowded, insufficient, obso-

lete roads. The truth is that States have not raised their revenues fast enough to catch up with the war-accumulated backlog and the skyrocketing traffic. The national administration has now proposed that for the next 10 years the Federal Government accept the major responsibility for financing a complete modernization of the 42,000-mile interstate highway system. This should enable the States to allot greater funds to the more than one-half million miles of other State roads. But they will have to increase their efforts at an even faster pace if they are to maintain a major role in the highway field.

These two examples, of schools and roads may suffice to demonstrate some of the reasons for the expansion in Federal activity. In areas of national concern, inadequate State action sooner or later leads to Federal intervention. The Federal Government may either take over certain functions or stimulate States into greater activity by grants-in-aid.

In the past 2 decades close to 50 programs of Federal aid were enacted, extending over a wide variety of fields. They have helped establish numerous useful activities and elevated standards in many vital services. In many respects they have been a healthy and beneficial influence. There is nothing inherently wrong with Federal grants—as long as they are taken in small doses. The trouble is that getting money the easy way is as habit forming as taking narcotics. It seems impossible to keep the amounts under control. The recipent, once he has had a taste, needs and demands increasingly stronger doses to produce a continued pleasant effect. They sap his strength to sustain himself by his own powers and rob him of his resistence till he becomes an addict, dependent upon ever-greater doses.

Public officials at State and local levels, aiming to please the various interest groups, try to give them the maximum in the desired services and facilities. They are restrained by the painful necessity of presenting their constituents with a bill. State and local services carry a price tag because State and local budgets generally must be balanced. The new school building, the new road, higher welfare checks may mean another percent on the sales tax, add another cent to the gas tax, an extra 5 mills on the property tax or lower exemptions on the income tax.

If the people have the alternative between paying higher taxes and foregoing a service they may often vote for the latter. Public officials at the local levels faced with a decision cannot easily evade political responsibility for it. The mayor, county commissioner, school board chairman, or tax assessor are clearly identified and must answer to their neighbors for higher taxes. It is an understandable human tendency to try dodging this unpleasant duty and to seek another way out. At the State level personal responsibility for tax boosts is somewhat diluted but still uncomfortably conspicuous.

At the Federal level there is no identifiable connection between the advocacy of higher appropriations and the responsibility for raising taxes. The proponents of Federal expenditures for some desirable and beneficial purposes are under no pains to stand up and be counted for higher tax rates. The names of the acts of Congress establishing major grant-in-aid programs are generally well-known: the Morrill Act, the Hill-Burton Act, the Clarke-McNary Act, the Bankhead-Jones and Smith-Lever Acts, the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, etc. But whoever heard of a tax bill named after those or any other Congressmen?

It is understandable that Representatives are eager to claim credit for the "manna from heaven" they secured for their constituencies. Their record will popularly be judged by the amount of bacon they brought home in the form of Federal money. Why? Because in most people's minds Federal money comes for free.

They do have a point. In the past 5 years Federal aid to the States totaled $13.8 billion, the budget deficit $17.6 billion. So, it seems that nobody had to pay for these benefits. That charm is hard to beat. Who wants to shoot Santa Claus? Only 3 out of the past 25 Federal budgets were balanced; meanwhile we piled up a national debt of $280 billion. Only now is there a chance that next year the Federal budget may be balanced—and will stay balanced.

You understand how hard it is for politicians to resist the temptation of handing out benefits—if they don't have to accept personal responsibility for higher taxes. Almost 100 years ago, President James Buchanan, in vetoing a bill making Federal grants-in-aid to the States, said: "Should the time ever arrive when the State governments shall look to the Federal Treasury for the means of supporting themselves and maintaining their systems of education and internal policy, the character of both governments will be greatly deteriorated." Two thousand years prior, Octavius Augustus took a more cynical—or as some would say realistic view, "I was strongly inclined to abolish forever the custom of distributing grain to the people at public expenses. * * * But I did not carry out my purpose, feeling sure that the practice would one day be renewed by someone ambitious of public favor."

It is essential for the maintenance of political responsibility that the level of government that decides on expenditure policies should also be responsible, as much as possible, for the raising of the necessary funds. The pleasure of spending public moneys should be tied to the pain of raising them.

The system of evading responsibility and seemingly getting something for nothing naturally whets the appetite of ambitious politicians for glory and of special interest groups for more of the easy money. Eventually, the system of depending increasingly on central government support must lead to central government domination. The only way out is, to deal with the American people honestly and squarely in presenting to them the bill for whatever services they wish. I believe that our citizens are able and competent to judge between the essential and the gingerbread, that they are willing and ready to pay for the cost of good roads, good schools, good care for the dependent and afflicted unable to care for themselves. I think that the people are way ahead of the politicians who think that they have to wrap it up nicely and hide the cost.

There are signs that the days of molly-coddling are coming to an end. A few months ago, a national magazine said in an editorial: "The politician of the cynical folklore decries inflation while favoring an easy money policy; he wants good roads, free colleges, free seeds and low taxes; he wants a United States Army second to none and deplores the draft; he wants high wages, rich farmers, and low prices. He favors States' rights and a strong Federal Government." The editorial's title was "Getting the Pussyfoot Out of Politics." That caption describes aptly what we need: statesmanship and courage.

I can see no reason why we should not raise at State and local levels the funds necessary to support the essential services that must be performed. There is no magic in the Federal Treasury beyond its ability to run up debts of astronomic proportions. In 1932 the gross Federal debt equalled 20 percent of the national income; State and local indebtedness was of the same magnitude. By 1954 the gross Federal debt had grown to 98 percent of the national income while State and local debt had shrunk to 12½ percent. Interest on the debt alone absorbs 10 percent of the Federal budget; interest on State debts amounts to only 1 percent of all State expenditures, interest on local debts 3 percent of local expenditures. Twenty years ago, interest payments took about four times as large a slice of State and local expenditures. Another significant sidelight on State and local fiscal ability: In the past 5 years State and local governments increased their investments in Federal securities by more than all other investors combined. They seem to be in a better position to taken on responsibilities than the debt-ridden Federal Government.

The crux of the Federal-State problem lies in the financial field. What we have to do at State and local levels is face up to the facts and quit looking to Washington for ever greater subsidies. A reduction in the Federal tax burden is the best avenue to enable State and local governments to get on their own feet. We had a major Federal tax cut last year, may possibly get another one next year. The keynote in governors' messages to the 42 State legislatures which met in January of this year was extension of services and acceptance of the fiscal responsibility for them. Legislative action so far indicates that the year 1955 may see more and heavier State tax boosts enacted than any year in recent history.

There has been a significant growth of social consciousness among the States. Serious efforts are being made in rich and poor States alike to rescue those in need and prevent distress, to create better opportunities for all their residents to grow up, work and live in decent conditions which are worthy of the promise of the American standard of life. Improvements can of necessity come only by degree. There is a limit to the additional tax burden our citizens can assume at a time when we devote—by no choice of our own—close to one-fifth of our earnings to the demands of national security. This imposes inevitable restraints. Those of us accustomed to the standards of the more advanced and economically more fortunate States must remember that part of the concept of liberty is tolerance of diversity among our sister States.

There are other fields beside the financial in which many States have failed to live up to expectations. Some of these shortcomings seriously affect the ability of States to exercise their duties in our Federal system. The most important ones among them seem to be these:

1. The structural organization of many State governments has become obsolete; we have reached a point where the ability of State government to work effectively and to discharge its duties efficiently is severely handicapped. Little Hoover commissions in more than 30 States prepared recommendations for organizational improvements. They stressed executive management, unity of command, limited span of control, a strong and comprehensive budget system, single-head departments, centralized auxiliary services. The legislative acceptance of these proposals has been discouraging. Actual accomplishments in most States have been moderate or negligible. There is an unfortunate lack of understanding of the compelling reasons and the urgency for integration of the State administrative structure.

2. State government has been conspicuously unable to compete with the Federal government or with private industry for administrative talent. Obviously, no Government can be better than the quality and competence of its employees. Fewer than half the States have a statewide merit system; in the majority of States, employees outside of certain Federal-aid departments are subject to the vagaries of elections every few years. There has been considerable improvement in the professionalization and the salary levels in certain specialized areas, in the medical fields, in engineering, in educa-

tion; this is not equally true in the field of general administration.

3. Legislative reapportionment is essential if State governments are to be representative of all their residents. For many years urban areas have complained that they are being discriminated against in the allocation of legislative seats. Unable to get adequate hearing or consideration of their problems from their State legislature, cities have been tending to appeal to the National Government for assistance in their legitimate needs. This lack of balance could be taken care of at the State level by cooperation and greater understanding of urban problems.

4. Over 100,000 governments exist and operate in the United States, more than half of them school districts. Many were carved out under an economic and settlement pattern that passed decades ago and do not have sufficient resources to provide their residents with adequate services at reasonable cost. The crazy-quilt pattern of coexisting, overlapping governmental units in some of our metropolitan areas is beyond belief. Consolidated government of those areas may be the cure for suburbanitis and other ills afflicting our cities. County government, that dark continent in our governmental structure needs a thorough overhaul. The pioneer work of the National Municipal League in the fields of county and city government ought to receive greater appreciation and recognition by State legislatures. True home rule and local responsibility cannot become a reality unless the States create or facilitate the creation of units of local government which are large enough in terms of area, population, and economic resources to stand on their own feet, finance their own services and run their own affairs.

5. In most States the administration of the property tax, the mainstay of local finance, is scandalous. The inequity and unrealistic level of assessments make a mockery of constitutional and statutory provisions for uniformity and assessment standards. The abuse of the property tax cuts the taxing and bonding powers of local governments to a fraction of their entitlement, it prevents them from rendering essential services and makes them more dependent upon State aid. The States in turn then rely on the Federal Treasury for relief. Few actions can contribute more toward restoring the vitality of local government than an honest and fair reassessment program which—as has amply been proven—must be directed from the State level.

6. State government has failed to sell itself to the public. Most people are far better informed about the National Government or about their local government and officials than about the manifold activities and vital services of State government. Newspapers and magazines give much less coverage to State government news particularly. In this they reflect the general lack of interest which is due in part to our own failure to tell about the investment in State government and the dividends in the form of services. The Federal Government is in the news all the time because the worldwide problems of the cold war have become our first item of interest. Also, it would be difficult not to be interested in an enterprise that takes about one-quarter out of every dollar we earn. Local government, our cities, school districts, etc., and their officials are physically close, affect us more directly in our everyday life. State government falls somewhat in between—it is in the middle—and somehow seems to fall between the two stools. State government will have to take the initiative, in finding media to lay its case before the public.

The points I have made may sound like a big bill. They are and they need to be because the States are facing an unprecedented task in the years ahead. In the next 10 years the population of the United States will grow by 25 million, the greatest increase in any 10-year period in our history. In 1954 58 percent of our population was in the most productive age brackets, 20 to 64 years. But less than one-third of the 25 million increase we expect will be in that group; more than 17 million will be under 20 or over 64. You can easily see what that will mean in terms of the public-service burden—in schools, hospitals, welfare institutions, and care for the young, homes, and support of the aged. and let's not forget that we are starting out with a multi-billion dollar backlog in facilities and with service standards that need to be raised to higher levels.

Under our traditional division of functions most of these responsibilities are in the realm of the States and communities. Will they be able to meet them? Or should we gradually relieve them of part of their duties? A man whose duties are being eased is usually the one who is being readied for retirement. A man's stature and position are measured by the extent of his responsibilities not by his rights. When we appraise the office of the President of the United States we talk about the weight of its responsibilities not about its rights. The significant trend of the past 25 years has not been that the Federal Government invaded States' rights but that it assumed part of the States' duties. That may have been the fault of the States as much as that of the Federal Government. I am convinced that most of what the Federal Government did for the States was for the good. But good government is no substitute for self-government.

Almost half a century ago Elihu Root said "If the powers of the States are to be preserved, and their authority is to be continued, the States must exercise their powers. The only way to maintain the powers of government is to govern." The measure of a man is whether he stands up and grows under greater responsibilities or whether he is trying to shunt them off. This holds equally true of a nation or a State. We cannot strengthen the States by lessening their responsibilities. The degree to which States will get ready and meet their greater responsibilities will determine their future position in our Federal system. If they fail, no claim or definition of historic States' rights will have any meaning.

For some years now by a process of constant attrition of constitutional safeguards we have been lowering the barriers against a monopoly of governmental power. Two years ago the eminent political scientist Leonard White, of the University of Chicago, wrote: "I do predict * * * that if present trends continue for another quarter century the States may be left hollow shells, operating primarily as the field districts of Federal departments and dependent upon the Federal Treasury for their support. This result would be bad for the Federal Government and would hold grave consequences for the kind of self-governing, local democracy that has been an essential part of our life."

A few weeks ago President Eisenhower said that the concepts of our forefathers were conceived at a time when none could have anticipated the changes in the social and economic conditions that mass production and modern incidents have created. But in adapting to these changes, he added, we should never let down those free Americans by adjusting the concepts out of existence.

The idea for which our forefathers bled and which they expressed in the Constitution was not the guarantee of permanence or specific rights to the States but "to promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity."

The deepest commitment of this Nation is to the dignity of the person. The only inalienable rights are those of the individual and not of any government. The genius of the Founding Fathers bequeathed to us a system which by a broad dispersal of power aimed to assure the freedom of man against any possible tyranny of government. This system has values beyond the accomplishments of certain everyday conveniences. It is our sacred duty to transmit to our children their rightful heritage and not to squander it for temporary advantages. I trust that our political and civic leaders will show the courage and devotion to preserve for future generations their birthright to the institutions of free government. I am convinced that in this the American people will support them.

And So Is Mr. Howrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the August 1, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine:

AND SO IS MR. HOWREY

Edward F. Howrey, the Eisenhower-appointed Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission—created by Congress in 1914 to protect the public against unfair trade practices and monopolies—was for many years a lawyer representing big business clients before the FTC. One of these clients was the Firestone Rubber Co. When he assumed the chairmanship in 1953, Mr. Howrey promised to keep out of a price discrimination suit then being brought by the FTC against his old employer, Firestone, and a number of other rubber firms.

The Government won its case in district court. But on appeal, the circuit court reversed the decision. FTC lawyers thereupon requested the Solicitor General to ask the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, which would, in effect, have upheld the Government. Mr. Howrey, adhering publicly to his resolution to stay away from this particular case, did not vote with the other Commissioners on the action. Ultimately, the Solictor General decided not to go to the Supreme Court. That all happened in 1953. Now it has been revealed that Mr. Howrey paid a visit to the Solicitor General for a quiet chat before the Solicitor decided not to ask the Supreme Court for certiorari.

This news came out under questioning before a House Small Business Subcommittee, headed by Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, Tennessee. The committee has begun an investigation of regulatory commission which is disclosing a pattern of White House control over these presumably independent agencies, stemming from the first Hoover Commission recommendations, accepted by President Truman. The Hoover reorganization plan gave the Chief Executive power to name the chairmen of the several commissions and empowered the chairmen, in turn, to appoint their staffs and exercise direct control over them. Heretofore, the chairmen—who held that post in rotation—had had no more power than their colleagues. Thereafter the 4 other members of the 5-man commissions tended to become superfluous personnel. Now commission decisions could be made between the White House and the White House-appointed chairman—in the above instance, Mr. Howrey. The budget too is now ma-

nipulated for control. Eisenhower's first budget director, Joseph Dodge—a Detroit banker—cut the FTC budget request $1 million and specified that the reduction would be in anti-merger prosecutions and anti-monopoly investigations. Former commissioner Stephen J. Spingarn—theoretically in charge of budget matters—protested this imposition by the Executive Department. But Chairman Howrey was content with being told what to do.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the FTC "cannot in any proper sense be characterized as an arm or an eye of the executive. It * * * must be free from executive control." The Securities and Exchange Commission seemed somewhat less than free from executive control (read, Sherman Adams) in its delaying action in the Dixon-Yates affair. And now the Federal Trade Commission has been reorganized, and the philosophy of the Commission transformed. As Business Week reported cheerily in June 1954:

"FTC's job has in no way changed, but the way it intends to carry it out has changed. As compared to the way the Democrats did things, the Republicans are making it easier for the businessman who is up on the FTC carpet, harder for the FTC lawyers handling the cases. * * * Some observers say that, as a practical matter, FTC is setting standards of proof that will make the lawyers' job almost impossible."

One of the Great Underdeveloped Resources in the Orient: Millions of English-Speaking Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, most historians agree that the Battle of Quebec was one of the decisive battles in history, because it determined that English was to be the predominant language of the North American Continent. That meant that the basic culture and the basic ideas and philosophies of government in the United States and Canada were to be not French, but Anglo-Saxon—Anglo-Saxon law and jurisprudence, Anglo-Saxon ideas of individual freedom and democratic self-government, the concepts set forth in the King James Bible, the Magna Carta, Shakespeare, Pilgrim's Progress.

Too few Americans have realized the extent to which, before World War II, English had also become the dominant language in Asia, except in Japan, French Indochina, and the Dutch East Indies, in the sense that more people in more countries in Asia could read and write English than any other language. Most of their political ideas and aspirations had come from their study of English. This foundation is a strong asset the free world has in Asia, but which it has failed to appreciate and use with imagination.

This fact was pointed out strikingly by Mr. Ernest Lindley in the following report in Newsweek on his visit to the Bandung Conference and 14 Asian countries:

In nearly all of free Asia, English is the second language, where it is not the first. It was the official language of the Bandung conference. It is the only language in which most Asian countries can communicate with each other. In many, including Indonesia, the study of English is now compulsory, beginning in junior high school. One specific result of this prevalence of English as the second language is that most free Asian students who go abroad to study—as thousands want to do—prefer English-speaking countries. Many of these young people will rise rapidly to positions of influence—in most Asian countries trained men and women are in very short supply. It would be short-sighted of us not to provide more opportunities for them to study in the United States.

I think every American will realize how valuable this second language factor is to the spread of American ideas and ideals. But just to emphasize its potential importance, let's imagine the situation were reversed. Think what a staggering blow it would be if the second language of free Asia were Russian.

As an illustration of the power of a language and the documents written in it to influence a people's development, look at India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon. One of the abiding residuals of several centuries of British rule is that their leaders have all been educated in English—it is the one thing they have in common. Most of their political and cultural ideas were imbibed from men, including the founders of America, who wrote in English and whose patterns of thought had been developed in that language medium.

It is no accident that the most successful elections in the newly independent countries of Asia have been those in the countries that learned their politics in England.

In contrast look at Japan. When she set out to modernize in the latter part of the 19th century, she sent a commission around the world to study the systems of government in various countries. It finally settled on the German system and the imperial Japanese Constitution was largely written in Germany. The Japanese adopted German, not English, as their foreign language and slavishly modeled their political system, their educational system, their military system, after the German imperial system. The results became apparent in the Japan that emerged a half-century later.

When China, after centuries of self-imposed isolation, was opened to outside influence, several foreign languages were introduced. For a while Russian predominated in Manchuria, French in southwest China, German in Shantung, English in the Yangtze Valley. But English gradually won out, due largely to the influence of two men: a cabin boy named Charley Soong, who was converted and educated in Christian schools in the United States and then founded a firm in China to publish the Bible and school textbooks in English; and Sun Yat-sen, who had a chance to study in mission schools in Hongkong and Hawaii.

Thirty years ago I found that Chinese schoolchildren began the study of English, not in high school, but in the fourth and fifth grades. I was surprised how many Chinese children knew as many facts about Washington and Lincoln as do our own youth. They studied our great heroes, memorized their writings, absorbed their ideas.

Almost the first thing the Communists did with Chinese schools was to abolish English and decree Russian as the second language. They understood better than we the power of a language to influence thinking and guide the direction a people takes in its political and economic development.

The Communists know, and we should never forget, that the West has in China a deep and abiding asset of western ideas and values which it will take the Communists decades to eradicate. We must not discount this asset in China and the continued opposition to Communist tyranny it will provide.

Even more urgent, we must not fail to appreciate and take advantage of the same priceless asset in the countries of Asia which are still free—and which do not need to be lost to the free world if we are alert and act intelligently. We should expand and improve our exchange programs for students and teachers; encourage private foundations and institutions to grant scholarships in the United States, Hawaii, the Philippines, to outstanding Asian students; and treat them, while in the United States, in a manner likely to enhance the ties of mutual respect, friendship, and cordiality between them and ourselves so they become ambassadors of good will—to us when here, and to their own people on their return.

Progress in Israel-Jordan Talks Egyptian, Syrian Attacks Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following news item which appeared in the July 29, 1955, issue of the Israel Digest is deserving of our attention:

PROGRESS IN ISRAEL-JORDAN TALKS EGYPTIAN, SYRIAN ATTACKS CONTINUE

JERUSALEM.—Representatives of Israel and Jordan this week met under the chairmanship of Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, to discuss the extension of the local commanders' agreement in the Jerusalem area along the entire Israel-Jordan demarcation line. A joint communique issued following the meeting announced that good progress had been made and that the discussions would continue next week.

The Jerusalem area commanders' agreement, concluded in April, provides for meetings and telephonic contact between local commanders and the use of only military personnel in the first line of defensive organization in the area. Since its conclusion, there has been a noticeable decrease in incidents in the area covered by the agreement.

Meanwhile, attacks upon Israel life and property by Egyptian and Syrian military personnel and infiltrators have continued during the past week.

On July 22, Syrians fired upon an Israel vessel sailing on Lake Kinneret.

On July 23, Syrians attacked an Israel border patrol near Tel Katzir in Galilee.

On July 23, hand grenades were thrown into houses in the Negev village of Patish by Egyptian infiltrators. Three persons were seriously injured. Twenty-three persons were wounded, and a young woman killed, in an attack on Patish on March 24.

On July 23 Egyptian infiltrators attacked an Israel patrol north of Ein Ha'Shlosha in the Negev.

On July 27 Syrians fired upon members of Gonen, in upper Galilee, as they were walking south of the village.

Peace With Prosperity, a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud that I stand here today as a member of the great Republican administration that has after better than 2½ years lived up to the pledge to give the people peace with prosperity.

We are so prone to forget that the peace we enjoy today did not just happen. It had to be worked for and it will require even harder work to maintain it.

We promised the people 3 years ago to wage peace first and then go to work on building a sound prosperity based on that peace. Today under a Republican administration we enjoy them both simultaneously—something no Democrat administration has ever been able to do.

After ending the fighting in Korea, we seized the initiative for peace with a new foreign policy based on firmness and strength.

We strengthened our collective security throughout the world with membership in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization — SEATO — achieving West German sovereignty and NATO membership; signing of the Austrian peace treaty calling for withdrawal of Soviet troops; we helped solve the Trieste, Suez base, and Iranian-oil problems; supported the defense pacts between Middle East countries; and entered into mutual-assistance agreements with Latin American countries and Panama.

In the last 2 years our Republican administration has built up our defenses at lower cost with greater effectiveness through increased emphasis on airpower and new atomic weapons. We have established an Air Force Academy.

President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace program has been launched. The atomic-energy law has been revised to promote sharing of atomic-energy data with private industry and 27 other friendly nations. The President has appointed a Secretary for Peace with Cabinet status established to plan world disarmament.

Our world trade relations have been improved through genuinely reciprocal agreements. The Trade Agreements Act has been extended and customs rules simplified.

Our Republican administration has accomplished the transition from war to a peace economy without sacrificing prosperity.

The confidence, foresight, and determination of President Eisenhower, and our Republican administration have lifted this Nation's economy to a record-breaking pinnacle of prosperity.

Never before in history have so many people been working, investing, building, and producing. Beginning in 1953, when the American people became certain that an era of good government was at hand, the Nation's progress steadily increased to the historic peak that has been reached in the year 1955.

The future holds greater promise. By taking speedy action in freeing the economy from the shackles of wartime controls, the Republican Party laid a firm, progressive base for the rapid and continuing expansion of the American economy.

Business, industry, and labor alike, despite the outcries of phony doom-predicting political economists, shed their fears of the future when the new administration revealed its realistic program for the good of all the people.

Factory wheels have been set spinning, industries expanding and new businesses booming by the partnership in prosperity created by vast and immediate cuts in Federal spending and waste, by across-the-board tax cuts totaling $7.4 billion and by the restoration of the people's faith in honest government.

The faith of the American people in our Republican administration is being demonstrated every day. Once unshackled the economy of America responded to the wise leadership that has been available in the Nation since 1953.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration is dedicated to keeping the peace and continuing the progress and prosperity, and I am sure a vast majority of the American people have full confidence in our ability to live up to this pledge.

Working Record of 1st Session of the 84th and 83d Congresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 84th Congress handled a much greater volume of work than the 1st session of the 83d Congress according to official statistics just compiled.

The House of Representatives in its recent session passed a total of 1,597 measures as compared to 1,048 in the comparable session of the 83d.

Committees of the House of the 84th Congress reported a total of 1,528 measures as compared to 1,019 in the 1st session of the 83d.

On the Senate side, the statistics show that in the first session of the current Congress 1,324 measures were passed as against only 848 in the first sesson of the previous Congress. Committees of the Senate reported 1,393 measures in the session just ended in contrast to 969 in the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

Also, the Senate in its recent session confirmed more than 40,000 nominations—both military and civilian—compared to more than 23,000 in the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

This tremendous volume of work which included many important bills both in the field of foreign affairs and domestic affairs, is a tribute to the Democratic Party in the Congress.

Included in my remarks a breakdown of the 1st session of the 84th Congress in comparison with the 1st session of the 83d Congress which was controlled by the Republican Party:

Working record, 1st sess., 84th and 83d Congs.

	84th Cong.		83d Cong.	
	House	Senate	House	Senate
Measures passed, total	1,597	1,324	1,048	848
Senate bills	361	576	172	342
House bills	966	566	596	320
Senate joint resolutions	16	21	15	22
House joint resolutions	24	19	26	21
Senate concurrent resolutions	18	24	20	25
House concurrent resolutions	25	22	15	14
Simple resolutions	187	96	204	107
Measures reported, total	1,528	1,393	1,019	909
Senate bills	215	608	120	406
House bills	1,099	[1] 557	682	333
Senate joint resolutions	7	28	8	29
House joint resolutions	33	15	26	21
Senate concurrent resolutions	9	29	13	25
House concurrent resolutions	17	21	12	14
Simple resolutions	148	135	158	141
Special reports	46	27	32	21
Conference reports	58	-------	43	-------

[1] Incomplete.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

This record includes rollcall votes and all quorum-call votes. For the purpose of identification I have included a brief description of each bill.

The purpose of this report is to provide my interested constituents with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

I would like to point out that I was present for every rollcall vote.

Voting and attendance record, Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD, *5th District of Maryland, 84th Cong., 1st sess.*

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1955		
1	Jan. 5	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 5	Election of the Speaker (Rayburn, 236; Martin, 198)	Rayburn.
3	Jan. 25	H. J. Res. 159: Authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting Formosa, etc. (Passed 410 to 3.)	Yes.
4	Jan. 27	H. R. 587: To provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veteran Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. (Passed 366 to 0.)	Yes.
5	Feb. 8	H. R. 3005: To Extend Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents' Assistance Act for 4 years. (Passed 394 to 4.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 16	H. R. 3828: To adjust legislative and judicial salaries; Congressmen to receive $22,500 plus $2,500 for expenses. (Passed 283 to 118.)	Yes.
7	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
8	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142: Motion to stop further debate on the question of a closed rule on H. R. 1. (Defeated 207 to 178.)	Yes.
9	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142: To permit 5 hours of debate and amendments from the floor on H. R. 1. (Defeated 193 to 191.)	No.
10	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142: Closed rule on H. R. 1 to prohibit amendments from the floor. (Passed 193 to 192.)	Yes.
11	Feb. 18	H. R. 1: To recommit to Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to amend to require the President to comply with recommendations of the Tariff Commission except when national security is involved. (Defeated 206 to 199.)	No.
12	Feb. 18	H. R. 1: Final passage to extend the authority of the President for 3 years to enter into trade agreements for reduction of tariffs. (Passed 295 to 110.)	Yes.
13	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
14	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
15	Feb. 25	H. R. 4295: To recommit to Committee on Ways and Means in order to delete provision calling for a $20 credit against individual income tax for each personal exemption in tax year 1955. (Defeated 210 to 205.)	No.
16	Feb. 25	H. R. 4592: Extending existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates and providing $20 credit against individual income taxes for each personal exemption. (Passed 242 to 175.)	Yes.
17	Mar. 1	H. R. 3828: An adoption of conference report setting judicial and legislative salaries: Congressmen to receive $22,500. (Passed 223 to 113.)	Yes.
18	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
19	Mar. 10	H. R. 4720: To increase the compensation of members of the Armed Forces. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Yes.
20	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
21	Mar. 18	H. R. 4903: Amendment to restore $4 million for the United Nations technical-assistance program which had been deleted by a point of order. (Passed 174 to 107.)	Yes.
22	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
23	Mar. 21	H. R. 4646: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing postal employees' salaries on an average of 7.5 percent. (Defeated 302 to 120.)	No.
24	Mar. 21	Quorum call (considered 7.5 percent inadequate)	Present.
25	Mar. 21	H. R. 4957: To suspend the rules and pass the bill directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for 1955–56. (Defeated 260 yeas to 152 nays, a ⅔ majority being necessary.)	Yes.
26	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 22	H. Res. 170: To disapprove of the disposal of some of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. (Defeated 283 to 132.) (Effect of my vote: Permits sale of plants to private companies.)	No.
28	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
29	Mar. 23	H. Res. 171: To disapprove of the disposal of some of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. (Defeated 276 to 137.) (Effect of my vote: Permits sale of plants to private companies.)	No.
30	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 30	H. R. 4295: To accept conference report extending corporate and excise taxes for 1 year and deleting the $20 income tax for each taxpayer and his dependents. (Passed 386 to 8.)	Yes.
34	Mar. 30	H. R. 5240: Amendment to restore a provision limiting to $1 per month the fee to educational institutions for reports on veterans. (Dfeated 226 to 156.)	No.
35	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
37	Apr. 20	H. R. 4644: Amendment to the postal pay raise which would increase the annual rate for certain classes of employees, raised the overall increase from 7.5 to 8.2 percent. (Passed 224 to 189.)	Yes.
38	Apr. 20	H. R. 4644: Motion to recommit to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. (Defeated 287 to 125.)	No.
39	Apr. 20	H. R. 4644: On final passage of the bill as amended to grant a postal pay raise of about 8.2 percent. (Passed 324 to 85.)	Yes.
40	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
41	Apr. 21	H. R. 4393: To provide for construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels; calls for a $1.3 billion, 4-year Navy shipbuilding program. (Passed 373 to 3.)	Yes.
42	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
46	May 5	H. R. 12: Amendment to remove peanuts as one of the basic commodities in the farm price-support program. (Defeated 215 to 193.)	No.
47	May 5	H. R. 12: To recommit to Committee on Agriculture. (Defeated 212 to 199.)	No.
48	May 5	H. R. 12: To restore the 90 percent of parity supports on 5 basic crops and fix the minimum level for support of dairy products at 80 percent of parity. Final passage. (Passed 206 to 201.)	Yes.
49	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 9	S. 1 and H. R. 4644: To recommit the conference report on the postal pay raise bills (8.8 percent increase) to the conference committee. (Defeated 275 to 118.)	No.
51	May 9	S. 1 and H. R. 4644: On final passage of conference report on postal pay raise bills (8.8 percent). (Passed 328 to 66.)	Yes.
52	May 9	H. Res. 223: To authorize consideration of the bill to permit statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. (Passed 322 to 66.)	Yes.
53	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 10	H. R. 2535: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. (Passed 218 to 170.)	Yes.
58	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
59	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
61	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
62	May 12	H. R. 6042 (Department of Defense appropriations): To strike out provisions requiring approval by congressional committee before the armed services may move any permanent facility. (Defeated 202 to 184.)	No.
63	May 12	H. R. 6042: Final passage of defense appropriations bill. (Passed 382 to 0.)	Yes.
64	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
68	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 23	S. 727: To increase the salaries of judges for the District of Columbia. (Passed 282 to 32.)	Yes.
70	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 25	H. Res. 224: To create a select committee to investigate the White County (Ind.) Bridge Commission. (Passed 205 to 166.)	Yes.
72	May 25	H. R. 2851: To make agricultural commodities owned by the CCC available to needy persons in areas of acute distress. (Passed 343 to 1.)	Yes.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
74	May 26	S. 727: To recommit to conference committee a bill which would raise salaries of District of Columbia judges to an amount greater than previously voted by the House. (Passed 170 to 165.)	No.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 26	H. R. 5881: To recommit to committee the bill which provided for Federal compensation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal reclamation projects in order to limit the scope of the bill to 17 Western States instead of all 48 States. (Defeated 229 to 62.)	No.
77	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
78	June 1	H. R. 3990: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate projects for conservation, development, utilization of the water resources of Alaska. Motion to recommit bill to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (Defeated 278 to 79.)	No.
79	June 7	S. 2061: To increase salaries in the postal service by an average of 8 percent and to provide for reclassification. (Passed 409 to 1.)	Yes.
80	June 8	H. R. 5923: To authorize an appropriation of $57,730,000 to complete the Inter-American Highway. (Passed 353 to 13.)	Yes.
81	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.

[1] Member, Board of Visitors, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; appointed by the Speaker.

Voting and attendance record, Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD, 5th District of Maryland, 84th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1955		
83	June 14	H. R. 1: On acceptance of conference report on the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. (Passed 347 to 54.)	Yes.
84	June 14	H. R. 6227: To provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies. (Passed 371 to 24.)	Yes.
85	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 15	H. Res. 210: To authorize an investigation of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board. (Defeated 214 to 178.)	Yes.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
88	June 20	S. 67: To increase salaries of civil-service employees by about 7.5 percent. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Yes.
89	June 20	H. Con. Res. 109: Authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference. (Passed 338 to 31.)	Yes.
90	June 20	H. R. 6295: To raise the per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses for Federal employees from $9 to $13. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Yes.
91	June 21	H. R. 4663: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, and to authorize an appropriation of $225 million therefor. (Passed 230 to 153.)	Yes.
92	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 22	H. R. 6040: To recommit to committee the customs simplification bill with instructions to strike out sec. 2, which would make export value the primary basis for assessing ad valorem duties. (Defeated 232 to 143.)	No.
94	June 23	H. Con. Res. 149: Expressing the sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism. (Passed 367 to 0.)	Yes.
95	June 27	H. R. 6992: To extend for 1 year the existing temporary ceiling on the public debt of $281 billion. (Passed 267 to 56.)	Yes.
96	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 27	H. R. 6829: To authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations. (Passed 316 to 2.)	Yes.
98	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 28	H. R. 3005: To recommit the conference report to committee. (Defeated 171 to 221.)	No.
100	June 28	H. R. 3005: To extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years and to extend for 2 years the Doctors-Dentists Draft Act. (Passed 388 to 5.)	Yes.
101	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
103	June 29	S. 727: To recommit the conference report on the bill which adjusts the salaries of the judges of the courts of the District of Columbia. (Defeated 157 to 227.)	No.
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
105	June 30	S. 2090: To authorize appropriations totaling $3,285,800,000 for carrying forward the mutual security program. (Passed 273 to 128.)	Yes.
106	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
109	July 6	H. R. 3210: To recommit the bill which would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. (Defeated 74 to 316.)	No.
110	July 7	S. 2090: To adopt conference report authorizing $3,285,800,000 for the mutual security program. (Passed 262 to 120.)	Yes.
111	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 11	H. R. 7224: Appropriating $2,638,741,750 for mutual security during the fiscal year 1956. (Passed 251 to 128.)	Yes.
113	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 13	H. R. 6766: Conference report making appropriations for the AEC, TVA, and certain agencies of the Departments of Interior and the Army. (Passed 315 to 92.)	Yes.
115	July 13	H. Res. 295: To provide for the consideration of H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. (Passed 376 to 24.)	Yes.
116	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
118	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
119	July 18	H. R. 7225: To amend the Social Security Act to extend coverage to certain disabled persons who are at least 50 years old, to women at 62 years of age, and to certain disabled children over 18 years old, and to certain occupational groups. (Passed 372 to 31.)	Yes.
120	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
121	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
123	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
124	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
125	July 20	H. R. 7214: To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective Mar. 1, 1956	Yes.
126	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
127	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
129	July 25	H. R. 7000: To agree to the conference report on the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. (Passed 315 to 78.)	Yes.
130	July 26	H. Res. 314: To provide for 3 hours' debate on H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill. (Passed 274 to 128.)	Yes.
131	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 27	H. R. 7474: To recommit this highway bill to committee and to substitute therefor the administration bond-financing proposal for highway construction. (Defeated 193 to 221.)	No.
133	July 27	H. R. 7474: Final passage on the highway construction bill increasing certain taxes. (Defeated 123 to 292.)	No.
134	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
135	July 28	H. Res. 317: To provide for 3 hours of general debate on H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. (Passed 272 to 135.)	Yes.
136	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
137	July 28	H. R. 6645: To recommit to committee the amendment to the Natural Gas Act. (Defeated 203 to 210.)	Yes.
138	July 28	H. R. 6645: The Harris bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to remove from control of the Federal Power Commission natural gas producers and gatherers. (Passed 209 to 203.)	No.
139	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 29	S. 2126: To adopt the Wolcott substitute for the Senate housing bill. (Passed 217 to 188.)	No.
141	July 29	S. 2126: Final passage with the Wolcott substitute inserted in the housing bill. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Yes.
142	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
143	Aug. 1	H. Res. 299: To grant to the Small Business Committee an additional $35,000 for operating expenses. (Passed 231 to 134.)	Yes.
144	Aug. 1	S. 2576: To strengthen the power of the District Commissioners in relation to the Capital Transit Co. and to authorize repeal of the franchise of the company. (Defeated 215 to 150, a ⅔ majority being required to suspend the rules.)	Yes.
145	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
147	Aug. 2	S. 2126: To adopt conference report on Housing Act of 1955. (Passed 187 to 168.)	Yes.

Arab Border Attacks Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following news item which appeared in the Israel Digest of July 22, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

ARAB BORDER ATTACKS CONTINUE

JERUSALEM.—The attacks upon the life and property of Israel citizens by Arab infiltrators and military personnel have continued during the past month.

The following is a partial list of incidents perpetrated by Egyptian, Jordanian, and Syrian soldiers and marauders during the past 4 weeks.

On June 21, an Israel patrol in Taibe was fired upon by Jordanians. One of the Israelis was seriously wounded and died on June 26.

On June 22, Syrians opened fire upon Israel vessels sailing on Lake Kinneret (Sea of Galilee).

On June 22 and 23, Jordanians fired upon Israel patrols near Naharayim.

On June 25, Jordanians directed machine-gun fire at Neve Yamin from the village of Kalkilya.

On June 28, Syrians opened fire upon Israel vessels sailing on Lake Kinneret.

On July 1, Israelis at an observation post near Mefalsim in the south discovered a group of armed Egyptians in Israel territory and chased them back across the Gaza Strip border.

On July 1, an Israel patrol found landmines laid in the road northeast of Kissufim in the south. Examination of the mines showed that they were of Egyptian make.

On July 2, Syrians fired upon a group of settlers from Gonen, in upper Galilee, attempting to extinguish a fire which had broken out in their fields.

On July 5, Egyptian soldiers penetrated Israel territory northeast of Kissufim but were chased back across the Gaza Strip border by an Israel patrol.

On July 8, Egyptian marauders penetrated into Israel territory northeast of Mefalsim

in the south. They were chased back across the border by an Israel patrol.

On July 9, Jordanians fired upon Israelis east of Sha'ar Ha'Golan in the Jordan Valley.

On July 11, Syrians fired upon settlers of Hagovrim in upper Galilee.

On July 11, Syrians fired upon an Israel jeep traveling from Pardes Hahuri to Hulata in the northeast part of the country.

On July 13, Egyptian soldiers penetrated into Israel territory northeast of Kissufim. An Israel patrol chased them back across the Gaza Strip border.

On July 14, Syrians fired upon an Israel vessel sailing on Lake Kinneret.

On July 14, an Israel patrol encountered Egyptian marauders south of Erez in the northern Negev and chased them back across the Gaza Strip border.

On July 16, an Israel patrol encountered Egyptian marauders southeast of Mefalsim. The gang escaped across the Gaza Strip border after one of their members had been wounded.

On July 19, Syrians fired upon a jeep from the settlement of Hagovrim as it was traveling toward Hulata.

On July 20, several Syrian posts opened heavy fire upon the settlement of Hagovrim. Members of the settlement and an Israel border patrol returned the fire. An hour later, the Syrians again attacked Hagovrim and the patrol's camp in Mishmar Ha'Yarden.

The "Mouse" Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, with the widespread interest in the recent disclosure of plans to send unmanned satellites into outer space, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dr. S. F. Singer, of the University of Maryland, published in Interavia Review, an authoritative aviation magazine. Dr. Singer's work is well known in scientific circles.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "MOUSE" PROJECT

(By Prof. S. F. Singer, University of Maryland)

(Associate professor of physics at the University of Maryland since 1953, the author has carried out extensive research into the origin of high-altitude radiation and the physical properties of the upper air layers. For this purpose he has used small experimental rockets for short-period measurements, but has also worked out plans for a miniature unmanned earth satellite for measurements over longer periods. His artificial moon, measuring only 30 centimeters in diameter, which bears the intriguing name "mouse" (an abbreviation of minimum orbital unmanned satellite, earth), is designed to obtain further information on ultraviolet and X-radiation from the sun. Professor Singer is a member of the United States Physics Society, Rocket Society and Geophysical Union, Britain's Royal Astronautical Society and Interplanetary Society, and the Washington Academy of Sciences. He also belongs to the Ionosphere Commission of the United States National Committee of the International Scientific Radio Union (U. R. S.) and from 1950 to 1953 was scientific liaison officer with the Office of Naval Research, United States Embassy, London.)

Space flight today finds itself at nearly the same point as aviation 50 years ago, but with two important differences. There was no science of aviation, no aerodynamics, when the first airships took wing; there exists today a completely worked out theory covering all the various aspects of space flight. The other important difference has to do with the tremendous rise within the last 50 years in the sciences of radio, electronics, instrumentation, and control.

Whereas airplanes had to be manned in order to fly, space flight will certainly start with vehicles which are flown and controlled by instruments.

There are, on the other hand, also important similarities; aviation was started by enthusiasts, by people without large means and support, with small motors and flimsy machines. If they had insisted on development of large aircraft engines before starting their experiments, aviation would never have come about because there existed no incentive for developing these engines. Similarly, for lack of direct motivation, and because of their great expense, large rocket motors will probably not be developed in the immediate future.

Instead, the approach to space flight will have to be made with available rocket motors and other developed components; these can then be put together into a multistep rocket vehicle. This appears to be the only method feasible at present for giving a small body the high velocities necessary for a satellite orbit or for escape. Even so, the limits set by present developments in large rocket motors allow us to place only extremely small payloads, of the order of 20 kilograms, at altitudes just barely beyond the effects of the atmosphere (at about 300 kilometers) where the atmospheric drag may be low enough to allow the vehicle to survive for some days or weeks. To place a satellite at a much higher altitude would decrease the present small payload even more and in order to send it into an escape trajectory out of the earth's gravitational field we would have to reduce the payload to a minute value.

Apparently we have reached a disappointing impasse; it seems very unlikely that more propulsion will be forthcoming soon which would raise the payload and altitude performance. On the other hand, what can be done with existing techniques seems disappointingly small and trifling unless we can demonstrate the usefulness of a 20-kilogram satellite orbiting the earth at about 300 kilometers. A demonstration of the worthwhileness of such a project would provide a motivation for its construction. For only by starting with a minimum satellite which is both feasible and worthwhile can we hope to advance into space flight.

Even with the present limitations of weight and altitude a properly instrumented satellite could provide us with a vast amount of important information about outer space and extraterrestrial radiations, particularly from the sun, and about the earth and its atmosphere. One can view such a satellite as an extension of present high altitude rockets which are being used to explore the upper atmosphere. During the past 8 years, over 200 of these rockets have been launched at the White Sands Proving Grounds in New Mexico, U. S. A., from ships at various positions in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, and even from balloons in the Arctic regions. They ranged from the huge V–2 down to very small rockets weighing only 100 kilograms. One small rocket which was launched from the nose of a V–2 at the end of its burning period reached the peak altitude of 400 kilometers above sea level, the highest ever attained by a man-made object.

A number of basic questions must now be answered: What is the purpose of the rocket or satellite observations? How are the observations performed? What results are obtained and how are they applied? Are they of practical importance?

The basic reason for rocket experiments comes about because the atmosphere, in spite of the fact that we can see throught it, is transparent only for the visible radiation (i. e. for electromagnetic radiation with a wave length of 7,700 to 4,000 Angström—Editor) and for certain radio waves. The atmosphere is not transparent, for example, to the ultraviolet radiations and X-radiation coming from the sun. It is also well known that the ionospheric layers in the upper atmosphere will not transmit radio waves but will bounce them back. All particle radiations (e. g. protons, atomic nuclei, etc.) coming from outer space are either completely stopped, or modified in character. Therefore, in order to study the radiations which are not transmitted through the atmosphere one has to go above it and carry out measurements at very high altitudes. Such studies have been done in a variety of ways and we know quite a bit by now about primary cosmic ray particles and about the emission of ultraviolet radiation from the sun. This latter knowledge is very important; it not only reveals much about the various mechanisms which operate on the sun's surface and in the sun's hot atmosphere, but these radiations also have a very profound influence on our own atmosphere. For example, they produce the ionospheric layers already referred to which are so important for radio communication. Although most of the heat energy which we receive from the sun arrives in the visible range of the spectrum, the ultraviolet is important because it produces gases such as ozone in the upper atmosphere which tend to trap this heat near the earth somewhat in the same fashion as a greenhouse. We suspect, therefore, that the ultraviolet emission from the sun may have considerable influence on our weather.

We know further that although the sun appears to be a stable type of star, it is actually quite variable when it comes to emitting ultraviolet and X-radiation. We believe that its output of ultraviolet radiation may change by factors of the order of 1,000 when the sun's atmosphere really becomes disturbed. Naturally, we would like to know more about these disturbing conditions. Here, however, appears the most important handicap of present-day rockets. It is true they can go to very high altitudes and therefore look at the sun directly and measure all of its radiations. However, they cannot stay up very much longer than perhaps 3 to 6 minutes. And one would like to observe the sun for a period of perhaps several weeks in order to learn something about these solar disturbances. It is for this reason that astrophysicists, particularly those interested in solar physics, have become very much concerned with the possibility of building a vehicle which will stay above the atmosphere for long periods of time.

From this discussion it appears that the requirements which a minimum instrumented satellite has to satisfy in order to be useful are very modest, merely to remain above the appreciable atmosphere, say 100 kilometers, for periods of days or even hours. The satellite is of course unmanned, but it is not even necessary to recover it physically in order to make it useful. All the information picked up by instruments in the satellite can be broadcast to ground receivers by radio telemetering techniques. The satellite would not even have to be visible; its position could be determined to good enough accuracy by radar techniques. It is clear also that the actual details of the orbit are of little consequence to the usefulness of this satellite. Even variations in altitude will not affect its essential value and it may therefore be allowed to depart

from a circular orbit into an elliptical one. This fact alone allows the removal of the most difficult control problems and makes it possible to talk about the project in a practical way.

Let us now consider what would be involved in building the smallest possible useful earth satellite. A proposal for such a satellite has been made recently by the author and has been christened the mouse (minimum orbital unmanned satellite, earth). It would consist of a spherical or cylindrical shell, about 30 centimeters in diameter, carrying a payload of about 20 kilograms of scientific equipment. In fact, we would instrument it with Geiger counters to measure the intensity of the cosmic radiation and with photon and X-ray counters to measure the intensities in the solar ultraviolet and X-ray spectrum. This satellite circling the earth once every 90 minutes at an altitude of 300 kilometers would keep us in touch with events on the sun and would allow us to link up these ordinarily inaccessible solar data with solar observations from the ground. This in turn would allow us to form a consistent theory of solar processes and perhaps make possible prediction of the solar effects which have such tremendous practical importance for radio communication and meteorology. It seems decidedly worthwhile therefore to tackle the difficult technical problems which will lead us to the final achievement of this research satellite.

The many problems connected with the Mouse satellite have now been investigated more closely in a theoretical manner. For example, it turns out that reasonable lifetimes of the order of days or weeks above the atmosphere are possible with only rudimentary control of the final angle of launching and with no necessity to control the final burnout velocity. The orientation of the satellite in space can be predetermined and controlled automatically by using the gyroscopic principle. By choosing the proper orbit, namely the one which goes across both poles of the earth, and by placing the satellite orbit in a plane perpendicular to the sun—earth line, the satellite can be made to view the sun at all times. This fact not only allows it to make continuous solar observations but, thanks to the development of the solar transitor battery, will enable it to obtain sufficient electric power for its radio transmissions.

Some of the more fascinating research applications of the satellite, in addition to the study of the all-important solar radiations referred to, will be investigations about the origin of the cosmic radiation, the nature and distribution of micrometeorites and cosmic dust, investigation of the causes of the polar aurora, studies of the properties of the outer fringes of the earth's atmosphere, and studies of the earth's albedo (sunlight reflected back into space by clouds) which may allow forecasts of long-term climatic changes. A small increase in the earth's albedo due to increased cloud coverage would lead to an appreciable lowering of the average temperature of the earth's surface. The Mouse satellite, by measuring the reflected sunlight on a continuous and worldwide basis, would allow us to make these economically important estimates. Another interesting experiment calls for the emission of sodium vapor from the satellite into the earth's upper atmosphere. Once emitted, the sodium would glow with its characteristic yellow light. Minute quantities suffice to lay down what amounts to a continuous sodium trail whose motion and dispersion can be observed from the earth.

There probably exist many other useful aspects of this minimum satellite, but the above examples may suffice. There appear to be no major obstacles at the present time to the launching of this minimum satellite, certainly not on the technical side. Even the cost picture is a very reasonable one, remembering that we are now spending of the order of $100,000 per minute for high altitude data in our most advanced types of upper atmosphere research rockets. A minimum satellite would provide many days of observations which could not be otherwise be made and could be built for less than the cost of a medium-sized modern bomber.

The arguments favoring such a satellite are so compelling that its establishment seems almost inevitable within the next 5 to 10 years, assuming that no other important activities develop. It is interesting to speculate whether the impetus of this first satellite will eventually lead to the development of larger rocket motors and other techniques which would be needed to produce larger and more ambitious satellites carrying television cameras and telescopes; satellites which are manned; and finally, space ships. I am willing to predict with confidence all of these developments during this century. We need only remember how utterly impossible and improbable supersonic flight and vertical takeoff appeared 50 years ago.

Louis M. Rabinowitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the story of America is best told not in statistics or generalities, but in the character and achievements of a leading citizen. I am very happy, indeed, to recount the story of one of my constituents because I believe that we can all learn from his example and be justly proud of the type of man who is a leader in our democratic system.

Louis M. Rabinowitz, businessman and philanthropist, is a truly fine American. He is a modest, retiring individual who has given his support to all creeds, and regardless of race or color. His donations are given with heart and mind, never with ostentation.

On one occasion when the Academy of Music in Brooklyn was in serious financial difficulty, Mr. Rabinowitz was one of the first to come forward to give needed aid to the Honorable James G. McDonald, the president of the Institute of Arts and Sciences. Mr. Rabinowitz not only gave money, but gave his home in order to get the help of others.

He has also encouraged scholars in their educational research activities by gifts to Yale, Columbia, and other institutions.

The Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn was the recipient of the famous 16 murals, Children of Many Nations, by Albert Cugat, because of Mr. Rabinowitz' generosity. These murals were autographed by Lord Halifax, the late Wendell L. Willkie, Senator Herbert H. Lehman, former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Gen. George C. Marshall, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Adm. Louis Denfeld, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Dr. Ralph Bunche, and many others.

In 1942 Mr. Rabinowitz tendered a dinner to the Right Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, archbishop of Brooklyn, where among others, the late Alfred E. Smith, the late Wendell L. Willkie, and Rabbi Jonah Wise paid tribute to His Excellency Bishop Molloy. At that time, he was presented with a painting of His Holiness Pope Piux XII.

Just this year Mr. Rabinowitz has added another achievement to his already ample list. By contributing $106,000 to Hunter College, of New York, Mr. Rabinowitz has made possible a coeducational graduate school of social work to meet the critieal need for trained field personnel. A 2-year, full-time program will be offered to students at less than half the tuition charged by other schools of social work in New York City.

Mr. Rabinowitz' record as a responsible and intelligent American deserves the commendation of all.

Commodity Credit Corporation

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, giving my full support to H. R. 7541, a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $10 billion to $12 billion.

In view of the adverse financial condition of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from executive branch application of the sliding-scale farm philosophy, the Congress has no alternative at this time but to increase its borrowing power if the Government is to fulfill its price support commitments to farmers in the year ahead. I believe, however, that it is imperative that we keep the record straight as to what the true reasons are why the sliding-scale administrators had to come to Congress for $2 billion additional borrowing authority.

The administration assertion, in the letter from Under Secretary of Agriculture Morse to the Speaker of the House requesting this legislation, that increased borrowing authority is required because of 90 percent price supports in 1953 and 1954 and limited sliding scale in 1955 is inaccurate, untrue, and the Department of Agriculture has already published all the facts that would lead one to believe that Morse knows his statement to be untrue, that is unless we are to believe that he signed the July 1, 1955 Report of the Crop Reporting Board without reading it or knowing what is in it. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Morse is a trained economist and statistician and cannot be said to be stupid. Therefore the only conclusion that can be reached is that he has purposely tried to mislead the Banking and Currency Committee and the Congress in making the statement that the $2 billion increase in Commodity Credit Corporation borrowing authority is needed because of 90 percent price supports in effect in the past.

The Department of Agriculture complains about the increased production of

feed crops. Secretary Benson, however, has had full authority to set price support levels at any level he wanted to on all the feed crops except corn. He has, in fact, exercised this authority and has flexed these prices downward drastically. The only crops he was prevented from flexing downward in 1953 and 1954 were wool, sugar, and the six basics—wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. Only these latter six, except tobacco, were on the limited sliding scale in 1955. The production of all these basic crops was drastically reduced from 1952 to 1955 by operation of acreage allotments and marketing quotas, contrary to the implication of Morse's letter to the Speaker. The other crops, the ones with the increased production of which Morse complains, have never had mandatory minimum price support levels set by law, nor have their producers been authorized to make use of marketing quotas as a means of keeping supply in line with demand. It was on these crops that Benson attempted to demonstrate the validity of his sliding scale theory; that reduced price supports rather than marketing quotas are the best way to reduce overproduction of farm commodities. The record shows clearly however that the Republican sliding scale theory of farm economics is fallacious. The increased production of feed grains from 1952 to 1955 demonstrates that lower price support levels do not prevent the production surpluses that Benson has shed so many crocodile tears over.

Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude my remarks by reading into the RECORD a chart which I have prepared based on official publications and reports from the United States Department of Agriculture:

Crops with 90 percent mandatory supports

Commodity	Support level				Estimated production		
	1952	Percent	1955	Percent	Unit of quantity	1952	1955
Wheat	$2.20	90	$2.06	82	Billion bushels	1.3	0.9
Corn	1.60	90	1.58	87	do	3.3	3.4
Cotton	.31	90	.31		Million bales	15.1	11
Tobacco		90		90	Billion pounds	2.3	2.1
Rice	5.04	90	4.66	85	Million bags	49	47
Peanuts	.12	90	.12		Billion pounds	1.4	1

Crops without mandatory minimum 90 percent supports

Commodity	Support level				Estimated production		
	1952	Percent	1955	Percent	Units of quantity	1952	1955
Milk		90		75	Billion pounds	98	107
Soybeans	$2.56	90	$2.04	70	Million bushels	292	404
Barley	1.22	80	.94	70	do	227	384
Oats	.78	80	.61	70	Billion bushels	1.3	1.5
Rye	1.42	80	1.18	70	Million bushels	15.9	27.2
Sorghum grain	2.38	80	1.78	70	do	83.3	(1)

[1] Up 96 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the figures which I have just read conclusively prove that the Eisenhower administration's theory that flexible price supports will reduce production is erroneous. The Democratic position has consistently been that marketing quotas are the most effective method of bringing about a proper balance between the supply and demand of agricultural products. These figures make it obvious that the Democratic position is 100 percent right.

In Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, high tribute to the work of the late Chief Judge Harold M. Stephens, of the United States court of appeals, and to Mr. Bernard G. Segal, of Philadelphia, chairman of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, is paid in this letter and attachments received by me. I commend them to the attention of our colleagues.

ARLINGTON, VA., *June 4, 1955.*

Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: The Nation suffered a great loss in the death of Chief Judge Harold M. Stephens, of the United States Court of Appeals, and his passing was sad news to those who have the privilege of working with him. I recently received a letter from him which reflected his excellent qualities.

Reference was properly made to the important work he did, among other great accomplishments as a judge and a leading citizen, toward improving public administration. He was most active in the efforts to have congressional and judicial salaries appraised and adjusted in keeping with the duties and responsibilities of office.

Great credit was also due to you for your own insistence that the studies of salary legislation be conducted so that the best thinking on the subject should be reflected in the decisions that were made.

As you are aware, it was my honor to have played a small part in the work of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, and it was indicative of the thoughtfulness of Judge Stephens and of Mr. Bernard G. Segal, the brilliant Philadelphia attorney, who headed the Commission, that they should have taken time to recognize that small contribution.

The encouragement of both Judge Stephens and Mr. Segal was indeed an inspiration to those of us who believe that private citizens, working only in the public interest like our legislators and the judiciary, can help to improve the processes of public administration.

With sincere good wishes, I am,

Yours truly,

HAROLD J. MILLER.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Now that the President has signed Public Law 9, providing more equitable salary scales for Members of the Congress and of the Federal judiciary, I wish to express appreciation to you for your efforts in gathering material on the subject, testifying at the public hearings conducted by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, and informing the American people on this important subject.

Having been an advisory member of the Commission I know at first hand that the information you presented was extremely helpful to the Commission. I refer particularly to the data you gathered during your interviews with Members of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD M. STEPHENS,
United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Now that the work of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries is completed and the President has signed Public Law 9, increasing the salaries of Members of the Congress and of the Federal judiciary, I want to extend to you on behalf of the Commission, and of myself as chairman, our appreciation for your cooperation in appearing and testifying at the public hearing conducted by the Commission.

Your testimony, particularly the data as to the cost of operation of their offices by various Members of the Congress, was especially valuable to the Commission in its deliberations and in the preparation of its report to the President, the Chief Justice, the Vice President as President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House. I am sure you must derive a great deal of personal satisfaction out of your contribution to the effort to correct, at least in part, the gross inequity which existed in the compensation being paid by our Government to its Federal judges and Members of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD G. SEGAL,
Chairman, Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

Report to My Constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, I feel it is my duty to make a report of my voting record to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. An analysis of this report will show that I cast my vote on every bill that was brought to a vote except one. On that day, I attended a function for the benefit of the Youth Opportunity Camp in Montgomery County.

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Date	Measure	Vote
Jan. 25	H. J. Res. 159: Authorizing the President to employ Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area. (Passed 410 to 3.)	Yea.
Jan. 27	H. R. 587: Provides that persons serving in the Armed Forces on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Act. (Passed 366 to 0.)	Yea.
Feb. 8	H. R. 3005: To amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending authority to induct certain individuals and to extend benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years. (Passed 384 to 4.)	Yea.
June 28	H. R. 3005: Conference report on above bill. Motion to recommit. (Failed 171 to 221.)	Yea.
June 28	H. R. 3005: Conference report, on passage. (Passed 389 to 5.)	Yea.
Feb. 16	H. R. 3828: To adjust salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress. (Passed 283 to 118.)	Yea.
Mar. 1	H. R. 3828: Conference report on above bill. (Passed 223 to 113.)	Yea.
Feb. 17	H. Res. 142: Providing for consideration of H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. On ordering previous question of closed rule. (Failed 178 to 207.)	Nay.
Feb. 17	H. Res. 142: Providing for consideration of H. R. 1. Amendment to previous question calling for open rule. (Failed 191 to 193.)	Yea.
Feb. 17	H. Res. 142: Providing for consideration of H. R. 1. On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 193 to 192.)	Nay.
Feb. 18	H. R. 1: To extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements, under sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions amending the bill to give Tariff Commission authority to limit imports causing serious injury to a domestic product, unless the President shall declare such limitation not in best interest of our national security. (Failed 199 to 206.)	Yea.
Feb. 18	H. R. 1: On passage of above bill. (Passed 205 to 110.)	Yea.
June 14	H. R. 1: Conference report on above bill. (Passed 347 to 54.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	H. R. 4259: To provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. On motion to recommit to delete income-tax provision. (Failed 205 to 210.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	H. R. 4259: On passage of above bill. (Passed 242 to 175.)	Nay.
Mar. 30	H. R. 4295: On conference report which provided 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax and excise-tax rates. (Passed 387 to 8.)	Yea.
Mar. 10	H. R. 4720: To provide incentives for members of uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Yea.
Mar. 18	H. R. 4903: Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. Amendment for technical assistance. (Passed 175 to 107.)	Yea.
Mar. 21	H. R. 4644: To increase rates of basic salary of post-office employees and to eliminate certain salary inequities. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Failed 120 to 302.)	Nay.
Apr. 20	H. R. 4644: Moss amendment to above bill to increase to 8.2 percent. (Passed 224 to 189.)	Nay.
Apr. 20	H. R. 4644: Motion to recommit above bill. (Failed 125 to 287.)	Yea.
Apr. 20	H. R. 4644: Passage of above bill. (Passed 324 to 85.)	Nay.
May 9	S. 1: To increase rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in Post Office Department. Motion to recommit with instructions to report bill same as H. R. 4644. (Failed 118 to 275.)	Yea.
May 9	S. 1: On adoption of conference report. (Passed 328 to 66.) Bill vetoed by President; Senate sustained veto	Nay.
June 7	S. 2061: To increase rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in Post Office Department and to eliminate certain salary inequities. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Passed 410 to 1.)	Yea.
Mar. 21	H. R. 4951: Directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for 1955-56 marketing year, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Failed 230 to 151.) Passed Mar. 24 on majority vote; no record vote.	Yea.
Mar. 22	H. Res. 170: To declare that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to Congress on Jan. 24, 1955. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed 132 to 283.)	Nay.
Mar. 22	H. Res. 171: To disapprove proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic rubber facilities as recommended by the RPFDC. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed 137 to 276.)	Yea.
Mar. 30	H. R. 5240: Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, etc., for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. On amendment providing no part of appropriation shall be used to pay more than $1 per month for reports on each eligible veteran enrolled in institution. (Defeated 154 to 227.)	Yea.
Apr. 21	H. R. 4393: To provide for construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes. (Passed 373 to 3.)	Yea.
May 5	H. R. 12: To amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide rigid price supports at 90 percent parity on basic agricultural commodities. On amendment to eliminate peanuts. (Failed 193 to 215.)	Yea.
May 5	H. R. 12: On motion to recommit above bill. (Failed 199 to 212.)	Yea.
May 5	H. R. 12: On passage of above bill. (Passed 206 to 201.)	Nay.
May 9	H. Res. 223: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 2535, to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States. (Closed rule without amendments.) (Passed 322 to 66.)	Nay.
May 10	H. R. 2535: To enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States. On motion to recommit. (Approved 218 to 170.)	Yea.
May 12	H. R. 6042: Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. On amendment to strike out sec. 639 re contract work by the Department of Defense. (Failed 184 to 202.)	Nay.
May 12	H. R. 6042: On passage of above bill. (Passed 384 to 0.)	Yea.
May 23	S. 727: To adjust salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court. (Passed 283 to 33.)	Yea.
May 26	S. 727: Conference report on above bill. On motion to recommit. (Approved 170 to 165.)	Nay.
June 29	S. 727: Conference report on above bill. On motion to recommit. (Failed 158 to 226.)	Nay.
May 25	H. Res. 244: Creating a select committee to investigate the White County Bridge Commission, Harmony, Ind. On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 205 to 166.)	Nay.
May 25	H. R. 2851: To make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress. (Passed 344 to 1.)	Yea.
May 26	H. R. 5881: To supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. On motion to recommit. (Failed 62 to 229.)	Absent.
June 1	H. R. 3990: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. On motion to recommit. (Failed 79 to 278.)	Nay.
June 8	H. R. 5923: To authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway. (Passed 353 to 18.)	Yea.
June 14	H. R. 6227: To provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes. (Passed 371 to 24.)	Yea.
June 15	H. Res. 210: Authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board. On agreeing to the resolution. (Failed 178 to 214.)	Nay.
June 20	S. 67: To increase the basic compensation of certain Federal employees. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Yea.
June 20	H. Con. Res. 109: Authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Passed 337 to 31.)	Yea.
June 20	H. R. 6295: To amend Travel Expense Act to provide an increase in per diem allowance for subsistence and travel. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Yea.
June 21	H. R. 4663: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws and authorized appropriation of $225 million. (Passed 230 to 153.)	Nay.
June 22	H. R. 6040: To amend administrative provisions of Tariff Act and repeal obsolete provisions of custom laws. On motion to recommit. (Failed 143 to 232.)	Nay.
June 23	H. Con. Res. 149: Expressing sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism. (Passed 367 to 0.)	Yea.
June 27	H. R. 6992: To extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in public debt limit. (Passed 267 to 56)	Yea.
June 27	H. R. 6829: To authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations. (Passed 316 to 2)	Yea.
June 30	S. 2090: To amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. (Passed 273 to 128)	Yea.
July 7	S. 2090: Conference report on above bill. (Passed 262 to 120)	Yea.
July 6	H. R. 3210: To authorize State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, under direction of Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan. On motion to recommit. (Failed 74 to 316.)	Nay.
July 11	H. R. 7224: To make appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. (Passed 251 to 123)	Yea.
July 13	H. R. 6766: Conference report on public works and civil functions appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. (Passed 316 to 92)	Yea.
July 13	H. Res. 295: Providing for consideration of H. R. 7089, to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 376 to 24.)	Yea.
July 18	H. R. 7225: To amend Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for disabled who have attained age of 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for disabled children. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Passed 372 to 31.)	Yea.
July 20	H. R. 7214: To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage to $1 an hour. (Passed 362 to 54.)	Yea.
July 20	H. R. 7000: To provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes. On adoption of conference report. (Passed 315 to 78.)	Yea.
July 26	H. Res. 314: Providing for consideration of H. R. 7474, to authorize appropriations for the Federal-State highway construction. On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 274 to 129.)	Yea.
July 27	H. R. 7474: To authorize appropriations for the Federal-State highway construction program by increasing certain taxes. On motion to recommit and substitute language on financing. (Failed 193 to 221.)	Yea.
July 27	H. R. 7474: On passage of above bill. (Failed 123 to 292.)	Nay.
July 28	H. Res. 317: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. On agreeing to the resolution. (Approved 273 to 135.)	Yea.

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 84th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Date	Measure	Vote
July 28	H. R. 6645: To amend the Natural Gas Act. On motion to recommit. (Failed 203 to 210.)	Nay.
July 28	H. R. 6645: On passage of above bill. (Passed 209 to 203.)	Yea.
July 29	S. 2126: To extend laws relating to housing, slums, urban communities, and public housing. Public housing not tied in with slum clearance or redevelopment. On amendment to remove public housing under these conditions. (Passed 217 to 188.)	Yea.
July 29	S. 2126: On passage of above bill. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Yea.
Aug. 2	S. 2126: On conference report which provided for 45,000 units of public housing not tied in with slum clearance or urban redevelopment, and other provisions. On adoption of report. (Passed 187 to 168.)	Nay.
Aug. 1	H. Res. 299: Resolution providing for $35,000 for further expenses for the Select Committee on Small Business. On passage. (Passed 231 to 134.)	Nay.
Aug. 1	S. 2576: To amend the joint resolution of Jan. 14, 1933, to give District of Columbia Commissioners power to settle the Capital Transit strike. On motion to suspend rules and pass; ⅔ vote required. (Failed 215 to 150.)	Yea.

Appraisal of the 1st Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 84th Congress is drawing to a close, and the time has come for an appraisal of the work done. There was much conjecture at the beginning of the session as to just how President Eisenhower and our Republican administration would fare with a Democrat-controlled Congress.

I suspect that when every Member has had his say there will be just about as many varied opinions registered as there are Members of this distinguished body, all colored by individual tastes, political affiliation, and peculiar interests.

As I see it, this 1st session of the 84th Democrat-controlled Congress left more undone than it accomplished except in the field of foreign affairs and national defense.

The following major legislative proposals of President Eisenhower were not enacted by the Democrat Congress:

First. Expanded highway program.

Second. Federal aid to school construction.

Third. Federal grants to needy school districts.

Fourth. Atomic peace ship. Authorized but not enacted.

Fifth. Customs simplification bill. Passed House, pending in Senate.

Sixth. Hawaiian statehood.

Seventh. Legislation strengthening internal security of United States.

Eighth. Amendments to Taft-Hartley law.

Ninth. Work-hours legislation.

Tenth. Aid to low-income farmers.

Eleventh. Strengthened Federal program of drought aid.

Twelfth. Constitutional amendment lowering voting age from 21 to 18.

Thirteenth. Comprehensive program of water resources.

Fourteenth. Immigration and refugee law amendments.

Fifteenth. Federal health reinsurance program.

The record of actual accomplishment except in the field of foreign affairs and national defense is disappointing particularly in domestic affairs. The box score of major legislation enacted is as follows:

First. Authorized President Eisenhower to use the Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Second. Extended to July 1, 1959, authority to draft men 18½ to 26.

Third. Extended to July 1, 1957 authority to draft doctors, dentists, and allied specialists.

Fourth. Extended provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act.

Fifth. Established a national program for Military Reserves.

Sixth. Provided rewards for information on illegal importation, manufacture or acquisition of nuclear material or atomic weapons.

Seventh. Extended to June 30, 1958, President's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements, reduce tariffs 5 percent a year for 3 years.

Eighth. Authorized and appropriated $2.7 billion for program of economic and military aid to foreign countries under the Mutual Security Act.

Ninth. Increased pay for Federal classified workers, postal employees, Federal judges, district attorneys, and Members of Congress.

Tenth. Extended to April 1, 1956, existing excise tax schedule, and the 52 percent corporate income tax.

Eleventh. Increased minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956.

Twelfth. Authorized 3-year program to complete the Inter-American Highway.

Thirteenth. Approved sale of 25 synthetic rubber plants owned by the Government.

Fourteenth. Extended Reorganization Act of 1949 to June 1, 1957.

Fifteenth. Extended for 2 years the period for making emergency loans to farmers and stockmen.

Sixteenth. Repealed the penalty that withholds soil conservation payments from farmers who exceed planting allotments.

Seventeenth. Granted $63 million in Federal aid to airports.

Eighteenth. Authorized free polio shots for 33⅓ percent of unvaccinated children between the ages of 1 and 19, and for expectant mothers, the program to end February 15, 1956.

I realize that it is not fair to compare the record of a single session with that of an entire Congress but on the basis of what little was done during this 1st session of the 84th Congress all the stops will have to be pulled out during the next session if the 84th Congress is to come anywhere near matching the enviable record of the Republican controlled 83d Congress.

As a parting word I would just like to say that I am sure many of our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle will find while home in their constituencies that the President's program is favored by the majority of the people the country over, and they ought to firmly resolve to join with our side in getting the entire program enacted into law next session.

Waste on the Upper Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent letter to the Washington Post by the able historian and writer on public affairs, Mr. Irving Brant, which appeared on June 26, 1955, emphasizing the basic issues of waste involved in the upper Colorado River project.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASTE ON THE UPPER COLORADO

If the backers of the upper Colorado River project want to get it through the House of Representatives they had better do three things fast:

1. Take the Echo Park Dam out of it. (They intend to.)

2. Offer a public oath that this dam, invading the national park system, will not be put back into the project at a later date, as is now planned.

3. Bring the bill to a vote before enough people realize that the whole enterprise is a half-baked squandering of billions of dollars.

A few days ago, talking in congressional circles, with an arguer for the bill, I mentioned the fact that former Governor Miller, of Wyoming, said that the cost of irrigation, under this project would amount to nearly $3,000 per acre.

"You can't charge the whole cost to irrigation," was his reply. "It is also a public power project."

"And how," I asked, "can you charge the cost to public-power investment when the estimated cost of that power is 10 times as high as at Grand Coulee and higher than the cost of producing it in steam plants in the same area?"

Not from him, but from another person discussing the subject, came this objection: "Is there enough coal in the upper Colorado region to produce the electric power that will be needed in the future?"

The three States of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado contain one-sixth of all the known coal deposits in the world. That tri-State area contains 40 times as much energy, in its coal, as the entire reserves of oil and gas in the United States. It contains vast, barely touched deposits of potash and phosphates, which, with the coal and other minerals, furnish the raw materials for an industrial empire.

Did the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Power Commission take account of these energy resources and industrial potentials in planning the upper Colorado River project? Did the Senate consider them before it passed the bill? Not a word on the subject was spoken in debate. And if these factors had been considered in the bureau planning, the dams would not have been located where they are.

Hydroelectric and steam electric plants both need water. Both should be close to coal deposits, so that they can be integrated without heavy transportation and transmission costs. The Bureau of Reclamation thought of nothing but irrigation and hydroelectricity, and in regard to these it asks the taxpayers to spend billions for fantastically expensive results.

Congressmen talk about the waters of the Colorado flowing wastefully to the sea. Two lakes in Utah evaporate as much water annually as the entire States of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado are permitted to take from the Colorado River. The central Utah Basin has a rainfall of 40 million acre-feet per year, which is being wasted while the Bureau of Reclamation asks Congress to pump half a million acre-feet over the mountains at an overall cost of $2,900 per acre.

Even the proposed Glen Canyon Dam, near the Arizona line, is part of the folly. Wastefully located from a power standpoint, outside the coal belt, its vast storage capacity is to insure delivery to the lower States of 75 million acre-feet per decade guaranteed them by the 1920 interstate compact. And how many 10-year periods have there been when the unstored waters of the Colorado failed to deliver that much? Not one.

All of this information has been available both to the Bureau of Reclamation and to Congress. The energy resources of the tri-State area are fully described in the publications of the Bureau of Economics and Business Research of the University of Utah, written before the politicians took over from the scientists.

Truly, the backers of the upper Colorado project had better act fast if they are going to get their bill through a House of Representatives whose 435 Members all have to face the voters next year.

IRVING BRANT.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Eulogy of Richard B. Vail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I know many Members of this House are sorely grieved as I am to have learned this past weekend of the passing of our former colleague, Richard B. Vail, of Chicago.

There was no more militant foe of communism in the Congress than Dick Vail. He was known for his steadfastness and firmness of conviction. Dick always spoke out as his conscience dictated regardless of political considerations and everyone respected him for it.

Those of us who knew Dick so well will miss the warmth of his friendship, the wisdom of his counsel, and the determination of purpose with which he met every problem.

Our deepest sympathy goes out to Dick Vail's family and close associates in their hour of bereavement.

The First Session Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 84th Congress comes to a close, we find the Nation enjoying the highest level of employment and prosperity ever achieved. In July expanding job opportunities had reduced the number of persons receiving unemployment compensation below 1.2 million for the first time since the end of 1953. In Michigan the rate of covered workers receiving benefits dropped from 5 percent in July 1954 to 1.9 percent in July this year. Everything is booming but the guns.

What you think of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 84th Congress depends on whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. The Democrats, citing their bipartisan cooperation with the Eisenhower Republican administration in foreign affairs and their support of predominently popular legislative proposals advanced by the President, will tell you it was a session of glorious accomplishments, thanks to them. As a matter of fact on those particular domestic issues which the Democrats brag about supporting, it would have been politically unpopular for them to have acted otherwise with a national election only a few months away.

Legislation killed, blocked, or delayed by Democrats includes:

President Eisenhower's sensible highway program, legislation designed to give Michigan and other sugar growers a greater share of the sugar market, amendments to the social-security law extending coverage and liberalizing provisions for widows, helpless children, and totally disabled adults; labor-backed amendments to the Taft-Hartley act and the President's plan for broadening health programs.

Measures enacted into law include the following:

Selective service: Extended to June 30, 1959.

New Reserve program: Designed to have a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 trained men by 1962. Youths 17–18½ years may volunteer for 6 months of active training followed by 7½ years Reserve training and receive draft-exempt status. Training may be delayed until completion of high school or reaching age of 20, whichever comes first. Men in service when law becomes effective exempt as are men with prior service.

Defense Facilities Act: In connection with new Reserve program, another $250 million provided for armories, airfields, and other training facilities.

Military career incentive pay: Designed to encourage reenlistments in Armed Forces and reduce expensive training of new recruits due to increasing number of men leaving services for jobs in private industry.

Defend Formosa: This resolution, which President Eisenhower said would "make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government," strengthened our position abroad.

Small business: Life of Small Business Administration extended to June 30, 1957. Loan limit to single companies increased from $150,000 to $250,000.

One dollar minimum wage: The former minimum wage rate of 75 cents an houre was raised to $1 an hour, effective March 1, 1956. Because prevailing rates are generally higher already, new law will affect only about 2 million of the 24 million covered workers.

Veterans' benefits: Home loan benefits for veterans engaged in farming enlarged funds appropriated for President's Commission on Veterans Pensions to appraise scope of present benefit laws, established period of entitlement for outpatient dental care, permit renewal of term insurance 120 days after separation from service.

Woman's Obligation to Maine's Motto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter of Mrs. Joseph B. Goodbar appearing in the July 18, 1955, issue of the Portland Press Herald. Dr. Harold M. Dudley, vice president of the Washington Pilgrimage, requested that I do so.

There being on objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMAN'S OBLIGATION TO MAINE'S MOTTO

EDITOR OF THE PRESS HERALD:

The Latin word "dirigo," meaning "I direct, or I show the way" is the Maine motto. It is the proud boast of the people of the Pine Tree State, that they, consistent with this motto, have supplied a generous portion of the able men and women who have shaped American life.

For the sons and daughters of Maine the cloister of memory is peculiarly rich with the records of Maine women.

Truly extraordinary is the story of Dorothea Dix, who galvanized the public conscience with respect to the treatment of the

insane. In 1841 she became aware that iron cages, chains, clubs, and starvation were the accepted means for handling insane persons. Burning with indignation, she undertook singlehanded the herculean task of overwhelming and uprooting such cruel and ignorant methods with the force of enlightenment and logic.

Under the impact of her inspired efforts State after State was induced to build hospitals for the insane. She is credited with having revolutionized the lunacy laws of England. In Italy she talked with Pope Pius IX himself, and later he warmly thanked her, though a woman and a Protestant, for crossing the seas to call to his attention the cruel treatment then visited upon the mentally ill members of his flock.

Less spectacular than Dorothea Dix, another great humanitarian among Maine women was Mrs. Lillian M. N. Stevens, a disciple of Frances E. Willard, and for 16 years national president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. In 1900, after 2 years as national president, she became also vice president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of the World.

Not only devoted to the cause of temperance, Mrs. Stevens led many hearings at the State legislature in advocacy of votes for women, of prison reform, and of a State reformatory for women. Her energy and influence were potent forces in shaping the thoughts and ideals of her era.

Some of our most important Maine women took no direct part in public affairs, but nevertheless exerted tremendous indirect influence through the training they gave their sons.

Among these perhaps Matha Washburn, of Livermore, Maine, is outstanding. She had a supreme honor of raising 7 sons, every 1 of whom became famous. Four of the Washburn brothers represented 4 different States in Congress, 3 serving at the same time—a situation without parallel in United States history. Two were governors of two different States. Two were foreign ministers. One was United States Secretary of State. One was a major general. One was commander of a ship. Among them they founded the Washburn Flour Mills in Minnesota.

In the field of writing perhaps the earliest and the most influential of all Maine women was Harriet Beecher Stowe, who, at the age of 41, produced Uncle Tom's Cabin, the antislavery book that electrified a nation. Wife of a professor of religion at Bowdoin College, and sister of Henry Ward Beecher, she found inspiration in the sea, where the shore stretched out its long, narrow fingers into beautiful Casco Bay, with its strips of rock, its sandy beaches, and its thickets of pointed fir. The vision of this book came to her at the Congregational Church in Brunswick during a sermon by her husband. Published in 1852, Uncle Tom's Cabin swept the Nation and later the world. More than 300,000 copies were sold within a year, burning a message into every reader's heart, preparing the way for the conflict between the States. Probably the pen of no other woman has had so large a part in shaping such stormy events as did that of Harriet Beecher Stowe.

At a more recent period came the career of Kate Douglas Wiggin, whose books and stories have brought fame and fortune at home and abroad. Not only a writer, she used her ability to initiate and establish free kindergartens for young children. Her maiden story, and her most successful, The First Christmas Carol, published in St. Nicholas magazine, was written to raise money for the establishment of the first free kindergarten on the Pacific coast. The success of this kindergarten inspired the founding of similar schools in Japan, Australia, New Zealand, British Columbia, and the Hawaiian Islands. Leadership, indeed, and of a most constructive kind.

It would be unfair to close this letter without mentioning Mrs. Laura Howe Richards, author of nearly a hundred books. Of her books, perhaps the best known is Captain January, used as the basis of a most successful motion picture.

It is a wonderful thing to have the heritage of so great and fruitful a past. But how much more wonderful, if we of the present day prove ourselves not only worthy heirs of a great ancestry, but also in our turn, inspiring ancestors for the future. In this sense the obligation of the women of Maine to the motto of the State faces both the past and the future. It is at once both glory and responsibility. Each day something new is added to memory's gallery of pictures. What will be found there in the years to come? May women and mothers not forget that what they are, as individuals, is God's gift to them. But what they do with themselves in worthy accomplishment is their gift to God.

Mrs. JOSEPH E. GOODBAR.

PORTLAND.

The Salk Vaccine: What Caused the Mess?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the current issue of Harper's magazine contains a very interesting summary and analysis of the Salk vaccine affair, written by Mr. Leonard Engel, an experienced reporter in scientific matters.

I ask unanimous consent that this interesting and revealing article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary and analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SALK VACCINE: WHAT CAUSED THE MESS?

(By Leonard Engel)

The peak of the polio season usually comes in the second half of August or the first part of September. This year, we might have had substantially fewer cases of polio than usual. As it is, the number we do have will be largely a matter of luck.

We will have whatever number of cases do occur instead of the smaller number we might have had because of the great vaccine mess. During this past spring, the country was made to witness a spectacle without precedent. On April 12, Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., of the University of Michigan, reported on the largest and most carefully executed field trial of a vaccine product in history, the 1954 test of the Salk polio vaccine. The trial confirmed a major medical discovery. The Salk vaccine was found to be adequately effective in preventing paralytic poliomyelitis, and remarkably safe. A month later, the hopes the Francis report had aroused, and the vaccine itself, had been very nearly dissolved in an incredible sea of confusion.

How did this come about? Who and what were responsible? It is no doubt too early for anyone to attempt a final assessment of what happened. The principal details, however, can be established.

The great vaccine mess was a tangled compound of many factors. It involved technical questions so abstruse there are scarcely twoscore men in the United States competent to pass on them, and everyone with a direct part in the situation, or nearly everyone, acted from the best of motives.

But demagogy and political expediency also contributed to the brew. So did oversensationalism by the press, radio, and TV, and a misguided attempt by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold from the public for many weeks information the public was entitled to have from the beginning. Also involved were timidity and lack of leadership; a complete failure to educate the public properly on vaccines (despite all the propaganda); the constitutional unwillingness of scientists to give absolute guaranties; and many things more.

The point is, though, that the mess was unnecessary. Even if better planning might not have avoided the accident with Cutter vaccine, many more children than were inoculated could have been immunized safely in time for this year's polio season. The vaccination program was perhaps not the best that could have been devised. But it was not a bad program. It could have been kept on the track. All that was necessary was a little judgment and some capacity for decisive action in the right places at the right time.

HOW IT ALL STARTED

The best way to unravel the great vaccine mess is to set down, first, a simple chronology of events as they were seen, let's say, by an average newspaper reader or TV viewer. Then we can get on to some other things that also happened—though they were not in the papers—and to a reexamination of what went wrong.

The place to begin is New York in October 1954. In that month, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, whose office is on downtown Broadway, announced that it was taking a calculated risk. The foundation had paid for the development of the Salk vaccine and paid for and arranged the field trial. Now, without waiting for Dr. Francis' report on the trial, it was ordering enough vaccine to immunize 9 million children. Its purpose was to get manufacturers into production and to have vaccine on hand as soon as the trial results were announced—in the event that these were favorable.

During the March of Dimes in January, foundation workers and foundation publicity carried the message of the calculated risk into nearly every home in the country. As the date for the Francis report drew near, interest was whipped up still more by advance newspaper stories—like an erroneous New York World-Telegram and Sun report that the vaccine had been found 100 percent effective.

The date for the Francis report was set by Dr. Francis himself. It could not be later than mid-April (otherwise the inoculation of school children could not be completed before the end of the school year). Dr. Francis was pressed by the big news magazines to make it early in the week (to meet their deadlines). The University of Michigan, where a special scientific meeting was held to hear the report, asked that the day not be a Monday (to avoid calling out a make-ready crew on a Sunday, at Sunday rates). So it was April 12, the second Tuesday of the month and the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the most famous polio victim of all—a circumstance which was to lead to caustic remarks later, but of which Dr. Francis insists he was at the time unaware.

By 9 a. m. of the big day, nearly 200 newsmen were jammed into a temporary newsroom on the third floor of the Michigan graduate school administration building, awaiting copies of the report. These arrived at 9:15 under the escort of a university press officer and four Ann Arbor policemen. (It took the four policemen to get the press officer and his cargo through the crowd of newsmen and into the newsroom.)

Dr. Francis began reading his report to an audience of 500 physicians and scientists in the auditorium downstairs an hour later. As the cameras ground, he announced that

the vaccine had been between 60 and 90 percent effective in preventing paralytic polio, and even more effective in avoiding the bulbar form of the disease. Side reactions among the 440,000 children who had received the vaccine had been very few and mild. There was no evidence to connect the vaccine with the cases of polio that did occur among inoculated children; those children simply did not develop immunity or did not develop it in time.

In Syracuse, N. Y., the success of the Salk vaccine was signaled by air-raid sirens, church bell, and the turning of all traffic lights red for 1 minute. In Washington, late that afternoon, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare signed licenses for manufacture of the vaccine. Parke, Davis & Co., 1 of 6 vaccine firms under contract to the polio foundation, made its first shipment less than 4 hours after its license was signed. Vaccination of first- and second-graders under the foundation program got underway, in San Diego, April 16.

Dr. Hart E. Van Riper, medical director of the polio foundation, predicted that there would be enough vaccine to immunize 20 million children by July 1. This was raised to 30 million when the foundation's medical advisory committee decided on two shots for each child this spring, with the third put off until next winter. (The longer interval between the second and third injections, Dr. Salk reported, would provide more solid, longer-lasting immunity.) Newspapers reraised Dr. Van Riper; they guessed there might be enough vaccine to inoculate 45 million children before the polio season.

To get some of this vaccine for youngsters not covered by the foundation program, State and local health departments throughout the country began placing orders with the vaccine manufacturers. The manufacturers said no orders could be accepted until commitments to the foundation had been fulfilled. It was soon evident that vaccine production was neither so large nor so elastic as expected and that the foundation contracts would take longer to complete than anticipated. New York and many other communities had to postpone scheduled inoculation clinics repeatedly because the vaccine had failed to arrive. The World-Telegram and Sun (Republican) charged that vaccine was being diverted to commercial channels and the black market. Congressmen (mostly Democratic) charged that the Eisenhower administration was failing to make adequate plans to meet the demand for the vaccine, and introduced bills to control the vaccine's distribution.

THE CUTTER CRISIS

Over the next 10 days, the vaccine shortage dominated the news. Then, during the night of April 26–27, the United States Public Health Service received word of six cases of paralytic polio in children inoculated with vaccine manufactured by the Cutter Laboratories of Berkeley, Calif. This was more than could have been expected to occur by chance, among the comparatively small number who had received Cutter vaccine, in the postinoculation interval before immunity develops. The Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, at once banned the Cutter product and started an investigation to see what, if anything, had gone wrong with it.

Additional cases of post-inoculation polio soon appeared, many involving Cutter vaccine, but also some where the injections had been the product of other manufacturers. The latter almost certainly had nothing to do with the vaccine. Like all other vaccines, polio vaccine takes a period of some weeks to produce immunity. During this interval, the inoculee is still susceptible to the disease, and some inoculees will get it, if there is polio around—as there was in most of the areas where inoculations were taking place. But no one in a responsible position had the wit or courage to make this clear for many weeks, not in the Public Health Service, not in the American Medical Association, not even in the polio foundation itself. So the panic grew.

In the meantime, on April 29, a committee of polio experts met at the National Institutes of Health (the research arm of the United States Public Health Service) to consider the problems posed by the Cutter vaccine. The committee, on April 30, recommended continuation of the polio program with the vaccine of other manufacturers, and the appointment of a smaller committee to see whether more stringent safety standards for polio vaccine were possible.

This second committee met on Thursday, May 5. On Friday, it was joined by representatives of the vaccine firms. At 4 a. m., on Saturday, May 7, the Surgeon General ordered a complete halt to the immunization program. He said he had acted because mass immunizations were scheduled in several States over the weekend, and because there had been insufficient time to evaluate the committee's findings.

During the next several weeks, a team of Public Health Service experts and consultants visited the vaccine plants. As a result, vaccine of two manufacturers that had been distributed but not used was recleared for use. (Vaccine of two other manufacturers was cleared later.) Between trips, the touring experts consulted with more experts at ad hoc conference. These went on at the National Institutes of Health until far into the night.

Finally, on May 25, Dr. Scheele appointed still another committee. This one, which consisted of two representatives of the Public Health Service and five polio experts (including Dr. Salk), recommended a series of changes in the procedure for testing polio vaccine. After a day of debate, the changes were accepted by the manufacturers.

Meanwhile, it developed that there was live polio virus in some Cutter vaccine. But this information did not come from the Public Health Service; to all questioners (and there were many), PHS was still replying as late as the first week of June that investigation of the Cutter vaccine was not yet completed.

The information came from Dr. Louis B. Gebhardt, of the University of Utah, via an enterprising young lady named Jane Krieger who works for the New York Times. Dr. Gebhart undertook to test a sample of Cutter vaccine for the Idaho Health Department. One of his monkeys died of polio after inoculation with the vaccine. Without leaving her office, or talking to Dr. Gebhardt, Miss Krieger got hold of this interesting news even before (according to a PHS spokesman) the Public Health Service.

During the weeks following the first Cutter cases, Dr. Scheele many times reiterated his faith in the Salk vaccine. But his actions and his constant qualifying phrases ("there is still some information we are checking") belied his brave words. Parents and local health officials took the hint. Attendance at immunization clinics fell sharply. Communities in 10 States put off their immunization programs (but most later reinstated them).

A few days before this article first went to press, Dr. Scheele announced that the program was "back on the track." But new supplies of vaccine did not begin to flow for another week. Even Dr. Scheele conceded that it would be July before the second round of shots in the foundation program could be completed in most States. It would take still longer to restore public confidence in the polio vaccine and in the United States Public Health Service.

WHAT HAD GONE WRONG

Even a cursory reading of the record raises many questions about the way the Salk vaccine has been handled. For example, the national foundation has been severely criticized for the huge publicity sendoff the vaccine received. It is certainly true that the Salk vaccine has received much more publicity than any medical discovery should. But it is also true that the vaccine would have had an overexuberant sendoff no matter what the foundation did.

Over the past two decades, polio has been built up into something more of a threat to health than it really is (though the incidence of polio has been rising in recent years, and it was well on its way to becoming an important health problem). The buildup was partly a consequence of the polio foundation's annual drive for funds, but only partly. It was also a product of polio's uncommon nastiness. This has made polio a dramatic story—and newspapers, radio, and TV feed on dramatic stories.

"It wouldn't have made a particle of difference if Dr. Francis had read the report to himself in his bedroom or sent it in to the most obscure medical journal he could find," comments a veteran Associated Press man. "Reporters would have broken into his bedroom or stormed the journal's printing plant and taken the report out of there line by line. The Francis report was the story of the year. The newspapers would have got it somehow and played it for all it was worth." It will take something more than simple restraints on the part of sponsoring agencies to avoid runaway publicity on other medical discoveries in the future.

It has also been argued, on the one hand, that the Cutter incident would not have occurred if the vaccine had not been rushed into production prematurely, and, on the other, that it would not have occurred if the Federal Government had made plans for orderly large-scale production and distribution of the vaccine in advance of the Francis report. The contention that mass production of the vaccine was premature ignores the fact that the Salk vaccine is one of the most thoroughly tested biological products in history, and that a very large quantity of it—3,500,000 cc—was produced last year. It also ignores the chaos and the outraged cries of press and public that would surely have resulted if there had been no vaccine on hand when Dr. Francis released his report.

It may be that trouble could have been avoided by a Government vaccine program, as in Canada (where a modest government program, which seeks to immunize about one-quarter of Canadian children by summer, has been going very well). However, the kind of trouble that occurred at Cutter can occur in plants operated by or working under contract to the Government, as well as in plants producing for the foundation or the commercial markets. In view of some of the technical difficulties that have since developed, moreover, it would hardly have been desirable to produce vaccine on a big enough scale for the entire United States before the Francis report had approved it.

In any event, the contention that the Federal Government should have ordered vaccine before the Francis report neglects political realities. During the weeks when the vaccine shortage was uppermost in the country's mind, the Eisenhower administration still resisted Federal control of distribution. It is absurd to suppose that the President could have been persuaded to endorse, or the Congress to pass, a vaccine production program last fall or winter when the need seemed far less pressing.

More serious, to my mind, is the evidence that there was a notable lack of real planning for the technical aspects of producing vaccine on the part of the foundation, agencies like the American Medical Association, and—most important, because they have the legal responsibility—the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. No matter how it's sliced, the production of 3,500,000

cubic centimeters last year was mass production. Any difficulties that turned up this year could and should have been detected last year. Whether or not it could have been avoided, in any event, the Cutter incident was subsequently so mismanaged that it very nearly wrecked the program we had.

In the first place—for reasons that I find hard to understand—the Department and the Public Health Service have not been candid with the public. From about the beginning of May through at least the first week of June, a curtain of silence was drawn down around Public Health Service scientific and technical personnel working on the polio vaccine problem. When I visited Washington and Bethesda (the Washington suburb where the National Institutes of Health are located), I was not permitted to see any PHS scientific or technical people. The excuse offered was that all were busy preparing a report for the President on new measures to reassure the safety of the vaccine. But reporters had not been able to obtain information directly from PHS technical people for weeks; and, except for a press conference held by Dr. James A. Shannon, Associate Director of the Institutes of Health, the press had seen PHS personnel only casually (mainly in the NIH hospital cafeteria, the only eating place in the sprawling medical research plant). Reporters were forced to submit questions through Department and PHS press officers. Practically all the important questions went unanswered for weeks, though no secrets of state were involved, just the health of the American people.

THREE BIG QUESTIONS

One can nevertheless establish some of what happened in the great vaccine mess, and much of what the Department and the Health Service did not see fit to tell. I address myself to three questions: What went wrong with the Cutter vaccine? Why did Dr. Scheele call off the immunization program at 4 o'clock in the morning of May 7? And who finally got the vaccine program back on the track?

Let us take up the Cutter affair first. Although the Public Health Service has been at some pains to avoid saying so, there was presumptive evidence of the presence of live virus in some samples of Cutter vaccine from the first dozen polio cases associated with it. First, some cases turned up in areas like Idaho, where polio does not ordinarily occur at that time of year. Second, in most of the first cases, paralysis began in the injected limb; such an association is not usual, though it may occur once in a while, when there is no connection between vaccine and postinoculation disease.

By now, of course, the presence of live virus in one sample of Cutter vaccine has been confirmed. (As recently as June 7, however, the Health Service refused to say whether its scientists had found virus in the vaccine or not.) How did it get there?

As Dr. Shannon of NIH points out, this may never be known for certain. The vaccine involved was shipped from the Cutter plants shortly after April 12. Its defects did not become known until 2 weeks later. How can one be sure precisely what submicroscopic viruses were where when that vaccine was processed, perhaps months before?

Nonetheless there appear to be only two ways in which live virus could have got into the vaccine. One was somehow to survive the killing treatment and pass undetected through the battery of safety tests to which all polio vaccine is subjected. Recent calculations suggest that this could have happened.

The other possibility is that the virus got in accidentally during bottling or at some other time after the killing agent was neutralized. (The agent employed to kill the polio virus, formaldehyde, is toxic to human tissue as well as virus and must be neutralized before the vaccine can be used.)

In favor of the second possibility is the fact that part of one of the suspect lots was apparently all right; no cases of polio turned up among children injected with a 22,000 cubic centimeter sublot of one of these lots. This implies (though it by no means proves) that the virus got in after manufacture was completed and before the vials in which the vaccine was packed were sealed. Moreover, Cutter alone among the six vaccine manufacturers bottled in the same building where live virus was handled. Polio virus may well get into the air in such a building. Two considerations would imply this. First, production workers in at least one other polio vaccine plant have been found to have very high concentrations of antipolio antibody in their blood, sure evidence of repeated exposure to the virus. Some of this was probably airborne. Second, accidental polio infections have occurred from time to time in diagnostic laboratories. Some of these are also thought to have been airborne.

It should be emphasized, whatever went wrong or was wrong at Cutter, that the Public Health Service is right in the boat with Cutter. The PHS Laboratory of Biologics Control prescribed the safety tests. PHS regulations permitted bottling in the same building with live virus, provided certain precautions were observed (and they were observed). PHS inspectors visited and approved the Cutter layout before Cutter received its license.

Almost none of the above was stated or admitted by the Public Health Service. Nor was the Surgeon General telling the whole story when he stated that he had called off the immunization program on May 7—the act that really sent the program into a tailspin—to allow more time to evaluate the findings of the expert committee that had been meeting in Bethesda.

During the 10 days between the first Cutter cases and May 6, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby had evidently made it plain to Dr. Scheele that there must be no more postinoculation polio cases on the Eisenhower administration's political doorstep. The immunization program was to be stopped unless and until the Surgeon General could give, or obtain from the experts, an iron-clad guaranty of no more Cutter incidents.

Dr. Scheele is an experienced public-health man. He knew that there is no medical preparation whatever that is absolutely and unconditionally safe; that some risk is taken when any medicine, even as innocuous as aspirin, is given. He knew also that the product of the other five vaccine manufacturers was (and is) as safe a vaccine as there is; and that the risk of another Cutter incident was very small—especially since other manufacturers began strengthening their safety procedures as soon as word of the Cutter affair got around.

But the Surgeon General is not a specialist in immunology, one of the most highly complex branches of modern medicine and biology; not one physician or public-health officer in a thousand, for that matter,, can have a really adequate knowledge of it. Dr. Scheele put the problem to the experts who met on May 5 and 6. Being experts, and therefore men who wouldn't absolutely guarantee anything, the committee would not give him the guaranty he needed. Furthermore, they brought up a variety of technical problems concerning the vaccine which should have been thrashed out prior to April 12 but which were now brandnew to Dr. Scheele. He felt he had no choice but to close down the program.

The person who finally started the program back on the track was none other than Dr. Jonas Salk. In the 2 weeks after the shutdown order, Dr. Scheele called platoons of additional experts to Washington. ("I've had more calls to the Washington Airport in the past 2 weeks than in the last 20 years," said a Bethesda cabdriver.) The experts now met in ad hoc conferences. This meant that anyone could say whatever he wanted to, at any length he desired, and no one had authority to decide anything. The ad hoc conferences stretched on and on into futility until one man decided he had had enough.

On Friday night, May 20, Dr. Salk went home to Pittsburgh. On Saturday night, he sent Dr. Scheele a wire informing him that he would attend no more ad hoc conferences and calling upon the Surgeon General to appoint a committee with power to act and get the program going again. A wire from Basil O'Connor, president of the polio foundation, seconded Salk's proposal. The committee (a larger one than Salk had suggested) was appointed May 25; Salk was named a member (though he had not proposed himself). In 2 days, this committee—given different titles in different Public Health Service releases—drew up and secured acceptance for a new set of safety standards. At last, the wheels slowly began to turn again.

LOOKING BACK

The new safety standards, which were announced May 27, make three material changes in the procedure for testing polio vaccine. First, larger samples of each lot must be tested to make more certain that any live virus present is picked up. Second, the killing process is somewhat lengthened and two successive negative tests for live virus instead of one are required at the end of the killing process. Third, the vaccine must be tested for live polio virus after bottling.

The new standards invite two comments. To begin with, there is no requirement for duplicate testing of all lots of vaccine (although the Public Health Service is increasing the number of lots on which it is running tests). The reasons why PHS has not asked for full duplicate testing are that the Health Service hasn't the manpower or facilities to perform them, and doesn't believe duplicate tests are necessary. Last year, the vaccine used in the field trial was triplicate-tested because few laboratories were experienced in performing the tests, and as a test of the reliability of the safety tests themselves. The tests (especially the tissue culture tests) were found sufficiently reliable so that no purpose would be served by holding up immunizations this year until all lots of vaccine could be duplicate-tested.

The other comment is that the new testing procedures, as Dr. Scheele has said, make a safe vaccine safer. They lock up all the doors through which live virus could have got into the Cutter vaccine, or might get into other vaccine. However, they could and should have been developed before the Cutter incident. Failing that, they could and should have been developed without putting the immunization program into reverse.

In saying this, I am aware, of course, that I have the benefit of hindsight. Also, I am urging someone else to have shown courage, I, for one, might have lacked, had I been in the kitchen when the heat was on.

It seems to me that the Surgeon General should have announced, as soon as he realized that some of the Cutter vaccine had gone sour, that Cutter's polio vaccine production unit had been shut down and would not be reopened until it had been entirely rebuilt under the most severe safeguards. Simultaneously, he should have directed other manufacturers to perform a final after-bottling live virus test on a sample of adequate size. This would have provided immediate protection against live virus in the final product (however it got there), and enabled the immunization program to proceed. Any other needed changes in safety standards could then have been made later.

The Surgeon General must or should have recognized almost immediately the probability that he was dealing with live virus, and that how it got there was likely never to be settled for sure. Instead of first conducting

a scientific experiment to settle largely unanswerable questions, he should have been busy putting out the forest fire that the Cutter accident had started.

If he had paid attention to putting out the fire, much less damage would have been done to the immunization program, to the Public Health Service, to public confidence in the Salk vaccine, to the dignity of the medical profession in general, and, incidentally, to Cutter Laboratories. An ironical feature of the policy the Surgeon General and his superiors actually followed—ironical because this is a Republican, probusiness administration—is that it has served only to deepen Cutter's difficulties. If the Surgeon General had announced that the Cutter polio-vaccine unit would have to be rebuilt—which it will have to be anyhow, if the Berkeley firm again expects to sell the vaccine—Cutter's name would soon have dropped out of the headlines. The Health Service's prolonged refusal to say what the situation was at Cutter and what was being done only kept reporters asking questions and thus kept Cutter's name in the newspapers.

Perhaps the misguided silence on Cutter was merely one more manifestation of a failing that has plagued the Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare throughout the vaccine mess. The Health Service and the Department not only hurt the polio program and themselves by doing the wrong things. They did it through plainly avoidable public-relations ineptness, typified by Dr. Scheele's penchant for announcements in the small hours of the morning and by Secretary Hobby's classic fatuity: "No one could have forseen the public demand for the vaccine."

Shortly before I left Washington, I stopped by for a chat with a friend in the Public Health Service who has nothing to do with polio or vaccines. "The only good thing this mess has shown," he said, "is that people are more discriminating than we think. Most of the kids who missed out on their shots will be back, though perhaps not as soon as they should be. But I don't know how our Service will come out. I asked a housewife who withdrew her youngster from the program at his school whether she'd lost confidence in the vaccine. 'No,' she replied, 'I'm just waiting for the Public Health Service to get itself squared away.' "

The Silver Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Silver Service," and an article from the Christian Science Monitor by George Ericson. Both the editorial and the article deal with the fictitious argument that the silver subsidy is a profit to the Government.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 1, 1955]

SILVER SERVICE

Silver a few days ago achieved a kind of parity with gold. Private buyers paid more for it than the 90.41 cents an ounce which the United States Treasury stands ready to shell out for it if it is mined in this country.

For the past 22 years this has not been the case. In 1933 American silver producers began receiving this special treatment, and it has amounted to a very substantial annual subsidy, since for almost the whole of those 22 years the market price has been far below the Treasury's buying price.

In contrast, gold, though much more widely regarded as a useful monetary standard, has sold most of the time at prices equal to or higher than the Treasury would pay for it. Silver, always jealous of gold, can now boast that it, too, stands on its own feet.

The silver mining industry can boast another honor. It has the distinction of being probably the inventor, at least in the United States, of price-support and stockpiling schemes for its own benefit. There was a Treasury silver-purchase program as far back as the 1870's—long before the American farmer had thought of any such thing. Of course, since the present silver program was started in 1933, other interests have caught on. Elaborate and permanent schemes of the same general kind, covering major farm commodities, have been adopted, and the idea also has spread to additional metals, including lead, zinc, mercury, and others.

But silver has a special magic of its own, by which even the Treasury benefits. Even though it pays more for silver than it's worth, it manages to make a profit on it—a secret which would be invaluable in the commercial world. The moment Uncle Sam buys an ounce of silver at 90.41 cents he lists it as an asset worth $1.29. Then he issues silver certificates on the basis of that new value. This process is called seigniorage, in reverence for the lords and kings who used to steal from their subjects in a similar manner.

You've probably got some of these certificates in your pocket right now. If you turned them in for the silver (in accordance with the promise on their face) you would, of course, lose about 30 cents of each dollar so exchanged. Fortunately, however, Uncle Sam will accept such bills in full payment of taxes on the $1.29-an-ounce basis of value. So Uncle Sam is rightly regarded in a better light than those old lords and kings.

Yet it is obvious that the Government could issue paper money of this kind without bothering to accumulate all that silver. It's got about 3 billion ounces of it, 15 times the world's annual production at the present rate. That's far in excess of any other stockpile in relation to output. Furthermore, this is one hoard that can't possibly have any real use in the war emergency.

Thus the silver stockpile is the first to have been started, relatively the biggest, and also the most useless. Quite a record for an industry about as big as the manufacture of gloves.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

FEDERAL SILVER BUYING PROGRAM HELD ILLOGICAL

(By George Ericson)

Once more silver has crept into the limelight, with the price at a 35-year high. Consuming interests are in conflict with producers and all the old arguments pro and con current before and during World War II are being revived. The Government is sitting on top of the world's largest accumulation of the metal which is being augmented by Federal purchases of newly mined silver. At the same time industry is steadily increasing its use of the metal at rising prices, at a time when foreign countries are finding it difficult to obtain silver for coinage purposes.

Only this week Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, took up the cudgels for the users of silver, as he has done on other occasions, and attacked the silver bloc of western Senators for trying to prevent hearings on his measure to repeal the Silver Purchase Act. This act in the eyes of most economists has outlived its usefulness. It obligated the United States to buy all the silver mined at a federally fixed price and retain it in stockpile until the price reaches 90.41 cents a troy ounce, after which the Government could sell out of "free stocks" to industry at say 91 cents an ounce, the slight difference between the two prices being accounted for by transportation costs.

SILVER BLOC FIGHT TO KEEP ADVANTAGE

The silver question is a classic example of how a subsidy serves the interests of one group while it nullifies the law of supply and demand. For decades the producing interests have been able to extract legislation which gives them substantially higher prices than would be possible in a free market. They have advanced the double-barrel argument that much of the silver thus bought becomes part of the monetary reserves of the currency system, and, too, that withdrawing price support would severally hurt zinc, lead, and copper companies, since silver is a valuable byproduct of mining such metals.

The latest tactic of the silver Senators is to delay hearings on a repeal measure, either on the assumption that indefinite postponement will prevent action, or that full publicity will alert the voting public to the irrationality of Federal silver buying. Such buying merely adds to the tons of silver put underground, now more than adequate as a monetary reserve, and produces an artificial scarcity which raises costs to the fabricating, photographic, and of late to the electronics industries, and, of course, to the public. With 1,285,000,000 ounces in the Treasury, and 410 million ounces loaned to our allies during World War II which is beginning to be repaid, any plea that we need silver, to stockpile it, is hollow.

UNITED STATES POLICY CAUSES SCARCITY OF THE METAL

With industry at large using more silver, 15 to 20 percent is the estimate, and with Mexican stocks depleted because of a 17 million-ounce purchase by Iran, the plight of the lend-lease countries who must repay the United States silver loan within 2 years from now is given emphasis. The largest borrowers, India, Pakistan, and Britain, unable to obtain the silver in any other way, have begun to substitute baser metals for their silver coins, and it is reported are using the silver content to pay the United States. Thus this country is doing on a minor scale what it did to China when the Silver Purchase Act pushed that country off the silver standard.

The opponents of a free market for silver said recently that "no worthwhile result could possibly accrue to the country" if the Green bill were enacted, since the New York market price and the Treasury selling price are now the same. To which Senator GREEN logically retorted that in that case there was no good reason why these Senators should oppose the repeal.

Of course, the western Senators hope that the $1.29 an ounce price, held to be its full monetary value, will eventually be attained. For every ounce purchased the Treasury can chalk up a gain of about 29 cents. Adding the profit on 400 million ounces owed us would enable the Treasury to claim a $640 million profit, no mean sum. However, the eastern Senators just say the the gain is fictitious. Will economic reasoning resolve this impasse between the producers and the users?

Taxation of Business Income Derived From Foreign Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, a letter and accompanying memorandum pertaining to the taxation of business income earned abroad. The Secretary's letter recommended favorable consideration of legislation which would grant a lower rate of tax on corporate business income earned abroad, somewhat similar to the present tax treatment accorded income earned in the Western Hemisphere.

As chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, I introduced legislation, H. R. 7725, which would give effect to this recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury which is in conformity with the President's recommendation as set forth in his message to the Congress on foreign economic policy of January 10, 1955.

For the benefit of those persons who are interested in this subject, I will insert at this point in the RECORD the letter which I received from the Secretary of the Treasury with the memorandum that accompanied that letter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, July 27, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Last year, your committee and the House of Representatives included as part of the tax revision bill new provisions giving a lower rate of tax on corporate business income earned abroad, somewhat similar to that available since 1942 to income earned in the Western Hemisphere. Provision also was made for postponement of taxes on the income of foreign branches until it was removed from the country where it was earned, a treatment somewhat comparable to that now given to the income of foreign subsidiaries. These sections were omitted from the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, but the report of that Committee stated the hope that provisions along these lines might be developed in the conference between the House and the Senate before final passage of the tax bill. This was not done. The Treasury Department has continued to examine the problem since that time.

I now submit to you a suggested draft of legislation designed to secure the results which were sought and apparently desired last year. This is in accord with the President's recommendation in 1954, which was reaffirmed in his message on foreign economic policy on January 10 of this year.

The purpose of this recommended legislation is to facilitate the investment abroad of capital from this country. At present our business firms are at a disadvantage in countries with lower taxes than our own when they have to compete with local capital, or capital from countries which impose lower taxes on foreign income than we do. Foreign countries are also under an incentive to increase taxes on United States enterprises up to the level of United States tax rates.

Capital investment will aid in the economic development of foreign countries. Participation by United States enterprises will encourage development along the lines we have followed in this country which are especially helpful in raising living standards, through high wages and mass markets, and which will promote the flow of international trade with the United States.

The Treasury staffs and I will be glad to be of such assistance as we can to you, your committee, and your staffs in any consideration which you may wish to give to the taxation of foreign business income. A memorandum explaining our analysis of three of the problems we have considered in this area is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,
G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM ON PROBLEMS IN TAXATION OF FOREIGN INCOME

The principal problem in developing recommendations for new legislation on taxation of income from foreign sources has been in the definition of foreign business income. Some argue for a broad definition, which would include not only income earned from significant business activity actually conducted abroad but also income from products made here and merely sold for delivery abroad. Others favor a definition related to a "permanent establishment" abroad, or to the existence of a business activity subject to taxation in the country where it is conducted. Still others prefer a specific listing of designated activities which are deemed to be of particular importance. Naturally, the representatives of almost every particular industry or activity argue that they should not be left out of any group which receives favorable tax treatment.

In our analysis of the problems of definition, the following principles have seemed important. (1) As a matter of national policy, it would not be desirable or wise for this country to subsidize exports by taxing profits from exports at a lower rate than profits from domestic sales. For this reason, a definition based, on ultimate destination, or place of delivery of goods produced, would not be satisfactory. (2) Small business should have the same potential advantages as larger businesses. (3) The standard selected should not be subject to manipulation by arrangements, for example, to rent an office or pay a small tax abroad to qualify for a substantial tax advantage at home.

The definition of foreign income suggested in the attached draft legislation revolves around the active conduct of a trade or business abroad, with the exception of export trade. It is a broad concept, related to economic activities which often involve capital investment and typically involve full participation and integration in the economy of the country where it is carried on. To avoid any tax motivation for companies to shift to foreign countries their production of goods intended for our own home markets, the importation to the United States of any substantial part of the products manufactured abroad would disqualify a company for the special tax treatment.

Inevitably there will be difficulties in administering this or any other definition of foreign income. In some instances it will be difficult to draw the dividing line between manufacturing which would qualify for the lower tax and minor assembly or repackaging which would not qualify. Such difficulties, however, should not stand in the way of an attempt to foster economic development through private capital investment.

Two problems, of more limited scope, exist in connection with the postponement of tax on income earned by foreign branches.

First, under present law the income from a foreign subsidiary corporation is not taxed until it is received by the domestic parent company. There is no legal basis for taxation by this country of such income so long as it is held abroad by the foreign subsidiary, regardless of how it is reinvested or shifted from the country where it is earned to other foreign countries. It has been proposed that foreign branches of United States corporations be given similar latitude to shift funds between countries with no intervening tax imposed by the United States until foreign income is finally repatriated.

A deferral of tax on foreign income until it is repatriated would give the maximum encouragement to foreign investment. However, such a provision would be subject to abuse. There could be indefinite postponement of tax by shifting profits earned in high-risk areas to low-risk investments in other places. The diversification and growth of foreign investment among firms already operating profitably abroad would receive greater benefit than that of firms presently operating solely in the United States. It therefore seems preferable to adopt deferral of tax on branch income on a limited basis, at least in the first instance.

The second problem concerns the simultaneous allowance of both a deduction and a credit for foreign taxes on income received through foreign subsidiaries. At present the earnings of a foreign subsidiary corporation, when received as dividends by the parent corporation here, are subject to the regular United States corporation income tax, but a credit is allowed against the United States tax for any foreign income tax paid by the subsidiary. The United States tax is imposed only on the subsidiary's net earnings after payment of the foreign income tax. The combined effect of the credit and deduction (under some combinations of rates) is a somewhat lower total tax, foreign and domestic, than the United States tax would be by itself. For example: when the foreign corporate tax rate is one-half of our rate (26 percent against our 52 percent), the combined effective tax on the foreign income (foreign and domestic) works out to only a little over 45 percent. This feature of the foreign tax credit was adopted in the Revenue Act of 1918. No recommendation has been made to change it, presumably because it has not seemed desirable to increase, directly or through technical changes, the present tax on foreign business income.

A similar treatment of foreign income taxes is suggested in the proposed taxation of income from foreign branches. This is not a necessary or essential part of the program, and is included only to secure similarity with tne taxation of income from subsidiaries, along the lines established by the 1918 Revenue Act.

Medical Profession Endorses Handling of Salk Vaccine by Secretary Hobby and Dr. Scheele

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MINNESOTA STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., June 2, 1955.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
Congressman, Fifth Minnesota District, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The following telegram was sent to President Eisenhower, Mrs.

Hobby, and Dr. Scheele by the Minnesota State Medical Association.

We are sending it to you for your information.

"The Minnesota State Medical Association, in its 102d annual session in Minneapolis, unanimously endorses and commends the admirable way in which you, Mrs. Hobby, and Dr. Leonard Scheele have handled the Salk polio vaccine controversy. We believe implicitly in the honesty and integrity of the manufacturers, of the distributors, of the medical profession, and in the good sportsmanship of the American people to handle the situation in the proper manner without Federal controls. We wish to have you know we heartily commend your attitude in this whole matter.

"A. O. SWENSON, M. D.,
"President."

Sincerely yours,

R. R. ROSELL,
Executive Secretary.

Tax Policies of the Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], in discussing the record of the 84th Congress, made a series of statements critical of the tax policies of the Secretary of the Treasury. Constructive criticism is always welcome. However, the statements of the gentleman were so ill-founded and misleading that they should not be allowed to go unanswered.

Following are some of the erroneous statements, and the true facts of the matter in each case:

The charge: That Secretary Humphrey's opposition to the Democratic proposal for an across-the-board $20 tax cut showed that "big business is truly in the saddle during this administration."

The facts: Secretary Humphrey opposed the Democratic proposal because it would have cost about $2.3 billion a year in revenue, and so would have deliberately increased deficit financing with all its inflationary dangers. It thus would have played fast and loose with the real welfare of all Americans.

The inflation which the proposal invited could have cost Americans far more than the tax cut would have saved them.

The Secretary, while opposing the $20-for-everybody tax cut, urged the Congress to continue responsible financial management of the Government's affairs by extension of, first, the corporate income tax rate at 52 percent; and, second, the excise taxes on tobacco, liquor, and so forth, which otherwise would have gone down automatically.

The charge: That 90 percent of the tax bill enacted in 1954 was "a windfall to the high-bracket taxpayers."

The facts: The administration's 1954 tax reduction program made reductions amounting to $7.4 billion, the largest dollar reduction in any one year in the country's history. Reductions included $3 billion in individual income taxes; $1 billion in excise taxes; $1.4 billion in various relief provisions of the tax revision bill; and $2 billion through termination of the excess-profits tax.

Two-thirds of the total $7.4 billion 1954 tax reduction program was for the direct benefit of individuals, the other third for the benefit of business. Of the $4.6 billion in reductions received by individuals, 37 percent went to individuals with incomes of less than $5,000. This group which received 37 percent of the relief had previously been paying approximately one-third of the total burden of the individual income taxes and the excises which were reduced in 1954. Individual income taxes were reduced 10 percent in the lower and middle income brackets, and only about 1 percent in the top brackets.

The charge: That "Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey engineered the excess profits tax repeal."

The facts: The Secretary has made it plain that he considers the excess-profits tax a bad tax. Practically all economists agree. However, the Secretary did not engineer repeal of the excess-profits tax. The truth is that, when revenue needs of the Government required it, he successfully sought a 6-month extension of this tax.

Actually it was legislation enacted in 1950 by the Democratic 82d Congress which provided for the automatic termination on June 30, 1953, of the excess profits tax. The huge budgetary deficits inherited by the new Republican administration in 1953 made immediate tax reductions financially unsound, and in spite of the very undesirable nature of the tax, President Eisenhower on May 20, 1953, found it necessary to recommend its extension for 6 months beyond the automatic termination date. Secretary Humphrey supported this recommendation. Therefore, the truth of the matter is that the Republican administration was actually responsible for keeping the excess profits tax for 6 months longer than the Democrats had provided.

The charge: This administration has given "handouts of about 19 billion" to big business through tax concessions "under the runaway-plant program."

The facts: This charge evidently refers to the provision for rapid tax amortization of emergency plants and equipment. The Revenue Act of 1950, enacted by the Democratic 82d Congress, provided special tax deductions for the 60-months amortization of facilities certified as essential because of the defense emergency. The Congress has not changed this provision of the law, and it continues to be adminstered as provided by the 1950 act. The maximum annual amount by which tax revenues were estimated to be decreased is $880 million in the fiscal year 1956. The aggregate decrease in revenues from 1951 through 1960 is estimated at $4.5 billion, and this will be substantially offset by revenue gains in the following years.

Secretary Humphrey has been one of the foremost in suggesting that the rapid tax amortization law be modified, and in this connection some recent remarks by J. A. Livingston in his well-known Business Outlook column in the Washington Post and Times Herald are interesting. Mr. Livingston wrote:

> As Humphrey sees it, incentives to expand plants no longer are needed. Since the fast writeoff was enacted, the excess-profits tax has been repealed, and the new Internal Revenue Code permits all businesses to quicken their depreciation—to take roughly two-thirds of the cost of a plant in one-half of its normal life.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Says Humphrey:
>
> "Certificates should be used sparingly and be confined to direct war requirements."

The charge: That the Eisenhower administration through Secretary Humphrey installed the "stock option plan which meant billions to the high-bracket taxpayers."

The facts: The provision for special tax treatment of restricted employee stock options was enacted in 1950 by the Democratic 82d Congress. There has been no basic change in this provision during the Eisenhower administration. In fact, the Republican tax revision law of 1954 made changes imposing some limitations on the use of the provision.

The charge: That "the Eisenhower tax brain trusters enacted the so-called rapid depreciation provision which allows corporations to charge off against taxes cost of new machinery, plant equipment, etc., which amounts between 15 to 20 billion."

The facts: The Eisenhower administration did indeed appreciate the need for a more flexible allowance of depreciation deductions than had been permitted under prior tax law. The President in his budget message of January 21, 1954, recommended changes in the depreciation provisions. He noted that the tax treatment of depreciation has far-reaching effects on all business, and liberalization would be especially helpful in the expansion of small business, whether conducted as individual proprietorships, partnerships, or corporations.

The need for change was also plainly evident to the Congress. In June 1953 some 70 statements urging liberalization of depreciation allowances were presented in hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means. It was pointed out that the rigid, long-standing rules were not in accord with modern business practice and economic facts. The situation was discouraging to plant modernization and economic progress, particularly when the investment was of a long-range character and involved a considerable business risk.

The revision of the depreciation provisions adopted by the Congress in the 1954 Internal Revenue Code will allow tax procedure of farmers, business concerns and others to conform to the economic reality of faster depreciation in the early years of the life of the property. The new methods allowed are in fact modest as compared to the action taken in other countries.

The decrease in Federal tax revenues resulting from these depreciation changes is estimated at $364 million in

the fiscal year 1955, $291 million of which is attributable to depreciation deductions of corporations and $73 million to businesses of individuals and partnerships. Actually, of course the more liberal depreciation allowance does not necessariy involve any loss of revenue. Taxpayers who take advantage of the new methods through larger depreciation deductions in current years will pay higher taxes in the future.

It is plain that talk of huge windfalls to big business and high bracket taxpayers from the administration's tax policies is nonsense. It is equally silly to charge Secretary Humphrey with responsibility for tax provisions enacted by Democratic Congresses under a Democratic administration.

Politically motivated attacks must be expected but those making charges should stick to the truth.

The Free Chinese Have Not Been Fooled by the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a prophetic speech given last February by Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Ambassador to the United States, at Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., February 27, 1955. The Chinese have learned from bitter experience the true nature of the Communist movement. The West would have done better if it had paid more attention to the Chinese warnings:

ASIA AT CROSSROADS

In the present uncertain and insecure condition of the world, what goes on in Asia is of great importance. Asia is the oldest, the largest, and the most populous continent in the world. It is the birthplace of the founders of all the great religions, including Mohammed, Jesus, Buddha, and Confucius. It occupies two-thirds of the land area of the earth and possesses 55 percent of the world's population.

True, it is behind Europe and America in scientific knowledge, technological skill, and industrial development. Equally true it is materially poor and underdeveloped, and a vast number of its people are illiterate. But it is rich in natural resources, strategic metals, and human labor. Its potential power is unlimited.

Politically, Asia has been undergoing a rapid transformation from a colonial and a semicolonial status to one of equal position with Europe and America. The spirit of nationalism has been growing so strongly and fast that in the last decade 17 countries have regained their independence and become full-fledged members of the family of nations.

Because of the combination of these vital factors, international communism, which seeks to dominate the world, considers Asia as of great importance to its cause and finds it a happy hunting ground. No lesser Communist leaders than Lenin and Stalin urged upon their comrades the conquest and control of Asia as an indispensable step to the complete communization of the world. The seizure of the Chinese mainland, the invasion of South Korea, the Indochinese war, and the present Communist attacks against offshore islands of the Republic of China—just to give a few illustrations of the Communist activities—are all integral parts of the Communist plan to bring Asia behind the Iron Curtain in preparation for the conquest of what they call the capitalistic world.

On the Asiatic scene there are, broadly speaking, three groups of nations pursuing three different policies. One belongs to the Communist camp and comprises the Soviet Union with its satellites, including the Peiping regime, Outer Mongolia, North Korea, and Viet Minh, all of which take directives from the Kremlin and seek to promote the interests of international communism.

Definitely opposed to this group are the Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Iran, the Arab countries in Asia Minor, Pakistan, and Japan. Some of these countries like Nationalist China and South Korea have made great sacrifices in resisting Communist aggression and are determined to continue their anti-Communist struggle. Others of this same group are fully aware of the threat of Communist imperialism and have not hesitated to adopt measures of self-defense. All of them have alined with the United States in one manner or another to strengthen the anti-Communist front through the conclusion of bilateral or muitilateral mutual defense pacts. The Treaty of Mutual Defense between the Republic of China and the United States concluded last December is the latest example of the bilateral agreements. The Manilla Pact and the SEATO Conference which has just ended in Bangkok are other samples of the collective efforts to check the forces of Communist aggression in Asia.

Between the Communist and the anti-Communist groups there is a third combination of Asiatic nations which pursues a policy of what is called neutralism. This group includes India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, and Afghanistan. These countries do not appear to realize the menace of Communist imperialism either to the free world or to their own independence. They believe in peaceful coexistence with international communism and do not hesitate to urge their views upon other nations, often with the effect of encouraging the Communist regimes and embarrassing the free world. They do not seem to understand or to care that the political philosophy of international communism divides the world only into two classes: those that are for communism and those that are against it. Mao Tse-tung as well as Lenin, Stalin, Malenkov, Khrushchev, and other Communist leaders admit no neutrals and no fence-sitters in their plot to conquer the world. Unless international communism abandons its fixed objective of world domination—and of this there is as much chance as for a leopard to change its spots—neutralism serves, however unwittingly, only to promote the Communist cause. It is therefore not only unwise but dangerous for any country to try to appease international communism in the hope of inducing it to give up its program to communize the world and enslave all the peoples.

In view of the basic and inflexible objective of international communism, there is no ground for believing or hoping that peaceful coexistence between the Communist and the free world will be possible for any length of time. As early as 1919 Lenin lectured to his party comrades on world aims in these terms:

"We are not merely living in a state but in a system of states and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable. That means that if the ruling class, the proletariat, wants to hold sway, it must prove its capacity to do so by its military organization."

From time to time the Communists, for reasons of their own, may adopt a less intransigent policy in dealing with the non-Communist world. But their apparently more conciliatory attitude must not be taken as a change of heart on their part or as a renunciation of their firm and ardent aspiration for world revolution. It is only a temporary expedient to promote their cause in a different guise. In the words of Lenin again: "The strictest loyalty to the ideas of communism must be combined with the ability to make all the necessary compromises, to 'tack,' to make agreements, zigzags, retreats, and so on, in order to accelerate the coming into power of the Communists."

In the light of the well-known purpose and policy of international communism, the advocates of neutralism in the so-called struggle between the East and West are really playing into the Communist hands. If they persist in their ill-chosen course, 1 of the 2 more likely developments will come to pass. Either they will find one day to their sorrow and dismay that their own countries have fallen victims to Communist guile and been taken into the Communist orbit against their will or, realizing at last the Communist menace to their own independence, they will choose definitely to join the anti-Communist nations and cooperate with them wholeheartedly to save themselves as well as the free world.

In the end Asia will have only two groups of nations pitted against each other: the Communist and the anti-Communist. One stands for dictatorship and enslavement, and the other for freedom and democracy. Which of the two groups will emerge victorious in Asia is a question of vital importance, for the outcome cannot but seriously affect the destiny of mankind. In the worldwide struggle of freedom versus Communist imperialism it is more than ever true that where Asia goes, there will go the rest of the world.

I am aware that there are people who believe and urge that in this global fight to preserve freedom against Communist dictatorship Europe should be saved first on account of its democratic tradition, scientific knowledge, industrial potential, technological skill and organizing ability. They favor a policy of appeasing the Communists in Asia in the hope of putting off the day of their own crisis. While I sincerely share the view that Europe should be saved from the grasping hand of international communism, I consider it a mistaken and dangerous idea to think that the leaders of Communist imperialism can be satisfied and reconciled with the winning of one-half of the world. Since the aim of international communism is to bring about world revolution and achieve global conquest, it is a common menace to all free nations and calls for united effort to resist it. If Asia should be lost to communism through the lack of cooperation of the free world, the days of Europe will be numbered.

It seems to me that the United States, the strongest bastion of democracy and the recognized leader of the free world, is pursuing a sound policy in stressing the importance of Asia to the cause of freedom and in striving to help her resist the onslaught of communism and preserve her freedom. I hope that this farsighted and statesmanlike endeavor will be loyally supported by its allies and friends in Europe as well as in Asia and elsewhere.

In the face of the flagrant Communist aggression in Asia, all the freedom-loving nations should see the writing on the wall and lose no time to close their ranks and pull together. For unity is strength and their unity is the more urgently needed

because the Communists are deliberately seeking to sow dissension among the Allies of the free world in order to weaken their position and make it easier to achieve their policy to divide and conquer. If Asia is successfully rescued from the Communist expansionist plot, she will be able not only to safeguard her own freedom but also rally to the aid and support of Europe in the event of an open challenge by the Communists. With Asia safe from the Communist menace, Europe and indeed the rest of the free world can look forward with greater confidence to a future of freedom and peace.

Politics Hurt Duck Shooting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the fine production of ducks in the Canadian prairie provinces permitted the Fish and Wildlife Service to allow Montana duck hunters an additional 15 shooting days this season.

With the increase, Montana will have a 75-day season on ducks, with bag and possession limits of 5 and 10, the same as last year.

Early this year, the duck hunters of western Montana asked for a migratory waterfowl season that would give them some shooting and, at the same time, be fair to eastern Montana hunters.

More than 4,000 signed petitions asking that that part of Montana west of the Continental Divide be taken from the central flyway and placed in the Pacific flyway. The request was based on the fact that mountainous wooded western Montana is much more like the area in the Pacific flyway than it resembles the plains of the central flyway and that the 80-day season of the Pacific flyway should apply to western Montana instead of the 60-day season of the central flyway.

These sportsmen of Montana are dedicated to the sound principles of conserving our waterfowl resource. They felt that a change would give hunters a reasonable opportunity to harvest this resource.

The senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, the junior Senator from Montana, Senator MANSFIELD, and I worked closely with the Montana Fish and Game Department and the Fish and Wildlife Service on this problem.

We met with Mr. John L. Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Out of these meetings came a recommendation for an 80-day season for Montana, depending of course on the production of ducks, with a decrease in bag and possession limits if necessary. With the help of the ducks, we got a 75-day season, an increase of 15 days, with no decrease in bag and possession limits.

The June issue of Sports Afield magazine carried a discussion of proposals to liberalize waterfowl regulations. Michael Hudoba, the magazine's Washington editor, said that if there is to be liberalization of waterfowling rules, it should be in longer seasons—because that is where the average hunter gets a better break.

Since Mr. Hudoba wrote his article, the information has come in on this year's waterfowl population. And it is good. The breeding grounds of the prairie Provinces—Alberta, Saskatchewan, and northern Manitoba—produced a crop of ducks large enough so that the seasons could be lengthened. The article follows:

POLITICS HURTS DUCK SHOOTING

Will waterfowl regulations this fall be set to the whim of political expediency?

This is a question that your reporter can treat only from straws in the wind, with the hope that—for the sake of waterfowling's future—later developments may prove him wrong.

This issue was thrown wide open back when the Eisenhower administration lifted the directorship of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service out of career civil service status and made it a political appointment. As this report predicted, that move made the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department vulnerable to political pressures and recriminations, which always had been present, but not have substance of political meaning.

As a result, most potent pressures about waterfowl regulations are piling up on the higher echelon of the politically conscious Interior Department. Even though no information is yet practical on the status of this year's waterfowl populations or breeding-ground results, there are demands for baiting of waterfowl and for relaxation and zoning—types of measures that would add to expanded waterfowl kill.

Also facing a crisis is the enforcement of waterfowl regulations. The outcome will determine the future effectiveness of waterfowl rules. This is another political issue.

Senator JOHN BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, had John Farley, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, in his office to discuss the waterfowl program. While no details of the talks are available, the effective activities of a Federal game agent in enforcing waterfowl regulations in northern Ohio, as reported in the Toledo Blade, did come under heavy fire.

Director Farley finds himself on the spot by the potency of a Senator and Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis, the top-level Interior Department Administrator of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Lewis, as well as Mr. Farley, has to answer to politics. If the enforcement activities of Federal game agent Fred L. Jacobson are affected, the resulting blow to the morale of the Fish and Wildlife Service enforcement staff would be disastrous.

And what of ducks, geese, doves, and migratory birds in such a mire of political currents? That's up to the sportsmen of our country. Either we can let the matter drift to an inevitable debacle, or we can demand that the best interests of a continuing migratory-bird population be served first.

It had been a long-standing policy of the Fish and Wildlife Service to resist zoning of a State for waterfowl shooting. Yet, the concern of early and late season waterfowlers is a pressing issue, accentuated by shortened seasons because of waterfowl declines.

The frustrations of the annual weather guessing game to get a good season for both early and late waterfowlers has developed a climate of impatience to zone. Until waterfowl populations are up enough to warrant extending the season to its previous long terms, the tug of war and weather guessing will continue.

But the Department of the Interior and its Fish and Wildlife Service have given in to zoning in one State (Long Island, N. Y.). As a result, at least eight States are strongly demanding a zoned waterfowl season.

The toughest issue, as far as political pressure is concerned, is baiting. While most of the States indicated they did not want waterfowl baiting, there are powerful demands piling in from at least three States for legalized baiting. This is the kind of pressure that politically vulnerable agencies find hard to resist.

Both zoning and baiting raise the basic question of what about waterfowl populations since these birds haven't shown any marked improvement. Yet both demands can only lead to increased kills of ducks and geese. And once zoning and baiting were set up as policies, they would be hard to get off the books in case of a sharp decline in migratory bird numbers. If that should happen, the average waterfowler, without club facilities, is certain to be squeezed out of his traditional sport.

If there's to be a liberalization of waterfowling rules, let it be in longer seasons. There is where the average waterfowler can expect his better break. But the average waterfowler is faced with the need to speak up strongly now, or subtle currents are likely to take his sport out of range.

Six Billion Dollars Versus Sixty Million People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article appearing in the August issue of the National Union Farmer.

The article in question concerns the activities of the natural gas monopolists. Gas consumers in Wisconsin are very much concerned with the windfalls that natural gas producers will reap unless some protection is given to the public.

The full text of the article, which I recommend to my colleagues, is as follows:

Ever since the dawn of democratic government the people have learned that they either must regulate the prices charged by a natural monopoly or take over that monopoly themselves, if they are not to be exploited right down to their socks.

In most countries, natural monopolies are directly owned by the government. In the United States on the other hand, the general trend has been toward private ownership and public regulation.

The law has been also that the owners of such monopolies (telephone, gas, electricity, water, etc.), are entitled to charge rates that will bring them a fair return on their prudent investment, and no more.

Of course they are always trying to "beat the game" by such tactics as inflating their costs and property values, and invading the commissions that are named to regulate them. Unceasing vigilance is the price the public pays, if it is not to be mulcted by profiteers in the price of necessities the people cannot do without.

History's boldest assault on the public's pocketbook, and the boldest raid on the public right to regulate natural monopolies, now is being staged in the form of the various

natural-gas bills before Congress. The stake is half a billion dollars yearly or more.

Natural gas occurs at many points in the United States, usually in combination with oil. In the last half century more gas was "flared" as waste into the air (thus wasting both gas and oil since the gas pressure is needed to drive up the oil) than the Nation has ever been able to use.

HUGE PROFITS

But in the past few years long pipelines have been driven to most parts of the United States, and the industry has rapidly grown to be the sixth largest in the United Stataes (including oil, it is the biggest). Profits have been huge. Many of the pipelines have been subsidized by the Government through tax amortization, ostensibly for defense purposes.

Nearly 20 million households, thousands of industrial plants and hundreds of electric power companies, public and private (many REA's included), are now natural-gas users.

The public has discarded billions of dollars worth of coal-and-oil burning equipment for $16 billion worth of natural-gas furnaces. And gas suppliers are natural monopolists—that is, you buy their gas, or move.

The situation is perfect for a move in and the huge gas and oil industry, with a war chest estimated at $1 million or more, and with a propitious political climate under the Eisenhower administration in Washington, is moving to make the sky the limit in what it can charge the public through the bills now before Congress.

INTERSTATE BUSINESS

The gas that comes into the kitchen range has almost invariably come across several State lines. This means that neither your city nor your State can effectively regulate the price you pay, if the price is not controlled clear from the wellhead.

By the well-known principle of bounce (which causes city consumers, for example, to pay 2.5 times as much for food as the farmer gets) every wellhead increase in the price of gas results in an increase several times as high at the kitchen range. About five times, or 500 percent, is the usual bounce.

Ever since 1938 when the first Federal regulation bill was passed, gas and oil companies have been trying either to interpret or legislate themselves out from under regulation.

More often than not the Federal Power Commission has sided with them, and Congress has passed one bill to end producer regulation, which President Truman vetoed.

Last year the United States Supreme Court held that the FPC could not shirk this duty, from which it had tried to escape, and shoved FPC's nose back against the grindstone of regulation. The Commission was by that time dominated by Eisenhower appointees. In apparent anger, it began granting interim increases as fast as gas producers and pipeline companies asked for them.

IKE SILENT NOW

Now there are rival bills before Congress. One would free gas producers from regulation, and thereby make the sky the limit for gas prices at the kitchen range. The other, by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, would confirm Federal regulation in line with the Supreme Court's ruling.

The battle cuts across partisan lines. The fate of the bills this year apparently rests upon administration support, and President Eisenhower, who first favored the "sky the limit" bill, has been silent since he learned that 60 million consumers would be adversely affected. This news apparently had been kept from him by his advisers.

Present prospects are that the big battle will come in the 1956 session of Congress, just before election. The question will be whether the interests of 60 million consumers outweigh those of the gas and oil cartel—$6 billion against 60 million people. The administration's heart is with the $6 billion.

William F. Gannon, of Revere, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Joseph F. Dinneen entitled "Not All Top Detectives Work in the Big Cities," which appeared in a recent edition of the Boston Globe, of Boston, Mass. Mr. William F. "Bill" Gannon, about whom the article is written, resides in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

The best detectives are not all in the big city police departments. FBI records detail superior work in small city and town departments by sleuths not widely known. William F. "Bill" Gannon, of Revere, is one so cited in a follow-up report on the graduates of the FBI Academy.

Bill Gannon solved a baffling case with a clue that was about to melt before his eyes. The clue was a tire tread mark in the snow and the sun was rising, but the FBI had taught Bill how to make plaster casts in snow and loose sand so that they could be fixed before they vanished.

In midwinter a Revere engineering company reported that $2,500 worth of metal had been stolen from its plant yard during the night. It was not the first such theft. Other plants were having the same trouble. It may surprise some Bostonians to learn that there are several smelting furnaces in Chelsea and Everett. From the air, their fire-belching smokestacks give the city a Pittsburgh appearance.

When Gannon arrived at the scene at about 10 in the morning, he observed the tire tread impressions in the snow and knew just what to do. He had soaked up all of the techniques, on molds, the use of plaster of paris and cameras at the FBI Academy. He picked up a package of plaster of paris at a nearby drugstore and went to work.

He made a perfect cast, fixed it permanently with shellac and photographed it; then set out to find a truck with tires that matched. He knew that the only market for scrap metal was the smelting refineries in the area where it is transformed into ingots. He canvassed all of them and made a list of all sales of scrap to them for 24 hours after the robbery.

He called upon each seller, checked tire markings and eliminated them. At one place, the truck owners were not at home. A woman he talked with said they usually returned at 6 o'clock in the evening, but that night they did not show up, and Gannon reasoned that they must have been warned.

He placed the house under surveillance. They turned up at 4 in the morning and Bill found that the tires and the cast matched. The suspects had alibis. They protested that they found the junk on a Lynn dump; but the jury was convinced by Bill's cast and his photographs of the truck and tires. The truck owners went to jail.

Bill Gannon is a detective with an unusual background. Born in Everett in 1910, he moved with his family to Revere, where he was graduated from grammar and high schools. He went on to Bentley School and Boston University. He studied law for 2 years and decided that there was a career in police work. He was appointed to the Revere force in December 1941, but 3 months later he was in the Army. An astute officer trained him for counter-intelligence, and he was assigned to various commands, in different ratings, to do the job assigned. Whether he was a private, corporal, or sergeant, those around him never knew his real mission.

He spent 2½ years in Europe in counter-espionage and wound up ostensibly as a member of the 101st Airborne. He landed on the Normandy beachhead on D-day in the first wave, along with two other counter-espionage agents, to make contact with friendly agents behind the lines. He was then listed as a master sergeant on the Army payroll. Gannon was shot up and wounded soon after landing. His brother agents went on without him, and later Bill was invalided home.

He returned to the Revere Police Department and was appointed a detective. He was recommended for the FBI Academy, completed the course and was graduated. Today he sometimes smothers a grin when he watches counter-espionage agents and detectives perform on TV. He has one quirk that always surprises newsmen. He won't pose for a picture; doesn't like the idea of letting criminals become too familiar with his face and appearance.

People of Asia Want Freedom and Dignity More Than Material Comforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, following a talk I gave before the Harvard Business School Club, I received a letter from a distinguished Washington lawyer which I believe merits sharing with a larger audience. The author, who was born in the Near East and trained in American institutions, sees our own country more clearly than we ourselves frequently do, because he sees us from the outside as well as from the inside. He also understands the spiritual revolution—in the broader sense of the word—that inflames the hearts and minds of the people of Asia and Africa who have had to fight for so long and hard, are still fighting, to gain human freedom. Until all of us understand that spiritual revolution, we will not fully succeed in our efforts to help these peoples with the overwhelming problems that beset them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: It was such a genuine pleasure to have you as our speaker.

What you said was the more meaningful to me because I'm intensely interested in the Near East and our problem there is essentially the same.

I was born in the Near East and my family migrated to the United States in 1920 not to enjoy the comforts of life but to be free, period. Americans who are born into freedom take freedom for granted and think that our physical comforts and luxuries are our chief assets. And they conclude from this that it is these luxuries and comforts that we should transport to the underdeveloped areas of the world.

What people in Near East and Asia want and crave for is not goods but freedom and that irreducible minimum of human dignity with which God has endowed each human being. I'm afraid the crux of the problem is that those people have understood President Wilson's message and have been fired

by it—man's irresistible inner urge for freedom and dignity—but our own people have not understood that message because they never lacked or were deprived of those basic necessities of life.

What those people want and need desperately is not physical things but things of the mind and of the soul. Indeed, giving material assistance to these people is even harmful to us insofar as it indirectly indicates to them that we are unaware of their basic problems and needs. And as long as they feel that way, that we do not understand their real needs and problems, we can never achieve a meeting of the minds which is so essential to a solution of any human problem.

Thank you again for a most thrilling and satisfying evening.

Very respectfully,

ARTHUR H. DADIAN.

Frederic R. Coudert, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses concerning the distinguished father, lately deceased, of our colleague, Congressman FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.:

ADDRESS BY HON BERNARD A. GROSSMAN, PRESIDENT, CONSULAR LAW SOCIETY

Another loss, alas, reminds us of the admonition of Holy Writ: "Shed tears over the dead, and reflect."

For life is an invitation to reflection.

And we look back on the lives of two of our esteemed colleagues who have departed this world and we give expression to what made them beloved to us, and we record here the sad fact of their passing.

I speak of our kindly and helpful associates, the Honorable Frederic R. Coudert, and Prof. Boris Mirkine-Guetzevitch.

A familiar face, an encouraging smile, a fortifying word, a sustaining friendship have been taken out of our lives. It is hard to realize that these generous and mellow friends who were so much a part of our society are so suddenly and so dramatically separated from us.

They each lived so that his memory is respected. They each lived so that his life will not be forgotten. By making evident to us what one could accomplish, they each designedly illustrated to us how rich in promise we all are. They each believed reverently in the equality of all.

Large was our friends' bounty, and earnest was their spirit. We are the heirs of that bounty and of that spirit and charged with its maintenance and growth. It has been turned over to us to be enjoyed in the practice, and passed on to the future with pride and with reverence; a gift in trust from them who created it. In this manner we, at once its beneficiaries and its grantors, can renew our unity with our beloved colleagues and our fealty to the future.

It is the sacred wisdom of Holy Writ that we who remain on the outside of the curtain that separates mortality from immortality should gather and reflect on the lives of the departed, and not leave their memories to be breathed only by the requiem of the wild winds. The haunting thought that the past is lost is thus reappraised, and, with another look, a new hope is born. We may thus see something of each of them in our fellow man, and perhaps, too, in time merge much of each of them in all of us, giving rise to the living, precious thought that the past is not irrecoverable—that it lives on, in those who follow. Though we become separated in space and time, we may thus with profit and understanding see the dimensions of the departed.

Though they have hurried on, still their spirit lingers in our midst. The humanity they have fostered, the relationships they have awakened, the love they have planted have grown roots that have grown and spread and bound colleague to colleague and will continue to bind their followers to come, in a pilgrimage on this side of the curtain that will endure until that new era comes when the human rights and the human hopes with which they concerned themselves are as real in life as they were in their hearts.

Farewell, dear friends, farewell, until we meet again.

ADDRESS BY DR. IVAN SOUBBOTITCH, PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL; ASSOCIATE, COUDERT BROS.

Frederic René Coudert was born in New York on February 11, 1871. His father was a well known lawyer, the senior partner of Coudert Brothers, established in 1853, an able writer whose name appeared often in the public affairs of this city and State. The part the elder Coudert played as one of Dudley Field's opponents in the latter's attempt to have the State codify its law into a civil code is well recorded in the legal history of the last century. The father of the elder Coudert, an officer in Napoleon Bonaparte's defeated armies, came from France, having chosen this country as an asylum when he succeeded in escaping execution for his part in the effort to overthrow King Louis XVIII.

Frederic R. Coudert received successively from Columbia University the degrees of bachelor and master of laws and doctor of philosophy, the last in 1894, at the age of 23. He was admitted to the bar in 1892 and was engaged in active law practice until his death on April 1, 1955. During those 63 years of active practice he was always associated with the law firm founded by his father, after whose death he became the senior partner of that firm.

Mr. Coudert's activities were not confined to the practice of law. This man of talent, energy, and learning, took a very active part in many professional, educational, and intellectual institutions and movements, both national and international. This is not the proper place to review them all, and this note, written for the members of our Consular Law Society, is necessarily limited to Mr. Coudert's contribution to the development of international law, of which a great portion of consular law is a part. However, it should be remembered that Mr. Coudert was a trustee of Columbia University; that in 1913–14, at the critical period which preceded World War I, he acted in the capacity of special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States; that he was also a member of the International Olympics Committee. As a cavalry officer he served in the Spanish-American War. That he was a man of physical vigor and a sportsman is attested by the fact that when he was approaching his 80th birthday I saw him fencing at the New York Fencers' Club.

Throughout his life he remained an active member of our various bar associations and of international professional organizations, and during two-thirds of a century lawyers of our country and of foreign countries had the opportunity at numerous of their meetings to appreciate his talent and to enjoy his wit and humor. The monographs, letters to editors, and notes, etc., which he contributed to our law reviews, periodicals, and bar journals would fill several shelves. They cover every aspect of the law. He also wrote several books.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Coudert's first contact with international law occurred while he was still in law school, when his father was appointed an Agent of the United States to the International Arbitration Tribunal established by Great Britain and the United States to arbitrate the famous Bering Sea Controversy which had arisen between those two powers in relation to the seal herds. In this famous arbitration young Coudert accompanied his father to Paris and acted as his secretary.

Significantly it happened that Mr. Coudert's first contact with the United States Supreme Court occurred in a case which involved a question of consular law (*Iasigi* v. *Van de Carr* (1897, 166 U. S. 391)). There Iasigi, Consul General of Turkey in Boston, an American citizen, had been arrested in New York for alleged embezzlement committed in Boston. The warrant of arrest was issued by a magistrate of this city. Iasigi applied to the United States district court for a habeas corpus writ on the ground that he, being a foreign consul, could not be prosecuted in other than a Federal court. Young Coudert (he was then 26 years old) fully argued the question of consular privileges before the United States Supreme Court, but the question was rendered moot because the Turkish Government removed Iasigi from the consular office and withdrew his consular status.

The same year, young Coudert argued before the United States Supreme Court another case involving very important questions of recognition of states and governments, legal status of "de factor" governments and acts of state. This was the well known case of *Underhill* v. *Hernandez* (168 U. S. 250).

During the next 60 years he handled a most impressive number of cases involving international law and international conflict of laws, many of which dealt with consular law, such as *Rocca* v. *Thompson*, decided in 1912 (223 U. S. 317). Some of these have faded into oblivion, others have become "causes célèbres" and are found in practically every case book of international law.

There are few facets of international law with which Mr. Coudert did not deal, either in court or in his speeches and writings. Among the topics he covered and discussed were such subjects as those relating to the nature and character of international law, its relation to internal law, states, recognition, suits by and against foreign governments (the Black Tom explosion case), sovereignty, transfer of territory, nationality (citizens, nationals, subjects, aliens), law of peace, law of war, neutrality, aggression, international crimes, sanctions in international law, law of prizes (the famous Appam case), pacific settlement of international disputes, protection of rights of United States citizens from interference by foreign nations, international claims commissions, arbitration, treaties (the power to make them, their binding force and effect) and international organizations, such as the League of Nations and the U. N.

His contribution to our law went beyond international law. For cases he argued have come to be regarded as part of the structure of our constitutional law (e. g., the so-called Insular cases dealing with the status of our territory acquired from Spain in 1899 and of that of its inhabitants). The very important last portion of section 47 of our decedent estate law evidences his influence on our stautory law.

It is to the credit of Mr. Coudert that the great amount of work done by him in the field of international law and international conflict of laws was not merely theoretical or even practical, but that he was able to contribute to the application and development of international law by usefully influencing the thinking of the courts and of scholars as well as that of the public at large.

His legal philosophy was pragmatic. His general approach was humanitarian. His knowledge was vast. His professional skill was outstanding. He was a man far above the average, having a keen interest in the life of this Nation and of the international community.

He was a founder and later a president of the American Society of International Law. However, his reputation extended beyond the borders of the United States. He was one of the few Americans who have been elected by the Institut de Droit International to its membership. That institute appointed him a few years before his death to its committee of three, entrusted with the preliminary study of the reconstruction and readaptation of the international rules of the law of war. The draft report he presented to the institute last year, in performance of that task, was his last contribution to high-level legal scholarship in the international field.

One of the great qualities of Frederic R. Coudert was that, although he had reached the Olympian heights of international legal scholarship, he never lost contact with reality or with the comprehension of the interests and reactions of the common man. He was a realist who believed in justice and who was always eager to make law an instrument for human happiness.

Congressman Crumpacker Plans Tour of 24 Third District Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, following my annual custom of bringing the services of my office directly to the people in their home communities, I am planning an official business tour of 24 cities and towns in the Third Indiana District while Congress is in recess.

My 1955 grassroots tour has been scheduled for November 14 through November 18 and will include visits to 7 communities in Elkhart County, 5 in St. Joseph County, 7 in La Porte County, and 5 in Marshall County.

A temporary office will be established in a central location in each community and local constituents will have an opportunity to confer informally with their Representative in Congress.

No advance appointments will be required. As in the past, I will be accompanied by a member of my Washington office staff and we will welcome the chance to be of service to any and all callers.

I have learned from experience, Mr. Speaker, that these tours are valuable for many reasons. As a supplement to the opinion polls I conduct each year by mail, they enable me to determine—through personal contact—the views and attitudes of my constituents on current national issues. They also give me the opportunity to report directly to the people on my stewardship in Washington.

With this in mind I am looking forward with pleasure to my 1955 tour of the Third Indiana District.

The complete tour schedule follows:

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14

Osceola, fire station, 9 a. m.
Elkhart, courthouse, 10 a. m.
Middlebury, First State Bank, 2 p. m.
Bristol, townhall, 3:30 p. m.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15

Wakarusa, Exchange State Bank, 9:30 a. m.
Goshen, courthouse, 10:30 a. m.
New Paris, State Bank, 2 p. m.
Nappanee, city hall, 3 p. m.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16

Lakeville, townhall, 9:30 a. m.
Bremen, townhall, 11 a. m.
Bourbon, News-Mirror office, 1 p. m.
Argos, townhall, 2:30 p. m.
Culver, Citzen office, 3:30 p. m.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17

North Liberty, post office, 9 a. m.
Walkerton, townhall, 10 a. m.
Plymouth, courthouse, 11 a. m.
La Crosse, townhall, 2 p. m.
Wanatah, H. W. Welkie office, 3 p. m.
Union Mills, fire station, 4 p. m.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18

Westville, public library, 9 a. m.
Michigan City, courthouse, 10 a. m.
La Porte, courthouse, 2 p. m.
Rolling Prairie, fire station, 4 p. m.
New Carlisle, townhall, 5 p. m.

Don't Let Them Take It Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an eloquent editorial from the July 22 issue of the Buffalo Evening News:

ANNIVERSARY OF A '52 DITTY

It was just 3 years ago that the 1952 Democratic convention opened to the rollicking tune of "Don't Let 'Em Take It Away."

Practically everybody was working at the time; a boom was on—and also a war. Now, 3 years later, things are also pretty good. About the only thing taken away is the war.

When the Democrats convened to sing their little ditty, the price level was almost exactly what it is today. The average factory worker then was earning $1.66 an hour; today $1.87. He was working an average of 40 hours a week; today 40.7 hours. His average weekly pay was $66.32; today $76.11.

In the second quarter of 1952, the average per capita disposable income (personal income after taxes) was at an annual rate of $1,478. In the second quarter of 1955, it was $1,619. The gross national product, when the Democrats convened in 1952, was running at the annual rate of $342.6 billion; today $383 billion. The national income rate then was $286.9 billion, of which $179 billion was labor income; today's national income rate is $319.8 billion, of which $214 billion is labor income.

"Don't Let 'Em Take It Away," they sang—but the people soon voted for Eisenhower regardless. And after 3 long years, just look where we are—wages 21 cents an hour higher, weekly paychecks nearly $10 fatter, the cost of living stabilized, taxes lower—and per capita purchasing power therefore $141 a year greater. Don't let 'em take that away.

Anti-Communist Seizure of Red Occupied Rumanian Legation in Bern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter from the president of the Foundation to Defeat Communism and concerning the seizure of the Red-occupied Rumanian Legation in Bern by young anti-Communists on February 14, 1955:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 2, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On the night of February 14 of this year, a group of young anti-Communists seized the Red-occupied Rumanian Legation in Bern, Switzerland.

They had information that the new political set-up in the Kremlin was in the process of sending fresh instructions to their various organizations and agents in the free world, one of these being the MVD chauffeur of the enslaved Rumanian Legation. They thought a raid in that Communist den would surely yield valuable clues in this direction. In fact it uncovered the espionage activities of the Red diplomats. An entire arsenal was found in the legation—a short-wave radio transmitter, automatic guns, all kinds of projectiles, time bombs, rockets, and a large quantity of ammunition.

The action of the young patriots has aided freedom wherever freedom still exists. Their cause is the cause of free men everywhere.

This stirring event, aided by excellent coverage by the European press, produced an enormous impression on public opinion. According to the Swiss press, the important documents found clearly proved that the Legation was a spy center.

As an immediate result of the Bern affair, the authorities in Sweden, alerted by this incident, on closer investigation uncovered also an important spy ring centering around the Rumanian and Czechoslovak Communist Legations in Stockholm, thus bringing an added proof of the results of the action in Bern.

The raid against the Communist Legation established beyond the shadow of a doubt that this Legation and every Communist Legation and Embassy are all spy centers, nests of espionage against the citizens of whatever country that recognizes them, including the United States.

A study recently completed by a commission headed by Gen. Mark Clark stated generally, we have permitted the collection of vital secrets in this country with relative ease by the Communists. "The information we need, particularly for our Armed Forces, is potentially available. Success in this field depends on greater boldness at the policy level, a willingness to accept certain calculated political and diplomatic risks."

Let us help these men who risked their lives and willingly took calculated risks to prove that the Soviet Union carries on against the free world constant espionage and subversion.

Let us encourage other patriots to bring out with them vital documents by aiding the cause of these young men, and we will encourage others to perform like acts of heroism in the name of freedom and liberty thus producing vital intelligence that will inform the free world of premediated acts of treachery.

During the time the young men held the legation the tension and excitement were at

their height in Bern. The morning after the coup about 2,000 Swiss were gathered in front of the building and 200 Swiss police surrounding it. As the young patriots refused to surrender at first, the Swiss authorites, under heavy pressure from the Communists, organized a veritable siege against these lone anti-Communists, surrounding the premises with barbed wire and bringing up an infantry battalion and an armored tank.

The young patriots had made a vow to obtain the release of five men from Communist jails, a cross section of the persecuted leaders of the Rumanian resistance behind the Iron Curtain, among whom was the heroic Bishop Suciu. In these five men, they were symbolically asking the liberation of their people from the curse of Soviet slavery. It was a cry of these patriots which stemmed from the same source as that of a Patrick Henry, as it voiced the eternal struggle for individual freedom and national independence.

Remember President Eisenhower stating on June 29 of this year that until the peoples enslaved by communism "have a right themselves by their own free will, to determine their own form of government and destiny * * * there could be no real peace in the world."

Finally after 42½ hours, this action which had caused such an impact on public opinion, came to an end. The young men, before entering the police car, in full view of the crowd, nailed upon the wall of the Legation the insignia of free Rumania. Inside they left a note saying: "We shall return."

The young heroes are now in a Swiss prison awaiting trial. Renowned lawyers throughout the world immediately expressed their desire to collaborate in the defense.

It is in the interest of our anti-Communist fight that an American participation in this defense should also be assured. We plan to send two prominent lawyers from this country to give an American voice to the world-wide resounding debate between freemen and the tools of tyranny.

If the defense of these boys is adequately secured and their trial is brilliantly defended, American sons could well be spared the horror of occupation, torture, brainwashing, mock trials or any hideous instrument of Communist treachery.

These patriots have a message for the free world. Trials throughout history have altered the course of history and this trial can produce a great victory on the side of humanity, Christianity, and freedom.

Sincerely yours,

LOUISA GUNTHER,
President, Foundation To Defeat Communism.

Hells Canyon Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Hells Canyon, located on the Snake River, is more than 1,500 miles away from the people living in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I represent. Despite this great distance, from 15,000 to 20,000 farmers in my district have an important stake in the proposed Hells Canyon Dam projects.

These farmers are members of a great regional farm cooperative—the Farmers Union Central Exchange—which owns mineral-bearing deposits needed for manufacturing fertilizer. The Farmers Union Central Exchange and a number of other farm cooperatives are very much interested in development of the Hells Canyon Dam project.

On the basis of correspondence from farmers and farm co-ops in my district I know that the farmers are opposed to the dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co. The farmers and their cooperatives favor building a high dam by the Federal Government.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the AFL News-Reporter. Here is the editorial:

Hells Canyon is of direct importance to the people of the whole Nation.

The Northwest has specific interest because a Federal high dam means irrigation, flood control, navigation, and recreational facilities not available with Idaho Power Co. dams. The people of the Northwest know also that the Federal high dam means lower power rates, more jobs—a total of 110,000 new jobs, 1,100 new retail outlets, 140,000 new households, and $525 million additional in retail sales.

The rest of the Nation has a stake because Hells Canyon is the last large remaining undeveloped dam site in America, deeper than the Boulder Dam site in Nevada. They want to be sure we do not squander our natural resources, neglecting flood control, irrigation and navigation, by handing them over for haphazard development by private interests.

They do not believe political debts should be paid at the expense of the rights of the people in natural resources that belong to all.

The rest of the Nation knows that only through the new low-cost power available through the Federal dam will new industry be attracted to the region. They know that new jobs, new homes, new retail establishments in the Northwest mean a greater demand for construction materials, household equipment, automobiles, and other products manufactured in other parts of the country.

The administration may try to delude the people by such phony terms as "partnership programs," "private enterprise," and "local initiative," but the fact of another giveaway is obvious.

The sneaky character of this new monopolistic move is evident in the delaying of the Federal Power Commission decision until the day after Congress adjourned.

Congress and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 84th Congress draws to a close, I am impressed by the commendable record of achievements to its credit. The Foreign Affairs Committee made some significant contributions, particularly the Formosa resolution which authorizes the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area. The extension for another year of the Mutual Security Act also means much in our overall program designed for our own security and world peace.

Under leave obtained, I insert an editorial from the New York Times citing achievements in our foreign policy:

CONGRESS AND PEACE

Viewed in the perspective of the atomic age, the most notable of these achievements is undoubtedly the development of both intergovernmental and national unity on the broad outlines of a national foreign policy, the supreme aim of which is a just and lasting peace to avert the horrors of nuclear war.

As developed in both theory and practice this policy is based first of all on the concept of peace through strength, our own and that of other free nations joined together in self-defensive alliances to deter and if necessary to suppress aggression. But it is also based on a vision of international cooperation in all fields that might include, if the Communists are willing, a negotiated modus vivendi with the Communist bloc. This, of course, would be based not on acceptance of Communist conquests but on the worldwide application of the no-force doctrine in the settlement of international disputes that is also the basis of the United Nations Charter.

The chief architect of that policy is without doubt President Eisenhower, who has become in fact its personification. Through it he has not only refuted Communist propaganda against the United States but has also made himself and this Nation the world's chief hope for peace. But that policy could be as effective as it has proved to be only because of the overwhelming support it has received from Congress, and through it from the American people.

That this support of the policy of a Republican President could be organized in a Congress controlled by the Democrats is in itself a tribute to congressional patriotism, in particular that of the congressional leaders, Senators JOHNSON and GEORGE, and Speaker RAYBURN, and even more to the maturity of the American people and the efficacy of the democratic process. These factors subdued not only the traditional conflicts between the two parties, especially notable in view of the forthcoming election year, but also the intraparty disputes among the Republicans. * * *

As regards peace through strength, Congress can claim credit for some truly historic achievements in that it supplemented the North Atlantic alliance with measures that made Germany a member of that alliance and provided the initial weapons for Germany's rearmament; established a mutual defense alliance in Southeast Asia; authorized the use of our Armed Forces in defense of Formosa; made free China an ally, and brought freedom and independence to Austria.

These measures, in which other nations of course participated, changed the political and strategic face of the world and helped to break the ice jam of the cold war that finally led to the Conference of Geneva.

National Conservation Memorial Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement

which I have prepared concerning the proposed establishment of a National Conservation Memorial Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, a bipartisan group of 25 Senators, representing every geographical region of the Nation, have joined with me in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 101. I am advised that more than 30 Democratic and Republican Members of the House, also representing every section of the country, have joined with Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, in introducing a companion resolution, House Joint Resolution 400.

The purpose of these resolutions is to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States.

The resolution sets up a National Conservation Memorial Commission which is directed to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and commemoration of the golden anniversary of the birth of the conservation movement in the United States and generally promote among the citizens of our country, a realization of the importance of protecting our natural resources.

All Government departments and agencies are directed to cooperate with and assist the Commission which in turn is instructed to cooperate with the governors of all of the States in carrying out its plans for observing the half-century milestone of the launching of conservation.

The President of the United States will serve as honorary chairman of the Commission. Other members will include Senators and Representatives from both political parties appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, representatives of national nonprofit organizations dedicated to conservation of various phases of natural resources, and 10 citizens from private life. All members will serve without compensation. The Commission will cease to exist not later than 1 year after the date of the observance of the birth of the conservation movement.

I think it is appropriate at this point to explain why it is so important to the future welfare of the citizens of our Nation that we properly commemorate the 50th anniversary of the birth of the conservation movement and through such action that we arouse, renew, stimulate, and maintain the greatest possible degree of interest of the greatest possible number of our citizens in the need for continuing conservation policies and programs that will preserve and protect our natural resources in the public interest.

The Commission can and will render such a vital service.

As recently pointed out by President Eisenhower and many informed leaders in Government, industry, labor, agriculture, science, and education, the problems involving the preservation and protection of our natural resources are as great today, if not greater, than ever before.

We only have to read the splendid and thought-provoking reports of the President's Materials Policy Commission in 1952, and study the proceedings of the meeting of the Mid-Century Conference on Resources for the Future in 1953 to realize how important and vital it is to our survival as a nation that we adopt and follow programs of action that will insure the protection of our natural resources and the intelligent and efficient use of them.

The President's Materials Policy Commission was headed by the Honorable William S. Paley and became known as the Paley Commission.

Under the general title of "Resources for Freedom" this Commission presented five comprehensive reports in addition to assembling a great deal of other valuable data. The five reports were entitled "Volume I: Foundations for Growth and Security"; "Volume II: The Outlook for Key Commodities"; "Volume III: The Outlook for Energy Sources"; "Volume IV: The promise of Technology"; and "Volume V: Selected Reports to the Commission."

To focus public attention on the findings and recommendations of this Commission should be one of the major achievements to stem from the observance of the 50th anniversary of the conservation movement.

The Paley Commission warns that our natural resources "will in the future demand much more thought and effort than we as a nation have seen fit to give them in the past."

At this point I should like to prescribe briefly the history of the conservation movement and how it was born 50 years ago.

The idea for the first conference of governors ever held in the history of the United States developed while President Theodore Roosevelt was the guest of the Inland Waterways Commission on a boat trip down the Mississippi River.

The idea and program for the conference were made public and developed by two members of the Waterways Commission, Hon. Theodore Burton, then United States Senator from Ohio, and Hon. Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, then the first head of the United States Forest Service.

President Roosevelt announced the calling of the conference in an address at Memphis, Tenn. He said then:

"As I have said elsewhere, the conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others. To solve it, the whole Nation must undertake the task through their organizations and associations, through the men whom they have made especially responsible for the welfare of the several States, and finally through Congress and the Executive. As a preliminary step, the Inland Waterways Commission has asked me to call a conference on the conservation of natural resources, including of course, the streams, to meet in Washington during the coming winter. I shall accordingly call such a conference. It ought to be among the most important gatherings in our history, for none have had a more vital question to consider."

The conference opened on the morning of May 14, 1907, with prayer by the Reverend Edward Everett Hale, then Chaplain of the United States Senate.

Then President Theodore Roosevelt spoke. He said in part:

"So vital is this question of conservation that for the first time in our history the chief executive officers of the States separately, and of the States together forming the Nation, have met to consider it. It is the chief material question that confronts us, second only—and second always—to the great fundamental question of morality.

"The occasion for the meeting lies in the fact that the natural resources of our country are in danger of exhaustion if we permit the old wasteful methods of exploiting them longer to continue. In the development, the use, and therefore the exhaustion of certain of the natural resources, the progress has been more rapid in the past century and a quarter than during all preceding time of history since the days of primitive man.

"All these various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as part of one coherent plan and not in haphazard and piecemeal fashion.

"The time has come for a change. As a people we have the right and the duty, second to none other but the right and duty of obeying the moral law, of requiring and doing justice, to protect ourselves and our children against the wasteful development of our natural resources, whether that waste is caused by the actual destruction of such resources or by making them impossible of development hereafter."

Among the speakers at the conference in addition to the governors and Members of Congress were Andrew Carnegie, John Hays Hammond, Elihu Root, Gifford Pinchot, and James J. Hill.

The governors unanimously adopted a series of resolutions calling for a national policy and programs that would preserve and protect the forests, the water and streams, the soil and the range, the minerals, fuels, and all other natural resources.

A key phrase in these resolutions declared: "We, the governors of the States and Territories of the United States of America, in conference assembled, declare our firm conviction that this conservation of our natural resources is a subject of transcendent importance, which should engage unremittingly the attention of the Nation, the States, and the people in earnest cooperation."

The Governors' Conference on Conservation was the first of its kind—the first not only in America, but in the world. It may well be regarded by future historians as a turning point in human history. Because it introduced to mankind the newly formulated policy of the conservation of natural resources, it exerted and continues to exert a vital influence on the United States, on the other nations of the Americas, and on the peoples of the whole earth.

The conference set forth in impressive fashion, and it was the first national meeting in any country to set forth, the idea that the protection, preservation, and wise use of the natural resources is not a series of separate and independent tasks, but one single problem.

It spread far and wide the new proposition that the purpose of conservation is the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time.

It asserted that the conservation of natural resources is the one most fundamentally important material problem of all, and it drove home the basic truth that the planned and orderly development of the earth and all it contains is indispensable to the permanent prosperity of the human race.

That great truth was never so true as now. It is therefore fitting that we as a Congress and a nation take all proper steps to observe this golden anniversary of the birth of the conservation movement.

New Dixon-Yates Fight Due on Hells Canyon Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that certain resources should be owned by the people and used for the benefit of all people. This philosophy is not original with me, for the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, and many other liberals of earlier generations entertained this belief.

It is for this reason that I have followed the developments pertaining to

the Hells Canyon Dam project. I realize that the fight on the Hells Canyon site goes back many years; however, the crucial period on development of the site is now.

As I have stated before on the House floor, thousands of farmers in the Ninth District of Wisconsin—which I represent—are interested in Hells Canyon. They are interested because their regional cooperative owns valuable mineral bearing land required in the making of fertilizer.

It appears that the Hells Canyon Dam projects are slated to become another Dixon-Yates deal. The Idaho Power Co. is bent on securing sites for its smaller dams. Advocates of the high-Federal dam believe that the peoples' interests can best be served by the high dam. From my study of the issues, I agree with the advocates of the high-Federal dam.

The CIO News contains a story which summarizes some of the issues at stake. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the news story from the CIO News, as follows:

A new Dixon-Yates fight was promised by angry Democrats following a Federal Power Commission decision awarding development of the vast Hells Canyon power resources to the Idaho Power Co., an eastern private utility.

Advocates of a high-level Federal dam in Hells Canyon, a deep gorge on the Snake River separating Idaho and Oregon, pledged a last-ditch fight in the courts and in Congress.

Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association, called the decision a blow to Americans "who fervently believe in the full-scale development of our natural resources for this and future generations."

Senator MORSE, Democrat, Oregon, warned that the fight is "far from over" and predicted that in the end "the people's interest will prevail."

Senator NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, branded the Idaho Power Co. "an absentee dominated company" with the "highest electric rate structure" in the Northwest, and charged that the company's program involved not "whole development but piecemeal exploitation" of the Hells Canyon site.

Senator KERR, Democrat, Oklahoma, predicted that "when Congress gets through with this one, it will be in the same junk pile where the remains of Dixon-Yates are now corroding."

The FPC decision, awarding permits to build three low-level dams on the Snake to Idaho Power, was reached on July 27. But it was not announced until August 4—after Congress had adjourned.

The fight over the Hells Canyon site goes back many years.

Termed the "last remaining great dam site in the Pacific Northwest," Hells Canyon was the subject long ago of an Army engineers' report supporting the feasibility of a single high-level Federal dam for flood control, irrigation, recreational facilities, and the production of low-cost electric power.

The Truman administration, backing up the advice of the Interior Department under former Secretary Oscar Chapman, recommended an authorization of Hells Canyon in 1953, as soon as post-Korea conditions allowed the Government to consider new starts on new major construction projects.

When Idaho Power Co. filed petitions for low-level dams that would forever preempt the site, Chapman's Interior Department intervened to fight the private utility's bid for control.

President Eisenhower in 1953 hastily dropped the Truman proposal from the first revised budget he presented to Congress. By midsummer, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay withdrew the Department's "intervention" against Idaho Power's application.

Abandoned by the administration, public power advocates intervened on their own responsibility and fought Idaho Power in hearings conducted for a year by an FPC hearing examiner, William J. Costello.

Costello produced a remarkable finding. He found as a matter of fact that "dollar for dollar the high dam would be the better investment and more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake River." But, because he thought that Congress wouldn't pass an authorization bill, he recommended that Idaho Power be granted a permit for just 1 dam—not 3.

The FPC, with 4 of its 5 members appointed by Eisenhower, unanimously overrode Costello's recommendation to the extent required to go beyond the 1-dam permit. The FPC granted permission for all 3 low-level dams proposed by Idaho Power.

The fight in the courts will be based on charges that the FPC decision violates the law and disregards factual evidence about the relative merits of Idaho Power proposals and the high-level Federal dam.

The fight in Congress will begin with the fact that in the session just ended, Interior Subcommittees of both House and Senate voted to approve authorization of a Federal Hells Canyon project.

"It is inexcusable for the FPC to grant a license for a project which is awaiting action of Congress as a Federal undertaking," said Representative MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington.

Pointing out that the FPC had heard oral arguments on July 6, MORSE said it was "incredible" that by July 27 the Commissioners "could have reviewed the voluminous records and testimony and exhibits" compiled in a year of hearings by Costello.

MORSE also urged the Office of Defense Mobilization to turn down Idaho Power's application for rapid tax writeoffs under the "tax bonanza" program.

Said Representative GRACIE PFOST, Democrat, Idaho, who won election last year on straight out advocacy of Hells Canyon in the Idaho district directly involved: "There can be no doubt that this administration believes what is best for the power trust is best for the people."

Mrs. Roosevelt Defends the President Against False Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the forthright article by Mrs. Roosevelt in which she defends President Eisenhower against an unjustified charge by a magazine published in New Jersey. The magazine said recently that—

Eisenhower is completely subservient to the Jewish plotters and is carrying forward their protocol plots steadily.

Mrs. Roosevelt says in part:

I am not a Republican but I believe that all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, owe the office of the President, as well as the man who occupies it, respect and truth in our criticism.

Mrs. Roosevelt says the magazine's charges are nonsense. Her defense of the office of the President and of the man who occupies that office compares most favorably with the attacks leveled on Democratic Presidents in recent years by some of the members of the official family of President Eisenhower.

Mrs. Roosevelt's article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

NONSENSE

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

I received a copy of a sheet from a newspaper sent by some people in Princeton, N. J. This, from my point of view, is a rather shocking development.

In the first place, it is openly antisemitic, so violently antisemitic it allows itself to say things which are completely untrue. In the second place, it attacks President Eisenhower in an outrageous way.

I am not a Republican but I believe that all of us Democrats and Republicans alike owe the office of the president, as well as the man who occupies it, respect and truth in our criticism. The criticisms in this sheet are far from true.

It is headed with a hammer and sickle on both side of the banner headline, "The Coming Red Dictatorship."

Here is one statement which, it seems to me, is unexcusable—"Eisenhower is completely subservient to the Jewish plotters and is carrying forward their protocol plots steadily."

What nonsense. How gullible can people be?

One must suppose the people who get out this sheet are writing what they believe, but if that is so one can only say that they are stupid beyond belief.

One thing about which I personally know the truth—they say: "The human rights covenant drawn up by Eleanor Roosevelt, Dean Acheson and two Russians, gives the government of any member nation and the U. N. the right, if it thinks itself threatened, to curb the freedom of the press and impose martial law and take over all industry and all labor."

AN EXAMPLE

Just to point out how inaccurate they are, here are the facts: No human rights covenant has been accepted by the General Assembly of the U. N. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was not legally binding and could not do any of the things here put down and it was written by the representatives of 18 nations who worked together for over 2 years. So, picking out the United States and the Soviet Union as responsible for it is rather absurd to say the least.

One might laugh at a publication such as this—which is called Common Sense and carried a subtitle, "The Nation's Anti-Communist Paper"—if it were not so tragic such nonsense can exist in a country like ours.

Smile, Pardner, Smile, When You Say "Subsidy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the last 20 years the public has been carefully conditioned to believe that farmers are the only group in the

United States to receive subsidies. At various times I have drawn my colleagues' attention to the fact that other groups in our economy are also the beneficiaries of subsidies—subsidies which often exceed the total sums paid to farmers.

The August issue of the National Union Farmer contains an interesting article on subsidies paid to the oil and gas industry. The full text of the article follows:

The United States oil and gas industry enjoys a yearly subsidy from United States taxpayers of $1 billion or more—equivalent each year to the total cost of the farmers' price-support program for the 20 years from 1932 to 1952.

Because the tax subsidy of American corporations is more closely guarded than the secrets of the hydrogen bomb, the sum must be reckoned indirectly.

Fortune magazine has published profits before-and-after taxes, of 500 larger American industrial corporations. These figures allow the special subsidies granted oil-and-gas companies to be roughly computed.

Such companies are first allowed to subtract all development and drilling costs—including "intangible" costs such as overhead—and then are further allowed to subtract 27.5 percent of their gross income from oil and gas wells (not exceeding 50 percent of net). They pay income tax only on what is left. This subsidy is known as the "depletion allowance."

The 10 largest American industrial companies, excluding oil companies, in 1954 paid 48 percent of their net income in taxes, had 52 percent left. The 10 largest oil-and-gas companies paid 28 percent in taxes, and had 72 percent of net income left.

The 10 largest oil and gas companies kept, in 1954, a total of $597 million that they'd have paid out if taxed at the regular corporation rate. This $597 million represents the hidden subsidy granted these corporate oil giants by United States taxpayers under the "depletion allowance."

Standard Oil of New Jersey in 1954 was subsidized approximately $135 million. Gulf, $40 million; Texas Co., $93 million; Standard of California, $80 million; Socony, $65 million; Shell $30 million; Standard of Indiana, $40 million; Sinclair, $40 million; Phillips, $29 million; Continental Oil, $16 million; Sun Oil, $15 million.

All the rest of the industry together, companies and individuals, probably does not match the subsidy granted the "big 10" of $597 million, but even so the industry total is well over $1 billion yearly. These big companies own by far the largest gas as well as oil reserves, and are the real powers behind the drive to free the "independent gas producer" from Federal regulation, at an estimated additional cost to gas consumers of $500 to $800 million yearly.

Pile this sum on top of a billion-dollar subsidy and the big boys would really "have it made."

Federal Subsidies to Commercial Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two columns by Ray Tucker which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader-the Evening News, one of June 30, 1955, and other on July 22, 1955. Mr. Tucker discusses the problem of Federal subsidies to commercial airlines and specifically of Federal subsidies to Pan-American Airlines:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader-the Evening News of July 22, 1955]

AIR GRANTS UNDER FIRE

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON, JULY 22.—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has joined the Capitol Hill forces which seek to reduce or eliminate taxpayers' heavy subsidies to profit-making commercial aviation companies. Since her late husband inspired expansion of the system on the advent of World War II, her testimony will have considerable effect on future subsidy appropriations to beneficiary lines.

Mrs. Roosevelt's deep concern is reflected in the fact that she wrote to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, at the behest of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. She also wrote to all conference committee members on this question. Senator DOUGLAS had conducted a 3-day floor fight against further exploitation of American taxpayers by a few commercial airlines.

He forwarded copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the debate to Mrs. Roosevelt and to many other influential financial, political, and civic figures. His replies have been 90 percent favorable, as Mrs. Roosevelt's letter to BRIDGES proves:

USE OF SUBSIDY MONEY

"I have just read a letter from Senator PAUL DOUGLAS," she wrote BRIDGES, "telling me about a situation which will come before you on the payment of airmail subsidies. You will have to decide whether the House figure of $40 million of the Senate figure of $55 million should stand, or whether you will make a compromise between the two.

"I know that you are thoroughly familiar with this question, and I only wish to say that for a number of years, I have watched this situation, including all the points which Senator DOUGLAS sets forth as regards Pan American and its subsidiaries."

She referred to Senator DOUGLAS' floor presenation, which revealed that Pan Am uses subsidy money to pay taxes, to finance luxury hotel losses, and to make profits. Although he lost the major battle, he did succeed in cutting the subsidy figure to $52,500,000.

EQUAL TREATMENT

"Why," continued Mrs. Roosevelt, "cannot audits be made of these companies just as well as of others and why should the entire (Pan Am—Editor's note) system not be treated as an entity, since that was the Supreme Court decision?

"It seems to me to be of interest to the country to have these subsidies made as low as possible, and to create a situation in which companies are treated equally by the Government."

Oddly enough, Senator BRIDGES, who is a Pan Am man, turned over Mrs. Roosevelt's critical letter to Carrol Cone, a former member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, a former Democratic National Committeeman from Arkansas, and now a well-paid vice president and political lobbyist at Washington for Pan Am, which enjoys the lion's share of subsidies and airmail pay—$31,920,000 for fiscal 1956.

MISREPRESENTATIONS

Cone's reply to Mrs. Roosevelt included numerous misrepresentations.

The Pan Am official said that "all financial transactions between Pan Am and other companies, affiliated or not, are subject to and under the continuing scrutiny and review of the Civil Aeronautics Board."

Chan Gurney, other CAB officials and General Accounting Office staff members have testified that there has never been a complete audit of Pan Am's complicated and bewildering financial and operational affairs. That is on the official record of Congress, the CAB and GAO.

OFFICIAL FIGURES

Cone said the Pan Am "enjoys no more favorable subsidy than that afforded to any other United States carrier." Official figures belie that statement. For fiscal 1955, Pan Am will enjoy a subsidy of $17,769,000. The next largest amount paid an airline firm is approximately $3 million.

However, the Bridges-Cone-Roosevelt exchange shows how politically entrenched, as of today, Pan Am is on Capitol Hill. It has led Capitol Hill to ask these questions:

Why should Senator BRIDGES, a Yankee legislator obligated with saving taxpayers' money, forward Mrs. Roosevelt's antisubsidy letter to such a special pleader as Cone? Why should Cone so misrepresent known facts and official statistics in his letter to the former President's wife?

And what does Mrs. Roosevelt think of this amazing example of politico-economic duplicity and doublecross?

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader-the Evening News of June 30, 1955]

CUT IN AIR SUBSIDIES

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON, June 30.—Behind closed doors, a House-Senate conference committee is struggling today with a problem which may cost or save American taxpayers many millions of dollars. It will decide whether Pan American World Airways shall continue to fatten on Federal subsidies, which have totaled more than $1 billion since World War II.

The White House and a House appropriations subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, of Brooklyn, cut the 1956 subsidy figure proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board from $55 million to $40 million. The reduction is not so important as the purpose behind it, which was to force Pan Am to adopt economies that would make it self-sustaining.

Pan Am gets the lion's share of taxpayers' money allotted to airlines subsidies. Its great overseas rival, Trans World Airlines, has just received a special citation from Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, congratulating it for operating without subsidies. Most other lines, foreign and domestic, pay their own way.

DEBATE ON SUBSIDIES

In Senate debate on this question, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, developed these facts about Pan Am's finances and its relationship with the CAB, the Treasury, and the General Accounting Office:

Pan Am receives between $8 million and $9 million a year from the Federal Treasury in order to pay its taxes to Uncle Sam. In some years, Pan Am has received more than it owed in taxes, but has simply pocketed the "windfall." The Treasury has never tried to recover the excess payments.

Pan Am operates a chain of luxury hotels in Latin America, with fancy bars, golf courses, and swimming pools, on which it loses between $2 million and $3 million a year. According to Senator DOUGLAS, this loss is financed by many taxpayers who cannot afford an air voyage to these luxurious hostelries.

FEDERAL OVERPAYMENTS

According to Postmaster General Summerfield, Pan Am owes millions to the Government for past overpayments it has received for carrying the mail, which is another form of subsidy. But despite Summerfield's urging, no suit to recover has been brought by the CAB or the Department of Justice.

Most amazingly, as several congressional investigations disclose, neither the CAB nor the Comptroller General have complied with legal requirement that they audit Pan Am's finances and operations. Both agencies have failed to comply with a Supreme Court decision to that effect, a decision which re-

vealed the Jurists' annoyance over this untidy state of affairs.

Despite Senator DOUGLAS' scorching analysis, a Senate Commerce Subcommittee, headed by Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND of Florida, increased the subsidy total from the House allowance of $40 million to $55 million. Although HOLLAND failed to answer the DOUGLAS indictment, the Senate voted for the larger amount by 51 to 25. Pan Am's lobbyists are extremely influential in the upper Chamber.

Thus, the subsidy problem comes to a climax before the House-Senate conference committee, now in session. It is expected that Pan Am will win.

SENATOR DOUGLAS' LETTER

Senator DOUGLAS, however, has carried his antisubsidy fight outside the Senate. He has scheduled a conference with Comptroller General Joseph Campbell for a detailed examination of Pan Am's financial position. In his letter to Campbell, Senator DOUGLAS said:

"I would be less than frank, if I did not say that I am very disappointed at the lack of information given to me by the General Accounting Office (which Campbell heads), in response to my repeated requests since February 25, 1954.

"As for my general question of possible waste and extravagance in the airline subsidy program, and my request for information as to ways and means whereby the expenditures of the Federal Government on this item could be reduced, I believe that I received nothing at all from the General Accounting Office."

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. John H. Wilson, of Ripon, Wis., describing the memorial services held recently in commemoration of the 100th birthday of Hon. Robert M. La Follette, Sr.:

RIPON, WIS., *July 10, 1955.*

Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress from Wisconsin, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LESTER: It was wonderful of you and Senator MORSE to give recognition to "Old Bob" on the 100th year of his birth. Both you and the Senator are excelent proponents geographically and spiritually of the principles that he represented and discharged.

The procedure of events at Madison which marked the observance was far better than I personally expected. Sunday morning commenced at the Society Building where a motorcade of about 54 cars was to take us to the birth spot of Bob, Primrose. On our way, the procession passed through Vernona where Senator MORSE had lived. Before we left, I had the pleasure of seeing Progressives that I had not seen in years like former Assemblyman Carlson, Harry Sauthoff, Gordon Sinykin, Fred Risser, and others. I shared the same car with a wonderful couple, former State Senator and past State Legion Commander, Kenneth Greenquest and his wife. At the brief ceremonies at Primrose, Bill Evjue delivered the address with Phil and Chief Justice Warren directly in front.

We returned to have dinner at the Memorial Union with brief introductory remarks there. The dinner was sponsored by the Dane County Bar Association.

The United States Chief Justice gave the principal address at the main event. Phil gave an excellent introductory address with others making remarks.

The day's activities ended at the grave at Forest Hill. Three floral pieces were at the grave. One basket, one wreath which Chief Justice Warren placed, and a red, white, and blue floral wreath given by local No. 1327, United Steel Workers, CIO, of Ripon.

Everyone was overly congenial and one never had to wait for introductions at the several occasions for everyone introduced themselves. The day is long to be remembered. The press states, of the gathering, only about 50 older Progressives were on hand with me in that list.

I am happy to see you working on the idea of reduction of the retirement age for women. It is the first step in the right direction for what must eventually have to come later. In fact, I would give you a 100-percent rating but only wish the rest of Congress or even a majority of Congress were with you.

This is longer than I had expected, but I did want to give you some report on things and I have done so as briefly as possible.

Cordially yours,

JOHN H. WILSON.

Legislative Output of the 1st Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, August 2, 1955:

If the legislative output of the 1st session of the 84th Congress seems somewhat meager, surely part of the reason is that the times have no demanded earth-shaking decisions. For that circumstance we may all be thankful. There should be satisfaction, too, in the refusal of this Congress to do a number of things it was asked to do.

The urgent things, or the things which seemed urgent at the time, were done. President Eisenhower got without difficulty his free-hand authority regarding the defense of Formosa and a mutual defense pact with that island's Government. Other important foreign legislation—like extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act and ratification of the Paris pacts on Germany and of the Austrian state treaty—was in due course enacted. The administration was given about what it said it needed for national defense and for the general operations of the Government.

But this session's omissions are almost equally important. Thus Congress declined to accept the Democratic $20-a-head tax cut, a starkly political suggestion as inequitable as it would have been damaging to Federal finances. And while Congress approved the foreign-aid bill, it served notice of a certain disquiet about this indefinitely prolonged program by slashing some $560 million out of the administration's request for more than $3.2 billion.

* * * * *

Attempts to restore 90 percent of parity farm price supports, before the new flexible system has even had a chance to work, also got nowhere this year. That was likewise the destination of a proposed big new Federal intrusion into school construction, of further Government involvement in medicine through the reinsuring of health insurance, and of further liberalization—at increased tax cost, of course—of the just-liberalized social-security program.

Now it would be naive to suggest that Congress resisted all these temptations out of undiluted public-spiritedness. Some of the failures to act were fortuitous. In the case of the highway program, political rivalry produced a political impasse. Certain of the welfare schemes did not go far enough to suit the Democrats—yet it is incidentally ironic that under a Democratic Congress the welfare state did not expand as much as the Republican administration hoped. But whatever the motivations, the country was saved, at least for a while, a lot of unnecessary and costly new legislation.

And we suspect that, along with the more specific motives, there was a general awareness on Capitol Hill these past 7 months that these were not really burning issues in the Nation as a whole. If anyone can sense the people's mood, it is the politicians who depend on the people's votes. Had they felt powerful pressure for Federal highways or more Federalized medicine, it is a safe bet they would have acted.

Instead, the Members of Congress may have detected that the mood of a Nation at peace and unprecedentedly prosperous is not conducive to dramatic new legislation or even to great quantities of any kind of legislation. This session did well to reflect that fortunate situation.

It was not a do-nothing Congress, but its political sixth sense may have helped to keep it from doing many things the country can well do without.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Activity Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 105, 84th Congress, I should like to submit a statement of the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 84th Congress, 1st session.

Notwithstanding circumstances that involved the committee in lengthy hearings and executive sessions on two different subjects, we were able to clear some extremely important legislation during the session.

In the field of health we reported and both Houses passed a resolution authorizing a 3-year study of the Nation's mental health problems. This resolution was frequently referred to in the course of the hearings as perhaps the most important legislation that was before the 84th Congress insofar as its ultimate effects on the welfare of the people are concerned.

When the announcement was made on April 12 that field tests conducted in 1954 proved the efficacy of the Salk vaccine, the committee immediately began a study of the problems presented by that important announcement. These problems were greatly accentuated by the dis-

covery of some live virus in batches of vaccine released by the Cutter laboratories.

The committee maintained a careful watch over all developments that followed and then, after hearing a panel of 15 top experts on the subject of poliomyelitis, reported legislation which we believe will be extremely helpful to the Nation as a whole in carrying on vaccination programs in the several States.

We reported legislation amending the Railroad Retirement Act to provide additional benefits for wives of retired railroadmen, and for widows who may be eligible to receive a widow's annuity under the act, and also eligible to receive social-security benefits in their own right.

In the field of aviation we reported legislation, which became law, making it possible for local service airlines to obtain permanent certificates, and a national airport program that should greatly assist in bringing our national airways up to date in line with the growth of the industry and the increased speed of planes.

Amendments to the Natural Gas Act were reported and passed the House but did not become law.

We reported a bill to provide for research in air pollution and this became law.

Reports were filed on newsprint and on the very controversial question that arose out of the conflict of opinion relating to a system of air navigation. This is commonly referred to as the VOR/DME/TACAN controversy, and it called for a very detailed technical study by the committee.

The detailed activity report follows:

ACTIVITY REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION—BILLS REPORTED

The committee has considered and reported favorably the following bills:

H. R. 2225, permanent certification of local-service air carriers: Report No. 265, by Mr. Williams, March 22, 1955. Approved May 19, 1955, Public Law 38.

House Joint Resolution 256, providing for study of mental health: Report No. 241, by Mr. PRIEST, March 21, 1955. Approved July 28, 1955, Public Law 182.

H. R. 1816, to declare certain tidewaters in Boston nonnavigable: Report No. 421, by Mr. MACDONALD, April 18, 1955. Approved May 13, 1955, Public Law 34.

H. R. 6645, to amend Natural Gas Act—exemption of producers: Report No. 992, by Mr. PRIEST, June 28, 1955. Passed House, amended, July 28, 1955.

H. R. 5222, flammable fabrics—exempt scarves: Report No. 969, by Mr. KLEIN, June 28, 1955. House rule rejected, August 1, 1955.

H. R. 2866, nonnavigable waters in Acushnet River, Mass.: Report No. 909, by Mr. MACDONALD, June 23, 1955. Approved August 3, 1955, Public Law 212.

S. 928, providing for research in air pollution: Report No. 968, by Mr. CARLYLE, June 28, 1955. Approved July 14, 1955, Public Law 159.

S. 1250, nonnavigable waters in Pike Creek, Kenosha, Wis.: Report No. 908, by Mr. FLYNT, June 23, 1955. Approved July 26, 1955, Public Law 169.

S. 1300, nonnavigable waters in Greenwich Harbor, Conn.: Report No. 905, by Mr. HAYWORTH, June 23, 1955. Approved July 12, 1955, Public Law 152.

S. 1469, nonnavigable waters in Cedar Creek, Bridgeport, Conn.: Report No. 907, by Mr. Friedel, June 23, 1955. Approved July 12, 1955, Public Law 151.

Senate Joint Resolution 38, interstate compact to conserve oil and gas: Report No. 917, by Mr. HARRIS, June 27, 1955. Approved July 28, 1955, Public Law 185.

H. R. 4744, railroad retirement—dual benefits for widows: Report No. 1046, by Mr. PRIEST, July 1, 1955. Approved August 12, 1955, Public Law 383.

H. R. 5614, to amend Communications Act—protest rule: Report No. 1051, by Mr. PRIEST, July 1, 1955. Passed House, July 21, 1955.

H. R. 4090, radio call selectors on cargo ships: Report No. 1618, by Mr. Macdonald, August 1, 1955.

H. R. 7126, grants to States for purchase of Salk polio vaccine: Report No. 1186, by Mr. PRIEST, July 14, 1955. S. 2501 passed House, amended, in lieu, August 1, 1955. S. 2501 approved August 12, 1955, Public Law 377.

S. 1855, Federal airport assistance: Report No. 1190, by Mr. HARRIS, July 15, 1955. Approved August 3, 1955, Public Law 211.

The committee held public hearings as follows:

Number of public hearings:	
Entire committee	54
Subcommittees	30
Hours of sitting:	
Entire committee	183
Subcommittees	90
Printed pages of public hearings	2,980
Unprinted pages of public hearings	815

In addition to the above, the committee filed House Report No. 683, newsprint study, current newsprint outlook; House Report No. 592, investigation of the development of the common system of air navigation and traffic control; and printed as a committee print a staff report on State taxation of interstate trucking and the reciprocity problem.

Others, Too, Lean on Price Crutches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Thorp Courier, edited by Robert Elkins of Thorp, Wis.

As the editorial points out, farmers are not the only people who lean on price supports. The editorial follows:

The Wall Street Journal suggests that the farmer has been leaning on price crutches so long that he can't handle himself without them.

Quite so, Mr. Wall Street Editor. But why confine your comments to the farmer?

Why not say something about the eastern industrialists who have been leaning on tariff price crutches for half a century or more? Tell them to learn to get along without them. Also, tell the other segments of our economy to throw away the crutches.

And remember, Mr. Wall Street Editor, that the farmer didn't start this price crutch business. Your pals in eastern industry did, and they did it so long ago that you've forgotten that they have crutches.

Check back in history a bit. The real agitation to do something for the farmers started in the twenties and the argument advanced then—a very solid one—was that industry was on price stilts and that the farmer needed some protection to place him on the same level. The contention was that "the farmer can't survive if he must sell in an open market and buy in a protected market."

That was the theme song when the famous McNary-Haugen bill was presented to Congress in the twenties. That was the gist of the argument in its favor. No one could provide a really sound answer against the farmers contention then, and no one can do it today.

Start a campaign, Mr. Wall Street Editor, to induce the eastern industrialists to abandon their price stilts. Then after you've accomplished that objective, come to the farmers and ask them to do likewise. But begin at home.

The farmer can battle his way in a free economy with no holds barred. He can take care of himself as well as anybody. But he has a right to expect the same economic rules for everybody.

MORE NOTES ON PRICE SUPPORTS

Even here in a farming area, you still find people who shake their heads and say they don't know about this price support business, it sounds like artificially maintaining prices.

Well, maybe it is, whatever that means, but look at it this way:

The several million farms in this country are each a separate business, run by individuals who are mostly unorganized, and despite that they have succeeded in producing all the food and fiber that this country needs, with some to spare. But being individual units, they have no marketing system they can control, except through the agency of their Government.

It's one thing to say a farmer ought to grow what he can get the most for and trust to luck to make a profit, the same as other people do, only it doesn't work that way and very few others function under such a system.

Take the car manufacturers. There are only 3 big companies, doing about 75 percent of the total business, and all told only 5 or 6 companies. If there were only 3 big farmers in this country, raising 75 percent of the cotton, corn, maize, etc., and 3 or 4 others raising all the rest, they wouldn't need any Government support prices, they'd just hold the food off the market until they got what they had to have.

Or take tractor manufacturers. The same thing is true. There are only 7 or 8 companies making all the tractors and other farm implements for all the farmers in this country.

And even so, car manufacturers and tractor manufacturers have price supports, in the form of tariffs.

As long as the farmland is divided up into small units, and we for one hope it will stay that way forever because if there's anything that keeps a democracy functioning it's a lot of small people who are their own boss and are economically uncontrolled by anyone else, then there has to be some method devised to let a farmer know when he starts a crop about what he can get for it when he finishes it. It's the most stabilizing fact in farming today, and it is now being proved right here in Williamson County.

Our only complaint is that the present Agriculture Department, headed by Secretary Benson, does not have much faith in it. Secretary Benson has lowered the support price at every chance he got, contending for

example that 70 percent of parity is better for the farmers than 90 percent. Parity, as you know, means a fair price, and what this means is that Secretary Benson believes 70 percent of a fair price is better than 90 percent of a fair price. When he ran for President, Mr. Eisenhower criticized the Democrats for supplying the farmers only 90 percent of parity, saying they were entitled to 100 percent. Now 100 percent of fairness never did seem like too much fairness to us, but it seems like at least 30 percent more than Secretary Benson believes in. Equal justice to all, except farmers, and 70 percent is enough for them.

The Superficial Aspect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the May 23, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine is deserving of our attention:

THE SUPERFICIAL ASPECT—MORALITY MINUS MENTALITY

The affair of the Salk vaccine involves no moral turpitude, as far as the public is aware. It does not even involve political shenanigans, as most governmental stupidities do. Neither the administration nor the Republican Party had anything to gain by risking the snarl-up that has occurred, so this cannot be described as an instance in which inept politicians outsmarted themselves. They were not trying to be smart, they were only being natural; but the result is an exhibition that staggers the sourest cynics.

To an outside observer, judging entirely by the news that is public property, it seems improbable that the Government was guilty of a single evil thought in connection with this business. The trouble is that it was not guilty of any thought of any kind. It appeared to be serenely unaware that a special duty devolved upon it simply by reason of the magnitude of the problem. It was content to follow the routine established many years ago to protect the public against harmful or useless innovations in the field of medicine; it could not understand that the intense interest in this particular innovation imposed upon it a special responsibility.

In this case, as in nearly every other special problem that has been suddenly presented, the administration seemed to be obsessed with something like Harding's certainty that a "return to normalcy" is the great desideratum. The first consideration in the circumstances was to see to it that there should be no interference with the normal operations of free private enterprise; why worry about a few dead children as long as holy enterprise remained free from the defiling touch of creeping socialism? The administration seems shocked and amazed by the discovery that the public regards the children vastly more important than either the profits or the convenience of pharmaceutical corporations.

Many years ago normalcy was succinctly, if inadvertently, described by a Republican stalwart. In 1920, shortly after the nomination of Harding, he asserted publicly that the nomination was unexceptionable except for one minor objection. "Warren," the stalwart admitted, "lacks mentality."

Judging by its first 27 months the epitaph of the Eisenhower administration may be, "It lacked mentality." From the day when Charles E. Wilson barked into Washington without first qualifying, legally, for the position he was to hold, down to the hash made of the Salk vaccine, the most startling of the administration's activities have evidenced lack not of morality but of mentality.

Only a fortnight ago when Chou, the Chinese Communist, made the first gesture that might be regarded as conciliatory and was instantly slapped in the face by the State Department, it developed that the repulse was due not to any wicked determination to provoke hostilities but merely to the fact that neither Mr. Hoover, at the State Department, nor Mr. Eisenhower, at Gettysburg, knew exactly what Mr. Dulles, off fishing somewhere, thought of the gesture, Mr. Dulles dashed back to Washington and hastily retrieved the error, but not until the world had been given the impression that the administration in Washington really doesn't know which way it is heading.

Mr. Benson's modest proposal to plow under the marginal farmers; Mr. Wilson's dictum that what is good for General Motors is good for the United States; and Mr. NIXON'S remarkable propensity for spilling the beans, all are attributable less to evil thinking than to nonthinking.

Perhaps the most startling of all, yet ignored as trivial, was an incident nearly 2 years ago when Lodge, at the United Nations, was fighting with his back to the wall because Nehru had jumped the reservation and was leading the Comanches in a raid on the democratic stockade. A White House spokesman announced that the President, then in Denver, proposed to take the week off and do nothing except go golfing and fishing. The fact of the matter was that there was little else he could do, but for the President to announce publicly that he was going loafing at that critical moment was, well, just lack of mentality.

This has imposed a terrific strain on the one-party press. To do it justice, it has seldom suppressed the news, but it has suppressed apposite comment on the succession of blunders. To appreciate the difference one need only recall what followed when Truman, at a moment when foreign affairs were so critical that sober-minded men were fearing war in a matter of days, toyed with the idea of sending Chief Justice Vinson abroad as an additional negotiator. But he consulted Secretary of State Marshall, then in Paris, and Marshall disapproved, so Truman dropped the idea.

But some Judas—it was Truman's ill luck always to have an Iscariot lurking in the background—gave the story to the one-party press, and it squalled for a week, not because the President had done anything, but because he had momentarily thought of an injudicious move. Yet there may be a certain consistency in it. President Truman was denounced for thinking wrong; President Eisenhower is not denounced, perhaps for lack of evidence that he thinks.

Dixon-Yates Deal Buried But Not Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Dixon-Yates contract attracted considerable interest outside the Halls of Congress. The reason for this interest outside of Congress rises out of the fact that the public had a stake in this and other phases of our power and resource development program.

I know that the REA cooperative patrons of the Nation were very much interested in the Dixon-Yates contract. It so happens that the Ninth District, which I represent in Wisconsin, is one of the strongest REA cooperative districts in the Nation. Thus, there was more than average interest by people in my district.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a story which appeared in the August issue of the National Union Farmer. The article summarizes very well the issues involved in the Dixon-Yates contract. The full text of the news story follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Dixon-Yates deal is dead, but it is a long way from buried and forgotten.

President Eisenhower sounded the death knell for the ill-starred project only 1 hour before Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of a Judiciary Subcommittee, was to open an unusual nighttime hearing on the involvement of high administration officials in what have been termed "scandalous" implications in the deal.

The Presidential announcement, which came out at the most unusual evening hour of 7 p. m. on June 30, made Senator KEFAUVER'S hard-hitting investigation falter—but only briefly. The 8 p. m. hearing was called off quickly, but soon thereafter the investigation was resumed.

Mainly as a result of the aggressive digging of Chairman KEFAUVER and subcommittee members LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, and O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, the main outline of the Dixon-Yates contract's origin and its unusual course through Government channels has been made public.

The story reveals that the Dixon-Yates method was invented by the Nation's biggest utility financial firm, which placed one of its own vice presidents inside the White House to work out the details. The Dixon-Yates deal itself had the personal favor of President Eisenhower, who ordered independent Government agencies to accept and back it against their better judgment. With the President personally behind them, the Dixon-Yates promoters were able to draw several agencies of the Government into their fight to put over the deal. Investigating Senators have charged possible violation of the criminal laws in the case.

FACE SAVING AT BEST

The administration gave as its reason for calling off the Dixon-Yates contract the fact that the city of Memphis intends to build its own steam plant—so the private utility combine's project is not needed.

But Washington observers consider this a hasty face-saving excuse at best. Memphis officials testified under oath 8 months earlier that they wouldn't accept electricity from Dixon-Yates; and ever since they have openly—even noisily—been making preparations for building their own powerplant for Memphis.

And just 2 days before the President called off the deal, the Atomic Energy Commission voted 2-to-1 against giving up the contract in light of Memphis' plans to build its own plant. AEC Chairman Strauss has been one of the utility interest's most vigorous supporters in the administration.

Fear of scandal, rather than Memphis' plans, prompted the sudden reversal of the President. The Kefauver-Langer-O'Mahoney investigating team is proceeding hot on the trail nevertheless.

For those supporters of REA co-ops and public-power projects believe that not only has wrong been done, but that the full story of Dixon-Yates will reveal a pattern of a captive White House made into a willing tool of the Nation's big utility and financial interests.

In the spring of 1953, shortly after the Eisenhower administration took office, George Wood, board chairman of the First Boston Corp., came to Washington to see his "good friend" Joe Dodge, then Director of the Budget Bureau. First Boston Corp., a Wall Street financial institution, is the Nation's biggest utility financial agency.

GLIB REPLY

Wood arranged to have First Boston's vice president, Adolphe Wenzell, placed in the Budget Bureau as a paid consultant, for the purpose of working out a plan for the Eisenhower administration to deal with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

When Senator KEFAUVER asked Wood if he thought of the possibility that First Boston might get some business as a result of this arrangement, he replied glibly:

"I was sophisticated enough to know that would be a pleasant byproduct."

The administration, meanwhile, completely halted TVA's regular program of expansion to meet the rapidly growing demands for electricity from cities and co-ops in the area.

Wenzell worked up a plan whereby all of TVA's electric power operations would gradually be turned over to private utilities. The first step in Wenzell's scheme was the original blueprint for the Dixon-Yates contract. Wenzell told investigating Senators that he considers TVA galloping socialism—not just creeping socialism as President Eisenhower has called it.

There is a gap at this point as to just how Dixon and Yates, the heads of two utility holding companies, were brought into the still-secret negotiations. But Wenzell was called back, again as a consultant, by the new Budget Bureau Director, Rowland Hughes, to help negotiate the contract as a Government representative.

Wenzell sat on one side of the negotiating table part time. At night, and weekends, and during odd moments, he crossed over to the other side to consult with the Dixon-Yates combine. All the while, he was working to get his own company into the deal as financial agent for the Dixon-Yates combine.

A memorandum in May 1954, by First Boston Board Chairman Wood noted that First Boston expected to split the financing fee 60–40 with another Wall Street financial house.

PUBLIC LEARNS LAST

By June 1954, the now famous Dixon-Yates contract was completed, and for the first time the affair was announced publicly. At no time were competitive bids asked for. The utility interests, working from inside the White House, with the powers of the Presidency backing them up, had arranged a risk-free proposition that guaranteed them enormous profits. The public would lose $140 million or more over the terms of the contract, according to the administration's own admission.

In announcing the Dixon-Yates plan, President Eisenhower indicated that the electricity to be produced by the project was needed for the Atomic Energy Commission, and therefore AEC was contracting to make the purchase on the Government's behalf. Everyone familiar with the situation quickly perceived, however, that AEC's nearest installations were some 200 miles away from the Dixon-Yates plant, and that AEC was being drawn into the deal to act as a middleman to get around legal restrictions against feeding private utility power directly into the TVA system or directly to TVA-area local power distributors.

Here the scheme hit its first snags. Both the AEC and TVA Boards refused to approve the contract. President Eisenhower personally ordered them to change their stand and O. K. it. But criticism from Congressmen and TVA-area citizen groups mounted quickly.

When control of Congress passed to the Democrats in the 1954 election, the lame-duck Joint Committee on Atomic Energy rushed approval of the contract before Congress changed hands. Important safeguards were forced into the contract, but it remained extremely disadvantageous to the Government—and the taxpayer.

COMPLAINTS POUR IN

About this time, complaints about the secrecy and lack of competitive bidding in the deal were provoking serious criticism from many sources, including those normally friendly to the administration. Pressed hard for disclosure of the facts about how it was negotiated, President Eisenhower promised at a press conference that a full and complete disclosure would be made of everyone who took part in the negotiations, and all meetings that in any way dealt with it.

The President's voluminous disclosure was released. It contained no mention of the First Boston Corp., nor of Adolphe Wenzell, nor of Wenzell's original blueprint for the Dixon-Yates deal and the ultimate destruction of TVA's electric-power program.

Ever since Dixon-Yates was first announced, the city of Memphis had been discussing the possibility of building its own powerplant rather than submit to high-cost electric rates from the private-utility combine. Its determination to do so was complete, and on the record, many months ago. This became the second line of defense for those determined to block the deal.

But the discovery of Wenzell's double-dealing role in the contract negotiations, together with evidence pointing to him as the originator of the Dixon-Yates blueprint itself, gave foes of the contract a new and potent weapon. They chose Securities and Exchange Commission hearings on the financing plan for the project as a forum from which to spring their sensational discoveries of scandal.

The issue simmered along at about this stage through the early months of 1955. Foes of the Dixon-Yates proposal settled on a first-line strategy of blocking an appropriation of $6½ million for a Government transmission line to take power from Dixon-Yates across the Mississippi River into TVA territory.

WENZELL TURNS UP

But also, Senator LISTER HILL'S (Democrat, Alabama) probing into the deal turned up the presence of Mr. Wenzell—and his connection with the Dixon-Yates financial agent. The Alabama Democrat, in February, wrote to the Budget Bureau. The Director replied that Wenzell had no connection whatsoever with the Dixon-Yates deal. And although later sworn testimony disclosed that Wenzell was asked specifically by Director Hughes to work on Dixon-Yates, Hughes told Senator HILL that Wenzell was hired before he became Director.

President Eisenhower declared flatly in a news conference that Wenzell "was never called in or asked a thing about the Dixon-Yates contract." The President added: "He was brought in as a technical adviser and nothing else, and even before this contract was even proposed."

But just as attorneys for the State of Tennessee and TVA-area municipalities and co-ops were about to put Wenzell and other First Boston Corp. officials on the stand, the SEC hearing was abruptly called off. No explanation was given by the SEC—a highly unusual if not entirely unprecedented procedure.

KEFAUVER'S subcommitee determined to find out why the hearing was put off. SEC Chairman Armstrong refused to tell. Chairman KEFAUVER threatened to cite him for contempt of the Senate, and let him think it over for a day.

The reluctant Armstrong then admitted that no one less than Sherman Adams, the "Assistant President" who is frequently the "Acting President" in effect, had asked him to hold up the Wenzell testimony until after the House debate.

Bit by bit, the Kefauver hearings have drawn from the SEC Chairman the admissions that: (1) Adams talked about the political problem of the House transmission line vote in asking for the hearing postponement, (2) any similar request by foes of Dixon-Yates would have been ignored, and (3) that Armstrong, as SEC Chairman, gave consideration to the administration's political stake in Dixon-Yates in agreeing to hold up the hearing.

But most serious of all is the web of contradictory statements and evasions by high officials of the administration, all designed to prevent the public from knowing what has been done at its expense.

Man of the Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address which was delivered at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on May 17, 1955, on the occasion of the presentation by the city of New York to Harry Hershfield of the honorary title and scroll of "Mr. New York." The address was delivered by Louis Nizer, and was reprinted by the New York Cardiac Home with a foreword by Robert F. Wagner, the mayor of the city of New York.

I am pleased to record it permanently as follows:

MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN

(By Louis Nizer)

FOREWORD BY ROBERT F. WAGNER, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Harry Hershfield has for several decades served with generous heart every charitable and civic undertaking in the city of New York. His fame has spread to the Nation. He has been the friend of Presidents, artists, and, above all, the average citizen, and he has held a unique place in their hearts. In recognition of his service and personality, I proclaimed May 17, 1955, Harry Hershfield Day, on which day he was designated "Mr. New York."

It was a heart-warming day for the greatest city in the world which has the greatest heart in the world. There was a parade. Policemen, firemen, actors, cartoonists, and other segments of our population paid tribute to Mr. New York. In the evening there was a gala banquet in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf Astoria, at which celebrities in all walks of life and some of his numberless friends paid him warm tribute.

On this occasion Louis Nizer's address evaluating Harry Hershfield was such an extraordinary fusing of humor and sentiment as to epitomize the whole occasion. From far and wide requests have poured in for copies of his address.

This reprint is the result. It is issued by the New York Cardiac Home to which the chairman of the event, Secretary of State Carmine de Sapio, presented $85,000, representing the proceeds from the dinner.

You are about to journey through some eloquent and exciting pages, and I am pleased as the chief executive of our city to join the chorus of all New York citizens in saying "Amen" to the sentiments there expressed.

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

ADDRESS BY LOUIS NIZER

Ambassador Patterson, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am sure that, after that introduction, you are eager to hear my address. Very well. My address is the Paramount Building, situated at the crossroads of the world at Hershfield Square. I suspect that, wherever you live or work you, too, live a little bit on Hershfield Square. For there is no citizen of this community who has not been touched by the good will, the good humor, and the good heart of the most popular guest of honor who has ever appeared in this historic ballroom—Harry Hershfield.

Today, by official proclamation of Mayor Wagner, he is Mr. New York. The sidewalks of New York are shining with happiness. The rivers which flow through New York are gleaming with gaiety. The automobile horns are honking their merry tunes. The skyscrapers are shaking with mirth. And the air is filled with a thunderous tumult of accumulated laughter in appreciation of the man who has made all our spirits lighter—Mr. New York himself—Harry Hershfield.

A human being is distinguished from all other animals by this capacity to laugh. Harry Hershfield is the greatest humanitarian of our day, because he keeps us in constant practice of that unique characteristic of the human race—laughter.

Every artist has an identification description. For many, many years—ever since Lincoln's day—Harry has been described as the man who walks with the mighty, but who has never lost the common touch. Indeed, he has walked with the mighty. Five Presidents of the United States have called him their friend. Statesmen, from Winston Churchill down, have paid him personal tribute. Great scientists, artists, and writers, have bestowed their affection upon him, but he has never lost the common touch—for the people have taken him into their hearts. This is in accordance with a great American tradition—to choose a humorist by popular choice to be the folk hero of his generation. It is our humorous folk hero who tells us the truth about our leaders and ourselves. He cleanses the democratic process by making us laugh at ourselves. Hershfield belongs to this long line of aristocracy in our democracy; Mark Twain, Josh Billings, George Ade, Robert Benchley, and Will Rogers.

I have had good opportunity to observe his hold upon the people. Frequently, I eat with him at the Algonquin Round Table. "Eat" is a bad description of it, for when you share a table with Harry, you choke and gasp for breath from laughter between bites. After lunch, he often walks with me to my office. It is only one block from Sixth Avenue to Broadway—but it is the most difficult block to traverse if you walk with Harry. As we pass the Lambs Club, great stars come out of the building and, upon seeing him, greet him with an enthusiasm out of all proportion to the need of professional recognition. Great actresses, like Helen Hayes, will come along and throw their arms around him. Sometimes, a woman will embrace him and kiss him on both cheeks, and he will say, as always: "So glad to see you." And, when she leaves, I will ask: "Who is that?" and he will say: "I don't know." The street cleaner raises his brush in salute. The shoeshine boy lights up with a smile which is brighter than his shine. And sometimes, when we pass the alleyway of the Belasco Theater, there is a drunken derelict lying in stupor, but he opens his swollen eyes and waves his hand, drawling: "Hello, Harry." I even believe the policeman's horse on that block neighs his salute to Harry as he passes. Yes, he belongs to all of us, for he has made us all happier.

There are people who carry germs, and infect others with diseases. We used to call them "Typhus Marys." There are also people who infect you with health and good will. Harry is such a person. If you are morose and moody, beware of him. If you are carrying the burdens of your business or public affairs upon your shoulders, shun him, you haven't a chance if you meet him. For, whether he is telling a story to 1 or to 25,000 at Madison Square Garden, his enthusiasm, his gaiety, his boyishness will infect you, and you will lose your sad face and walk away with stronger back, if not lighter burden. You can observe this procedure at any banquet at which Harry presides, there have been thousands of them. During dinner some distinguished governor or statesman will approach Harry ponderously, intending to pay him solemn compliment. Before he has finished, Harry has gracefully interrupted him and waved his finger to him to get closer and said: "Have you heard this latest story?" Then, watch the face of the victim. Within a few moments, a wide smile is spreading across his features; he begins to shake with laughter and his diaphragm, for the first time in a year, is moving violently up and down. He has been infected with good humor, and he walks away—having intended to give—but having received instead. He is now a germ carrier. Watch him, as he sits down at the end of the dais. There are guests on each side of him and he is still laughing. They want to know why. He tells them the latest story which Harry has told him. Now, watch their faces. Within a few moments, they have been infected too. They are roaring with laughter and there is a little pool of merriment which has been setup at that end of the dais. The same procedure is taking place at the other end of the dais, where another little pool of mirth is formed, and, soon, the whole dais, is in light-spirited mood. Then his laugh germ spreads to the whole audience, particularly when Harry speaks. And thus, for years, this man has been spreading epidemics throughout the city.

The city of New York is the largest laboratory test of the Biblical admonition: "Thou shalt live happily with thy neighbor." Here, we have all races, creeds, and religions living side by side; men of character and those who are characterless; men of culture and those who are ignorant. Despite the problems which exist in the city, the experiment has been brilliantly successful, and New York City continues to be the greatest metropolis on the face of the globe representing the happy conglomeration of many nationalities and peoples of all descriptions. Walt Whitman once said: "The United States is not a nation—it is a nation of nations." How true that is of New York.

Harry Hershfield is properly designated—Mr. New York. He represents, in himself, so many conglomerate qualities. Observe his Irish grey hair. Look at his Scandinavian blue eyes. Notice his Greek pallor. Watch his French vivacity; his Italian gaiety and love of music. Yes, and sometimes, I think he also has several wonderful Jewish characteristics, too.

I like to think of a symbol—New York as a huge melting pot, and Harry as Mr. New York, standing over it with a large stirring spoon. If the pot threatens to boil over with tensions; if there is coagulation, he pours some ingredients into the pot—they are always marked "humor." The tensions and anxieties subside—the even consistency of the contents is restored.

Freud commented on what he called "the peculiarly liberating and elevating effect" of humor. I do not pretend that Harry has social consciousness and that his humor is practiced with design. On the contrary, he is totally oblivious of high purpose. He tells stories because he enjoys making people laugh. He breathes laughter, as ordinary mortals breathe air. It is as necessary to him as oxygen. He is the only man I know who never needs a vacation, because what he is doing is sheer joy all the time. The effect nevertheless of his activities is to decrease our tensions; to make us laugh at ourselves; to give us a better perspective of the turbulent times in which we live.

So, if the subject which oppresses us is juvenile delinquency—Harry has a story: "Strike your child every day," he says. "If you don't know why, he does."

"The place to stop juvenile delinquency," he says, "is in the high chair—not the electric chair."

Is there a debate raging on progressive education? Harry addresses the teachers' groups and tells them of the mother who said to the teacher, "My child is very sensitive. If he does something wrong, beat the child next to him; that will be punishment enough for him."

Are we oppressed by the threat of communism? Harry lightens the mood. "A Communist is a man who minds his own business at the top of his voice." And he suggests "That the Communist leaders will find out that, when they have each other as friends, they do not need any enemies."

Is the country boiling over with indignation on the subject of loyalty tests? Harry tells the story of the applicant who answered every question satisfactorily but, finally, was asked, "What do you think of a man who goes horseback riding at 3 o'clock in the morning?"

"I would say he is very eccentric."

"Ah, poking fun at Paul Revere, are you?"

Is Harry addressing an Irish audience? He suggests that the Irish always fight among themselves—to be sure of having worthy adversaries.

Is he addressing a Jewish audience, proud of its ancestry? He brings them down a peg. A jew and a Christian were arguing about their heritage. The Jew said indignantly: "Why, when your ancestors were picking up acorns in the forest mine already had diabetes."

To the overwhelming majority of Protestants in this country, he suggests that some day he hopes they will have minority rights.

Is there a debate on the theatrical pages about the traditional conflict between critics and authors? Harry consoles the author: "Go to any public scquare and see if you can find a statue erected to a critic."

Is psychiatry the center of discussion? Harry tells about the psychiatrist who treated a man for an inferiority complex and after 2 years, reported: "I have good news for you. You have no inferiority complex. You are really inferior."

And Harry suggests a sign for a psychiatrist office: "A cure guaranteed, or your mania back."

Is there a current controversy about a strike? Harry tells the story of the woman who calls the owner of a store and says, "Please call my husband, Mr. Jones, to the phone." "We have no Mr. Jones working here," the owner replies. "I know," says the woman, "he is outside picketing your store."

Or, he makes the union people laugh a little bit at themselves when he tells the story of Mr. Bernard Baruch going to a fine restaurant with two men dressed in sweat shirts. The owner protests. "I can't help it," says Mr. Baruch, "I bought a hearing aid, and the union makes me carry two electricians."

Have we frontline headlines about a prison break? Harry suggests that every prison should be a pen with a lifetime guaranty.

Is there a filibuster in Washington? Harry reduces our indignation somewhat by suggesting that this Nation has wide, open spaces entirely surrounded by teeth.

Is he addressing a medical group? He tells the story of the doctor who prescribed that the patient eat only meat. The next day the patient was worse, and the doctor prescribed only vegetables. The patient could not understand the reversal. The doctor says, "You would be surprised to learn, my dear

man, how medicine has progressed in the last 24 hours."

Is there a judicial conference? Harry reduces the judicial pomp. There was a judge who made a record-breaking number of decisions. The reporters asked how he achieved this. "I listen to the plaintiff and decide," said the judge. "Don't you ever listen to the defendant?" asked the reporters. "I used to," said the judge, "but I found it befuddled me."

Is there a debate on the subject of modern art? Harry pours a vial of humor into the brew. A marriage broker introduced an ugly girl to a young man. The victim protested that the lady had misplaced eyes, a broken nose, and a deformed face. "Ah," said the marriage broker, "It is apparent that you do not like Picasso."

When Harry addresses the Army in Washington, he suggests that there is one plaque that will never be erected on the Pentagon Building, and that is, "George Washington slept here."

During the political campaigns, when the politicians are bragging about being self-made men, Harry says, "That certainly relieves God of a terrible responsibility."

Is divorce in the headlines? Harry tells of the wife who was a wonderful housekeeper. Every time she divorced she kept the house.

He is not a monologist; he is a creative humorist, and his witticisms are not merely funny—they have a profundity of their own, in capsuled form. "Don't laugh at the bull," he suggests, "he knew the meaning of the red flag before we did."

During an investigation of public officials, he comments that any man, who points an accusing finger, should remember he has three fingers pointing at himself.

When anyone makes a public statement about retaliation and revenge, Harry reminds him that if a man goes to dig a grave, he should always dig two.

So, he has gone through a lifetime telling another story and another story. If we could gather in all the laughter from his jokes, there would be a veritable cascade, a Niagara Falls of screaming hilarity such as has never been known in history.

I think it is time that we told him a story. I should like to tell you and him the story of the Man of the Mountain, written by Hawthorne. In New Hampshire, nature, with mystical ferocity, cast together stone boulders so that they formed a human face jutting out from the top of a mountain. The legend grew in the region that, some day, a man would come along who would have the same face as the man of the mountain and that man would be a noble, good, and true man. At the foot of that mountain there was a village, and a young man, I think his name was Ernest, decided to dedicate his life to finding the man who would have the face of the man of the mountain.

He traveled far and wide among the villages, and then to other States, and, finally, to other countries. And, each time, he brought back some famous scientist, political leader, artist, humanitarian, or philanthropist. A platform was erected at the foot of the mountain, and Ernest would introduce his celebrity to the villagers. He would extol the man's virtues, and ask them to compare his profile with the profile above of the man of the mountain, but, each time, the villagers found the resemblance lacking. They were unsatisfied that the good, noble, and true man had been found.

Ernest continued his task. He roamed far and wide across the earth but, always unsuccessfully. Finally, when he was gray and somewhat wan from his labors, he brought back a great poet who, he was certain, had the face of the man of the mountain. Again, all the villagers gathered and Ernest introduced the great poet from the platform at the foot of the mountain. The villagers, eager to have Ernest succeed after a lifetime of search, sympathetically compared the profile of the poet with the man of the mountain, but, again, shook their heads dolefully—the resemblance was imperfect. They were about to depart in dejection, when the leader of the community glanced up and, in the bronze light of the setting sun upon Ernest's face, he observed—sharply etched against the mountain—the profile which was identical with that of the man of the mountain. "Look," he cried out, "Ernest, Ernest, himself, is the man of the mountain."

The villagers turned sharply. Cries of exaltation emanated from the crowd. It was Ernest, himself—the introducer of all the great celebrities and distinguished men who was the man of the mountain. There was great rejoicing. A public holiday was declared. They marched in the streets and held a public festival to honor Ernest—the good, noble, and true man.

Need I elaborate this analogy? For 50 years, Harry Hershfield has been extolling the virtues of distinguished figures—telling you that they were great and noble men; but each time in our own minds and hearts we found the praise somewhat wanting. And now that he is gray and wan from his labors, the leader of our community—the mayor—with that unerring instinct which has characterized his other acts, cries out: "Look at Harry Hershfield—look at the introducer—he, himself, is the good and the noble and true man. He is Mr. New York." And we the villagers have looked and found that it was true. Today, we have celebrated by marching in the streets. And this evening, we have a public festival to honor the good and the noble and the true man—Harry Hershfield.

This honor bestowed upon him is one of the greatest ever conferred by the city of New York upon a living man in our memory. But there is something more unique than that. No other man in this Nation could have had this distinction bestowed upon him without evoking, in some quarters, jealousy or criticism. The only man to whom it could have been given with unanimous acclaim and affection; with universal comment, "What a wonderful man—I'm so happy he's getting this honor" is Harry Hershfield.

I know how youthful Harry's heart is; I know that he is going to be with us for decades to come. Indeed, the philosophers say that every man has a right to deduct from his years those moments in which he has done good for others. And, by this standard, Harry is very, very young indeed; for he has found the philosopher's stone—the secret of youth—laughter.

I wish to express a concluding thought which I hope will not be too tactless. When Mark Twain died, a one-sentence eulogy was delivered at his funeral: "This is the first day you have made us sad."

How delighted we are that we can tell Harry how happy he has made us, and how happy we are to be with him as his friends for long, long years to come.

Tonight, Harry Hershfield, we salute you—not only as Mr. New York, but as the man of the mountain, the good, the noble, the true man.

SENATE PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of August 2, 1955,

The following bills were signed after the sine die adjournment by the Vice President, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

On August 3, 1955:

S. 125. An act for the relief of the State of Illinois;

S. 197. An act for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata;

S. 198. An act for the relief of Fillipo Mastroianni;

S. 204. An act for the relief of Fred P. Hines;

S. 393. An act for the relief of Chicko Suzuki;

S. 550. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson;

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara;

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

S. 732. An act to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York city area, and for other purposes;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan;

S. 1033. An act for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.;

S. 1041. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes;

S. 1077. An act to provide for settlement of claims resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947;

S. 1189. An act to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, and 9-month residential construction loans;

S. 1415. An act for the relief of Anna Mertikas;

S. 1681. An act for the relief of Cecile Doriac and her minor child;

S. 1792. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954;

S. 1899. An act to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries;

S. 1906. An act to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 1917. An act to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to United States Highway No. 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 2049. An act to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes;

S. 2088. An act for the relief of Ladislav Mencl;

S. 2126. An act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes;

S. 2295. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2339. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes;

S. 2514. An act to declare the portion of the waterway of West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north 85°54'43.5" east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers Harbor Line System are north 4,616.76 and west 9,450.80, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 2576. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5168. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6122. An act to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.;

H. R. 6182. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H. R. 6193. An act to provide for the sale of certain war housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income;

H. R. 6199. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act;

H. R. 6373. An act to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals;

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6887. An act to extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (d) and to amend section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States, classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7117. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes.

On August 4, 1955:

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis;

S. 756. An act to authorize the appropriation of accumulated receipts in the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund established by the Pittman-Robertson Act and to authorize the expenditure of funds apportioned to a State under such act for the management of wildlife areas and resources;

S. 2039. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 2127. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953;

S. 2296. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2391. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2501. An act to provide grants to assist States to meet the cost of poliomyelitis vaccination programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul;

H. R. 1003. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of Vera Gregovich Kenter;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Vasilios Linkopoulos;

H. R. 1641. An act for the relief of Mary Mancuso;

H. R. 1909. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna;

H. R. 2079. An act for the relief of Ingrid Liselotte Poch;

H. R. 2235. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas;

H. R. 2339. An act for the relief of Monika Schefbanker;

H. R. 2704. An act for the relief of Kazuko Iwata Rausch;

H. R. 2897. An act for the relief of Chung Poik Cha and her minor child, Myra Poik Cha;

H. R. 2907. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe;

H. R. 3063. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co. and certain others;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman;

H. R. 4048. An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4508. An act for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry;

H. R. 4544. An act for the relief of Andrew Carrigan;

H. R. 4643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon);

H. R. 4734. An act to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period to November 7, 1953;

H. R. 5074. An act for the relief of Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro;

H. R. 5082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Koto Nakagawa;

H. R. 5469. An act to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5908. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Eckles;

H. R. 5913. An act for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu);

H. R. 6102. An act to change the name of Garza-Little Elm Dam, located in Denton County, Tex., to Lewisville Dam;

H. R. 6634. An act to provide for the conveyance of 1 9/10 acres of land, more or less,

within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir prject to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes;

H. R. 6741. An act for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft;

H. R. 7195. An act to provide for the adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for reservoir projects in Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 7244. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836;

H. R. 7245. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7618. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 7684. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7746. An act to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On August 3, 1955:

S. 72. An act to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands;

S. 91. An act for the relief of Luzia Cox;

S. 987. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary;

S. 1621. An act to authorize adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain obligations of settlers on projects developed or subject to the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1757. An act to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946;

S. 1759. An act to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

S. 1894. An act to provide for the granting of career-conditional and career appointments to certain qualified employees;

S. 1894. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation;

S. 2087. An act to amend the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, so as to permit per capita payments to the individual members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to be made quarterly;

S. 2098. An act to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress;

S. 2237. An act to amend the act of May 26, 1949, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On August 4, 1955:

S. 2126. An act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes; and

S. 2576. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes.

On August 5, 1955:

S. 125. An act for the relief of the State of Illinois;

S. 197. An act for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata;

S. 198. An act for the relief of Fillipo Mastrolanni;

S. 204. An act for the relief of Fred P. Hines;

S. 393. An act for the relief of Chicko Suzuki;

S. 463. An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 550. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson;

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis;

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara;

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as the affect such States;

S. 732. An act to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes;

S. 756. An act to authorize the appropriation of accumulated receipts in the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund established by the Pittman-Robertson Act and to authorize the expenditure of funds apportioned to a State under such act for the management of wildlife areas and resources;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan;

S. 1033. An act for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.;

S. 1041. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes.

S. 1077. An act to provide for settlement of claims resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947;

S. 1189. An act to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, and 9-month residential construction loans;

S. 1415. An act for the relief of Anna Mertikas;

S. 1681. An act for the relief of Cecil Doriac and her minor child;

S. 1792. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954;

S. 1899. An act to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries;

S. 1906. An act to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 1917. An act to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to U. S. Highway 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 2039. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 2049. An act to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes;

S. 2088. An act for the relief of Ladislav Mencl;

S. 2127. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953;

S. 2295. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2296. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments.

S. 2391. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2339. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes;

S. 2501. An act to provide grants to assist States to meet the cost of poliomyelitis vaccination programs, and for other purposes; and

S. 2514. An act to declare the portion of the waterway of West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north 85 degrees 54 minutes 43.5 seconds east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers Harbor Line System are north 4,616.76 and west 9,450.80, a nonnavigable stream.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

On August 3, 1955:

S. 741. An act to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years; and

S. 1855. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended.

On August 4, 1955:

S. 1177. An act for the relief of desert land entrymen whose entries are dependent upon percolating waters for reclamation;

S. 2630. An act to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties of such communities;

S. 667. An act to exempt meetings of associations of professional hairdressers or cosmetologists from certain provisions of the acts of June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 611), and July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622), as amended;

S. 1741. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, United States of America National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 2176. An act to repeal the requirement that public utilities engaged in the manufacture and sale of electricity in the District of Columbia must submit annual reports to Congress;

S. 2177. An act to repeal the prohibition against the declaration of stock dividends by public utilities operating in the District of Columbia;

S. 2427. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White

House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency; and

S. 2592. An act to increase the mileage allowance of United States marshals and their deputies from 7 cents per mile to 10 cents per mile.

On August 3, 1955:

S. 665. An act to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 847. An act to authorize the construction of two surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 1051. An act to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended;

S. 1093. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2237. An act to amend the act of May 26, 1949, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for other purposes;

S. 2375. An act to provide for 5-year terms of office for members of the Subversive Activities Control Board with one of such terms expiring in each calendar year; and

S. 2428. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and for other purposes.

On August 9, 1955:

S. 34. An act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases;

S. 38. An act for the relief of Joseph Jerry Earl Sirois (also known as Jeremie Earl Sirois);

S. 56. An act authorizing construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen;

S. 72. An act to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands;

S. 85. An act for the relief of Rosetta Ittner;

S. 86. An act for the relief of Wilhelmine Schelter;

S. 91. An act for the relief of Luzia Cox;

S. 100. An act for the relief of Hermine Lorenz;

S. 119. An act for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong;

S. 135. An act for the relief of the Elkay Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill.;

S. 141. An act for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Ernesto DeLeon;

S. 176. An act for the relief of Gerda Irmgard Kurella;

S. 181. An act for the relief of Manhay Wong;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand;

S. 197. An act for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Melanie Schaffner Baker;

S. 238. An act for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto);

S. 240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek;

S. 254. An act for the relief of Giussepina Cervi;

S. 293. An act for the relief of Miss Cecile Patricia Chapman;

S. 326. An act for the relief of Leopoldine Maria Lofolad;

S. 346. An act for the relief of Klara Anna Maria Fleischer;

S. 394. An act for the relief of Ali Hassan Waffa;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri;

S. 430. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller;

S. 463. An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 464. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River;

S. 466. An act for the relief of Capt. George Gafos, Eugenia Gafos, and Adamantios George Gafos;

S. 470. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch;

S. 474. An act for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas;

S. 476. An act for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout;

S. 503. An act for the relief of Cirino Lanzafame;

S. 518. An act for the relief of Elsa Alwine Larsen;

S. 535. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier;

S. 707. An act for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas;

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara;

S. 843. An act for the relief of Gerda Graupner;

S. 878. An act to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character;

S. 884. An act for the relief of Gabor Lanyi;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan;

S. 1033. An act for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.;

S. 1035. An act for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox;

S. 1105. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lieselotte Emilie Dailey;

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas;

S. 1138. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic);

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling;

S. 1167. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act;

S. 1187. An act to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks;

S. 1210. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to provide a 5-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia;

S. 1266. An act for the relief of Helene Margareta Jobst;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of Maria Anna Coone;

S. 1340. An act to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.;

S. 1496. An act for the relief of Ruriko Hara;

S. 1512. An act to amend section 107 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to eliminate separate divisions and reduce the number of places of holding regular terms of the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska;

S. 1521. An act for the relief of Garabed Papazian;

S. 1577. An act to amend the acts granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate toll bridges across the Connecticut River;

S. 1621. An act to authorize adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain obligations of settlers on projects developed or subject to the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1706. An act for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and his wife Efrossini Saintoufis;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt, and her minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger;

S. 1757. An act to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946;

S. 1758. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans;

S. 1899. An act to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries;

S. 1906. An act to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 1917. An act to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to United States Highway 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 1965. An act to repeal a particular contractual requirement with respect to the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico;

S. 1974. An act for the relief of Rosa Birger;

S. 2049. An act to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes;

S. 2081. An act to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training;

S. 2087. An act to amend the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, so as to permit per capita payments to the individual members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to be made quarterly;

S. 2127. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953;

S. 2197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to distribute equally to members of the Kaw Tribe of Indians certain moneys to the credit of the tribe in the United States Treasury;

S. 2269. An act for the relief of Mualla S. Holloway;

S. 2277. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for park and recreational purposes, for an amount equal to the cost to the United States of acquiring such lands from the city;

S. 2297. An act to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other puposes;

S. 2339. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes;

S. 2351. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain war-housing projects to the city of Norfolk, Va.;

S. 2391. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2403. An act to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 2511. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended;

S. 2514. An act to declare the portion of the waterway of West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north 85° 54' 43.5" east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers harbor line system are north 4,616.76 and west 9,450.80, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 2566. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes;

S. 2573. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia;* and

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey.*

On August 11, 1955:

S. 92. An act for the relief of Irene C. (Karl) Behrman;

S. 125. An act for the relief of the State of Illinois;

S. 198. An act for the relief of Fillipo Mastroianni;

S. 214. An act for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut;

S. 223. An act for the relief of Mary Freida Poeltl Smith;

S. 239. An act for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas;

S. 352. An act for the relief of Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru;

S. 388. An act for the relief of Petre and Liubitza Ionescu;

S. 393. An act for the relief of Chieko Suzuki;

S. 644. An act for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis;

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

S. 732. An act to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes;

S. 987. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Edward Naarits;

S. 1189. An act to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, and 9-month residential construction loans;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil;

S. 1353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeanette S. Hamilton;

S. 1367. An act for the relief of Antonio Jacoe;

S. 1391. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States;

S. 1395. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954;

S. 1397. An act providing for the conveyance of certain lands to St. Louis Church of Dunseith, Dunseith, N. Dak.;

S. 1415. An act for the relief of Anna Mertikas;

S. 1522. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettmen;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Ernest Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of Constaninos Pantermalis;

S. 1681. An act for the relief of Cecile Doriac and her minor child;

S. 1759. An act to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

S. 1792. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954;

S. 1894. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation;

S. 2088. An act for the relief of Ladislav Mencl;

S. 2098. An act to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress;

S. 2126. An act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes;

S. 2198. An act to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 2260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for the apportionment of the waters of the Red River and its tributaries;

S. 2270. An act for the relief of Nadia Noland and Samia Ouafa Noland;

S. 2295. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2296. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2312. An act for the relief of certain Korean war orphans;

S. 2575. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols;

S. 2604. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; and

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On August 12, 1955:

S. 541. An act for the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden;

S. 550. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson;

S. 756. An act to authorize the appropriation of accumulated receipts in the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund established by the Pittman-Robertson Act and to authorize the expenditure of funds apportioned to a State under such act for the management of wildlife areas and resources;

S. 1077. An act to provide for settlement of claims resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947;

S. 1849. An act to provide for the granting of career-conditional and career appointments to certain qualified employees;

S. 2168. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to increase the national minimum wage, and for other purposes;

S. 2253. An act to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954;

S. 2501. An act to provide grants to assist States to meet the cost of poliomyelitis vaccination programs, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a certain contract with the Toston Irrigation District, Montana.

On August 14, 1955:

S. 2039. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; and

S. 2576. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had disapproved bills of the Senate of the following titles, together with his reasons for such actions:

On August 5, 1955:

I am withholding approval of S. 2171, an act "To amend the Subversive Activities Control Act so as to provide that upon the expiration of his term of office a member of the Board shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified."

The language of this bill is incorporated in identical terms in S. 2375, which I have approved today. Under the circumstances, approval of S. 2171 is unnecessary and would result in a nullity and possible confusion.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1955.*

On August 12, 1955:

I have withheld my approval of S. 204, 84th Congress, an act for the relief of Fred P. Hines.

The bill would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay to Mr. Fred P. Hines the sum of $778.78, which sum represents the amount claimed as the cost of private hospital and medical expenses incurred in connection with the treatment of a disability not connected with his active military service in the Spanish-American War.

On July 20, 1953, I submitted a message to the Senate (S. Doc. No. 62, 83d Cong.) returning without my approval S. 152, 83d Congress, a bill identical to this bill except that S. 204 eliminates the payment of attorney fees in connection with the claim. No new evidence has been submitted in the interim, and the legislative history of the current bill contains no information which would justify a change in my position in the matter.

Under the circumstances and for the reasons set forth in my earlier message, I could take no other action than to withhold approval of S. 204.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1955.*

I am withholding approval of S. 1041, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes.

This bill would provide additional retirement benefits to those Federal and District of Columbia employees who also have been, are now, or in the future may become employees of the States or of State instrumentalities on Federal-State programs financed either wholly or in part by Federal funds, in five types of agricultural programs and in programs of vocational education.

The bill is not approved because it would (1) make improper use of Federal funds to pay for services never received by it, (2) result in an unsound shifting of fiscal responsibility from State to Federal Government, (3) set an undesirable precedent, and (4) constitute an unsound approach to a desirable goal of increased employee mobility.

First, and most important, these additional retirement benefits would not be based upon Federal employment but on State employment. States and State instrumentalities are responsible for paying for services rendered to them, and there is no assertion that such obligations are not met. Federal retired pay is a basic element in the compensation system provided by the Federal Government in exchange for work performed by its employees. To provide additional compensation payable out of the Federal civil-service retirement fund on the basis of work performed for another employer appears to be an unnecessary and improper use of Federal funds.

Second, the financing principle followed in this bill is unsound. The Federal civil-service retirement fund has been built up by contributions from Federal employees and from the Federal Government as an employer. Under the bill the affected employees would now pay retirement contributions for their State service as if it had been Federal service but since the ultimate annuity payments would average several times such contributions, the major portion of the cost of this bill would be borne by Federal taxpayers. This shift of fiscal responsibility from the actual employer, the State or State instrumentalities, to the Federal Government would be accomplished with no corresponding transfer of funds. This unsound fiscal policy could become an even more serious matter if the program were to be extended to all employee groups having similar claims.

Third, the bill appears to establish an undesirable precedent for making similar payments on the basis of employment in many other Federal-State cooperative programs. The record on the bill indicates that over 80 such programs have already been identified. Extension of similar benefits to employees of all such programs would lead far afield.

Fourth, although the bill seems to have the sound objective of encouraging transfers of employees between State and Federal employment, I do not believe that it moves toward this objective in a proper manner. A firmer, more acceptable step would be to extend the Federal old-age and survivors system to include Federal employees. With employees of an increasing number of States also covered under that system, both Federal and State retirement systems would share a common base and all OASI benefits would be preserved in moving from one employer to another. Recommendations to the Congress will be made on this matter early in the next session.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1955.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Pursuant to a special order agreed to on August 2, 1955, the Clerk of the House, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, received a message from the Secretary of the Senate announcing that the Senate had, on August 2, 1955, passed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen;

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 1352. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.;

S. 1584. An act for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner; and

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States.

BILLS ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that, on the following dates, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 3, 1955:

H. R. 5168. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6122. An act to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.;

H. R. 6182. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H. R. 6198. An act to provide for the sale of certain war-housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income;

H. R. 6199. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act;

H. R. 6373. An act to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals;

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6887. An act to extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (b) and to amend section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 6994. An act to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States, classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7117. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes.

On August 4, 1955:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul;

H. R. 1003. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Remon de Amusategui O'Malley;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of Vera Gregovich Kenter;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Vasilios Linkopoulos;

H. R. 1641. An act for the relief of Mary Mancuso;

H. R. 1909. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna;

H. R. 2079. An act for the relief of Ingrid Liselotte Poch;

H. R. 2235. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas.

H. R. 2339. An act for the relief of Monika Schefbanker;

H. R. 2704. An act for the relief of Kazuko Iwata Rausch;

H. R. 2897. An act for the relief of Chung Poik Cha and her minor child, Myra Poik Cha;

H. R 2907. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe;

H. R. 3063. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co., and certain others;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman;

H. R. 4048. An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4508. An act for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry;

H. R. 4544. An act for the relief of Andrew Carrigan;

H. R. 4643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon);

H. R. 4734. An act to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project as Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period to November 7, 1953;

H. R. 5074. An act for the relief of Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro;

H. R. 5082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Koto Makagawa;

H. R. 5469. An act to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5908. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Eckles;

H. R. 5913. An act for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu);

H. R. 6102. An act to change the name of Garza-Little Elm Dam, located in Denton County, Tex., to Lewisville Dam;

H. R. 6634. An act to provide for the conveyance of 1$\frac{3}{10}$ acres of land, more or less,

within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes;

H. R. 6741. An act for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft;

H. R. 7195. An act to provide for the adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for reservoir projects in Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 7244. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836;

H. R. 7245. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7618. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 7684. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7746. An act to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced that, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, he did, on the following dates, sign enrolled bills of the following titles:

On August 3, 1955:

H. R. 5168. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6122. An act to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.;

H. R. 6182. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H. R. 6198. An act to provide for the sale of certain war housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income;

H. R. 6199. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act;

H. R. 6373. An act to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and productions of certain domestic minerals;

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6887. An act to extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (b) and to amend section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 6994. An act to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States, classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7117. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State Defense Forces, and for other purposes.

On August 4, 1955:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul;

H. R. 1003. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Remon de Amusategui O'Malley;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of Vera Gregovich Kenter;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Vasilios Linkopoulos;

H. R. 1641. An act for the relief of Mary Mancuso;

H. R. 1909. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna;

H. R. 2079. An act for the relief of Ingrid Liselotte Poch;

H. R. 2235. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas;

H. R. 2339. An act for the relief of Monika Schefbanker;

H. R. 2704. An act for the relief of Kazuko Iwata Rausch;

H. R. 2897. An act for the relief of Chung Poik Cha and her minor child, Myra Poik Cha;

H. R. 2907. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe;

H. R. 3063. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co., and certain others;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman;

H. R. 4048. An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4508. An act for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry;

H. R. 4544. An act for the relief of Andrew Carrigan;

H. R. 4643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon);

H. R. 4734. An act to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954, which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period to November 7, 1953;

H. R. 5074. An act for the relief of Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro;

H. R. 5082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Koto Makagawa;

H. R. 5469. An act to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5908. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Eckles;

H. R. 5913. An act for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu);

H. R. 6102. An act to change the name of Garza-Little Elm Dam, located in Denton County, Tex., to Lewisville Dam;

H. R. 6634. An act to provide for the conveyance of 1.8 acres of land, more or less, within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes;

H. R. 6741. An act for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft;

H. R. 7195. An act to provide for the adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for reservoir projects in Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 7244. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836;

H. R. 7245. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7618. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 7684. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7746. An act to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereof.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced that, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, he did, on the following dates, sign enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

On August 3, 1955:

S. 125. An act for the relief of the State of Illinois;

S. 197. An act for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata;

S. 198. An act for the relief of Filipo Mastroianni;

S. 204. An act for the relief of Fred P. Hines;

S. 393. An act for the relief of Chicko Suzuki;

S. 550. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson;

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara;

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

S. 732. An act to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan;

S. 1033. An act for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.

S. 1041. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes;

S. 1077. An act to provide for settlement of claims resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947;

S. 1189. An act to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, and 9-month residential construction loans;

S. 1415. An act for the relief of Anna Mertikas;

S. 1681. An act for the relief of Cecile Doriac and her minor child;

S. 1792. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954;

S. 1899. An act to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries;

S. 1906. An act to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 1917. An act to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to U. S. Highway 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 2049. An act to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities

Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes;

S. 2088. An act for the relief of Ladislav Mencl;

S. 2126. An act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes;

S. 2295. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2339. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes;

S. 2514. An act to declare the portion of the waterway of West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north 85° 54' 43.5" east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers Harbor Line System are north 4,616.76 and west 9,450.80, a nonnavigable stream; and

S. 2576. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes.

On August 4, 1955:

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis;

S. 756. An act to authorize the appropriation of accumulated receipts in the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund established by the Pittman-Robertson Act and to authorize the expenditure of funds apportioned to a State under such act for the management of wildlife areas and resources;

S. 2039. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes.

S. 2127. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953;

S. 2296. An act to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments;

S. 2391. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2501. An act to provide grants to assist States to meet the cost of poliomyelitis vaccination programs, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, reported that, on the following dates, that committee had presented to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 4, 1955:

H. R. 100. An act to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes;

H. R. 257. An act to amend section 112 (n) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, relating to the suspension of certain periods of limitation while the taxpayer is on extended active duty with the Armed Forces, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with respect to tax treatment where the taxpayer recovers amounts held by another under claim of right;

H. R. 593. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 3908. An act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4581. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax on cutting oils;

H. R. 4763. An act for the relief of Elzie C. Brown;

H. R. 5249. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund or credit of internal revenue taxes and customs duties paid on distilled spirits and wines lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by health authorities as a result of the hurricanes of 1954;

H. R. 6263. An act to amend section 1233 and section 542 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 7018. An act to authorize subpenas in connection with the enforcement of the narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7034. An act to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7035. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720);

H. R. 7117. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes.

On August 5, 1955:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul;

H. R. 1003. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of Vera Gregovich Kenter;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Vasilios Liakopoulos;

H. R. 1641. An act for the relief of Mary Mancuso;

H. R. 1909. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna;

H. R. 2079. An act for the relief of Ingrid Liselotte Poch;

H. R. 2235. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas;

H. R. 2339. An act for the relief of Monika Schefbanker;

H. R. 2704. An act for the relief of Kazuko Iwata Rausch;

H. R. 2897. An act for the relief of Chung Poik Chu and her child, Myra Poik Chu;

H. R. 2907. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Schoeppe;

H. R. 3063. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co. and certain others;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman;

H. R. 4048. An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4508. An act for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry;

H. R. 4544. An act for the relief of Andrew Carrigan;

H. R. 4643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon);

H. R. 4734. An act to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954, which authorizes the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period to November 7, 1953;

H. R. 5074. An act for the relief of Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro;

H. R. 5082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Koto Nakagawa;

H. R. 5168. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5469. An act to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5908. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Eckles;

H. R. 5913. An act for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu);

H. R. 6102. An act to change the name of Garza-Little Elm Dam, located in Denton County, Tex., to Lewisville Dam;

H. R. 6122. An act to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.;

H. R. 6182. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H. R. 6198. An act to provide for the sale of certain war-housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income;

H. R. 6199. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act;

H. R. 6373. An act to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals;

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to provide for the conveyance of 1.8 acres of land, more or less, within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes;

H. R. 6741. An act for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft;

H. R. 6887. An act to extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (b) and to amend section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 6994. An act to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7195. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for reservoir projects in Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 7244. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836;

H. R. 7245. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7618. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 7684. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7746. An act to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House, that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 3, 1955:

H. R. 473. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 605. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl;

H. R. 932. An act for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz);

H. R. 1180. An act for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson;

H. R. 1185. An act for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar;

H. R. 1302. An act for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring;

H. R. 1304. An act for the relief of Mother Amata (Maria Cartiglia), Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa), Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale), and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffiro);

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Paul Compagnino;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of Ervin Benedikt;

H. R. 1439. An act for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kalisz;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Frank Budman;

H. R. 1698. An act for the relief of Anne Cheng;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens;

H. R. 1987. An act for the relief of Kimie Hayashi Crandall;

H. R. 1997. An act for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo;

H. R. 2059. An act for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio;

H. R. 2078. An act for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio;

H. R. 2242. An act for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon;

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Maria de Rehbinder;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner;

H. R. 2313. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby.

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas;

H. R. 2735. An act for the relief of Inako Yokoo and her minor child;

H. R. 2738. An act for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic;

H. R. 2749. An act for the relief of George Risto Divitkos;

H. R. 2755. An act for the relief of Benjamin Johnson;

H. R. 2947. An act for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo;

H. R. 3281. An act for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Raymond George Palmer;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista;

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Glessner (nee Schega);

H. R. 2866. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) in the city of New Bedford and the towns of Fairhaven and Acushnet, Mass., a nonnavigable stream;

H. R. 4001. An act to provide for the management and disposition of certain public domain lands in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 4362. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954;

H. R. 4727. An act to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin;

H. R. 4904. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years; and

H. R. 6980. An act providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority.

On August 4, 1955:

H. R. 898. An act to provide for the approval of deeds executed by the heirs of Anna Hollywood Fickz;

H. R. 910. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to John Ekonomos, of the Fairbanks precinct, Alaska;

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3338. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914;

H. R. 3786. An act to incorporate the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4280. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 4718. An act to authorize and direct the issuance of patent to Robert W. Retherford, of Anchorage, Alaska, to certain land in Alaska;

H. R. 4747. An act to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city;

H. R. 4808. An act to authorize the transmission through the mails of certain keys, identification devices, and small articles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 5512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6259. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948;

H. R. 7278. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 22, 1955, as National Olympic Day; and

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

On August 5, 1955:

H. R. 727. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school;

H. R. 939. An act for the relief of Laura Safir;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Nurith Spier;

H. R. 1159. An act for the relief of Anna Histed (nee Wiesneth);

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Vittorio Capano;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of Luigi Tomasella;

H. R. 2783. An act for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang;

H. R. 2944. An act for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 2972. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights;

H. R. 3048. An act for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Arsena;

H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Eveline Wenk Neal;

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou;

H. R. 3625. An act for the relief of George Vourderis;

H. R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ilse Werner;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara;

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield;

H. R. 3871. An act for the relief of Orville Ennis;

H. R. 3956. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rotics Whitney;

H. R. 4044. An act for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others;

H. R. 4147. An act for the relief of Angelo DeVito;

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray;

H. R. 4284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco;

H. R. 4289. An act for the relief of Vladislav Bevc;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Christa Harkrader;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Duncan McQuagge;

H. R. 4970. An act for the relief of Edeltraudt Margot Gallagher, nee Hackelberg;

H. R. 5080. An act for the relief of Florence E. McConnell;

H. R. 5283. An act for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki;

H. R. 5767. An act for the relief of Sally S. Shulman or Zeli Sholman;

H. R. 6036. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florentine Kintzel;

H. R. 6277. An act to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station;

H. R. 6396. An act for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson;

H. R. 6613. An act for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi;

H. R. 7029. An act to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7117. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel.

On August 9, 1955:

H. R. 46. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.;

H. R. 291. An act to extend the retirement income-tax credit to members of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 482. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, Springfield, Mo., to the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

H. R. 542. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 593. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. de Mocskonyi;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1301. An act for the relief of Karlis Abele;

H. R. 1423. An act for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruthe Graves Messer;

H. R. 1552. An act for the relief of Dalisay Lourdes Cruz;

H. R. 1599. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla. and Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 1641. An act for the relief of Mary Mancuso;

H. R. 1751. An act for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Walling;

H. R. 2065. An act for the relief of Sada Zarikian;

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2109. An act to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26) to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service;

H. R. 2149. An act to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 2559. An act to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers;

H. R. 2619. An act to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951;

H. R. 2747. An act for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill;

H. R. 2753. An act for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt;

H. R. 2788. An act for the relief of Miguel Sandoval-Michel (also known as Arturo Rodriguez Gomez);

H. R. 2791. An act for the relief of Ofelia Martin;

H. R. 2851. An act to make cornmeal and wheat flour available to needy persons;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Dorothy Claire Maurice;

H. R. 3235. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Richard Raffo Hanson;

H. R. 3437. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a maximum manufacturers' excise tax on the leases of certain automobile utility trailers;

H. R. 3587. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Klamath River by the States of Oregon and California;

H. R. 3712. An act to extend the period during which claims for floor stocks refunds may be filed with respect to certain manufacturers' excise taxes which were reduced by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954;

H. R. 3822. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended;

H. R. 3856. An act for the relief of Leopoldine Simonetti;

H. R. 3908. An act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3990. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska;

H. R. 4048. An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop;

H. R. 4394. An act to amend section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 4410. An act for the relief of William E. Ryan;

H. R. 4468. An act for the relief of Margarethe Bock and her son, Robert Harald Bock;

H. R. 4643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon);

H. R. 4734. An act to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period to November 7, 1953;

H. R. 4763. An act for the relief of Elzie C. Brown;

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover civilian officers and employees and military personnel of the Federal Government;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein;

H. R. 5469. An act to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5875. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5936. An act to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before April 1956, and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before April 1956;

H. R. 6002. An act for the relief of Helene Rapp;

H. R. 6066. An act authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California;

H. R. 6102. An act to change the name of Garza-Little Elm Dam, located in Denton County, Tex., to Lewisville Dam;

H. R. 6122. An act to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.;

H. R. 6198. An act to provide for the sale of certain war housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income;

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6417. An act to revive and reenact the act "Authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.," approved May 17, 1939;

H. R. 6585. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6590. An act to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to provide for the conveyance of $18\frac{1}{10}$ acres of land, more or less, within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes;

H. R. 6727. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.

H. R. 6886. An act to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes";

H. R. 6896. An act for the relief of Luisa Guidi Miller;

H. R. 7000. An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7035. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720);

H. R. 7148. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Codes so as to provide a personal exemption with respect to certain dependents in the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 7244. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836;

H. R. 7301. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va.;

H. R. 7684. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security;

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex.; and

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine.

On August 11, 1955:

H. R. 100. An act to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul.

H. R. 1003. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of Vera Gregovich Kenter;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Vasilios Liakopoulos;

H. R. 1909. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna;

H. R. 2079. An act for the relief of Ingrid Liselotte Poch;

H. R. 2235. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas;

H. R. 2339. An act for the relief of Monika Schefbanker;

H. R. 2553. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, relating to the use of corporation property by a shareholder;

H. R. 2704. An act for the relief of Kazuko Iwata Rausch;

H. R. 2897. An act for the relief of Chung Poik Cha and her child, Myra Poik Cha;

H. R. 2907. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe;

H. R. 3063. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bartlett Springs Co. and certain others;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Luise Pempfer (now Mrs. William L. Adams);

H. R. 3628. An act for the relief of Luise Isabella Chu, also known as Luise Schneider;

H. R. 3635. An act for the relief of Brigit Camara, also known as Brigit Heinemann;

H. R. 4508. An act for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry;

H. R. 4544. An act for the relief of Andrew Carrigan;

H. R. 4581. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax on cutting oils;

H. R. 4672. An act to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 5074. An act for the relief of Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro;

H. R. 5082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Koto Nakagawa;

H. R. 5168. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5249. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund or credit of internal revenue taxes and customs duties paid on distilled spirits and wines lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by health authorities as a result of the hurricanes of 1954;

H. R. 5546. An act for the relief of Francisca Alemany;

H. R. 5908. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Eckles;

H. R. 5913. An act for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu);

H. R. 6199. An act to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act;

H. R. 6600. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6741. An act for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft;

H. R. 6994. An act to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7018. An act to authorize subpenas in connection with the enforcement of the narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7024. An act to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7034. An act to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7095. An act to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to certain athletic events held for the benefit of the United States Olympic Association;

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State Defense Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7300. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of income received from patent infringement suits; and

H. R. 7618. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

On August 12, 1955:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 257. An act to amend section 112 (n) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, relating to the suspension of certain periods of limitation while the taxpayer is on extended active duty with the Armed Forces, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to tax treatment where the taxpayer recovers amounts held by another under claim of right;

H. R. 4663. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws;

H. R. 4744. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 5647. An act to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles;

H. R. 6182. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H. R. 6263. An act to amend section 1233 and section 542 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 7245. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7628. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the White House office of Maj. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7746. An act to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereto; and

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of presidential libraries, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS DISAPPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, transmitted to the Clerk of the House a list of bills disapproved, together with his reasons for such actions, as follows:

On August 12, 1955:

I have withheld my approval from the bill (H. R. 1393) "For the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co."

The bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $142,007.75 to the E. J. Albrecht Co. as reimbursement for actual losses sustained by it in performing its contract with the United States for the construction of the outlet works for Sardis Dam on the Little Tallahatchie River, near Sardis, Miss.

After an exhaustive review, the Court of Claims dismissed this claim as being without merit. While this decision was based on legal grounds, the opinion issued by the court in connection with its decision shows, particularly when taken in conjunction with the rest of the record, that there is no basis for affording relief to the contractor on equitable grounds. From these sources it is clear that the overriding causes of the losses which the contractor sustained were its own acts or omissions and the weather conditions it encountered in the performance of the work. I see nothing in these circumstances giving rise to equitable liability on the part of the Government.

The continued success of the policy of awarding public contracts by competitive bids depends, of course, on the knowledge that successful bidders will be held to their bids with the same strictness as if they were dealing with private contractors. Relieving bidders of losses occasioned by the submission of bids that were successfully low because of overoptimism or failure to account for risks would not only strike a serious blow at the integrity of the competitive bidding system but would be unfair to more provident bidders who might otherwise have received the awards. It would deprive the Government of benefits resulting from favorable circumstances occurring during the performance of a contract while requiring compensation for losses encountered as a result of unfavorable circumstances.

There are no circumstances in this case that would serve to distinguish it

from others wherein contractors with the United States have suffered losses for which the Government was not responsible. In view of this fact and in the absence of any equitable considerations in favor of the contractor, I perceive no merit in the claim for special treatment in this case.

Accordingly, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1955.*

I have withheld my approval of enrolled enactment H. R. 6232, 84th Congress, "To include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War."

The effect of this legislation would be to determine by legislative decree, contrary to the facts, that, for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, Stephen Swan Ogletree rendered at least 70 days' active military service as a member of Company G, 2d Regiment, Alabama Volunteer Infantry, and was honorably discharged therefrom. No benefits would accrue by reason thereof prior to the date of receipt of an application to be filed subsequent to the date of its enactment.

There have been a number of affidavits submitted in support of Mr. Ogletree's contention that he served on active duty during the Spanish-American War. These affidavits are all dated some 29 or more years after the occurrence of the events to which they relate. In some, the affiant could "almost" swear that Mr. Ogletree served with Company G, 2d Regiment, Alabama Volunteer Infantry. In others, the affiant states that Mr. Ogletree did serve with that organization. However, most of these affidavits are entirely consistent with the official records of the organization which show that any service of Mr. Ogletree with that organization was prior to the time that it entered into active Federal service. In addition, the statement of one individual, who was of the opinion that Mr. Ogletree did serve in active Federal service, indicates that during such period the commanding officer of the company was J. H. Brazila. The records of the company show that Brazila did not command the company while it was in Federal service. Therefore, it is apparent that the passage of time has dimmed the recollection of the individuals who made these affidavits and that they have become confused as to the actual period of time during which the company was in Federal service or when Mr. Ogletree was a member thereof.

Military records pertaining to Mr. Ogletree show quite clearly that he was not a member of Company G, 2d Regiment, Alabama Volunteer Infantry, while that organization was in Federal service. The frequent muster rolls submitted on behalf of that organization, certified by the commanding officer and by the individual who acted as mustering officer, not only show the men who were present with the organization but also all men who were members of the organization during the period and who were absent for any reason whatsoever. The name of Stephen Swan Ogletree does not appear on any of these muster rolls.

Company G, 2d Regiment, Alabama Volunteer Infantry, was mustered into Federal service on May 31, 1898. During the Spanish-American War, regulations provided that before volunteer organizations were mustered into the service of the United States, the members thereof should be medically examined to determine whether or not they were physically qualified for active military service. Retained records of the 2d Regiment, Alabama Volunteer Infantry, clearly show that Mr. Ogletree was medically examined in accordance with such regulations, that he was rejected for service because of physical disqualification at least 12 days prior to the time that this organization was mustered into the service of the United States, and that he was returned to his home at Eufaula, Ala., through issuance of a "request for transportation," which provided as follows:

"M. No. 28570
Request for Transportation
Good for one days from date
Date. Mobile Ala May 19 1898
To The L & N RR Co
For John H. Nowlund and 26 men no pounds extra baggage, Co & Regt. Co "G" 2d Regt Ala Vols
From Mobile Ala
To Eufaula Ala
Via The L & N and Central of Ga
En route from Mobile Ala
To Eufaula Ala
Remarks; Recruit Co G. 2d Regt Ala Vol
Rejected by Medical Board
Issued on authority of telegram dated May 3 1898

H C CORBIN,
AG [Adjutant General]
[See otherside]
[other side]
* * * * *
Stephen S. Ogletree
* * * * *

Section 131 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812), provides, pertinently, as follows:

No private bill or resolution (including pension bills), * * * authorizing or directing * * * the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

H. R. 6232 would change the military records of Stephen Swan Ogletree.

Section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, supra, established the Army Board for the Correction of Military Records. That Board was established for the purpose of reviewing military records and recommending to the Secretary of the Army the correction of any such records, where, in the judgment of the Board, such action might be necessary to correct an error or remove an injustice. Upon the recommendation of the Board, the act authorized the Secretary to take corrective action. No application for the correction of the military records of Stephen Swan Ogletree has been received by that Board.

The Congress, by general legislation, has determined that cases of this character should be considered by the Army Board for the Correction of Military Records rather than by the Legislature itself. The affidavits which have been presented in Mr. Ogletree's behalf are entirely consistent with the fact that any service which he may have rendered was prior to the time that the organization was mustered into Federal service. Official records pertaining to the matter show quite clearly that Mr. Ogletree was not at any time during the Spanish-American War in the service of the United States. Under such circumstances, to determine by legislative decree that he rendered any active military service during such war and was honorably discharged therefrom would be entirely discriminatory. There is nothing in law or equity which would justify approval of this bill. To do so would confer upon Mr. Ogletree benefits provided for Spanish-American War veterans to which he is no more entitled than are other individuals who may have been members of local volunteer units prior to the time the unit was mustered into the Federal service, but who were physically disqualified for Federal service and were rejected prior to the mustering-in of the unit. I cannot, in justice, approve this enrolled enactment.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1955.*

I have withheld my approval from the bill H. R. 6887, "To extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (b) and to amend section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954." This bill would extend for 1 year a section of the Revenue Code designed to facilitate certain railroad reorganizations. In addition, it would safeguard certain bequests to charity from the pyramiding effect of State and Federal inheritance and estate taxes.

Federal law properly exempts bequests to charity from estate taxation. In some situations, however, the intent of the Federal law is negated by the imposition of State taxes on charitable bequests. As a result of a provision of Federal law designed to prevent tax avoidance, such State taxes in turn give rise to increased Federal tax liabilities. H. R. 6887 is intended to relieve charitable bequests in these situations to the extent that Federal legislation can do so.

I am sympathetic with the objectives of both portions of the bill. However, I am informed that there are three defects in the part of the bill dealing with the estate tax, which are sufficiently serious to require my disapproval.

First, this legislation would often increase Federal tax liabilities on estates containing bequests to charity.

Second, the legislation would, in certain situations, accrue not to the benefit of charity but to other heirs.

Third, it would disturb existing well-established relationships between Federal and State inheritance and estate tax liabilities based on the credit against Federal tax liability allowed for taxes paid to States since 1926. Since the State tax on the charitable bequest is deductible under the bill, it would no longer be counted in determining the amount which may be claimed by the estate as a credit for State taxes paid

against the Federal tax liability. However, the tax imposed under the so-called State pickup laws, which are designed to absorb the full credit allowable against the Federal estate tax, is based upon the total State tax otherwise levied (including the tax on the charitable bequest). Consequently, many State pickup laws would not pick up the full amount allowable as a credit. Enactment of this bill would probably stimulate State legislation to enlarge the credit for taxes paid to States.

In view of these defects in the legislation, I must reluctantly withhold my approval from the bill, H. R. 6887.

My reluctance would be greater, however, had I not been advised that the defects in section 2 of the bill can be remedied and that section 1 and section 2, appropriately remedied, can be enacted so as to apply retroactively without any serious difficulty.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1955.*

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 7195, to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for reservoir projects in Texas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to make adjustments in the land holdings of the United States acquired for five Texas reservoir projects (Belton, Benbrook, Garza-Little Elm, Grapevine, and Whitney Reservoirs) by reconveyance of certain lands to former owners, or the grantee, devisee, or successor in title of a former owner of contiguous property.

The Secretary has no authority to adjust land holdings where title has been acquired by purchase. The bill would provide the Secretary with authority to make such adjustments through reconveyance of lands or interests in lands to former owners at what the Secretary determines to be the original purchase price, adjusted to take into account improvements, damages, or interests retained by the United States.

However, H. R. 7195 goes further and requires the Secretary to determine whether the rights of a grantee, devisee, or successor in title of a former owner of contiguous property are equitably superior to the rights of the former owner himself. The law reports are replete with decisions which disclose the problems with which courts have been confronted in giving just recognition to asserted equitable interests in title to a tract of land. Moreover, in such cases the courts have enjoyed the historic cautionary benefits of the judicial process, such as notice and hearing, rights of intervention, the rules of evidence, and judicial precedents in a particular jurisdiction with respect to the application of equitable principles. The bill does not provide, and the Secretary of the Army does not have, comparable cautionary benefits for an administrative proceeding in which he would be required to engage in the subtle problems involved in weighing justly the equitable superiority or inferiority of the rights, on the one hand of a former owner of a tract, and, on the other hand, of those of the grantee or successor in title to a contiguous tract of property.

This provision would unjustly expose the Secretary to a series of burdensome and time-consuming administrative proceedings which are entirely alien to his statutory responsibilities. It would inevitably subject him to criticism from unsuccessful contestants. These unnecessary burdens and the attendant criticism can, and should, be avoided.

It is my firm opinion that, except for the return of lands or interests directly to the former owners or their heirs in cases of this kind, lands no longer required for project purposes should, if determined to be excess to the needs of the Department, be reported to the General Services Administration for disposal in accordance with general legislation providing for the disposition of excess and surplus Government-owned property. I see no reason for establishing a new and special category of priority holders based on a chain of title from a former owner of contiguous property.

I have approved legislation authorizing similar adjustments by reconveyance of lands to former owners (or their heirs) upon application by them at Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, and at Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida and Georgia, because I am convinced of the soundness of the principle behind the revised reservoir land acquisition policy of the Departments of the Army and the Interior.

I recommend that the Congress reconsider H. R. 7195 and enact a bill along those lines for the five reservoir projects in Texas to which the bill is applicable.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 12, 1955.*

On August 14, 1955:

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 6373, an act "To amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals."

This bill, by congressional action, would direct the continuation of the existing domestic minerals purchase programs under the Defense Production Act for certain minerals after defense needs have been met. Moreover, it would continue such purchases at prices considerably in excess of market price. It would direct the establishment of two new manganese buying depots and the reopening of a third. It would commit an additional $150 million for the purchase of double the original program quantities of these minerals.

Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, certain purchase programs were established for these minerals during the Korean hostilities. Public Law 206 of the 83d Congress extended for 2 years the termination dates of these programs. H. R. 6373, in effect, would direct the expansion of these programs so as to require the Government to buy far greater quantities of these minerals than are necessary for defense purposes. As a result, Government assistance to the producers of several minerals will be continued under the guise of defense needs when such needs do not exist.

Furthermore, the fiscal arrangements that are provided for in H. R. 6373 are unsound. The bill would bypass the usual budgetary processes and the customary review by congressional committees. It would direct the use of the defense borrowing authority conferred by the Defense Production Act.

Finally, the provisions of H. R. 6373 would apply to only a small segment of the domestic minerals industry and would not reach the fundamentals of the problem. Indeed this bill would make solution of the overall problems of the industry more difficult.

I am conscious of the desirability of developing a long-range minerals program for the United States to assure an adequate mobilization base and to preserve a sound minerals economy. The Advisory Committee on Minerals Policy so advised and the Office of Minerals Mobilization has been established in the Department of the Interior to determine and recommend such a program. The funds to make the necessary studies have just become available, and work toward the development of a long-range program has begun.

The interests of the domestic minerals industry will be better served by proceeding with the careful development of a long-range minerals program than by approving a stopgap measure extending substantial Government aid to only a segment of the industry. Meanwhile, with the exception of a single manganese depot, the existing domestic minerals procurement program remains uncompleted, and sales by domestic miners to the Government will continue under the provisions of the regulations now in effect.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 14, 1955.*

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the first calendar quarter of 1955 were received after April 20, 1955, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $921. E. (9) $530.74.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, CIO, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $458.40.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,701.53. E. (9) $7,701.53.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $14,077.41. E. (9) $12,777.41.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $237.70. E. (9) $4,561.85.

A. American Social Hygiene Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,800.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $2,288.21.

A. AMVETS (American Veterans World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,405.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Federal Republic of West Germany.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Gibbs L. Baker, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mastercraft Linen Fabrics Corp., 1071 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Frederick J. Fawcett, Inc., 129 South Street, Boston, Mass.; and Hughes Fawcett, Inc., 115 Franklin Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,270. E. (9) $40.55.

A. Wm. J. Barnhard, 351 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gold Star Wives of America, Inc., 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. F. W. H. Beauchamp, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul H. Bolton, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wholesalers, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $1,266.80.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,499.96. E. (9) $315.90.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $575.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875.02.

A. Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc., 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $15,125. E. (9) $15,028.12.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1023 Connecticut Avenue NW., Wahington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul M. Castiglioni, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $499.98. E. (9) $393.04.

A. Theodore S. Chapman, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,550.75. E. (9) $1,550.75.

A. The Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,992.22. E. (9) $1,992.22.

A. Herman Clott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 412 Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 501 Patrick Street, Portsmouth, Va.
B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $113.47.

A. John G. Coffey, 742 Hospital Trust Building, Providence, R. I.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., Grand Central Terminal Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $325.53.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $545.85.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $421.17.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $30,922.50. E. (9) $17,967.63.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 3210 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $11.42.

A. R. Ammi Cutter, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $24.25.

A. William L. Daley, 912 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $146.51.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $324.41.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,264.15.

A. Casimir de Rham, Jr., 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. John W. Edelman, 811 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,997.03. E. (9) $372.03.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John R. Foley, 753 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,550.75.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $68.75. E. (9) $32.35.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley Gewirtz, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $80.75.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $1,900.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $359.92.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $149.35.

A. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dr. Eleanor M. Hadley, 1825 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Social Workers, 1 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Jess Halsted, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lloyd C. Halvorson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $101.35.

A. William A. Hanscom, 701 Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union—CIO, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,055. E. (9) $180.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899.98. E. (9) $132.21.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edward S. Hartman, rural route 2, Delavan, Wis.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $417.93.

A. Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, Waverly, Va.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $67.85.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Laurance G. Henderson, 1190 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. North American Airlines, Burbank, Calif.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $487.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemical Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island NW., Washington, D. C.
B. AMVETS (American Veterans World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $75.

A. R. F. Hollister, 825 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Independent Bankers Association, 12th Federal Reserve District, 825 Failing Building, Portland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $29.71. E. (9) $28.60.

A. Kenneth N. Hurley, 2700 South 16th Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Independent Bankers Association, 12th Federal Reserve District, Portlond 4, Oreg.
E. (9) $7,038.50.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $2,150.

A. Delos L. James, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $3,165. E. (9) $343.81.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

A. John T. Koehler, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Demark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. D. B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stephen Levitsky, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John J. Lyons, 3133 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $423.58.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York 18, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $145.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $29,250. E. (9) $30,922.31.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, Its Public Relations Department and Its Realtors, Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $63,674.64. E. (9) $31,169.64.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $55.50. E. (9) $55.50.

A. National Council Against Conscription, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,295.13. E. (9) $7,031.18.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington D. C.
D. (6) $11,660. E. (9) $12,567.23.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,186. E. (9) $375.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,314.45. E. (9) $6,341.45.

A. National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,027.03. E. (9) $1,525.77.

A. National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,350. E. (9) $101.35.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 636 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $11,727.58. E. (9) $10,137.77.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $55.55.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $201.84.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, P. O. Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $801.60. E. (9) $1,135.91.

A. Charles A. Parker, Room 714, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,183.34. E. (9) $1,102.41.

A. George F. Parrish, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, P. O. Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,249.99.

A. Peoples Lobby—Emory Speer Avant, 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (6) $2,192.28. E. (9) $1,805.18.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $2,300.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $117.27.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,300.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Charles M. Price, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,249.98. E. (9) $498.36.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899.98. E. (9) $42.45.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $430.53.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 106 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 106 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (9) $62.50.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $174.35.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $27.38.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $143.41.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $24.45.

A. Paul Sifton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,620. E. (9) $138.75.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $27,136. E. (9) $9,721.82.

A. Leland Glen Snarr, 2576 Redondo Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. David W. Evans & Associates Advertising Agency, Phillips Petroleum Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $5,249.39. E. (9) $4,951.91.

A. Spence & Hotchkiss, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,708.20. E. (9) $10,112.67.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Leo V. Sullivan, 106 Chestnut Street, West Haven, Conn.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $562.58.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,332.31. E. (9) $1,332.31.

A. John R. Talmage, 2734 Morgan Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. David W. Evans & Associates Advertising Agency, Phillips Petroleum Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $650.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $453.49.

A. John U. Terrell, 407 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis 3, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $55.50.

A. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Upper Colorado River Grass Roots, Inc., Grand Junction, Colo.
D. (6) $38,660.69. E. (9) $22,230.99.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $71.27.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the liaison committee.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $231.44.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300. (E. (9) $4.50.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $73,160.56. E. (9) $52.98.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $91.04.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,001.80. E. (9) $2,001.80.

A. Herbert P. Wilkins, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $398.49.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc.
D. (6) $52.50. E. (9) $52.50.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1955:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description; (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $110.06.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,504.66. E. (9) $5,504.66.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., international president.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America (CIO), High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $338.98.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Joseph Amann, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $837.25.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $6,717.67.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $5,749.20. (E. (9) $5,749.20.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,647.84. E. (9) $7,647.84.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington D. C.
D. (6) $32793. E. (9) $29,643.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $31,623.45.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $992.32.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $124,396.79.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $6,290.92. E. (9) $25,343.72.

A. American Life Convention, 230 Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,803.69. E. (9) $1,803.69.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $14,750. E. (9) $9,930.51.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $9,317.82.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $53,275.97. E. (9) $1,012.34.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $342,290.15. E. (9) $2,685.35.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund (legislative) c/o Dr. Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
D. (6) $5,537.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $977.61. E. (9) $977.61.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,087. E. (9) $15,769.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $160.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $$97,341.98. E. (7) $13,489.52.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,062.63. E. (9) $2,062.63.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $7,016.90. (E. (9) $1,768.25.

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $43.50.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $19,800. E. (9) $3,392.02.

A. American Veterans' Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,444.40. E. (9) $1,874.34.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,059.30.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 400 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,560. E. (9) $2,542.11.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,141.70. E. (9) $6,777.05.

A. John R. Arant, 1102 King Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $37.50.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $712.57.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $774.03.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicolas Reisini, 11 West 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,619.29.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Associated Third-Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,025. E. (9) $5,749.96.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $38,035.73. E. (9) $38,035.73.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,865.31. E. (9) $1,865.31.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,833.67. E. (9) $1,833.67.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42 Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 126, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 East Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $147. E. (9) $17.85.

A. George P. Baker, 808 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America, 808 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,563.36. E. (9) $402.73.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,922.43. E. (9) $961.38.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co., Ltd., 500 Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, et al.

A. Joel Barlow, 710 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $126.47.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,268.75. E. (9) $168.40.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. William J. Barnhard, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Elof Hansson, Inc., 225 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.; Johaneson, Wales & Sparre, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Treetex Corp., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Grace & Co. (west coast), 2 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $50.

A. F. W. H. Beauchamp, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Transportation Association of America, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $833.38.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,828.39.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Mrs. Louella Miller Berg, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The G. B. Macke Corp., 212 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Automatic Canteen Company of America, Merchandising Mart, Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; National Automatic Merchandising Association, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $51.90.

A. Tell Berna, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. J. Raymond Berry, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $142.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,200.34. E. (9) $2,200.34.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,867. E. (9) $354.

A. Bigham, Engler, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.; and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $215.14.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $164.07.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $925.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 3026 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $44.55.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry W. Blalock, Sr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Electric Power Cooperative, Jefferson City, Mo.; N. W. Electric Power Cooperative, Cameron, Mo.; Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Anadarko, Okla.
D. (6) $250.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,234.89. E. (9) $2,234.89.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John J. Boland, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $100.

A. Paul H. Bolton, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wholesalers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Borax Cartel Story, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $241.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $60.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. David F. Brinegar, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $137.98.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,499.96. E. (9) $229.50.

A. Clark L. Brody, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
D. (6) $415.38. E. (9) $28.05.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $600.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Board of Trade, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,220. E. (9) $310.88.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,949.99. E. (9) $5,790.66.

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $22.88.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, 1771 N. Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John M. Brumm, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,374.98. E. (9) $113.60.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $38.37

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $1.26.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $84.68.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $420. E. (9) $74.12.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,495. E. (9) $962.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $10,800.60. E (9) $5,647.55.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $185.85.

A. Robert M. Burr, Hill Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Bureau for Economic Realism, Inc., Hill Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $299.97. E. (9) $35.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $208.33. E. (9) $5.22.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $33.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,307.66. E. (9) $269.22.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1023 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $200.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $653.21. E. (9) $281.67.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn., Washington, D. C., and 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $587.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,443.05.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. Cassidy & Renneisen, 1519 Heyburn Building, Louisville, Ky.
B. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $56.30.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,661.30.

A. Francis R. Cawley, Room 1005, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $101.55.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $14,282.10. E. (9) $9,919.37.

A. Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL, of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $2,382.50. E. (9) $4,350.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Nicholas J. Chase, 400 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frederick Stafford, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $7,119.21. E. (9) $4,270.79.

A. CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,312.34. E. (9) $6,500.14.

A. Earl Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $69.45.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Oho.
D. (6) $2,769.24.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,025.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $26.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montepelier, Vt.
D. (6) $60.52. E. (9) $78.34.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,074.10. E. (9) $2,074.10.

A. Herman Clott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, 412 Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $137.80.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Joseph H. Colman, 1300 First National-Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. First Bank Stock Corp., 400 First National-Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $165.13.

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $480.62.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $12,519.72.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.
D. (6) $4,400. E. (9) $10,202.74.

A. Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $267.89.

A. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,188. E. (9) $542.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,622.10. E. (9) $7,432.40.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $18,928.01.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $6,710. E. (9) $11,632.12.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers' Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,305. E. (9) $13,464.76.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $29,635.43. E. (9) $29,635.43.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $46.01.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $654.40.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 512 South Market Street, Wichita, Kans.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $958.33. E. (9) $160.97.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $786.86.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, 122 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $130.56.

A. Cotton, Brenner & Wrigley, 225 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Martin Aloysius Madden, 27 West 96th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $513.68.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washingtoon, D. C.
D. (6) $8,656.29. E. (9) $18,671.16.

A. A. M. Crawford, 718 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, 12 East 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $116.19.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $480.62. E. (9) $480.62.

A. John C. Cuneo, P. O. Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio
D. (6) $2,394.71. E. (9) $1,230.74.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $525

A. R. Ammi Cutter, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $430.28.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,407. E. (9) $11.12.

A. Joan David, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,420.71.

A. Joan David, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,036.05.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,515.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Copley Press, Inc., 428 Downer Place, Aurora, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.
E. (9) $400.57.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $948.56.

A. Sherlock Davis, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Tony T. Dechant, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $750.

A. Richard A. Dell, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW,. Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $787.50.

A. Florence de Haas Dembitz, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Benjamin Graham, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $600.

A. Casimir deRham, Jr., care of Palmer Dodge Gardner & Bradford, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,300.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $9,692.40.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,750.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,550.39. E. (9) $189.10.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Thomas J. Green and Edward Simone, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Building Granite Quarries Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.

A. District Lodge, No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,588.28. E. (9) $13,541.81.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $5,917.81.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $367.69.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 236 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,624.99.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, Tax Council of the Alcoholic Beverage Industries, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Sureties Co's., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,483.95. E. (9) $75.

A. John E. Dougherty, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.70.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $3,343. E. (9) $828.57.

A. Adin M. Downer, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $106.90.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, State Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $225.

A. Robert A. Drum, Chairman of the Board, Metz Brewing Co., Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $3,161.38.

A. Ben DuBoise, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,869.50.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5–141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York. N. Y.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $215.

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., 444 West 56th Street, New York, N. Y.; Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York City, N. Y.; Paramount Pictures Corp., Paramount Building, New York City, N. Y.; RKO Radio Pictures, Inc., 1270 Sixth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.; United Artists Corp., 729 Seventh Avenue, New York City, N. Y.; Columbia Pictures Corp., 729 Seventh Avenue, New York City, N. Y.; Loew's Incorporated, 1540 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.; Universal Pictures Co., Inc., 445 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
E. (9) $810.56.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,276. E. (9) $499.60.

A. John W. Edelman, 811 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,978.35. E. (9) $353.35.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $225.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th at F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $96.85.

A. Oscar Elder, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John Doyle Eliott, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $910. E. (9) $95.83.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,237.85.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,050. E. (9) $241.50.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $14,400. E. (9) $264.24.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Robert B. Ely 3d, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,740.40. E. (9) $2,041.98.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $2,475. E. (9) $273.70.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $813.92.

A. David W. Evans & Associates, Phillips Petroleum Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Upper Colorado River Grass Roots, Inc., Grand Junction, Colo.
D. (6) $19,081.96. E. (9) $17,122.61.

A. Charles J. Fain, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $697.26.

A. Edward Falck & Co., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Gas Light Co., 815 Main Street, Bridgeport, Conn.; Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., South Road, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Commonwealth Natural Gas Corp., 116 South Third Street, Richmond, Va.; The Connecticut Light & Power Co., P. O. Box 2010, Hartford, Conn.; Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.; Delaware Power & Light Co., 600 Market Street, Wilmington, Del.; The Hartford Gas Co., 233 Pearl Street, Hartford, Conn.; Lynchburg Gas Co., 600 Main Street, Lynchburg, Va.; Long Island Lighting Co., 250 Old Country Road, Mineola, N. Y.; New Haven Gas Co., 80 Crown Street, New Haven, Conn.; New York State Electric & Gas Corp., 507 Cayuga Heights Road, Ithaca, N. Y.; Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., 300 Erie Boulevard West, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., 89 East Avenue, Rochester, N. Y.; Rockland Light & Power Co., 10 North Broadway, Nyack, N. Y.; Washington Gas Light Co., 1100 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,843.75. E. (9) $3,150.67.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $45,757.06. E. (9) $27,248.97.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.
D. (6) $4,150. E. (9) $2,613.13.

A. Jerry K. Fields, Box 1732, Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,050

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $472.50.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $35,083.97. E. (9) $8,951.59.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $830.33.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $9,000. E. (9) $1,650.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $31.74.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $756.73.

A. John F. Floberg, Esq., 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $2,774.16.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,388.37.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $1,979.44.

A. John J. Flynn, 737 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Works, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $190.

A. Forest Farmers Association, P. O. Box 7284, Station C., Atlanta, Ga.
E. (9) $866.24.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,224.99. E. (9) $6.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,076.96.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $47.54.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2304 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
B. National Tax Relief Coalition, 2304 Pine Craft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $870.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 2 West 46th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,775. E. (9) $1,653.25.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,114.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Mills Corp., 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $84.13.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,523.62. E. (9) $22,653.23.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $625.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $541.73. E. (9) $541.73.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,042.55.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $118.70. E. (9) $18.70.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $218.75. E. (9) $47.30.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $1,765.68.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $255.

A. General Gas Committee, 1612 Continental Life Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $6,980. E. (9) $40,586.27.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer & C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,440.75. E. (9) $110.05.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

A. George Goldstein, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $260.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $159.97.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49. E. (9) $3.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, Post Office Box 2212, Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Philip P. Gott, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,783.12. E. (9) $5,807.17.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers' National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $65.10.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $234.50. E. (9) $7,550.83.

A. Charles A. Grant, 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $613.92.

A. S. H. Grauten, 1722 Harrison Street, Evanston, Ill., and 3743 Upton Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $32.38.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens' Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $760. E. (9) $49.95.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, P. O. Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Francis T. Greene, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $331.63.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $5.49.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $2.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $197.55.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $150.70.

A. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $30,850.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $141.72. E. (9) $121.35.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $312. E. (9) $42.87.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $336.58.

A. Dr. Eleanor M. Hadley, 1825 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Social Workers, 1 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $16.13.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,047.50. E. (9) $394.53.

A. W. F. Hall, Sparta, Ga.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875.12. E. (9) $562.89.

A. Jess Halsted, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $15,425.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,982.78. E. (9) $857.78.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William A. Hanscom, 805 G Street NW., room 701, Washington, D. C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union (CIO), 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,055. E. (9) $180.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $435.49.

A. Hardboard Association, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,668.65.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899.98. E. $85.37.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. Wade Harrison, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $41.15.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $24.08.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,839.50.

A. Bernard C. Harter, 5402 Albemarle Street, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Wood Fabric Institute, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Institute, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $125.

A. Robert N. Hawes and John A. Gosnell, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $20.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $39.15.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railway, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275.60. E. (9) $45.

A. John C. Hazen, 808 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $12.55.

A. Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $84.68.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $163. E. (9) $13.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $203.90.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $33.75. E. (9) $33.75.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $38.48.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, P. O. Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. W.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $141.45.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $269.11.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $107.50.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobile Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,548.61. E. (9) $298.61.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Charles M. Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $220.65.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4200 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union, 1141 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,530.92. E. (9) $575.92.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Thomas C. Dennehy, Jr., et al., trustees under the last will and testament of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $948.56.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jesse V. Horton, Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,562.50. E. (9) $147.39.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,384.36. E. (9) $1,384.36.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,546.

A. William T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,572.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $536.59. E. (9) $900.01.

A. W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,266. E. (9) $408.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $825.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $13,130. E. (9) $15,501.69.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $41,893.50. E. (9) $7,685.29.

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $364.77.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalsen, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $245. E. (9) $3.58.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $25.02.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $2,150.

A. International Trade Section, New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $934. E. (9) $1,981.48.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,615.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $20.31.

A. Ivins, Phillips & Barker, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Remington Rand, Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $5.78.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $1,575. E. (9) $181.65.

A. Theodore Jaffe, 400 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frederick Stafford, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Japanese American Citizens League.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $300.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participatione Industrielles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr 19, Basle, Switzerland.
E. (9) $285.20.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,962.57.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,534.96. E. (9) $68.90.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $1,413.93.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $9.80.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $450.11.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $266.85.

A. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
E. (9) $2,330.92.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. Robert C. Keck, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $153.12.

A. Arthur C. Keefer, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. War Department Beneficial Association, United States Department of Labor Beneficial Association, and United States Departments of Commerce and Justice Beneficial Associations, Washington, D. C.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Joseph Duff Kelly, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Tariff Committee of the Woven Felt Industry, care of Albany Felt Co., Albany, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $37.86.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $10.

A. I. L. Kenen, 302 Beechwood Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,377.77. E. (9) $408.12.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $280.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $151.10.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $243.85.

A. Jeff Kibre, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $805.90. E. (9) $675.82.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $79.66.

A. Joseph William Kinghorne, 1365 Iris Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lynnes Publishing Co., 155 West First Street, Elmhurst, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $100.

A. Bill Kirchner, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,124.96.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $37.87.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,038. E. (9) $884.66.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 2623 North Van Dorn Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $300.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Alden Lown, receiver of the joint venture of Barrett & Hilp, McDonald and Rutherford, 600 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Eastern Corp., 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,888.13. E. (9) $4,163.62.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,359.29. E. (9) $4,796.03.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. A. M. Lampley, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $333.30.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,333.30.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. William C. Lantaff, 916 DuPont Building, Miami, Fla.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $656.06.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $3,093.50.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $3,888.32.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $4.80.

A. John G. Laylin and Edward G. Howard, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50,000. E. (9) $2,756.06.

A. Randall J. Le Boeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $3,664.83.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $8,005.69.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,780.55. E. (9) $280.55.

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $400.68.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $741. E. (9) $1,914.48.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. G. E. Leighty, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I.

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,756.83. E. (9) $7,756.83.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,729. E. (9) $2,770.80.

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,875.02. E. (9) $50.61.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Donald Linville, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $4,265.53.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $220.11.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,850. E. (9) $103.36.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,749.99. E. (9) $15.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,210.37.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Valeriu C. Georgescu, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., and Max Ausnit, 525 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $280.08.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. S. A. Healy Co., 61 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $115.93.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Cook Electric Co., 2700 Southport Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $61.34.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N. Y.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,532. E. (9) $72.19.

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $43.20.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $558.33. E. (9) $73.32.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
E. (9) $82.26.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,680. E. (9) $277.90.

A. McDonnell & Slattery, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edwin McElwain, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co.
D. (6) $781.25. E. (9) $771.43.

A. A. J. McFarland.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $810. E. (9) $300.

A. Charles T. McGavin, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, United States of America, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $301.65.

A. J. V. McLaughlin, 543 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $602.44.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
E. (9) $52.67.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Confectioners' Association, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $654.92.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $189.95.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, P. O. Box 1170, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $375.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $50.40.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,296.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $1,172.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $145.12. E. (9) $5.12.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. John M. Martin, Jr., 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Japanese-American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese-American Citizens' League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $18.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,867. E. (9) $432.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,409. E. (9) $2,014.34.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $27.17.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $48.66.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, State Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $19,710. E. (9) $2,025.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. and N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $480.04.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C .
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $133.30.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $986.73.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $225.30.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $1,387.97.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, attorneys (Hogan & Hartson), 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Harriett O. Davis, Harry Handley Cloutier, Elinor S. Cloutier, estate of John H. Davis, Henri H. Cloutier, deceased, Harry M. Cloutier, executor, Margaret S. Cloutier; Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $57.57.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler and Richard A. Mullens (Hogan & Hartson), 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $30.30.

A. Allen P. Mitchem, 406 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Board of Water Commissioners, city and county of Denver, State of Colorado.
D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $375.50.

A. M. D. Mobley.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $69.67.

A. F. E. Mollin, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $617.81.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $226.40.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Robert A. Drum, chairman of the board, Metz Brewing Co., Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $111.88.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pickett Development Committee, Blackstone, Va.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $1,138.48.

A. Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,756.46.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute.
D. (6) $4,734.99. E. (9) $70.05.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $706.05.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Howard E. Munro, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $1,412.31.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
E. (9) $866.24.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,070.01. E. (9) $2,070.01.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $36,265. E. (9) $28,524.95.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,062.04. E. (9) $1,296.85.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $14,287.50. E. (9) $239.53.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12,620.88. E. (9) $41,076.95.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $837.29. E. (9) $837.29.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,070.25. E. (9) $5,306.46.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $44,381.51. E. (9) $31,713.25.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $496.97.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,250. E. (9) $7,075.21.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 1111 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,314.50. E. (9) $1,210.59.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $748.02. E. (9) $1,008.41.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 1218 Locust Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $653.70. E. (9) $521.66.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,893.02. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $431,887.76. E. (9) $2,448.57.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $1,317.20.

A. National Committee on Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, care of D. G. Ward, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $423.72.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $326.09. E. (9) $326.09.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,741.16. E. (9) $2,741.16.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,994.35. E. (9) $1,994.35.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,306.49. E. (9) $2,724.56.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (7) $2,319.72. E. (9) $2,194.92.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Strect NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $183,118.55. E. (9) $32,392.14.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,232.24. E. (9) $1,232.24.

A. National Housing Conference, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $23,699.18. E. (9) $16,203.29.

A. National Institute of Diaper Services, Inc., 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,839.50.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,444.65. E. (9) $1,491.95.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,250.92. E. (9) $3,250.92.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
E. (9) $806.11.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $46,543.35. E. (9) $4,665.50.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,611.50. E. (9) $14,842.95.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $715.57. E. (9) $570.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 32st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,989.67.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,655.06. E. (9) $8,643.80.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,683.83. E. (9) $15,683.03.

A. National Savings & Loan League, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,392.20. E. (9) $1,479.16.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $5,220.29.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $99,508.50. E. (9) $1,555.72.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,390.98. E. (9) $7,134.34.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $3,659.09. E. (9) $1,767.72.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $5,107.12.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,562.50. E. (9) $14,376.24.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bureau of Accident & Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $137.13.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Otis H. Ellis, General Counsel, National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $70.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,624.72.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319, 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $22.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,775.

A. Blake T. Newton, Jr., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,937.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161, William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $163.78.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,204.44.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51 Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $260.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $13.55.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Co.'s, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,212.50. E. (9) $22.99.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock & Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $358.50. E. (9) $158.50.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $70.25.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,827.25.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $492.82.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Of. 504, Lima, Peru.
E. (9) $570.44.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $115.92.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $120.53.

A. A. E. Oliver, 600 Folgar Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $45.69. E. (9) $2.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,363.65.

A. Clarence H. Olson, c/o The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvannia Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,370. E. (9) $307.70.

A. Samuel Omasta, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $19.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,613.64.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
E. (9) $415.77.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $507.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $75.11. E. (9) $75.11.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,624.99.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Parker, Milliken & Kohlmeier, 650 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, as trustee of the Mary Paula Ball Trust, Fourth and Main Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. George F. Parrish, Charleston, W. Va.,
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,499.99. E. (9) $181.26.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $43.90.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $603.67.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gambel Realty & Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $742.11.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,993.75. E. (9) $71.27.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Edward F. Pipe.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,650. E. (9) $258.29.

A. Hugh Peterson, Ailey, Ga.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $730.44.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $274.77.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $64.83.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $400.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $2,516.67.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $60.

A. Walter C. Ploeser, 50 South Bemiston Avenue, Clayton, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $465.74.

A. Milton H. Plumb, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,899.96. E. (9) $539.43.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Poole,, Shroyer & Denbo, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Portland, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $100.19.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee Representing American Fluorspar Producers, care of J. Blecheisen, Rosiclare, Ill.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $705.43.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pin, Clip & Fastener Association, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $21.87.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $20.75.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,514.61.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Charles M. Price, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $15,425.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $7.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $50.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, National City Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $154.37.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $255.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Achison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
E. (9) $549.44.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 369 Lexington Avenue, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City, and National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
D. (6) $7,799.97. E. (9) $5,415.13.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $102.50. E. (9) $45.85.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $51.25. E. (9) $84.98.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

A. D. C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users' Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $627.44.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Joint Committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $2,763.88.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,041.22. E. (9) $4,041.22.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $168.36.

A. Nicolas Reisini, 11 West 42 Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $30,356.11.

A. Retirement of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (16) $7,646.43. E. (9) $7,994.42.

A. Andrew E. Rice, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,038.45. E. (9) $49.70.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) 870.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899.98.

A. George D. Riley, 910 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,867. E. (9) $420.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference.
E. (9) $242.12.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, P. O. Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $221.17.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $611.81.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $716.74.

A. Watson Rogers, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Delbert L. Rucker, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $25.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $136.92.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $167.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $95.34.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $419.32.

A. William H. Ryan, Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Salzstein, 515 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.01. E. (9) $26.63.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $85. E. (9) $346.50.

A. L. R. Sanford, Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $176.50.

A. John T. Sapienza and Walter A. Slowinski, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd. et al.
E. (9) $9.90.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $185.25.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $118.21.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $55.67.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 378 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $329.75.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $26.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $25.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $105.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Elof Hansson, Inc., 225 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.; Johaneson, Wales & Sparre, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Grace & Co. (West Coast), 2 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $134.54.

A. James R. Sharp, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Elof Hansson, Inc., 225 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.; Johaneson, Wales & Sparre, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Treetex Corp., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Grace & Co. (West Coast), 2 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,793.99.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $570.81.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $120.53.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $307.86.

A. Charles B. Shuman, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Silk and Rayon Printer and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $4,513.55.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,305. E. (9) $9,996.26.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $14,664.24.

A. Stephen Slipher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $43.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $281.71.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $303.51.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $3,675.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $953.78.

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $206.90.

A. Madlyn Smyth, 690 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Alden Lown, receiver appointed by the superior court of the city and county of San Francisco to represent him in the matter of *Barrett and Hilp* v. *McDonald and Rutherford.*
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $691.41.

A. Leland Glen Snarr, 2576 Redondo Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. David W. Evans & Associates Advertising Agency, Phillips Petroleum Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $340.87.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $18,081.75. E. (9) $25,585.52.

A. Spence & Hotchkiss, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $165. E. (9) $652.63.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $2,362.12.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $24.50.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 9307 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba, and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $4,923.29.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,370.19. E. (9) $12,254.16.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,259.90. E. (9) $509.90.

A. Erskine Stewart, 808 Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,949.78. E. (9) $299.78.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 400 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,538.46.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 400 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. D. R. Strackbein, as chairman for the Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,875.01.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $8.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084 Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $722.56.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $24.42.

A. Leo V. Sullivan, 106 Chestnut Street, West Haven, Conn.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $953.57.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $472.02.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $178.53. E. (9) $178.53.

A. Glenn J. Talbott, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $269.06.

A. John R. Talmage, 2734 Morgan Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. David W. Evans & Associates Advertising Agency, Phillips Petroleum Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Barrett Godwin Tawresey, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
D. (6) $365.50. E. (9) $391.69.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,350. E. (9) $590.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Jay Taylor, 712 First National Bank Building, Amarillo, Tex.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Tyre Taylor, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $308.09.

A. Ruth H. Tegtmeyer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 130 N. Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John U. Terrell, 407 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $4,480. E. (9) $4,904.51.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $1,077.38.

A. W. M. Thomas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $201.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,531.88.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,734.30. E. (9) $339.80.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $77.55.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $392.56.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,228.35. E. (9) $128.35.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $239.58.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,969. E. (9) $78.07.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Co., South Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 736 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 493, Balboa, Canal Zone.
D. (6) $102.31. E. (9) $35.30.

A. Unemployed Service Association, 622 5th Street, Washington, D. C.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $2,101.76.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,343.52.

A. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $97,262.61. E. (9) $39,855.48.

A. Upper Colorado River Grass Roots, Inc., Grand Junction, Colo.
D. (6) $31,401.48. E. (9) $22,622.83.

A. Richard G. Van Buskirk, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.51.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 528 Mills Building, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $61.35.

A. Weston Vernon, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley Vogt.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,534.96. E. (9) $143.27.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Claude R. Wallace, 1453 Harvard Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 3423 Joseph Street, New Orleans, La.
B. California Commercial Co., Inc., 635 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $409.99. E. (9) $414.11.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,493.75. E. (9) $54.82.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, A. F. of L., 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $12.25.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Committee, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,750. E. (9) $6,750.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,681.45. E. (9) $1,878.47.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $500.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $4,492.75.

A. J. R. Watson, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $361.39.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $257.23.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Liaison Committee.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,000.91.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,649.60. E. (9) $1,137.71.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $2.69.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,550.90. E. (9) $145.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans' of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $352.42.

A. Moss & Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $198.05.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $764.68.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Frank J. Whalen, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. W. F. Beunderman, Jr., No. 8 Mahaaiweg, Willemstad, Curacao, South America.
E. (9) $4.45.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kenneth W. White, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $17.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $72.28.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph F. Wildebush, 7 Church Street, Paterson, N. J.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert P. Wilkins, care of Palmer Dodge Gardner & Bradford, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. A. E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $253.51.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
D. (6) $2.46. E. (9) $10.22.

A. Hugh S. Williamson, 1621 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $986.01.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,675. E. (9) $416.21.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $229.83.

A. J. B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyo.
B. Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo.
E. (9) $805.97.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $1,651.76.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $563.28.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,000. E. (9) $9,038.05.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $6,353.49. E. (9) $1,530.29.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,555.46. E. (9) $1,634.29.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,344. E. (9) $163.49.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $37.49.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1955:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Airport Operators Council, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilbur H. Baldinger, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. R. M. Beach, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association, Chicago, Ill.

A. H. M. Baldrige.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building., Washington, D. C.
B. The Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Kenneth M. Birkhead, 1830 Jefferson Place, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans Committee, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Granville S. Borden, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Mohave Mining & Milling Co., Box 1106, Wickenburg, Ariz.

A. Charles Bragman, 838 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. M. F. Comer Bridge and Foundation Co., 990 Northwest North River Drive, Miami, Fla.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Carl S. Buchanan, 404 Hollister Building, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Motor Bus Association.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 24 Beekman Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold Burke.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. E. Thos. Burnard, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Airport Operators Council, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Bernard N. Burnstine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 50 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Monroe Butler, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 930 Edison Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Sally Butler, 1300 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Mary B. Cameron, 3220 Luwana Lane, Knoxville, Tenn.
B. International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Cassidy & Renneisen, 1519 Heyburn Building, Louisville, Ky.
B. Stephen Fitzgerald & C., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Nicholas J. Chase, 400 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frederick Stafford, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph H. Colman, 1300 First National Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. First Bank Stock Corp., 400 First National Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. M. F. Comer Bridge and Foundation Co., 990 NW., North River Drive, Miami, Fla.

A. Committee on Imports for the American Pulpwood Industry, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Howard L. Cousins, Jr., 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.
B. Bangor and Aroostock Railroad Co., 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, and Kenneth C. Royall and Ralph D. Pittman, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., 444 West 56th Street, New York City; Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York City; Paramount Pictures Corp., Paramount Building, New York City; RKO Radio Pictures, Inc., 1270 6th Avenue, New York City; United Artists Corp., 729 7th Avenue, New York City; Columbia Pictures Corp., 729 7th Avenue, New York City; Loew's Inc., 1540 Broadway, New York City; Universal Pictures Co., Inc., 445 Park Avenue, New York City.

A. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.

A. Edward Falck, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., et al., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 5508 Montgomery Street, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. American Association of Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Edward J. Flynn, 1422 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Martin L. Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chapman & Wolfsohn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ginsburg, Leventhal & Brown, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Society To Study Private Property Interests in Foreign Countries, Contrescarpe 46, Bremen, Germany.

A. Arthur J. Goldberg, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Joint Minimum Wage Committee, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Hal H. Hale, 425 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. W. F. Hall, Sparta, Ga.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Everett A. Hayes, 1422 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 4545 Augusta Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Theodore Jaffe, 400 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frederick Stafford, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Thomas W. James, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Bell, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Joint Minimum Wage Committee, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert I. Kabat, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert C. Keck, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Arthur C. Keefer, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. War Department Beneficial Association, U. S. Department of Labor Beneficial Association, and U. S. Departments of Commerce and Justice Beneficial Association, Washington, D. C.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Tariff Committee of the Woven Felt Industry, care of Albany Felt Co., Albany, N. Y.

A. Joyce L. Kornbluh, 4612 High Street, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Minimum Wage Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Alden Lown, 600 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. William C. Lantaff, 916 Dupont Building, Miami, Fla., and 805 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Phillip Lemelman, 209 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Aluminum Extruders Council, 209 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Artemas C. Leslie, 416 Mills Building, 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Cross Commission of the American Hospital Association, 425 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. George W. Malcomson, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chrysler Sales Corp., 12200 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Joseph F. Marias, 461 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Compania Maritima, 109 Juan Luna, Manila, Philippines.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Jay R. Martin, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James G. Michaux, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roger C. Minahan, 735 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Pfister & Vogel Tanning Co., 1531 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Allen P. Mitchem, 406 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Board of Water Commissioners, City and County of Denver, State of Colorado.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Maryland Railroad Association, care of E. H. Burgess, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Joseph A. Moran and Associates, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Uranium Ore Producers Association, Grand Junction, Colo.

A. Motorola, Inc., 4545 Augusta Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Group Health Dental Insurance, Inc., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cushman Motor Works, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.; Simplex Manufacturing Corp., New Orleans, La.; Harley-Davidson Motor Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Francis A. O'Connell, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Division, Transport Workers Union, CIO., 80-07 Broadway, Elmhurst, N. Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philippine nonprofit educational, health, and welfare institutions, Manila, Philippine Islands.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philippine Steam Navigation Co.

A. George W. Overton, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Bell, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Irving R. M. Panzer, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Steckler, Frank & Gutman, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

A. Maurice G. Paul, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 4545 Augusta Boulevard, Chicago 51, Ill.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Howard L. Shannon, Acting Trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.

A. Milton Plumb, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Section, Joint United States-Mexican Trade Union Committee (A. F. of L., CIO, United Mineworkers & Railway Labor Executives Association Brotherhoods).

A. Postal Transportation Contractors of America, 422 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. W. E. Reynolds, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Webb & Knapp, Inc.

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. P. F. Claveau, P. O. Box 1958, Anchorage, Alaska.

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert Emmet Rodes, 34 West 65th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Gerald E. Rowley, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. North American Airlines, Burbank, Calif.

A. Walter S. Rothschild, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John T. Sapienza and Walter A. Slowinski, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago and North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Benjamin H. Saunders and Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunray Mid-Continent Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.

A. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.

A. William F. Sharon, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Elof Hansson, Inc., 225 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.; Johaneson, Wales & Sparre, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Treetex Corp., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; W. R. Grace & Co. (Pacific coast), 3 Pine, San Francisco, Calif.

A. M. Q. Sharpe, Kennebec, S. Dak.
B. Tribal Council, Lower Brule Tribe, Sioux Indians, Lower Brule, S. Dak.; Tribal Council, Crow Creek Tribe, Sioux Indians, Ft. Thompson, S. Dak.; Tribal Council, Standing Rock Tribe, Sioux Indians, Ft. Yates, N. Dak.

A. Sher, Oppenheimer & Harris, 1026 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. A. S. Aloe Co., St. Louis, Mo.

A. Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.

A. Madlyn Smyth, 690 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Alden Lown, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank C. Staples, 168 Aspen Street, Floral Park, N. Y.
B. American Molasses Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Ernest F. Staub, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dale I. Stoops, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Dale I. Stoops, 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. U. S. Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. Hajime William Tanaka, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Tariff Committee of the Felt Industry, care of Lewis R. Parker, Chairman, Albany Felt Co., Albany, N. Y.

A. John Thomas Taylor, 14th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Advertising Distributors of America, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Citizens Association, Canal Zone, Post Office Box 354, Balboa, C. Z.

A. Frank J. Whalen, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. W. F. Beunderman, Jr., No. 8 Mahaaiweg, Willemstad, Curacao, South America.

A. Anna Helton Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.
B. The Women's City Club, 1733 I Street NW.; National League of American Pen Women, 1300 17th Street NW.; North Star Union of the WCTU; District of Columbia Federation of Citizens Associations, and District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C.

A. Edgar A. Zingman, 300 Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

Appendix

Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the outstanding record that was accomplished by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

It is a record that was achieved only through the efforts of every member of the committee for which I would like to express my grateful appreciation. This legislative record involved arduous effort and long hours of work on the part of all concerned.

It is interesting to note how the workload of the Committee on Ways and Means has been increasing. More bills were referred to the committee during the 1st session of this Congress than were referred to it in all of the 81st and 82d Congresses. During the 1st session of the 84th Congress 752 bills were referred to the committee compared to 458 for the whole of the 81st Congress and 696 for the whole of the 82d Congress. In the 83d Congress 1,203 bills were referred to the committee. If the same number of bills should be referred to our committee in the 2d session of the 84th Congress as were referred to it in the 1st session, the total will run over 1,500.

The committee reported to the House 61 bills in the first session of this Congress compared to 54 in both sessions of the 81st Congress, 64 in both sessions of the 82d Congress and 52 in both sessions of the 83d Congress. In the 81st Congress 44 bills reported by the Committee became public law, 51 in the 82d Congress and 41 in the 83d Congress plus another that received a pocket veto.

For the first time during my service on the committee, each committee member was given an opportunity to request and get consideration of any bills pending before the committee which he, or any other Member of the House, had introduced in this session of Congress.

Of the 61 bills that were reported favorably to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, 5 of them might be termed major legislation and 11 of them were bills on which specific requests for favorable action had been received from the administration. Thirty-two of the bills reported by the committee were enacted into law. It is expected that this number will increase next session as a result of consideration by the Senate of legislation originating in the Ways and Means Committee that is now pending in that body.

For the information of all interested persons, I will insert at this point in the RECORD a compilation of committee activities for the 1st session of the 84th Congress:

RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

The following record of the Committee on Ways and Means sets forth in summary form the activities and accomplishments of the committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress:

I. STATUS OF LEGISLATION

The status of bills pending before the committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress is indicated in the table set forth below:

Status:	*Total bills*
Reported by the committee	61
Passed by the House	58
Reported by Senate Finance	33
Passed by the Senate	33
Enacted into law	32

(NOTE.—There are 25 bills reported by the committee which passed the House that are pending before the Senate Committee on Finance for action next session. There was a memorandum of disapproval on one bill, H. R. 6887.)

During the course of the 1st session, the committee met 80 times in executive session and held a total of 29 days of public hearings on a variety of subjects. Testimony was received from 329 witnesses in the public hearings, in addition to which a number of persons submitted statements with regard to the subject matter under consideration in lieu of appearances. Data concerning these hearings follow:

Subject	Days	Witnesses
Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955	16	214
Prepaid income and reserves for estimated expenses	4	29
Revision of Philippine Trade Agreement	1	7
Customs Simplification Act of 1955	2	14
Public debt limit	1	1
Individual Retirement Act of 1955	2	41
Bonding period for distilled spirits	1	12
Upjeweling of watch movements	2	11
Total	29	329

II. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Tariffs and customs legislation

In the first session the committee took favorable action on 3 major bills affecting tariff and customs laws and 11 minor bills. The three major bills are as follows:

H. R. 1: This legislation, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, was one of the most important pieces of legislation to be considered by the committee and to pass both Houses of Congress during the first session. This legislation became Public Law 86. It continues through June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements and made other liberalizing and clarifying improvements in our reciprocal trade program. H. R. 1 prescribes the delegation of authority to the Executive for the establishment of our foreign economic policy which the President has described as the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

In the careful consideration of this legislation the committee held 16 days of public hearings and heard from 214 witnesses in addition to receiving voluminous material for inclusion in the printed record of the hearings. Seven administration witnesses of Cabinet rank appeared before the committee in support of the enactment of H. R. 1. In favorably reporting H. R. 1 to the House, the committee expressed the view that this legislation was a part of the answer to our objectives of increasing domestic prosperity, free world strength, and international peace.

H. R. 6040: This legislation, the Customs Simplification Act of 1955, provides improved procedures for the valuation of imports and conversion of foreign currency into dollars for the purpose of assessing customs duties. In addition, the legislation repeals a number of obsolete provision of the customs laws. In reporting this legislation to the House of Representatives, the committee expressed the view that its enactment would bring about greater speed of customs administration and increased certainty and commercial realism in our customs laws. This legislation passed the House of Representatives and is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance for action next session.

H. R. 6059: This legislation, the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955, authorizes revision of the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines. This legislation passed both Houses of Congress and became Public Law 196. Comparable legislation passed the Philippine Legislature and, after the signing of the agreement authorized by the United States and the Philippine legislation, the Chief Executives of the respective countries will proclaim the authorized modifications in the existing trade agreement. The legislation will further serve to strengthen the historic bond of friendship that has always existed between the peoples of the United States and the Philippines as well as improve the economic relationship between the two countries.

In addition to the above enumerated 3 major bills affecting our tariff and customs laws, the committee also took favorable action with respect to 11 tariff and customs bills of somewhat lesser importance. Among other things, these bills continued the suspension of duties on certain strategic and critical materials, extended the free entry period on gifts for members of the Armed Forces abroad and on household and personal effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and made appropriate adjustment in the tariff and customs status of certain other articles.

B. Tax legislation

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means took favorable action with respect to 40 bills which amended the Internal Revenue Code. Many of these bills made important changes in our tax structure and one of them might be deemed to be a major bill as it was reported by the committee and passed by the House of Representatives. That bill was H. R. 4259.

H. R. 4259, the Revenue Act of 1955, as passed the House, provided a $20 tax credit

against the individual income tax for each personal exemption claimed by a taxpayer. In addition, this legislation provided a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates. In providing this $20 tax credit the committee expressed the view that this tax relief was necessary to support an expanding economy and to restore balance to our tax structure. While the House-passed version of H. R. 4259 granted across-the-board individual tax relief amounting to over $2 billion in a full year of operation to an estimated 71 million taxpayers, the net revenue effect of this legislation as passed the House was to increase receipts toward a balanced budget. This was to be accomplished through a more equitable distribution of the total tax burden among all taxpayers. The Senate deleted the $20 tax credit from the bill and as H. R. 4259 was enacted into law (Public Law 18) it merely provided for a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates.

Other tax legislation of somewhat major importance was H. R. 7201, which would revide a revised formula for the taxation of life insurance companies. This legislation passed the House and is presently pending before the Senate Committee on Finance for action next session.

The Committee on Ways and Means also prepared legislation, H. R. 4725, closing two loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which, it is estimated, would have cost the Treasury in excess of $1 billion. In taking this action to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the 1954 code (relating to prepaid income and reserves for estimated expenses) the committee directed a staff study to be made with a view to preparing legislation embodying the principles of these sections but providing adequate safeguards to prevent the existence of any loopholes.

The remaining 37 tax bills which were approved by your committee were designed to eliminate existing inequities in our Federal tax structure and to grant appropriate tax relief in certain hardship areas.

C. Social-security legislation

The Committee on Ways and Means prepared and presented to the House for favorable consideration major amendments to the social-security law. This legislation, H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1955, provided (1) monthly benefits for disabled insured individuals who have attained age 50; (2) a reduction in the benefit eligibility age for women to 62 years; (3) continued monthly benefits for disabled children after they attain age 18; (4) expanded old-age and survivors insurance coverage; and (5) an adjustment in the contribution schedule. It is estimated that in the first year of operation these amendments will make old-age and survivors insurance benefits in the amount of $600 million payable to approximately 1 million persons. In the long run, it is estimated that 2.8 million people will be added to the benefit rolls who will receive approximately $2.2 billion in annual benefits. By making benefits available to eligible disabled workers, by providing for a reduced retirement age for women, and by continuing monthly benefits to children who become totally and permanently disabled before age 18, these important amendments to the old-age and survivors insurance title of the social-security law will remove serious benefit gaps existing under present law. The expanded coverage provided under H. R. 7225 will make available to an estimated 250,000 individuals and their families the protection of the old-age and survivors insurance system for the first time. H. R. 7225 provided for an adjustment in the contribution schedule that is designed to place the system in a stronger actuarial condition than exists under present law. H. R. 7225 passed the House of Representatives and is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance for consideration next year.

In addition, the committee also approved H. R. 5936, which continued old-age and survivors insurance wage credits for military personnel. This legislation passed both Houses of Congress and became Public Law 325.

D. Miscellaneous legislation

The committee approved 6 bills that might be grouped under this miscellaneous category. One of these bills, H. R. 4904, extended for 2 years, with amendments, the Renegotiation Act of 1951. This action was taken in view of the fact that expenditures for national defense are expected to exceed more than one-half of the total budgetary expenditures for the period that the renegotiation authority is extended by the bill. This legislation was approved by the Congress and became Public Law 216.

At the request of the administration, the Committee on Ways and Means took favorable action on H. R. 6992, a bill to extend for 1 year the existing $6 billion temporary increase in the public debt limit. This legislation was approved by the Congress and became Public Law 124.

The committee also favorably reported 2 bills designed to strengthen the enforcement of our narcotic laws, viz.: H. R. 2369 (Public Law 1) and H. R. 7018 (Public Law 362). Two other bills relating to certain Treasury administrative expenses (S. 1727, Public Law 57) and to the collection of State sales and use taxes on cigarettes (H. R. 6886, Public Law 335) were favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

III. SUBCOMMITTEES

During the closing days of the first session of the 84th Congress, 3 subcommittees were established. These subcommittees and their respective memberships are as follows:

The Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, Arkansas, chairman; Hon. NOBLE J. GREGORY, Democrat, Kentucky; and Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Missouri.

The Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems: Hon. AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, Rhode Island, chairman; Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, New York; Hon. BURR P. HARRISON, Democrat, Virginia; Hon. A. S. HERLONG, JR., Democrat, Florida; Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, Ohio; Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, Pennsylvania; and Hon. NOAH M. MASON, Republican, Illinois.

The Subcommittee on Narcotics: Hon. HALE BOGGS, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman; Hon. FRANK M. KARSTEN, Democrat, Missouri; Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, Minnesota; Hon. FRANK IKARD, Democrat, Texas; Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, Wisconsin; Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK, Republican, Connecticut; and Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, Tennessee.

Plans and procedures are presently being formulated with a view to arranging the activities of the above-mentioned subcommittees.

Hamilton on the Constitutionality of Treaties—No. 1 of a Series of Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in his little known and almost forgotten Camillus letters—1795–96—Alexander Hamilton discussed fully the nature, purpose, and constitutionality of treaties between the United States and foreign nations. These letters applied specifically to the treaty with England negotiated by John Jay.

From his own knowledge as a member of the Constitutional Convention, and from his experience in President Washington's Cabinet, Hamilton wrote authoritatively on a question which is today troubling many people throughout the country. These letters are not to be found outside Hamilton's collected works, which are not readily available.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD part 1 of a series of three of Hamilton on the Constitutionality of Treaties.

There being no objection, part 1 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMILLUS: LETTERS XXXVI, XXXVII, AND XXXVIII, BY ALEXANDER HAMILTON, ON THE NATURE, SCOPE, AND CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TREATIES—THE HISTORY OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AS TRACED IN THE WRITINGS OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES

(Edited by John C. Hamilton (1857))

NO. XXXVI

It is now time to fulfill my promise of an examination of the constitutionality of the treaty. Of all the objections which have been contrived against this instrument, those relating to this point are the most futile. If there be a political problem capable of complete demonstration, the constitutionality of the treaty in all its parts, is of this sort. It is even difficult to believe, that any man in either House of Congress, who values his reputation for discernment or sincerity, will publicly hazard it by a serious attempt to controvert the position.

It is, nevertheless, too much a fashion with some politicians, when hard pressed on the expediency of a measure, to intrench themselves behind objections to its constitutionality—aware that there is naturally in the public mind a jealous sensibility to objections of that nature, which may predispose against a thing otherwise acceptable, if even a doubt, in this respect, can be raised. They have been too forward to take advantage of this propensity, without weighing the real mischief of the example. For, however, it may serve a temporary purpose, its ultimate tendency is, by accustoming the people to observe that alarms of this kind are repeated with levity and without cause, to prepare them for distrusting the cry of danger when it may be real: yet the imprudence has been such, that there has scarcely been an important public question, which has not involved more or less of this species of controversy.

In the present case, the motives of those who may incline to defeat the treaty, are unusually strong for creating, if possible, a doubt concerning its constitutionality.

The treaty, having been ratified on both sides, the dilemma plainly is between a violation of the Constitution, by the treaty, and a violation of the Constitution by obstructing the execution of the treaty.

The sixth article of the Constitution of the United States declares that "the Constitution and the laws of the United States, made in pursuance thereof, all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." A law of the land, till revoked or annulled, by the competent authority, is binding, not less on each branch or department of the Government than on each individual of the society. Each House

of Congress collectively, as well as the Members of it separately, are under a constitutional obligation to observe the injunctions of preexisting law, and to give it effect—if they act otherwise, they infringe the Constitution; the theory of which knows, in such case, no discretion on their part. To resort to first principles for their justification, in assuming such a discretion, is to go out of the Constitution for an authority, which they cannot find in it—it is to usurp the original character of the people themselves—it is, in principle, to prostrate the Government.

The cases must be very extraordinary that can excuse so violent an assumption of discretion. They must be of a kind to authorize a revolution in government; for every resort to original principles, in derogation from the established Constitution, partakes of this character.

Recalling to view, that all but the first 10 articles of the treaty are liable to expire at the termination of 2 years after the present war; if the objection to it in point of constitutionality cannot be supported—let me ask, who is the man hardy enough to maintain, that the instrument is of such a nature as to justify a revolution in Government?

If this can be answered in the affirmative, adieu to all the securities which nations expect to derive from constitutions of government. They become mere bubbles, subject to be blown away by every breath of party. The precedent would be a fatal one—our Government, from being fixed and limited, would become revolutionary and arbitrary—all the provisions which our Constitution, with so much solemnity, ordains "for forming a more perfect union, establishing justice, insuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity," evaporate and disappear.

Equally will this be the case, if the rage of party spirit can meditate, if the momentary ascendency of party, in a particular branch of the Government, can effect, and if the people can be so deceived as to tolerate—that the pretense of a violation of the Constitution shall be made the instrument of its actual violation.

This, however, cannot be—there are already convincing indications on the very subject before us, that the good sense of the people will triumph over prejudice and the acts of party—that they will finally decide according to their true interest, and that any transient or partial superiority, which may exist, if abused for the purpose of infracting the Constitution, will consign the perpetrators of the infraction to ruin and disgrace. But alas, what consolation would there be in the ruin of a party for the ruin of the Constitution?

It is time to enter on the momentous discussion. The question shall be examined in the four following views: 1. In relation to the theory of the Constitution. 2. In relation to the manner in which it was understood by the convention who framed it, and by the people who adopted it. 3. In relation to the practice upon a similar power in the confederation. 4. In relation to the practice under our present Constitution, prior to the treaty with Great Britain. In all these views, the constitutionality of the treaty can be vindicated beyond the possibility of a serious doubt.

1. As to the theory of the Constitution: The Constitution of the United States distributes its powers into three departments, legislative, executive, judiciary. The first article defines the structure, and specifies the various powers of the legislative department; the second article establishes the organization and powers of the executive department; the third article does the same with respect to the judiciary department; the fourth and fifth, and sixth articles, which are the last, are a miscellany of particular provisions.

The first article declares that "all legislative power granted by the Constitution shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

The second article which organizes and regulates the executive department, declares that the "executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America;" and proceeding to detail particular authorities of the Executive, it declares that the "President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." There is in no part of the Constitution any explanation of this power to make treaties, any definition of its objects, or delineation of its bounds. The only other provision in the Constitution respecting it, is in the sixth article, which provides, as already noticed, that all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and this notwithstanding anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary.

It was impossible for words more comprehensive to be used than those which grant the power to make treaties. They are such as would naturally be employed to confer a plenipotentiary authority—a power "to make treaties," granted in these indefinite terms, extends to all kinds of treaties, and with all the latitude which such a power, under any form of government, can possess—the power "to make" implies a power to act authoritatively and conclusively, independent of the afterclause which expressly places treaties among the supreme laws of the land. The thing to be made is a treaty.

With regard to the objects of the treaty, there being no specification, there is, of course, a carte blanche. The general proposition must, therefore, be, that whatever is a proper subject of compact between nation and nation may be embraced by a treaty between the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the correspondent organ of a foreign state.

The authority being general, it comprises, of course, whatever cannot be shown to be necessarily an exception to it.

The only constitutional exception to the power of making treaties is that it shall not change the Constitution, which results from this fundamental maxim that a delegated authority cannot alter the constituting act, unless so expressly authorized by the constituting power. An agent cannot new-model his own commission. A treaty, for example, cannot transfer the legislative power to the executive department, nor the power of this last department to the judiciary; in other words, it cannot stipulate that the President, and not Congress, shall make laws for the United States, that the judges, and not the President, shall command the national forces.

Again, there is also a national exception to the power of making treaties, as there is to every other delegated power, which respects abuses of authority in palpable and extreme cases. On natural principles, a treaty, which should manifestly betray or sacrifice the private interests of the state, would be null. But this preesnts a question foreign from that of the modification or distribution of constitutional powers. It applies to the case of the pernicious exercise of a power, where there is legal competency. Thus the power of treaty, though extending to the right of making alliances offensive and defensive, might not be exercised in making an alliance, so injurious to the state as to justify the nonobservance of the contract.

Beyond these exceptions to the power, none occurs that can be supported.

Those which have been insisted upon, toward invalidating the treaty with Great Britain, are not even plausible. They amount to this, that a treaty can establish nothing between the United States and a foreign nation, which it is the province of the legislative authority to regulate in reference to the United States alone. It cannot, for instance, establish a particular rule of commercial intercourse between the United States and Great Britain, because it is provided in the Constitution, that Congress "shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations." This is equivalent to affirming that all the objects upon which the legislative power may act, in relation to our country, are excepted out of the power to make treaties.

Two obvious considerations refute this doctrine: One, that the power to make treaties, and the power to make laws, are different things, operating by different means, upon different subjects; the other, that the construction resulting from such a doctrine would defeat the power to make treaties, while its opposite reconciles this power with the power of making laws.

The power to make laws is the power of pronouncing authoritatively the will of the nation as to all persons and things over which it has jurisdiction; or it may be defined to be the power of prescribing rules binding upon all persons and things over which the nation has jurisdiction. It acts compulsively upon all persons, whether foreigners or citizens, and upon all things within the territory of such nation, and also upon its own citizens and their property without its territory in certain cases and under certain limitations. But it can have no obligatory action whatsoever upon a foreign nation, or upon any person or thing within the jurisdiction of a foreign nation.

The power of treaty, on the other hand, is the power by agreement, convention, or compact, to establish rules binding upon two or more nations, their respective citizens and property. The rule established derives its reciprocal obligation from promise, from the faith which the contracting parties pledge to each other—not from the power of either to prescribe a rule for the other. It is not here the will of a superior that commands; it is the consent of two independent parties that contract.

The means which the power of legislation employs, are laws which it enacts, or rules which it enjoins; the subject upon which it acts is the nation of whom it is, the persons and property within the jurisdiction of the nation. The means which the power of treaty employs, are contracts with other nations, who may or may not enter into them—the subjects upon which it acts, are the nations contracting and those persons and things of each to which the contract relates. Though a treaty may effect what a law can, yet a law cannot effect what a treaty does. These discriminations are obvious and decisive; and however the operation of a treaty may, in some things, resemble that of a law, no two ideas are more distinct than that of legislating and that of contracting.

It follows that there is no ground for the inference pretended to be drawn, that the legislative powers of Congress are excepted out of the power of making treaties. It is the province of the latter to do what the former cannot do. Congress (to pursue still the case of regulating trade) may regulate, by law, our own trade and that which foreigners come to carry on with us; but they cannot regulate the trade which we may go to carry on in foreign countries; they can give to us no rights, no privileges there. This must depend on the will and regulations of those countries; and, consequently, it is the province of the power of treaty to establish the rules of commercial intercourse between foreign nations and the United States. The legislative may regulate our own trade, but treaty only can regulate the national trade between our own and another country.

The Constitution accordingly considers the power of treaty as different from that of legislation. This is proved in two ways: 1. That while the Constitution declares that

all the legislative powers which it grants shall be vested in Congress, it vests the power of making treaties in the President with consent of the Senate. 2. That the same article by which it is declared that the executive power shall be vested in a President, and in which sundry executive powers are detailed, gives the power to make treaties to the President, with the auxiliary agency of the Senate. Thus the power of making treaties is placed in the class of executive authorities; while the force of laws is annexed to its results. This agrees with the distribution commonly made by theoretical writers, though perhaps the power of treaty, from its peculiar nature, ought to form a class by itself.

When it is said that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, this has reference to the distribution of the general legislative power of regulating trade between the national and the particular governments; and serves merely to distinguish the right of regulating our external trade, as far as it can be done by law, which is vested in Congress, from that of regulating the trade of a State within itself, which is left to each State.

This will the better appear from the entire clause. "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes," which is the same as if it had been said, "The whole powers of regulating trade by law shall reside in Congress, except as to the trade within a State, the power to regulate which shall remain with such State." But it is clearly foreign to that mutual regulation of trade between the United States and other nations, which, from the necessity of mutual consent, can only be performed by treaty. It is indeed an absurdity to say, that the power of regulating trade by law is incompatible with the power of regulating it by treaty; since the former can, by no means, do what the latter can alone accomplish; consequently, it is an absurdity to say, that the legislative power of regulating trade is an exception to the power of making treaties.

Laws are the acts of legislation of a particular nation for itself. Treaties are the acts of the legislation of several nations for themselves jointly and reciprocally. The legislative powers of one state cannot reach the cases which depend on the joint legislation of two or more states. For this, resort must be had to the pactitious power, or the power of treaty. This is another attitude of the subject, displaying the fallacy of the proposition, that the legislative powers of Congress, are exceptions to, or limitations of, the power of the President, with the aid of the Senate, to make treaties.

CAMILLUS.

Hamilton on the Constitutionality of Treaties—No. 2 of a Series of Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD part 2 of a series of three of Hamilton on the Constitutionality of Treaties.

There being no objection, part 2 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO. XXXVII

It shall now be shown, that the objections to the treaty, founded on its pretended interference with the power of Congress, tend to render the power of making treaties, in a very great degree, if not altogether, nominal. This will be best seen by an enumeration of the cases of pretended interference.

First. The power of Congress to lay taxes, is said to be impaired by those stipulations which prevent the laying of duties on particular articles; which also prevent the laying of higher or other duties on British commodities than on the commodities of other countries, and which restrict the power of increasing the difference of duties on British tonnage and on goods imported in British bottoms.

Second. The power of Congress to regulate trade is said to be impaired by the same restrictions respecting duties, inasmuch as they are intended, and operate, as regulations of trade—by the stipulations against prohibitions in certain cases; and, in general, by all the rights, privileges, immunities, and restrictions in trade, which are contained in the treaty; all which are so many regulations of commerce, which are said to encroach upon the legislative authority.

Third. The power of Congress to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, is said to be interfered with, by those provisions of the treaty which secure to the settlers, within the precincts of the British posts, the right of becoming citizens of the United States, and those which, in certain cases, remove the disability of alienism as to property.

Fourth. The power of Congress "to define and punish piracies and felonies, committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations," is said to be contravened by those parts of the treaty, which declare that certain acts shall be deemed piracy, which constitute certain other things offenses, and stipulate the reciprocal punishment of them by each.

Fifth. It is also said that the Constitution is violated, in relation to that provision which declares, that "no money shall be drawn from the treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law"—by those parts of the treaty which stipulate compensations to certain commissioners, and indemnifications to Great Britain, in certain cases to be adjusted and pronounced by the commissioners; and generally, by all those parts which may involve an expenditure of money.

Sixth. The Constitution is said to be violated in that part which empowers Congress to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory, or other property of the United States, by those provisions of the treaty which respect the adjustment of boundary in the cases of the rivers St. Croix and Mississippi.

Lastly. The Constitution is said to be violated, in its provisions concerning the judiciary department, by those parts of the treaty which contemplate the confiding to the determination of commissioners certain questions between the two nations.

A careful inspection of the treaty with these objections in view will discover, that of the 28 articles which compose it, at least 17 are involved in the charge of unconstitutionality; and that these 17 comprise all the provisions which adjust past controversies, or establish rules of commercial intercourse between the parties. The other 11, which are the 1st, 10th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 22d, 23d, and 24th, except the 1st, are made up of provisions which have reference to war; the first merely declaring that there shall be peace between the parties. And it is a question, even with respect to all of these, except the 1st, and 10th, whether they also are not implicated in the charge inasmuch as some of their dispositions have commercial relations. Is not this alone sufficient to bring under a strong suspicion the validity of the principles which impeach the constitutionality of the instrument?

It must have been observed that the argument in the last number is applicable to all the legislative powers of Congress, as well as to that of regulating trade, which was selected, by way of illustration, on the ground of its being common to all. Indeed the instance of the regulations of trade is that which is most favorable to the opposite doctrine, since foreign nations are named in the clause the true intent of which, however, has been explained.

The same reasoning, too, would extend the power of treaties to those objects which are consigned to the legislation of individual States; but here the Constitution has announced its meaning in express terms by declaring that the treaties which have been and shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. This manifestly recognizes the supremacy of the power of treaties over the laws of particular States, and goes even a step further.

The obvious reason for this special provision, in regard to the laws of individual States, is that there might otherwise have been room for question—whether a treaty of the Union could embrace objects, the internal regulation of which belonged to the separate authorities of the States. But with regard to the United States there was no room for a similar question.

The power of treaty could not but be supposed commensurate with all these objects to which the legislative power of the Union extended, which are the proper subjects of compacts with foreign nations.

It is a question among some theoretical writers—whether a treaty can repeal preexisting laws? This question must always be answered by the particular form of government of each nation. In our Constitution, which gives, ipso facto, the force of law to treaties, making them equal with the acts of Congress, the supreme law of the land, a treaty must necessarily repeal an antecedent law contrary to it; according to the legal maxim that "leges posteriores priores contrarias abrogant."

But even in those forms of government, in which there may be room for such a question, it is not understood that a treaty containing stipulations which require the repeal of antecedent laws is, on that acount, unconstitutional and null. The true meaning is that the antecedent laws are not, ipso facto, abrogated by the treaty—but the legislature is, nevertheless, bound in good faith, under the general limitation, stated in another place, to lend its authority to remove obstacles which previous laws might oppose to a fair execution of a treaty.

One instance of the inconsistency, prevailing in the arguments against the treaty negotiated by Mr. Jay, is observable in this point. To get rid of the infractions of our treaty of peace with Great Britain by certain laws of particular States, it is strenuously maintained that treaties control the laws of States. To impeach the constitutionality of the treaty under consideration, it is objected, that, in some points, it interferes with the objects of State legislation. The express provision of the Constitution in this particular, quoted above, has not been sufficient to check the range for objection.

The absurdity of the alleged interferences will fully appear, by showing how they would operate upon the several kinds of treaties usual among nations. These may be classed under three principal heads: (1) Treaties of commerce; (2) treaties of alliance; (3) treaties of peace.

Treaties of commerce are, of course, excluded; for every treaty of commerce is a system of rules devised to regulate and gov-

ern the trade between contracting nations, invading directly the exclusive power of regulating trade which is attributed to Congress.

Treaties of alliance, whether defensive or offensive, are equally excluded, and this on two grounds: (1) Because it is their immediate object to define a case or cases in which one nation shall take part with another in war, contrary, in the sense of the objection, to that clause of the Constitution which gives to Congress the power of declaring war; and (2) because the succors stipulated, in whatever shape they may be, must involve an expenditure of money—not to say that it is common to stipulate succors in money, either in the first instance or by way of alternative. It will be pertinent to observe incidentally, in this place, that even the humane and laudable provision in the 17th article, which all have approved, is within the spirit of the objection; for the effect of this is to restrain the power and discretion of Congress to grant reprisals, till there has been an unsuccessful demand of justice. Nothing can better illustrate the unreasonable tendency of the principle.

Treaties of peace are also excluded, or, at the least, are so narrowed as to be in the greatest number of cases impracticable. The most common conditions of these treaties are restitutions or cessions of territory, on one side or on the other, frequently on both sides, regulations of boundary—restitutions and confirmations of property—pecuniary indemnifications for injuries or expenses. It will, probably, not be easy to find a precedent of a treaty of peace which does not contain one or more of these provisions, as the basis of the cessation of hostilities, and they are all of them naturally to be looked for in an agreement which is to put an end to the state of war between conflicting nations.

Yet they are all precluded by the objections which have been enumerated: pecuniary indemnifications, by that which respects the appropriations of money; restitutions or cessions of Territory or property, regulations of boundary, by that which respects the right of Congress to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations concerning the Territory and property of the United States. It is to be observed, likewise, that cessions of Territory are almost always accompanied with stipulations in favor of those who inhabit the ceded Territory, securing personal privileges and private rights of property; neither of which could be acceded to on the principles of that objection, which relates to the power of naturalization; for this power has reference to two species of rights, those of privilege and those of property. An act allowing a foreigner to hold real estate is so far an act of naturalization; since it is one of the consequences of alienism, not to be able to hold real estate.

It follows, that if the objections which are taken to the treaty, on the point of constitutionality, are valid, the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, can make neither a treaty of commerce nor alliance, and rarely, if at all, a treaty of peace. It is probable, that on a minute analysis, there is scarcely any species of treaty which would not clash, in some particular, with the principle of those objections; and thus, as was before observed, the power to make treaties, granted in such comprehensive and indefinite terms, and guarded with so much precaution, would become essentially nugatory.

This is so obviously against the principles of sound construction; it, at the same time, exposes the Government to so much impotence in one great branch of political power, in opposition to a main intent of the Constitution; and it tends so directly to frustrate one principal object of the situation of a general government, the convenient management of our external concerns, that it cannot but be rejected by every discerning man who will examine and pronounce with sincerity. It is against the principles of sound construction; because these teach us, that every instrument is so to be interpreted, as that all the parts may, if possible, consist with each other, and have their effect. But the construction which is combated would cause the legislative power to destroy the power of making treaties. Moreover, if the power of the executive department be inadequate to the making of the several kinds of treaties, which have been mentioned, there is, then, no power in the Government to make them; for there is not a syllable in the Constitution which authorizes either the legislative or judiciary departments, to make a treaty with a foreign nation. And our Constitution would then exhibit the ridiculous spectacle of a government without power to make treaties with foreign nations; a result as inadmissible as it is absurd; since, in fact, our Coustitution grants the power of making treaties, in the most explicit and ample terms, to the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. On the contrary, all difficulty is avoided, by distinguishing the province of the two powers, according to ideas which have been always familiar to us, and which were never exposed to any question till the treaty with Great Britain gave exercise to the subtleties of party spirit.

By confining the power to make laws within our jurisdiction—and by assigning to actions to the establishment of rules for our own Nation and those foreigners who come within our jurisdiction—and by assigning to the power of treaty the office of concerting those rules of mutual intercourse and connection, between us and foreign nations, which require their consent as well as our own; allowing to it the latitude necessary for this purpose, a harmonious agreement is preserved between the different powers of the Government: that to make laws, and that to make treaties; between the authority of the legislative and the authority of the executive department.

Hence, though Congress, by the Constitution, have power to lay taxes, yet a treaty may restrain the exercise of it in particular cases. For a nation, like an individual, may abridge its moral power of action by agreement; and the organ charged with the legislative power of a nation may be restrained in its operation by the agreements of the organ of its federative power, or power to contract: let it be remembered, that the nation is the constituent, and that the executive, within its sphere, is no less the organ of its will than the legislature.

Though Congress are empowered to make regulations of trade, yet they are not exclusively so empowered—but regulations of trade may also be made by treaty; and, where other nations are to be bound by them, must be made by treaty.

Though Congress are authorized to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, yet this contemplates only the ordinary cases of internal administration; in particular and extraordinary cases, those in which the pretensions of a foreign government are to be managed—a treaty may also confer the rights and privileges of citizens; thus the absolute cession and plenary dominion of a province or district, possessed by our arms in war, may be accepted by the treaty of peace, on the condition that its inhabitants shall, in their persons and property, enjoy the privileges of citizens.

The same reasoning applies to all the other instances of supposed infraction of the legislative authority: with regard to piracies and offenses against the laws of nations; with regard to expenditures of money, with regard to the appointment of officers, with regard to the judiciary tribunals, with regard to the disposal and regulation of the national territory and property. In all these cases, the power to make laws and the power to make treaties are concurrent and coordinate. The latter, and not the former, must act, where the cooperation of other nations is requisite.

As to what respects the commissioners agreed to be appointed, they are not, in a strict sense, officers. They are arbitrators between the two countries. Though in the Constitutions, both of the United States and of most of the individual States, a particular mode of appointing officers is designated—yet, in practice, it has not been deemed a violation of the provision to appoint commissioners or special agents for special purposes, in a different mode.

As to the provision, which restricts the issuing of money from the Treasury, to cases of appropriation by law, and which, from its intrinsic nature, may be considered as applicable to the exercise of every power of government, it is, in no sort, touched by the treaty. In the constant practice of the Government, the cause of an expenditure, or the contract which incurs it, is a different thing from the appropriation for satisfying it. Thus the salary of a public officer is fixed by one law, the appropriation for its payment by another. So, the treaty only stipulates what may be a cause of expenditure. An appropriation by law will still be requisite for actual payment.

As to the disposal and regulation of the territory and property of the United States, this will be naturally understood of dispositions and regulations purely domestic, and where the title is not disputed by a foreign power. Where there are interfering claims of foreign powers, as neither will acknowledge the right of the other to decide, treaty must directly or indirectly adjust the dispute.

So far then it is from being true, that the power of treaty can extend to nothing upon which, in relation to ourselves, the legislative power may act—that it may rather be laid down as a general rule, that a treaty may do between different nations whatever the legislative power of each may do with regard to itself. The exceptions to this rule are to be deduced from the unfitness and inconvenience of its application to particular cases, and are of the nature of abuses of a general principle.

In considering the power of legislation in its relations to the power of treaty, instead of saying, that the objects of the former are excepted out of the latter, it will be more correct, indeed it will be entirely correct, to invert the rule, and to say, that the power of treaty is the power of making exceptions, in particular cases, to the power of legislation. The stipulations of treaty are, in good faith, restraints upon the exercise of the last-mentioned power. Where there is no treaty, it is completely free to act. Where there is a treaty, it is still free to act in all the cases not specially excepted by the treaty. Thus, Congress is free to regulate trade with a foreign nation, with whom we have no treaty of commerce, in such manner as they judge for the interest of the United States; and they are also free so to regulate it with a foreign nation wtih whom we have a treaty, in all the points which the treaty does not specially except. There is always, therefore, great latitude for the exercise of the legislative power of regulating trade with foreign nations, notwithstanding any treaties of commerce which may be formed.

The effects of a treaty to impose restraints upon the legislative powers, may, in some degree, be exemplified by the case of the compacts which the legislature itself makes, as with regard to the public debt. Its own compacts are, in good faith, exceptions to its power of action. Treaties with foreign powers, for obvious reasons, are much stronger exceptions.

CAMILLUS.

Hamilton on the Constitutionality of Treaties—No. 3 and Last of a Series of Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD part 3 and last of a series of three of Hamilton on the Constitutionality of Treaties.

There being no objection, part 3 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO. XXXVIII. AND LAST

The manner in which the power of treaty, as it exists in the Constitution, was understood by the Convention in framing it, and by the people in adopting it, is the point next to be considered.

As to the sense of the Convention, the secrecy with which their deliberations were conducted, does not permit any formal proof of the opinions and views which prevailed in digesting the power of treaty. But from the best opportunity of knowing the fact, I aver, that it was understood by all, to be the intent of the provision to give to that power the most ample latitude—to render it competent to all the stipulations, which the exigencies of national affairs might require; competent to the making of treaties of alliance, treaties of commerce, treaties of peace, and every other species of convention usual among nations; and competent, in the course of its exercise for these purposes, to control and bind the legislative power of Congress. And it was emphatically for this reason that it was so carefully guarded; the cooperation of two-thirds of the Senate, with the President, being required to make any treaty whatever. I appeal for this, with confidence, to every member of the Convention—particularly to those in the two Houses of Congress. Two of these are in the House of Representatives, Mr. Madison and Mr. Baldwin: it is expected by the adversaries of the treaty that these gentlemen will, in their places, obstruct its execution. However this may be, I feel a confidence that neither of them will deny the assertion I have made—to suppose them capable of such a denial were to suppose them utterly regardless of truth. But, though direct proof of the views of the Convention on the point cannot be produced, yet we are not wholly without proof on this head.

Three members of the Convention dissented from the Constitution, Mr. Mason, Mr. Gerry, and Mr. Randolph. Among the reasons for his dissent, published by Mr. Mason, we find this clause: "By declaring all treaties supreme laws of the land, the Executive and Senate have, in many cases, an exclusive power of legislation, which might have been avoided by proper distinctions with respect to treaties, and requiring the assent of the House of Representatives where it could be done with safety." This shows the great extent of the power, in the conception of Mr. Mason, in many cases amounting to an exclusive power of legislation; nor did he object to the extent, but only desired that it should have been further guarded by certain distinctions and by requiring, in certain cases, the assent of the House of Representatives.

Among the objections to the Constitution addressed by Mr. Gerry to the Legislature of Massachusetts, we find one to have been "that treaties of the highest importance might be formed by the President, with the advice of two-thirds of a quorum of the Senate." This shows his idea of the magnitude of the power, and impliedly admitting with Mr. Mason the propriety of its extent, he seems only to have desired that the concurrence of the Senate should have embraced two-thirds of the whole body, instead of two-thirds of a quorum. But how small and how insignificant would the power of treaty be, according to the doctrine lately promulgated, with regard to its constitutional limit?

As to the sense of the community in the adoption of the Constitution, this can only be ascertained from two sources, the writings for and against it, and the debates in the several State conventions—while it was under consideration.

I possess not, at this moment, materials for an investigation, which would enable me to present the evidence they afford; but I refer to them, with confidence, for proof of the fact, that the organization of the power of treaty, in the Constitution, was attacked and defended with an admission on both sides, of its being of the character which I have assigned to it. Its great extent and importance—its effect to control, by its stipulations, the legislative authority, were mutually taken for granted, and upon this basis, it was insisted, by way of objection—that there were not adequate guards for the safe exercise of so vast a power; that there ought to have been reservations of certain rights, a better disposition of the power to impeach, and a participation, general or special, of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties.

The reply to these objections, acknowledging the delicacy and magnitude of the power, was directed to show that its organization was a proper one, and that it was sufficiently guarded.[1]

[1] The Federalist, No. XLII, has these passages: "The power to make treaties and to receive and send Ambassadors speak their own propriety—both of them are comprised in the Articles of Confederation, with the difference only that the former is disembarrassed by the plan of the convention, of an exception by which treaties might be substantially frustrated by regulations of the States." This plainly alludes to the proviso which has been cited and commented upon. "It is true that when treaties of commerce stipulate for the nominal appointment of consuls, the admission of foreign consuls may fall within the power of making commercial treaties." And in No. LXIV are these passages: "The power of making treaties is an important one, especially as it relates to war, peace, and commerce; and it should not be delegated but in such a mode and with such precautions as will afford the highest security, that it will be exercised by men the best qualified for the purpose, and in the manner most conducive to the public good." "There are few who will not admit, that the affairs of trade and navigation should be regulated by a system cautionsly formed and steadily pursued, and that both our treaties and our laws should correspond with, and be made to promote it." "Some are displeased with it (that is, the power of treaty), not on account of any errors or defects in it, but because, as the treaties, when made, are to have the force of laws, they should be made only by men invested with legislative authority;" "others, though content that treaties should be made in the mode proposed, are averse to their being the supreme law of the land."

It is generally understood that two persons were concerned in the writings of these papers, who, from having been members of the convention, had a good opportunity of knowing its views—and were under no temptation at that time, in this particular, to misrepresent them.

The manner of exercising a similar power under the confederation shall now be examined.

To judge of the similarity of the power, it will be useful to quote the terms in which it was granted. They are these: "The United States in Congress assembled, shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of entering into treaties and alliances, provided that no treaty of commerce shall be made, whereby the legislative power of the respective States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts and duties on foreigners as their own people are subject to, or from prohibiting the importation or exportation of any species of commodities whatsoever" (art. IX).

It will not be disputed that the words "treaties and alliances" are of equivalent import, and of no greater force than the single word "treaties." An alliance is only a species of treaty, a particular of a general—and the power of "entering into treaties," which terms confer the authority under which the former government acted, will not be pretended to be stronger than the power "to make treaties," which are the terms constituting the authority under which the present government acts; it follows that the power, respecting treaties, under the former, and that under the present government, are similar.

But though similar, that under the present government is more comprehensive; for it is divested of the restriction in the provision cited above, and is fortified by the express declaration, that its acts shall be valid notwithstanding the Constitution or laws of any State. This is evidence (as was the fact) of a disposition in the convention to disembarrass and reinforce the power of treaty. It ought not to pass unnoticed, that an important argument results from the proviso, which accompanies the power granted by the confederation as to the natural extent of this power. The declaration that no treaty of commerce shall be made restraining the legislative power of a State

In the address and reasons of dissent of the minority of the convention of Pennsylvania to their constituents, they state, that they had suggested the following proposition, among others, for an amendment to the Constitution, "That no treaty which shall be directly opposed to the existing laws of the United States in Congress assembled, shall be valid until such laws shall be repealed or made conformable to such treaty." This shows that it was understood that the power of treaty in the Constitution extended to abrogating even preexisting laws of the United States, which was thought exceptionable; while no objection was made to the idea of its controlling future exercises of the legislative power. The same address states, in another place, that the President and Senate "may form treaties with foreign nations, that may control and abrogate the Constitution and laws of the several States."

In the second volume of the Debates of the Convention of Virginia, which is the only part I possess, there are many passages that show the great extent of the power of treaty in the opinion of the speakers on both sides. As quotations would be tedious, I will content myself with referring to the papers where they will be found, viz, 91, 99, 131, 137, 143, 147, 150, 186. It will, in particular, appear that while the opposers of the Constitution denied the power of the House of Representatives to break in upon, or control, the power of treaties, the friends of the Constitution did not affirm the contrary, but merely contended, that the House of Representatives might check by its influence the President and Senate—on the subject of treaties.

from imposing such duties and imposts on foreigners as their own people are subject to, or from prohibiting the importation or exportation of any species of commodities whatsoever, is an admission (1) that the general power of entering into treaties, included that of making treaties of commerce; and (2) that without the limitation in the proviso, a treaty of commerce might have been made which would restrain the legislative authority of the State in the points interdicted by that proviso.

Let it not be said, that the proviso, by implication, granted the power to make treaties of commerce, under which Congress afterward acted; for besides that this is inconsistent with the more obvious meaning of the clause, the first article of the confederation leaves to the States individually every power not expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled. The power of Congress, therefore, to make a treaty of commerce, and every other treaty they did make—must be vindicated on the ground that the express grant of power to enter into treaties and alliances is a general, which necessarily included as particulars the various treaties they have made, and the various stipulations of these treaties.

Under this power, thus granted and defined, the alliance with France was contracted: guaranteeing, in the case of a defensive war, her West India possessions, and when the casus foederis occurs, obliging the United States to make war for the defense of those possessions, and consequently, to incur the expenses of war.

Under the same power, treaties of commerce were made with France, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Prussia. Besides that every treaty of commerce is necessarily a regulation of commerce between the parties, it has been shown in the antecedent comparison of those treaties,[2] with that lately negotiated, that they produce the specific effects of restraining the legislative power from imposing higher or other duties on the articles of those nations than on the like articles of other nations, and from extending prohibitions to them which shall not equally extend to other nations the most favored; and thus abridge the exercise of the legislative power to tax and the exercise of the legislative power to regulate trade.

These treaties likewise define and establish the same case of piracy, which is defined in the treaty with Great Britain. Moreover, the treaty with France, as has been elsewhere shown, with regard to the rights of property, naturalizes the whole French Nation.

The consular convention with France, negotiated likewise under the same power, grants to the consuls of that country various authorities and jurisdiction, some of a judicial nature, which are actual transfers to them of portions of the internal jurisdiction and ordinary judiciary power of the country; the exercise of which our Government is bound to aid with its whole strength. It also grants exemptions to French consuls from certain kinds of taxes, and to them, and French citizens, from all personal service, all which are extremely delicate interferences with our internal policy and ordinary jurisdiction.

Under the same power, the treaty with Morocco was formed, which, besides various other regulations relative to war, and several relative to trade, contains the rule that neither party shall make war without a previous demand of reparation, in restraint of the general discretionary power of Congress to declare war.

Under the same power, the treaty of peace with Great Britain was made. This treaty contains the establishment of a boundary line between the parties, which, in part, is arbitrary and could not have been predicated upon precise antecedent right. It also prohibits the future confiscation of the property of adherents to Great Britain: declares that no person shall, on account of the part he took in the war, suffer any future loss or damage in his person, liberty, or property, and provides for the release of such persons from confinement and the discontinuance of prosecutions against them.

It is difficult to conceive a higher act of control, both of the legislative and judiciary authority, than by this article. These provisions are analogous in principle, to those stipulations which, in the second and ninth articles of the treaty under examination, have given occasion to constitutional objection.

Under the same power, various treaties with Indians, inhabiting the territory of the United States, have been made, establishing arbitrary lines of boundary with them: which determine the right of soil on the one side and on the other. Some of these treaties proceed on the principle of the United States having conquered the Indian country, and profess to make gratuitous concessions to them of the lands which are left to their occupation. There is also a feature of importance common to these treaties, which is the withdrawing of the protection of the United States from those of their citizens, who intrude on Indian laws, leaving them to be punished at the pleasure of the Indians.

Hence it appears, that, except as to the stipulations for appointing commissioners, the treaties made under the confederation, contain all the features, identically or by analogy, which create constitutional objections to the treaty before us: they restrain, in certain instances, the legislative power to lay taxes; they make numerous and important regulations of trade; they confer the benefit of naturalization as to property; they define cases of piracy; they create causes of expenditure; they direct and modify the power of war; they erect, within the country, tribunals unknown to our constitutions and laws, in cases to which these are competent—whereas the treaty with Great Britain only provides for the appointment of arbitrators in cases to which our tribunals and laws are incompetent; and they make dispositions concerning the Territory and property of the United States.

It is true, that some of the treaties made under the former government, though subsequent to the proposing of the articles of confederation to the States, were prior to the final adoption of these articles; but still it is presumable that the treaties were negotiated with an eye to the powers of the pending national compact. Those with Great Britain, Sweden, Russia, and Morocco, and the convention with France, were posterior to the completion of that compact.

It may, perhaps, be argued that a more extensive construction of the power of treaty, in the confederation, than in our present Constitution, was countenanced by the union in the same body of legislative powers with the power of treaty. But this argument can have no force, when it is considered that the principal legislative powers with regard to the objects embraced by the treaties of Congress, were not vested in that body, but remained with the individual States. Such are the power of specific taxation, the power of regulating trade, the power of naturalization, etc.

If in theory the objects of legislative power are excepted out of the power of treaty, this must have been equally, at least, the case with the legislative powers of the State governments as with those of the United States. Indeed the argument was much stronger for the objection, where distinct governments were the depository of the legislative power, than where the same government was the depository of that power and of the power of treaty. Nothing but the intrinsic force of the power of treaty could have enabled it to penetrate the separate spheres of the State governments. The practice under the confederation for so many years, acquiesced in by all the States, is, therefore, a conclusive illustration of the power of treaty, and an irresistible refutation of the novel and preposterous doctrine, which impeaches the constitutionality of that lately negotiated. If the natural import of the terms used in the Constitution were less clear and decisive than they are, that practice is a commentary upon them, and fixes their sense. For the sense in which certain terms were practiced upon in a prior constitution of government, must be presumed to have been intended, in using the like terms in a subsequent constitution of government for the same nation.

Accordingly, the practice under the present government before the late treaty has corresponded with that sense.

Our treaties with several Indian nations regulate and change the boundaries between them and the United States. And in addition to compensations in gross, they stipulate the payment of certain specific and perpetual annuities. Thus a treaty in August 1790 with the Creeks (art. 5) promises them the yearly sum of $1,500. And similar features are found in subsequent treaties with the Six Nations, the Cherokees, and the North Western Indians. This last has just been ratified by the unanimous voice of the Senate. It stipulates an annuity of $9,500—and relinquishes to the Indians a large tract of land which they had, by preceding treaties, ceded to the United States.

Hence we find that our former treaties under the present Government, as well as one subsequent to that under consideration, contradict the doctrine set up against its constitutionality—in the important particulars of making dispositions concerning the territory and property of the United States, and binding them to raise and pay money. These treaties have not only been made by the President, and ratified by the Senate, without any impeachment of their constitutionality, but the House of Representatives has heretofore concurred, and without objection, in carrying them into effect, by the requisite appropriation of money.

The consular convention with France stands in a peculiar predicament. It was negotiated under the former government, and ratified under the present; and so may be regarded as a treaty of both governments, illustrative of the extent of the power of treaty in both. The delicate and even the extraordinary nature of the provisions it contains, have been adverted to. Though all reflecting men have thought ill of the propriety of some of them, as inconveniently breaking in upon our interior administration, legislative, executive and judiciary; only acquiescing in them from the difficulty of getting rid of stipulations entered into by our public agents under competent powers, yet no question has been heard about their constitutionality. And Congress have, by law, assisted their execution by making our judicial tribunals, and the public force of the country, auxiliary to the decree of the foreign tribunals which they authorize within our territory.

If it should be said, that our Constitution, by making all former treaties and engagements as obligatory upon the United States, under that Constitution, as they were under the confederation, rendered the ratification of the convention a matter of necessity—the answer is, that either the engagements, which it contracted, were already conclusive, or they were not—if the former, there was no need of a ratification; if the latter, there was no absolute obligation to it. And, in every supposition, a ratification by the Pres-

[2] Arts. 2, 3, and 4 of treaty with France; 2, 3, and 20 of treaty with Russia; 2 and 3 of treaty with Holland; 3 and 4 of treaty with Sweden.

ident, with the consent of the Senate, could have been predicated only upon the power given in the present Constitution in relation to treaties; and to have any validity, must have been within the limit of that power.

But it has been heretofore seen that the inference from this instrument is no less strong, if referred to the power under the confederation, than if referred to the power under the present Constitution.

How happens it, that all these invasions of the Constitution, if they were such, were never discovered, and that all the Departments of the Government, and all parties in the public councils should have cooperated in giving them a sanction? Does it not prove that all were convinced, that the power of treaty, applied in our exterior relations to objects, which, in the ordinary course of internal administration and in reference to ourselves, were of the cognizance of the legislative power, and particularly that the former was competent to bind the latter in the delicate points of raising and appropriating money? If competent to this, what legislative power can be more sacred, more out of its reach?

Let me now ask (and a very solemn question it is, especially for those who are bound by oath to support the Constitution), has it not been demonstrated that the provisions in the treaty are justified by the true and manifest interpretation of the Constitution—are sanctioned by the practice upon a similar power under the confederation, and by the practice in other instances under the present Government?

If this has been demonstrated, what shall we think of the candor and sincerity of the objections which have been erected on the basis of a contrary supposition? Do they not unequivocally prove, that the adversaries of the treaty have been resolved to discredit it by every artifice they could invent? That they have not had truth for their guide, and consequently are very unfit guides for the public opinion, very unsafe guardians of the public welfare?

It is really painful and disgusting to observe sophisms so miserable as those which question the constitutionality of the treaty, retailed to an enlightened people, and insisted upon with so much seeming fervency and earnestness. It is impossible not to bestow on sensible men, who act this part, the imputation of hypocrisy. The absurdity of the doctrine is too glaring to permit even charity itself to suppose it sincere. If it were possible to imagine that a majority in any branch of our government, could betray the Constitution, and trifle with the Nation, so far as to adopt and act upon such a doctrine—it would be time to despair of the Republic.

There would be no security at home, no respectability abroad. Our constitutional charter would become a dead letter. The organ of our Government for foreign affairs would be treated with derision whenever he should hereafter talk of negotiation or treaty. May the great Ruler of nations avert from our country so grievous a calamity.

CAMILLUS.

Outstanding Record of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 84th Congress established an outstanding record with respect to postal and civil-service legislation. This is a record in which each Member of the House of Representatives may take just pride.

I feel that the members of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in particular, are deserving of the highest commendation for their contribution to this exceptional record. Both personally and as chairman of the committee I want to extend to each member my deep appreciation and sincere respect for a job well done. They have been most loyal and conscientious in their attendance at committee meetings. Their conduct at all times has been characterized by unselfish devotion to duty regardless of personal sacrifices. In my judgment, there is no other group so well informed on the many—and often controversial—problems of the postal service and the Federal civil service. It is a fair statement that much that was accomplished on these problems should be credited to their spirit of helpful cooperation and the information and evidence relating to legislation before the committee which has been developed through their individual and collective efforts.

POSTAL PAY AND POSITION CLASSIFICATION

An outstanding instance of the value of such concerted committee action is the enactment of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955—Public Law 68, 84th Congress. This was truly a committee bill, representing the product of the combined efforts of the entire membership of the committee. The act provides for an average of 8.1-percent increase in the salary of postal employees and corrects serious inequities in their salary schedules. At the same time, it establishes a new salary structure which reflects a more realistic relationship between the various positions in the postal service—particularly with reference to their duties and responsibilities—and the salaries of such positions. The basic provisions were contained in a bill reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Postal salaries and the classification of 500,000 postal positions are a tremendously complex and difficult subject. Full and complete hearings on the matter were held by our committee over a period of several weeks. The Postmaster General and his staff presented the proposal of the administration and advised the committee on technical and operating problems. The views and recommendations of all major employee organizations were received and given extensive consideration. A number of executive sessions were held in order to work out a solution of differences.

On the basis of the information developed in this very comprehensive deliberation our committee reached agreement on the principles and specific provisions of legislation to establish a complete new system of postal pay and position classification giving appropriate recognition, salarywise, to substantial differences in the levels of the duties and responsibilities of positions in the postal service.

This new postal salary law represents a great milestone in the development of a comprehensive and modern personnel program for the postal service. Our postal establishment is essentially a service organization, with more than half a million employees, and over 70 percent of its expenditures are for personal services. It is impossible, therefore, to overemphasize the importance of a sound and effective personnel program, from the standpoint of both management and employee benefits.

The new law, in addition to salary increases averaging 8.1 percent with a minimum of 6 percent for all employees, contains many other employee benefits as well as provisions which will contribute materially to efficiency and economy in postal operations.

Any postal employee will have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission in order to determine if his position has been placed in the proper salary level. The Post Office Department must comply with the decision of the Commission.

Each postal employee is protected against any loss of salary, and everyone will receive at least the minimum of 6 percent salary increase.

Progress of clerks and carriers—who constitute the major working force—through the automatic step-increases will be accelerated under the new law. Each step-increase will be larger than before and the employee will reach the top of his salary level in 7 years, instead of 9 years as had been the case.

Substitute employees, who previously were ineligible for longevity step-increases, will be entitled to the same automatic step-increases as regular employees.

Postmasters and supervisors, who heretofore had single salary rates, also will receive automatic step-increases as do other employees, thus for the first time being given a real incentive for superior performance in the form of salary recognition.

Any employee who is promoted will receive a salary increase which, at the minimum, equals the difference between the first step-rates of his old and new salary levels.

There will be far greater opportunity for promotion. The new salary schedule, which establishes 20 separate salary levels, permits placement of many employees in positions at levels above those they previously occupied. A large number of positions in the postal service warrant higher salaries than could be paid under the old law, and such higher salaries may be paid under this new law. The inclusion of positions in the regional and district offices in the same salary schedule also will open up greater promotional opportunities for qualified personnel.

Appointments at higher than the initial step-rate for any position in the postal field service will be permitted only in the cases of, first, persons who have been civilian employees in other branches of the Government; and, second, positions in the district or regional offices or which are professional or scientific in nature.

Postal employees will be changed from the semimonthly to the biweekly system of salary payments, providing 26 pay-

ments per year and thereby granting an extra day's pay each year. This will permit standardization of the payday on the same day of each alternate week throughout the year.

The present system of payments for Sunday and holiday work is continued, at the request of the clerk and carrier employee organizations.

One classified substitute will be permitted for every 5 regular employees—a continuation of the principle established under the old law which provided a 1-for-6 ratio.

The authorized travel allowance for postal transportation employees assigned to road duty is increased from $6 to $9 per day. This authorization is in conformity with the recent increase in authorized travel allowances for other Federal personnel.

The Postmaster General must submit a comprehensive report on operations under this legislation by January 15, 1956. Such report must include information, in summary and in detail, with respect to activities under the act and such other data as will enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service more effectively to perform their legislative review function under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The urgent need for this legislation has long been recognized. The attention of Congress has been directed to this need through its committees as well as the reports of special commissions. The postal salary system—or rather lack of system—in effect before enactment of this legislation completely ignored the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work. It made no provision for recognizing variations in the difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of any postal position. Employees were paid solely on the basis of job titles and pay rates established by law for such titles.

To eliminate waste and achieve a greater measure of efficiency and economy in the postal establishment, it is essential that adequate recognition be accorded the responsibility of supervisory personnel. It is only with such recognition that the number of employees needed to perform the many tasks of the postal service may be reduced and kept at a minimum. The outmoded salary procedure previously in effect was a millstone around the neck of management, a major obstruction to all efforts toward improving postal service as well as the lot of postal employees.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASE ACT OF 1955

Immediately after reporting the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, our committee took up the matter of increases for other classified Federal employees. Complete hearings also were held on legislation to adjust the salaries of these employees, at which representatives of the Civil Service Commission presented the views of the administration and representatives of employee organizations submitted their recommendations. On the basis of these hearings and information developed by the committee on its own initiative, the committee reported legislation to provide a 7½-percent salary increase for over one million classified Federal employees—see Public Law 94, 84th Congress.

One of the major factors in recommending this salary increase was the increase in cost-of-living. The last salary increase was granted effective July 1, 1951, when the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was 110.9. In January 1955, the index stood at 114.3, an increase of 3.4 points or 3.07 percent. Our committee reported a bill granting a 7.5 percent increase to every employee covered.

As in the case of the postal salary increase legislation, this increase for Federal classified employees likewise was truly a committee bill. The increase is substantially greater than the increased cost of living since the last pay raise, but in the view of the committee it is appropriate in order to provide these employees with increased real wages which will permit them to enjoy a general rise in their standard of living along with the millions of workers outside of Government.

BONDING OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Long-sought legislation to authorize the Government to procure bonds for Federal employees—Public Law 323, 83d Congress—was reported by our committee. This legislation permits the procurement by the Government of blanket, position schedule, or other types of bonds—suitable for the numbers and types of employees involved—for Federal employees who are required by law or regulation to be bonded. These employees have had to pay for their own bonds, and will be relieved of this expense. The new procedure also will result in savings in administrative costs to the Government which will more than equalize the cost of procuring the bonds. This policy is in conformity with the best practice in private business and industry.

CAREER APPOINTMENTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The committee also approved legislation—Public Law 380, 84th Congress—to authorize the granting of career-type appointments for thousands of indefinite and temporary employees who are not eligible for such appointments under Executive Order 10577. Early in the year I wrote the Civil Service Commission, pointing out the necessity of providing for career-type appointments for these employees, but the Commission declined to adopt my recommendation. An employee not covered by the Executive order may obtain such an appointment if he occupied a position in the competitive civil service on January 23, 1955, served in the position from that date to the effective date of the legislation, has passed a qualifying competitive examination or within 1 year passes a noncompetitive qualifying examination, and has completed 3 years of satisfactory service in the competitive civil service.

INCREASES IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

The committee also worked out and reported legislation to increase annuities of retired Federal employees by 12 percent on the first $1,500 and 8 percent on all in excess of $1,500, except that no regular annuity will be increased to an amount in excess of $4,104—Public Law 369, 84th Congress. This will relieve a great deal of the hardship which many of our retired Federal employees have suffered because of the rise in cost-of-living.

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

The Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 resulted in a inequity with respect to the interests which many employees and former employees hold in nonprofit beneficial associations that had been organized by groups of employees over the years. About 135,000 Federal employees were faced with loss of life insurance protection which they held as members of such beneficial associations. The committee action will make possible the continuance of such protection for these employees. Arrangements for the necessary amendment to the law was worked out with the Civil Service Commission—Public Law 356, 84th Congress.

TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT IN THE POSTAL SERVICE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Public Law 286, 84th Congress, authorizes the employment on suitable work in the postal service of certain custodial employees—many of whom have previous postal experience—notwithstanding the laws which in general prohibit dual employment of Government personnel.

ALLOWANCES FOR UNIFORMS

Legislation to remove an inequity in the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act was approved by the committee—Public Law 37, 84th Congress. This legislation will permit that act to apply to employees who in the future may be required to wear uniforms, and also will require annual reports to Congress on the administration of that act.

SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS FOR CERTAIN CORPS OF ENGINEERS EMPLOYEES

The committee reported legislation—Public Law 35, 84th Congress—to provide for the furnishing of subsistence and quarters to approximately 2,500 employees of the Corps of Engineers whose rates of pay are established under the prevailing wage system. Although their pay rates are comparable to those for similar jobs in private industry, they have not been furnished quarters and subsistence as is generally the case in private industry. This legislation will place them on a par with employees in private industry in such respect.

PROHIBITION AGAINST GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT OF DISLOYAL PERSONS

The 84th Congress wrote into a single permanent law—Public Law 330, 84th Congress—the many provisions which have been carried in appropriation acts and other laws to deny Federal employment to disloyal persons and those who strike, or assert the right to strike, against the Government. Such employment will be a penal offense.

EQUALIZATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL SALARIES

In separate legislation—Public Law 90, 84th Congress—the committee removed an inequity in the postal salary laws whereunder a number of dispatchers in the motor vehicle service and other su-

pervisors were limited to salaries lower than similar workers with lesser periods of service. Some of these employees might have been required, without this legislation, to repay certain salary payments they had received.

MAILING OF KEYS AND IDENTIFICATION DEVICES

Existing law authorizing the return by mail of hotel and steamship keys was clarified and brought up-to-date by the committee—Public Law 238, 84th Congress. This will authorize transmission through the mails of keys, identification devices, and other small articles designated by the Postmaster General, at a postage rate of 5 cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof. The bill was strongly recommended by the Disabled American Veterans and other organizations which had developed convenient means for the identifying and returning of such articles.

MAILING OF PUBLICATIONS OF CHURCHES AND CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS

Under a simplified procedure approved by the committee—Public Law 170, 84th Congress—churches and church organizations no longer will be required to maintain subscription lists separate from their memberships in order to obtain second-class postage rates for mailing their publications. Publications of institutions of learning, trade unions, lodges, beneficial socieities, and similar organizations have had this privilege for some time.

OTHER COMMITTEE LEGISLATION WHICH BECAME LAW

Other legislation reported by the committee includes Public Law 65, 84th Congress, barring claims for unpaid money orders unless presented within 20 years, and Public Law 108, 84th Congress, authorizing transmission in the mails, under appropriate regulations, of live scorpions for purposes of medical research or the manufacture of antivenin.

BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE BUT NOT BY THE OTHER BODY

Several bills of special note reported by the committee were passed by the House but not acted on by the other body.

FREE MAIL FOR TROOPS IN KOREA

One of my greatest disappointments of the first session of the 84th Congress is the failure to obtain final action on legislation to continue the free mailing privilege for troops in Korea which expired June 30 of this year.

Free mail for these troops first was authorized in 1950, to expire in 1953. The expiration date later was extended to June 1955, unless terminated earlier by the President. When this final termination date approached without any word from the Department of Defense, I requested the views of that Department and the Post Office Department on an extension under the same conditions. Upon their failure to submit a timely recommendation, an arrangement was worked out with them to allow the troops to send mail free until such time as Congress could have an opportunity to act, and I introduced legislation—H. R. 7125—to fix a new expiration date of June 30, 1956, unless terminated earlier by the President.

This legislation, H. R. 7125, was unanimously approved by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House of Representatives, but has not yet passed the other body. I earnestly hope that prompt action will be taken in the next session on this urgently needed measure, which will provide our troops in Korea some small measure of convenience and necessity by granting them the right to send mail free to their families and loved ones at home.

The discontinuance of free mail for troops in Korea in my judgment has resulted in a severe blow to the morale and well being of these troops as well as their families and friends on the home front.

SAVING OF SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES WHOSE POSITIONS ARE DOWNGRADED

H. R. 3255 would prevent loss of salary for classified Federal employees whose positions are reclassified to lower salary grades. This measure applies the recognized principle of a savings provision for salaries of employees who have satisfactorily performed their duties for 2 or more years when their positions are downgraded. It applies to any downgrading on or after July 1, 1954, and will benefit an estimated 5,000 Federal employees who have suffered losses of salary through downgradings through no fault of their own. It will also be prospective in effect. The mere threat of this legislation forced the Civil Service Commission to revise its regulations so as to provide partial relief for these employees. The regulations, however, are deemed inadequate and the committee bill is designed to provide the necessary protection for these employees.

EXECUTIVE PAY

A bill entitled "The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1955"—H. R. 7619—providing needed adjustments in the salaries of top officials in the executive branch of the Government and certain others, was approved by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and passed by the House of Representatives, but was not acted on by the other body. The salary rates and the relationships between the various positions in this bill were very carefully worked out on the basis of administrative advice and recommendations and an extensive study in which our ranking minority member cooperated with me. The legislation was requested by the President, who outlined the general principles which he believed should be followed in the adjustment of executive salaries. Only Cabinet officers—$25,000 per annum—would receive salaries higher than those paid Members of Congress, while but 10 other officials would receive as much as a Member of Congress.

"PRAY FOR PEACE" STAMP

The committee and the House of Representatives unanimously approved H. R. 692, to authorize the use of first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace," but the other body did not act on this bill.

Additional bills passed by the House and pending before the other body follow:

ACCOUNTING FOR PENALTY MAIL

H. R. 5856 will eliminate unnecessary paperwork by Government departments and agencies in their accounting for penalty mail materials. Approval of this legislation will result in savings of a large part of the present $3.8 million cost of such accounting. Needed fiscal information is available through other, less expensive means.

RENEWAL OF DEEPWATER MAIL CONTRACTS

H. R. 4569 will authorize renewal of contracts for carrying the mail on deepwater routes without advertising for bids, when it is in the interest of the postal service to do so. Such authority presently applies to contracts for inland-water routes, star routes, screen-vehicle routes, and mail messenger service.

LEGISLATION NOT APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT—RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR CERTAIN STATE SERVICE

S. 1041, providing for allowance of civil service retirement credit for certain service on Federal-State projects financed by Federal funds rendered by persons who are retired on or after June 30, 1954, who make application for such credit, and who make appropriate contribution to the retirement fund, was disapproved by the President's memorandum of disapproval dated August 12, 1955.

EMPLOYEE BENEFIT LEGISLATION REPORTED BY OTHER HOUSE COMMITTEES

In this discussion of legislation for the benefit of Federal employees I want to mention in passing two important measures which were approved by committees other than the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

For some time past there has been general recognition of the need for revision of the dual-compensation statute which generally prohibits the receipt by retired commissioned officers of salary for a civilian position if such salary, together with retired pay, exceeds $3,000. Public Law 239, 84th Congress, reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, increases this limitation to $10,000, thus permitting the utilization in civilian positions of the special qualifications of many of these retired commissioned officers.

The House Committee on Government Operations approved legislation—Public Law 189, 84th Congress—further amending the Travel Expense Act of 1950, increasing from $9 to $12 a day the maximum authorized allowances for Federal employees traveling on official business. This conforms to the provision in the postal pay legislation which increases by $3 the maximum authorized allowance for postal transportation employees assigned to road duty. These increases were necessary to compensate employees in travel status for increased costs of living.

COMMITTEE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

House Resolution 304, 84th Congress, approved July 13, 1955, authorizes the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to conduct studies and investigations of certain specific matters relating to the postal establishment, the Civil Service Commission, and personnel programs, and civilian manpower utilization in the Government.

Pursuant to the resolutions, three standing subcommittees were appointed.

The Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations is composed of JOHN DOWDY, Texas, chairman; EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR., Virginia; DANTE B. FASCELL,

Florida; JOE M. KILGORE, Texas; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York; CHARLES S. GUBSER, California; ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Michigan. Ex officio: TOM MURRAY, Tennessee; EDWARD H. REES, Kansas. This subcommittee has broad jurisdiction to conduct studies and investigations of postal operations.

The Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management Subcommittee is composed of JAMES C. DAVIS, Georgia, chairman; JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan; HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, North Carolina; GRACIE PFOST, Idaho; CHET HOLIFIELD, California; ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; JOHN E. HENDERSON, Ohio; AUGUST E. JOHNANSEN, Michigan. Ex officio: TOM MURRAY, Tennessee; EDWARD H. REES, Kansas. This subcommittee is responsible for study and investigation of a number of specific matters relating to the more effective utilization of civilian manpower in the Federal Government.

The Subcommittee on the Civil Service and Personnel Programs is composed of JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana, chairman; GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; JOHN E. MOSS, California; T. JAMES TUMULTY, New Jersey; CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana; ALBERT W. CRETELLA, Connecticut; JOEL T. BROYHILL, Virginia. Ex officio: TOM MURRAY, Tennessee; EDWARD H. REES, Kansas. This subcommittee is responsible for study and investigation of the operations of the Civil Service Commission and of Federal civilian personnel programs.

These studies and investigations in part are extensions of similar ones completed in the last Congress, but largely will relate to matters which were not considered in such earlier studies and which, according to information and evidence developed by the committee in the present Congress, warrant the committee's attention.

The objectives of these studies and investigations are the achievement of greater efficiency and economy in postal operations and in the utilization of manpower by the Government, and the strengthening of civil service and personnel practices in order to increase their value as management tools and factors in better employee relations.

The legislative record of our committee speaks for itself. I regard it as a great privilege to serve as chairman of this fine committee and deeply appreciate the cooperation which each member of the committee has given.

Theater as Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Saturday Review had an article entitled "Theater as Communication" which pointed out the effective contribution our cultural activities make to international understanding. I ask permission to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD in order to call attention to the important projects which have been taken during this past year.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEATER AS COMMUNICATION
(By Henry Hewes)

Exporting theater is one of the most effective ways the people of any nation have of communicating with the people of other countries. Who could be more winning tourists than the stars, director, and hands of a first-rate show? But "communicating" should not be thought of as propagandizing or a gimmick of prestige. What communicating means is the finding of mutual points of similarity beneath the surface of life in various lands, and under various systems of government, so that the people of the country in which the audience is located can come to recognize that foreigners are not strange monsters, but human beings with the same basic drives and feelings that they have.

For instance, on a visit to Soviet-controlled East Berlin last November I was touched and encouraged to find what had appeared to me cold citizens hostile to Western ideas of compassion and the tenderer emotions audibly sighing in sympathy with a sentimental piece of theater. The occasion was the ending of Bertholt Brecht's The Caucasian Circle of Chalk, when a little boy runs across the stage to the arms of his adopted mother during a test to decide to which of two parents he is to be awarded. The scene was evoking something fundamental to all human beings, independent of any propaganda message printed in the program.

Although this sort of communication should be the purpose of an international exchange of theater, there's more to a show than purity of heart. Someone's got to put up the dough. Governments who spend public funds to make possible the sending abroad of plays must sell the project to the people's representatives as more valuable than armament, dams, soil conservation, and other expenditures. This makes it strongly tempting for the theater to advertise itself as a cold-war weapon. And the fact that the Russian Government has spent nearly $2 billion on international theater exchange since the end of World War II strengthens the argument that a burst of Gorki must be countered by a volley of Thornton Wilder.

After obtaining funds from a reluctant Congress or from a less reluctant but extremely cautious State Department, the next step is to arive at a decision of what to send. And here again, since there is no recognized permanent theater company, and no guaranty of a continuation of the exchange program, the criterion is, "What will make this best impression?" What's worse is that this last question really means, "What will get a favorable reaction from the press of a big foreign city?" Complicating matters is the fact that a great many of our best plays are those highly critical of the American way of life, or those delving into abnormal behavior. These are put aside as bad ambassadors to people who know us—it is feared—only through this one play. Other countries escape this dilemma by sending classic drama, which is not representational of contemporary life. But young America has virtually no classic plays of our own to export, and no readily identifiable manner with the English classics which distinguishes our acting from that of England.

This year's advisory panel on the drama set up by the American National Theater and Academy found itself with a thoroughly proved asset in Porgy and Bess, and with a subsidy from a special President's fund this attraction was sent to many spots in Europe, the Middle East, and South America, where it could otherwise not have afforded to go. As for new productions, the panel was pretty well stymied. The State Department contract with ANTA provided only for travel expenses and losses incurred because of unfavorable rates of exchange, and not for the underwriting of the cost of production itself. For this and other reasons Salute to France came to be organized as a gesture of private philanthropy. The ANTA drama panel, with the advice of the State Department, assisted in making the choices, which in the end turned out to be the least controversial selections possible. Judith Anderson in Medea presented an Australian-born actress in a Greek play made American through the rewriting of our distinguished poet, Robinson Jeffers. The Skin of Our Teeth, a positive-thinking play by the broadly cultured Thornton Wilder, seemed an even better companion-choice when producer Robert Whitehead was able to persuade Helen Hayes and Mary Martin, two of our most extroverted performers, to play the leading roles. And to round out the program, Rodgers and Hammerstein's Oklahoma, which combines folk drama and American musical-comedy techniques, appeared the most likely of all to please a Paris audience to which musical comedy is an almost unknown experience.

The press cutings from Paris have indicated a mixed reaction to the program. With the possible exception of Miss Hayes' performance, none of it bowled over the French critics as did Porgy and Bess or even as did a Paris production of Arthur Miller's The Crucible earlier this season. On the other hand, we did break the cultural ice. If the French have not come to think of us as theatrical supermen, they have at least come to know us as spirited theatrical workers.

But Salute to France is not a good test case. The Paris Festival of which it is a part is more-or-less a tourist attraction held at a time of year when a large number of theatergoing Parisians are away for the summer. The real problem is to break down the barriers of misunderstanding between the people of entire foreign populaces and ourselves. This means allocating funds to make possible tours into the smaller and less glamorous cities and to more distant and more primitive lands.

The prospect of getting our established stars to undertake extended trips of this nature—even if we do succeed in convincing Congress of their desirability—is dim. A week in Paris is one thing. Three months in Southeast Asia at a nominal salary is far less attractive, and not a very sensible step for stars whose services are in demand and whose expenses at home are high.

Fortunately, there is an answer which has proved effective in many countries. A subsidized theater company composed mainly of young and unestablished players—though often led by two or three stars who prefer working in repertory—could take the American combination of vitality and sincerity to these areas. There are in New York today several off-Broadway groups who are proving how effective young semipermanent companies can be. Of these, one in particular has arrived at a very definite style of its own which makes any work it does an artistic achievement that could be exported with pride and confidence. This is Circle-in-the-Square, which—operating in the round under José Quintero's direction—usually interests visiting artists and critics more than almost anything on Broadway.

Its recent, The King and the Duke, though it received a negative reception from the Broadway critics, is the kind of thing that for better or worse is most representative of

America, and because it grows out of the writings of Mark Twain is about the nearest thing we have to a classic. Such a production would be ideal for the smaller cities of Europe and the Asiatic countries. It is real, it is honest, and it is more likely to cause unsophisticated people to find bonds of experience with us than more pretentious and ambitious forms of drama.

Another possibility—and this is as yet undeveloped—is that Actors Studio with its newly acquired facilities and its immense pool of young talent may mount productions that will utilize our actors' and directors' gifts to a greater extent and with a greater unity than has heretofore been achieved. If it does it may be the cementing of a definite American school of acting.

The ideal solution, of course, would be the setting up of a permanent resident company in New York City which would compare favorably with the national companies to be found in the theater capitals of every European country. The New York chapter of ANTA has made this project its primary goal and has made considerable progress in affiliating it with the Columbia University Arts Center. If a permanent resident company can get the support it deserves from both private and Government subsidy, it could provide a continuing source of characteristic American theater at its highest level. It could act as a flagship to all of American theater, could tour our own country, and could be sent abroad not as propaganda but as a true expression of our way of life.

Necessity To Meet the Nation's Health Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent study conducted by the Ford Foundation, based on numerous individual personal interviews, indicates that Americans of all income groups are greatly concerned over health problems and how to meet the cost of illness. This concern also finds expression in the steadily climbing sales curve for health insurance policies and the increasing number of labor agreements which include health insurance at fringe benefits. Obviously, this great demand on the part of the American people for protection against the cost of illness must be recognized by State legislatures and the Congress.

During the 83d Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under my chairmanship, conducted extensive hearings into health problems and voluntary health insurance. Throughout these hearings emphasis was placed on the present outlook for the treatment and cure of major diseases and how individuals may protect themselves against major medical expenses through voluntary rather than compulsory insurance arrangements. The hearings also highlighted the great need which exists for increased health facilities—including research into and treatment of diseases—and health personnel including physicians, research staffs, and nursing personnel.

There is no simple answer to our health problems. Rather, the answer must be sought in a multitude of measures. Individual health insurance is exceedingly costly and offers comparatively little protection. New ways must, therefore, be found of expanding group coverage. There is some hope that title I of the omnibus health bill now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the reinsurance title—may speed up experimentation with new group coverage in the health-insurance field and particularly with regard to major medical expenses. It is gratifying to learn that the Prudential Insurance Co. of New Jersey has shown commendable interest in this field by recently announcing a plan applicable to those of advanced years. This is a field in which there is great need for a workable plan.

Increasing amounts of private capital must be channeled into the construction of health facilities. I am greatly pleased that the administration has adopted in its proposed omnibus bill the principle of mortgage loan insurance for health facilities which was developed in the course of the hearings during the 83d Congress conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This approach is not dissimilar to the plan that has proved an outstanding success in stimulating residential housing construction. There is every reason to believe that this approach might also be useful in providing additional privately financed health facilities.

In several communities, we have seen competition between health plans sponsored by State or local medical societies on the one hand, and lay-sponsored health plans on the other hand. Competition among these plans has resulted in more extensive coverage, thus greatly benefiting the members of these plans.

Industrial and labor health plans have been inaugurated under numerous collective-bargaining agreements. While many workmen are thus benefited with increased protection against the cost of illness, sight must not be lost of the fact that similar protection must be secured for individuals not employed in these industries.

Legislation now pending in the Congress would provide some Federal assistance for the construction of medical schools and non-Federal research facilities. Availability of these facilities would make possible the graduating of additional physicians and would provide space for additional research workers.

Finally, Congress has adopted legislation to assist in the financing of a study of present methods of treating mental illnesses. This study amounts to a critical self-examination conducted jointly by those who are primarily concerned with the treatment of mental diseases. The undertaking of this study holds out some hope for the future that we might be able substantially to improve treatment methods now employed. It also may result, I trust, in the improved utilization of available health personnel in the field of mental health.

In conclusion, the health needs of the Nation are so varied and complex with regard to different geographical areas and different diseases that no single answer will be able to meet all legitimate needs. In the case of many diseases, as for example in the case of venereal diseases and tuberculosis, the discovery of new remedies has radically changed our needs with regard to treatment of these diseases. I am hopeful that new discoveries will similarly ease the burden that other diseases have placed on individuals, communities, and governments—local, State, and Federal—but I also hope that the Federal Government will become increasingly active in sponsoring and supporting voluntary methods by which increased protection can be given to individuals against the cost of illness.

Closure of Gavins Point Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on July 31, 1955, the States of South Dakota and Nebraska celebrated the closure of Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River by appropriate ceremonies.

The Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, as one of his first official acts, participated in the ceremonies.

His remarks on this occasion clearly show that he appreciates and realizes the full impact of the many benefits that will come to the area and the Nation by the Missouri River development program. It was a most excellent address and I ask unanimous consent to have the speech in its entirety inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, AT CLOSURE OF GAVINS POINT DAM, YANKTON, S. DAK., JULY 31, 1955

The closure of the Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River has impressive national significance. Today the page is being turned to the beginning of another inspiring chapter in the history of the Missouri Basin—a region embracing all or part of 10 great States and comprising one-sixth of the land area of the United States. This new chapter will tell the story of tremendous advances in the agricultural, industrial, and commercial development of this entire region. It will record a steadily rising level of economic security and well-being for millions of Americans.

As Secretary of the Army, as one of my first official duties, I am particularly proud to be present, because of the leading role the Army—our Corps of Engineers—has played in carrying out the vast Missouri Basin development program, bringing to fruition the hopes and great expectations of generations of the people of this area.

I do not come here today as a neophyte in the field of water-resource development. No son of Michigan, surrounded by the Great Lakes, and which to a large extent owes its founding and growth to water, could fail to appreciate the vital part that water plays in the life of our Nation. Moreover, as Gov-

ernor of that State, and in other official and unofficial capacities, I have grappled with the myriad problems connected with harbors and inland navigation, lake levels, beach erosion, water diversion, drought relief, and other matters related to water, or the lack of it. I come with full understanding of your problems, of the difficulties you have experienced, and of the great good which you and your children's children will derive from the Missouri Basin program.

Gavins Point Dam is of extraordinary importance as a key installation of the entire program, the key to many of the major benefits flowing from that program. It is a symbol of all that has been accomplished in the last 20 years in harnessing "Old Muddy" and its tributaries from the furthest rivulet in northwestern Montana to the mighty volume of water discharged into the Mississippi at St. Louis.

When we recall that within a little over a century there have been 16 disastrous floods below this point, with a toll of tragedy reckoned in many lives, and property damage adding up to hundreds of millions of dollars—and at least a hundred lesser but still costly inundations—we are able to appreciate the true value of a control system which, although incomplete, already has largely robbed the great river of its power to destroy.

When we recall further the suffering and despair and huge economic loss caused by searing drought in this plains region during the last several decades, the significance of the fact that this vast system now makes the once waste waters of the Missouri readily available to irrigate the dry and thirsty land becomes strikingly apparent.

Nor are these the only great benefits conferred upon this area by the Missouri Basin development program. A third is hydroelectric power—power to lighten the farmer's labor and to extend his capabilities; power to vitalize new and highly productive industries and create new wealth; power which will add immeasurably to the prosperity of the entire basin.

A fourth benefit is the advantage to your commerce which will accrue from the stabilization of the Missouri throughout a distance of 760 miles from the authorized head of navigation—which, in time, may be extended upriver as economic factors warrant—to its juncture with the Mississippi. Before long the products of the Missouri Valley will be able to move in ever-mounting volume to the markets of the midcontinent along this waterway. Your industries will have freer access to the great trunk system of waterways reaching south to the oil and cotton fields of the gulf and along the coast of Florida and Mexico; up the Ohio to the present industrial heart of the Nation; north to the Twin Cities, and eventually to the Great Lakes and, by the St. Lawrence, to all the oceans of the world. It is a magnificent prospect.

I would hesitate to conclude even this abbreviated catalog of the benefits of the Missouri Basin development program without at least mentioning the recreational advantages provided by the creation of a chain of lakes along 1,200 river-miles through the rolling prairies. The satisfactions looked forward to by the residents of Yankton and its environs from the use of Lewis and Clark Lake, which will shortly fill behind this Gavins Point Dam, will be matched, and multiplied, a hundredfold, along the course of the Missouri northward to Fort Peck.

So far I have sketched the benefits of the development program largely in terms of advantage to the Missouri Basin itself. If I went no further, I would be guilty of drawing a very incomplete picture, because the benefits of this development accruing to the Nation at large are of incalculable value.

This big country of ours has become such a closely knit industrial, agricultural, and social entity that disaster in one area is keenly felt throughout the land. The tragic consequences of recurrent flood and drought here in the Missouri Valley have had adverse effects on the welfare of the entire United States.

Conversely, the increased productivity and prosperity of any section of the country is reflected from coast to coast and from border to border. When, for example, a waterway cuts the cost of marketing Nebraska grain, or brings fertilizer more cheaply to the fields of South Dakota, it helps to cut the cost of the food on every American table. When the stabilization of this great river, and the harnessing of its power attracts new industries to its banks, the entire Nation is the richer. The people who live in one section of our land are today full partners, both in adversity and in prosperity, with those who live in every other section.

Taking the long-range viewpoint, our national security—our continued existence as a free nation—depends upon a dynamic and expanding economy. Not only must we meet continuing defense requirements of a magnitude unprecedented in our peacetime experience—including heavy commitments to our friends and allies abroad—but we must also be prepared to bear the enormous burden of a full-scale war if it should be thrust upon us. All of this is superimposed on the necessity of supporting a constantly increasing population. Today there are more than 165 million people living in the United States; in 20 years, it is predicted, there will be 220 million, and we certainly want to make sure that these 220 million have no less high a standard of living than we enjoy today.

The backbone of our economy is our natural resources, which we have been exploiting with a prodigal hand for nearly two centuries. None of these is more important than water. Disregarding the huge amounts of water needed by individuals in their daily living—which is proving a serious and growing problem in our metropolitan areas as well—we need, as our economy expands, more and more water for industrial power, more and more water to turn dry but fertile land into productive farms, water to float our inland commerce, tremendous supplies of water to satisfy the seemingly insatiable appetite of modern technological processes.

Of course rain and snow, which are the sources of our water supply, continue to fall on our land, but our needs have grown so great and so specialized that we can no longer afford to take water for granted. We can no longer treat it as an inexhaustible resource and allow it to run a wayward and wasteful course to the sea. Where water is concerned, America is learning to face realities. Our necessities demand that it be controlled, that its power be turned from destruction to production, and that it be distributed, not in accordance with the whims of nature, but the requirements of man. If we fail to accomplish these ends, we invite the gravest difficulties, and perhaps disaster.

President Eisenhower pointed up the seriousness of the situation when he declared that: "If we are to continue to advance agriculturally and industrially, we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil or which can be extracted from the ocean."

In that statement he spelled out the basic philosophy behind his vigorous support of water resource development programs, such as this Missouri Basin program, which are being pushed forward as fast as the Nation's budgetary situation and economic health permit.

Although both as a public official and a private citizen I have long been aware of the increasing need for water conservation, and have had no little personal experience with the problems involved, it was a revelation to me to discover, as I delved into the matter from the viewpoint of the Army, the true magnitude of the Nation's requirements. For instance, our Corps of Engineers has at the present time a backlog of over $8½ billion worth of congressionally authorized construction, which is considerably more than all the construction the corps has done in the entire 134 years it has been engaged in civil-works programs. This huge backlog, General Sturgis tells me, has accumulated largely in the last 25 years, and is constantly growing greater. I might add that all these projects have been carefully screened. They are completely feasible from an engineering standpoint, and economically justified.

President Eisenhower has emphatically demonstrated his complete and continuing approval of this inland waterway program. This administration has initiated several worthwhile projects, and is devoting itself enthusiastically to completing them.

Among the many big projects in the engineer backlog on which work is now underway, and which the administration is pushing with redoubled vigor, are the complex central and southern Florida flood control and drainage project; the great Folsom, The Dalles, and Chief Joseph Dams in California, Oregon, and Washington; the 20-year project for the modernization of the Ohio River, and the Calumet-Sag Channel, which will link the Mississippi River system with the Great Lakes. The backlog also includes construction which will cost over $1 billion to complete the Army's part of this Missouri Basin program, including such big items as the Oahe and Big Bend Dams. We are going ahead with these as rapidly as possible. Many important projects, however, are still under study. These include deepening the Delaware River Channel, most of the units of the big flood control project on the Kansas River and its tributaries, and the Old River closure, which will eliminate the great and ever-present danger that the Mississippi will seek a new channel down the Atchafalaya River and isolate such cities as Baton Rouge and New Orleans on a bayou. I am happy to say that work on the Old River project will be started this year.

To me the existence of so large a backlog is sobering evidence of how rapidly our necessity is outstripping our development. It underscores the urgency that attaches to our water resources development programs. It also suggests that the efforts of the Federal Government alone, as limited by budgetary considerations, will not be sufficient to keep us ahead in this race. It must seek, as it is seeking, earnestly and persistently, to find ways in which local, State, and other non-Federal agencies and institutions country-wide can participate to a greater extent in the big job of resources development.

The success of the Missouri Basin development program as so far carried out is a dramatic illustration of how much can be accomplished through a close partnership among the Federal Government, the States, local communities, quasi-public agencies, and private citizens. It is an outstanding example of sound planning and proper coordination at all levels.

The Federal agencies—the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and others—have worked closely with the States of the Missouri Basin through the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. Great credit for this approach, and the results achieved, is due to the farsighted State governors who over the years have provided inspired leadership and developed effective support throughout the basin. Much credit is also owed to the vision and judgment of the Members of the Congress.

The contributions of you South Dakotans and Nebraskans have been particularly noteworthy. The intense interest shown in basin development by your State executives dates considerably further back than the Pick-Sloan plan on which the program is

based. Governors Joe Foss and Vic Anderson and their distinguished predecessors have all been untiring in their efforts to bring this splendid concept into physical being. It would be impossible for me to pay individual tribute to the thousands of dedicated men and women in all walks of life who have devoted so much of their time, their energy, and their enthusiasm to achieving this success, but I feel I would be remiss if I failed to mention especially former Governor Sharpe, of South Dakota, who has been one of the most indefatigable and effective proponents of the basin program since its conception.

All who have had a part in this undertaking, no matter how large, can well be proud of what has been accomplished. There is no doubt in my mind that you will address yourselves with equal determination and enthusiasm to the big task of putting to practical, constructive use the full potential created by the Missouri Basin System. In the years to come, generations of Americans will have cause to bless you all for your efforts.

Résumé of the Activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 84th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted the chairman of all standing committees and subcommittees of the House, relative to the activities of their respective committees, I desire to include the résumé of the activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 84th Congress, 1st session.

At the outset of its work in the 84th Congress, the committee found itself with a fairly large number of new members who were unfamiliar with the scope and detail of its operations. Accordingly, arrangements were made with the various agencies under the committee's jurisdiction to present information concerning their activities. A series of open hearings were held for this purpose and the information thus received proved extremely useful in connection with bills and other matters considered later affecting the several agencies.

OPERATION OF TANKER TRADE-IN LEGISLATION

The preceding Congresses enacted legislation providing for the trade-in of 10-year-old tankers for credit toward construction of new vessels. At the hearings on the bill, the executive agencies charged with the responsibility of encouraging a merchant fleet for peace and war emphasized the need for tankers with a sustained speed of 18 knots. While this was not mentioned in the bill, the committee's report accompanying it referred to the necessity of such speed. Subsequently, it came to the attention of the committee that credits were being allowed for the construction of tankers of less than 18 knots speed. Early in the session hearings were held by the committee to obtain the facts. As a result, the Maritime Administrator stated that he would encourage the construction of the 18-knot type and that vessels of a lesser speed would not be approved without prior consultation with the committee.

The first transaction consummated involved the trade-in of tankers by Cities Service Oil Co. In order to assure itself that the law was being observed with respect to condition of the trade-in vessels, the committee sent surveyors to examine the vessels. It was found that the Maritime Administration had fully complied with the law in respect to the condition of the ships.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

During the past session of Congress, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee made notable strides in its examination of the ills that beset the American Merchant Marine. Extensive hearings were held on the relations between labor and management with a view toward assessing responsibility for the all-too-prevalent interruptions in service which have been costly not only in terms of Government money paid in subsidies, but also from the point of view of loss of cargo to foreign lines. At the hearings, representatives of Government, management, and labor were afforded opportunity to express themselves freely with respect to their problems, and it is reasonably certain that there has been an improvement in understanding among the various interests. The committee has every intention of continuing its interest in the field and considerable activity has been planned, by way of hearings and staff studies, during the recess in preparation for further work in the next session.

MERCHANT VESSEL REPLACEMENT

The problem of block obsolescence of merchant vessels has become of increasing concern to the committee. It is generally accepted that a ship has a useful life of 20 years. Virtually all of the American merchant marine consists of vessels built during World War II which are presently 10 to 13 years old. If no action is taken, they will all become obsolete within a span of 4 years beginning in 1962. In such an eventuality the shipyards would have more work than they could possibly handle at that time but in the meantime they would have practically no work, which would result in a loss of skilled manpower difficult to replace or reemploy.

To cope with this problem the committee held a series of hearings to develop ideas which would encourage construction of new vessels in the immediate future, not only to spread ship construction over a longer period but to obtain vessels of new designs better able to compete with foreign built tonnage. In connection with this problem, the future use of nuclear power in merchant vessels was explored. It had been suggested that some companies might delay replacing vessels, if atomic power on a commercially feasible basis, was "just around the corner." It was found that little or no effort was being made to experiment with atomic power for merchant ships. Hence, the committee reported a bill authorizing the construction of a prototype nuclear powered merchant vessel. This bill was passed by the House.

A number of subsidized lines indicated their willingness to enter into new subsidy contracts in which they would undertake replacements of existing vessels in the immediate future but were hesitant to do so because they believed that the new contracts would jeopardize favorable recapture positions in the old. To meet this problem, the committee reported a bill, subsequently passed by the House, that would enable the operators to enter into new contracts without losing the benefit of their old ones which had a year or two to run.

Plans presently underway call for the construction or conversion by private interests of 26 passenger, passenger-cargo, and cargo ships for service on essential routes. In addition, bills authorizing the sale of the passenger vessels *Monterey* and *La Guardia* were reported by the committee and passed by the House. Necessary work to prepare these vessels for operation on the west coast-Hawaiian run will result in more than $12 million in work for American shipyards.

FIFTY-FIFTY LEGISLATION

The committee continued its vigilance to assure proper functioning of the 50-50 Act to obtain a fair share of ocean-borne commerce in which the Government has a financial interest. In the Mutual Security Act of 1955, an attempt was made to eliminate the requirement that half of such cargoes be carried in American bottoms, but the integrity of the 50–50 concept was maintained. The necessary information to confirm the effectiveness of the concept had been developed early in the year when the committee, taking heed of certain protests as to its adverse effects, held hearings and brought in as witnesses the representatives of various viewpoints. As a result of these hearings the committee concluded that the law was working satisfactorily and that claims of harm to any American interest were unfounded.

WAR RISK INSURANCE

The continued operation of ships in peace and war requires that adequate insurance be available either from private or Government sources. No prudent shipowner will hazard a vessel, representing an investment of many millions of dollars, to the perils of the sea, natural or man-made, without sufficient insurance against damage or loss. History has shown that private underwriters are unwilling to continue coverage in case of hostilities and it is necessary for Government to take their place. Standby authority to assume marine risks had been given the Maritime Administration in 1950, and this authority was extended for an additional 5 years during the current session.

MERCHANT MARINE TRAINING

Competent leadership at sea is extremely important. To assure trained men to handle our ships, the United States Merchant Marine Academy was established in 1938. As experience demonstrated the value of its graduates both in war and peace to the merchant ma-

rine, it became evident that the time had come to place the Academy on a permanent basis, to take its place with Annapolis, West Point, and the Air Academy as an important part of our national defense. So, for the second time, the committee reported, and the House passed, a bill to give the Academy permanent status.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Accurate charts and maps of the coastal waters are a necessity, not only to the merchant marine but also to the Navy and the fisheries. The duty of preparing such maps is entrusted to the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce. This unsung but most important branch of Government is presently engaged, in addition to its more or less routine duties of mapping the coastline of continental United States, in the fairly urgent job of completing charts of the coast of Alaska. The importance of its work cannot be overemphasized, because the location of Loran stations and the whole effectiveness of this system of navigation is dependent upon accurate bearings. To increase the effectiveness of its work, the committee authorized the construction of two new survey vessels. These will be equipped with necessary facilities for helicopters and will permit the Survey to perform its duties with even greater efficiency. In addition, the committee considered and reported to the House, which subsequently passed, a measure designed to improve the operation of the Survey in respect to its purely internal functioning.

COAST GUARD

In the field of its Coast Guard jurisdiction, the committee reported, and the House subsequently passed, a number of bills designed to boost the morale and improve the efficiency of its operations. Discharges of enlisted men before expiration of their term of enlistment without loss of benefits, involuntary retirement of higher ranks of officers, and compensatory time off for personnel serving at isolated stations were considered and bills reported which passed the House. In the interest of the remaining civilian members of the former Lighthouse Service, bills were reported and passed making pension increases permanent and lowering the age limit for voluntary retirement to conform to limits in other Government retirement systems.

PHILIPPINE SHIPS

Since the close of World War II, a number of the smaller warbuilt coastal type vessels have been chartered to citizens of the Philippines for operation among the islands. The committee has been observing this operation for the past few years in the light of certain discriminations practiced by the Philippine Government against American shipping lines and agricultural interests. Having finally been convinced that the discriminations had been substantially removed or modified, the committee reported a bill authorizing the sale of the vessels to the present operators; the bill became law.

WILDLIFE RESTORATION

In 1937 the Pittman-Robertson Act was passed which provided for Federal aid to the States in wildlife restoration projects. The funds for such work were derived from the proceeds of an excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition. By reason of conditions created by the war, the full amount of the tax was not appropriated from 1939 to 1946, by reason of which a fund of over $13 million accumulated which, in equity, should have been distributed. A number of bills providing for various schemes of distribution were referred to the committee and, after extensive hearings, a bill providing for use of the fund over a 5-year period was reported to the House.

In the course of its work, the committee held 71 days of hearings and has reported 26 bills and resolutions to the House, of which 18 were passed and 13 have become law. While the committee reported 5 bills and resolutions to the House, the Senate companion measures, which were not referred to the committee, were adopted on the House floor and have either become law or are pending before the President for signature, making a total of 18 laws.

Activities of the House Committee on Government Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the following is a report of the activities of the Committee on Government Operations for the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

The Committee on Government Operations, formerly known as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, was set up in 1816 to consider expenditures in the executive departments then consisting of State, Treasury, War, and Navy. As time went on and departments multiplied the number of such committees on executive expenditures became 11. In the 70th Congress, by a massive merger, these 11 committees became 1—the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The ancient jurisdiction of these committees included abolition of useless offices, the economy and accountability of officers, the examination of the accounts of the Departments, proper application of public moneys, enforcement of payment of money due the Government and economy and retrenchment generally.

A logical restatement of this jurisdiction is found in Rule XI placing on the Committee on Government Operations the mandate to study the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

The importance of this mandate to the Committee on Government Operations is emphasized by the fact that nowhere else is any provision made for the constant, continuing and overall scrutiny of the vast appropriated moneys of the Government.

The Bureau of the Budget winnows executive requests; the Appropriations Committee sifts the Bureau's recommendations and the General Accounting Office makes limited audits covering technical compliance. Only the Committee on Government Operations is charged with the duty of determining the economy and efficiency of the expenditure of so incomprehensible a sum as $65 billion a year.

As it is the business of the Appropriations Committee to keep a hand on the intake valve and a watchful eye on the gage measuring appropriations so is it the business of the Committee on Government Operations constantly to measure the quantity and quality of the resulting output.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, has inaugurated a new plan of committee organization designed to accomplish this purpose. He has created seven subcommittees having the identical subject matter jurisdiction as do corresponding subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. The following are the subcommittees and their chairmen:

Executive and Legislative Reorganization: Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.

Military Operations: Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.

Intergovernmental Relations: Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman.

Public Works and Resources: Hon. EARL CHUDOFF, chairman.

International Operations: Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., Chairman.

Legal and Monetary Affairs: Hon. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman.

Special Government Activities: Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman.

Thus when the Labor Department, for example, goes before a subcommittee of Appropriations on an appropriation item it will subsequently account to a similar subcommittee of Government Operations in respect to the expenditure of that item. In the meantime these two subcommittees have relations of continuing comity and cooperation on matters of common interest. The seven different subcommittees cover the entire field of executive expenditure.

This single act of legislative statesmanship promises to save many millions of the taxpayers' money. In fact, it should accomplish much more than has ever been done by either of the Hoover Commissions. In the first place the Commissions' recommendations were, at best, extralegislative and were seldom enacted. In the second place their recommendations were transitory and periodic.

The recommendations of the Committee on Government Operations have the high authority of legislative approval and the potentiality of securing respectful compliance because of the close cooperation of the Appropriations Committee. Again the recommendations of our committee are based on a surveillance that is constant and permanent and the committee always has the full use of the facilities of the General Ac-

counting Office for expert technical assistance.

A project so momentous and far reaching does not attain its full fruition overnight. It requires much planning, careful staff work, and extensive ground preparation.

An experienced staff made up of people dedicated to the public interest is being set up by the respective subcommittees. This qualified personnel is cooperating with the committees having substantive jurisdiction. The area of cooperation is unlimited and because our jurisdiction is prudential or adjective rather than substantive there are no areas of conflict.

With this work only just begun it is still possible to measure tangible results in terms of dollars saved.

Let me cite examples from our subcommittees. The failure to mention other instances does not mean that equal or greater savings are not being accomplished. In some instances disclosure would be premature and in any event the record would be too long.

The saving resulting from Congressman HOLIFIELD's Subcommittee on Military Operations may readily be projected by reading the comprehensive intermediate reports on military procurement of air navigation equipment, Federal catalog progress report, proposed disestablishment of San Pedro Naval Supply Depot, and Navy procurement of beverage base.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, under Congressman FOUNTAIN, has investigated a deal whereby the Agriculture Department, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, bought more than 80 million pounds of cheese at 37 cents a pound and agreed at the same time to sell it back to the same people a few days later at 1¾ cents to 2¾ cents a pound less. The cheese never moved from the warehouses but checks went from the Government to cheese processors and dealers in an amount of over $2 million. Congressman FOUNTAIN stated during the hearings he believed the transaction was illegal and that he intended to press for the recovery of the money. The Comptroller General of the United States in a recent letter to Congressman FOUNTAIN has stated it was his "opinion that the transactions were not premised upon bona fide purchases within the meaning of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and consequently, that payments thereunder were unauthorized and improper." Congressman FOUNTAIN has forwarded a copy of the Comptroller General's opinion on the legality of the purchase-resale transactions to the Secretary of Agriculture requesting that he be advised as to what action the Department would take.

Congressman CHUDOFF secured the revocation of an illegal automobile rental contract and disclosed irregularities in auto purchases and subsistence payments. His subcommittee is now engaged in investigating a matter of agency policy which jeopardizes $70 million of he taxpayers' money invested by he REA.

The cash returns from Congressman HARDY's study of the use of foreign currency accruing from surplus commodity sales abroad are not yet known.

Since the investigation of abuses of tax amortization certificates by Congressman MOLLOHAN there has been at least a temporary supervision of a policy which Secretary Humphrey says is currently costing the taxpayers $880 million a year.

Congressman BROOKS' subcommittee has investigated many so-called negotiated sales and leases where there has been no competitive bidding. In one instance alone where he insisted on readvertising the Laramie alumina plant, the Government received $173,000 more than it would have received had it not been advertised.

The work of Chairman DAWSON's Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, in pressing for unified procurement in the Defense Department, has not yet been completed. Assurances of cooperation have been received which, when translated into practice, will save unestimated but multiplied millions yearly.

While perhaps the greatest opportunity for the committee is in the fields just discussed it nevertheless exercises important legislative functions in considering legislation referred to it. A review of this part of the committee's work follows:

LEGISLATION

H. R. 3322, which was enacted into law as Public Law 61, was introduced by Congressman MCCORMACK and considered by a special Subcommittee on Donable Property under his chairmanship. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizes donations of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes, and this program has made an important contribution to the welfare of the American people. As a result of a regulation by the Department of Defense in February 1954 a substantial amount of surplus property valuable for educational and public-health purposes was capitalized in working capital funds. The immediate result was to make this property unavailable for donation despite the fact that it might be excess to the requirements of the Department of Defense or the stock funds. Public Law 61 is essentially a restatement of the original purpose of the Congress in making provision for donations of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes. Its most important feature is to spell out the fact that property capitalized in a working capital fund shall not be held for sale as surplus property instead of being made available as donable property for educational or public-health purposes.

Public Law 16, considered by the committee as H. R. 2576, gives the President authority to transmit reorganization plans to the Congress in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949 at any time before June 1, 1957. The authority of the President to transmit reorganization plans would have expired on April 1, 1955.

Public Law 46 was considered by the committee as H. R. 6015. For a number of years executive agencies, in the interest of economy, have been entering into reciprocal fire-protection agreements. Such agreements were made with local governmental units and public or private organizations maintaining fire-protection facilities near Federal installations. In 1952 the Comptroller General ruled that expenditures could not be made for fighting fires on non-Federal property.

Public Law 46 specifically authorizes reciprocal fire-protection agreements and ratifies and confirms existing agreements. This law immediately saved the Federal Treasury a large amount of money. Even larger economies will result in the future because of expenditures which would have been necessary in the absence of this legislation. The Departments of the Army and Navy alone would have had to make an initial expenditure of almost $6 million and an annual recurring expenditure of approximately $20 million for personnel and equipment in the absence of reciprocal fire-protection agreements.

Public Law 148 was considered by the committee as H. R. 3758. This law clarifies the effect of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and Reorganization Plan 20 of 1950. The law authorizes the General Services Administration, through the National Archives, to receive copies of agreements or compacts between the States. In doing so the law clears up the confusion which existed as to whether the Department of State or the General Services Administration is the proper depository for such records.

Public Law 189, considered by the committee as H. R. 6295, increases the maximum per diem allowance for subsistence from $9 to $12 and mileage rates for privately owned automobiles from a maximum of 7 cents per mile to 10 cents per mile. The maximum per diem allowance for employees who serve the Government without compensation was raised from $10 to $15. The law also provides that in the case of unusual circumstances the heads of agencies may prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for travel expenses may be authorized on an actual expense basis up to a maximum amount not to exceed $25 per day.

Public Law 200 was considered by the committee as H. R. 3757. This law gives authority to donate to the American National Red Cross surplus Government-owned property which was in the first instance donated to the Government by the Red Cross. Since this type of property was donated by the public for charitable purposes it was felt desirable to authorize the return of such property when it became surplus to the needs of the Federal Government.

Public Law 365 was considered by the committee as H. R. 7034. Section 1 of H. R. 7034 provides a permanent and uniform method for relief of disbursing officers by the Comptroller General. Under this legislation the Comptroller General may relieve disbursing officers of accountability when it has been determined that improper payments made were not the result of bad faith or lack of due care. Hitherto such relief was provided through private relief bills. Section 2 of H. R. 7034 authorizes reimbursement of dis-

bursing officers within the Department of Defense for payments made out of their own pockets to make up for physical losses or deficiencies of Government funds, vouchers, et cetera, when such losses occur in the line of duty and without fault or negligence on the part of the officers concerned. In this case too the legislation eliminates the need for private relief bills which have been utilized up to now to accomplish the same results. H. R. 7034 does not reduce the liability of the Government officials involved. The legislation merely changes the procedure for making desirable adjustments.

Public Law 334 was considered by the committee as H. R. 7035. This legislation does for accountable officers of the Government generally what H. R. 7034 does for disbursing officers in the Department of Defense.

Public Law 373 was considered by the committee as House Joint Resolution 330. This legislation provides a procedure for the preservation and administration by the Federal Government of the papers and other historical materials of any President or former President of the United States. House Joint Resolution 330 would enable our Presidents and former Presidents to plan for the preservation of their papers at the places of their choice in different parts of the United States. It makes possible a decentralized system of historical archives in cooperation with States, universities, institutions of higher learning, and other private institutions. This act would not only tend to assure the preservation of invaluable presidential papers but would serve to make them available to all who are interested in the history of their country.

Public Law 388 was considered by the committee as H. R. 6182. The problem of payments by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes is one of long standing. There has arisen a general feeling that temporary provision for such payments should be made in limited cases to take care of obvious inequities. Consequently, H. R. 6182 authorizes a payment in lieu of taxes on real property once held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and transferred on or after January 1, 1946, to any Government department. In such cases H. R. 6182 authorizes payments in lieu of taxes for a temporary period from January 1, 1955, to January 1, 1959. This legislation takes care of those commercial and industrial properties which had been on State and local tax rolls when they were held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but were removed from such tax rolls by accident of transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to a regular Government department or agency.

H. R. 7227, considered by the committee, was passed by the House. This legislation amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by adding another category of donable property. To date the Federal Government has appropriated approximately $241 million for civil defense, including $62 million for grants-in-aid. It was considered desirable therefore that provision be made for donation of surplus property which might be of use for civil-defense purposes. If H. R. 7227 is enacted into law, donations of surplus property may be made for civil-defense purposes as well as educational and public-health purposes. H. R. 7227 provides that the Secretary of Defense may determine, in the case of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, whether such property, not including common-use items, is peculiarly adaptable for civil defense. If such is the case, the Secretary of Defense is directed to allocate it for transfer by the General Services Administrator. In other applicable cases, including common-use items, the determination shall be made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator who is to make a like allocation to the Administrator of General Services.

There are various general statutes which authorize transfer of surplus Government-owned property to States and their political subdivisions for enumerated public purposes. Nevertheless, from time to time special situations arise which call for special consideration by the Congress. The committee has had referred to it a substantial number of bills providing for specific transfers of real property for various public or charitable purposes. Where careful consideration indicates especially meritorious circumstances affected with a definite public interest the committee has recommended to the House, and the Congress has generally enacted, specific statutes authorizing transfers of particular parcels of real property.

The committee has also held hearings on a number of other bills which require further study before final action is taken on them.

A number of bills have been referred to the committee dealing with the termination of Government competition with private enterprise. The committee obtained the views of the principal departments and agencies concerned and held a meeting to consider the pertinent bills then pending before the committee; namely, H. R. 279, H. R. 687, and H. R. 6013. H. R. 7032 and H. R. 7382, dealing with the same subject matter, have since been referred to the committee.

The Bureau of the Budget has issued Budget Circular 55–4, requiring the executive agencies to inventory and study commercial activities which may be in competition with private enterprise, and so far as possible to dispose of the same. The committee desires to study and evaluate the reports made to the Bureau of the Budget, under Circular 55–4, before acting on legislation covering the same field. Section 638 of the defense appropriation bill expresses the latest sense of Congress on the problem of termination of Government competition with private enterprise but it has been declared unconstitutional by the President. A resolution of this conflict of judgment may well be an incident to the consideration of this legislation.

Hearings were held on related bills dealing with budgetary reform, H. R. 4009, H. R. 6558, and House Joint Resolution 346. H. R. 4009 would direct the Comptroller General to make studies for the appropriations committees in connection with budget items submitted to the Congress. House Joint Resolution 346 and H. R. 6558, both introduced by Chairman CANNON of the House Committee on Appropriations, aim at a balanced budget. House Joint Resolution 346 would require the submission of a budget which did not contain estimated expenditures in excess of estimated receipts for each fiscal year. H. R. 6558 would completely overhaul the budgetary system of the Federal Government. It would create an Office of the United States Budget in the legislative branch of the Government in order to provide effective congressional control over the budget of the United States. Mr. CANNON appeared before the committee and gave it the benefit of his great experience. In view of the complexity of the problem, the committee is continuing to study ways and means of strengthening the budgetary system.

Legislation to create a Department of Civil Defense is contained in House Concurrent Resolution 108, House Joint Resolution 71, House Joint Resolution 75, and House Joint Resolution 98. One approach contemplates a civilian department of defense within the existing Department of Defense. The other envisions a separate executive department of Cabinet status. The committee has placed these measures under special study.

H. R. 1864, to create a Department of Urbiculture, has been heard by the committee. Subsequently H. R. 7731, to create a Department of Urban Affairs has been referred to the committee. This legislation brings to the attention of the Congress the problem which has emerged with the urbanization of our population. There are aspects of urban living which may well require research, and technical assistance if Federal, State, and local programs are to be properly coordinated. The committee hearing on H. R. 1864 and its subsequent study of this bill, as well as H. R. 7731, may reveal the need for legislative recognition of the new problems of urban and metropolitan areas.

A hearing was held on H. R. 6854 which aims at achieving better coordination of transportation, traffic, and public utility management services. The bill proposes to centralize responsibility for these functions in the Administrator of General Services by amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to that end. This is one of the measures stemming from the studies of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. In view of the fact that the committee is also considering that Commission's report on transportation functions and services of the Government, H. R. 6854 wil require further consideration in connection with the overall report on transportation.

REVIEW OF REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Under the rules of the House, the committee has the function of receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States. During the 1st session of the 84th Congress some 50 audit reports on the operations of Government agencies were received from the Comptroller General,

as well as a substantial number of reports made because of special investigations. The committee has placed each one of these reports under study and has held hearings in order to obtain further information in connection with some of the reports.

The committee considers that it is of primary importance to the Congress to have the investigations and reports of the Comptroller General carefully examined. To this end the committee has instituted a program of carefully evaluating the reports and recommendations of the Comptroller General and of encouraging the adoption of many of the Comptroller General's recommendations by the executive agencies. There has also been a substantially increased use by the committee of the facilities of the General Accounting Office as provided by law. There is significant evidence that the initiation of these closer working relationships between the committee and the General Accounting Office has already resulted in adding to the effectiveness of the General Accounting Office as an arm of the Congress.

REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Hoover Commission—transmitted 18 reports to the Congress dealing with various aspects of Government operations. Of these 18 reports, 13 were referred by the Speaker of the House to the committee for study.

The committee has placed each of the 13 reports referred to it under study. Hearings have been held on the following reports: Food and clothing, surplus property, lending agencies, and transportation. The committee's study of these four reports is not yet completed.

Approximately one-fifth of the total expenditures of the Commission on Organization were devoted to its study of water resources and power. The report of the Commission on this subject is one of the most massive reports ever produced by any study commission. Moreover, its recommendations so vitally affect the general welfare that the committee has established a Special Subcommittee on Water Resources and Power in order to make a thorough study of the Commission's report on water resources and power. The Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, JR., is chairman of this subcommittee.

STUDY OF REPORTS FROM THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, together with its accompanying studies, has been referred to the committee for consideration. It consists of 15 separate volumes.

A comprehensive analysis of the Commission's report has been undertaken. That part of the Commission's report which is devoted to payments in lieu of taxes has already been considered in part in connection with the hearings held on H. R. 6182 which has been passed by both House and Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS IN THE FIELD OF GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

The committee has been perturbed by the apparent tendency in the last 2 years for high Government officials to place increasing restrictions on the flow of information to the Congress, to the press, and to the public. The right of the people and their elected representatives to know what their Government is doing is basic to the maintenance of our free and democratic society. This makes it imperative that information about Government activities be available. Some restrictions are, of course, necessary in the interest of national security. But this necessity must not be used as a cloak for keeping basic and essential information from the Congress, the press, and the public.

Because of the importance of maintaining a free flow of information, the committee has organized a special study of Government organization, operations, and policies with regard to the availability of Government information. This investigation has begun under the aegis of a Special Subcommittee on Government Information with the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS as chairman.

A Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, with the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK as chairman, considered and recommended for passage the important donable property bill and the equally important bill dealing with the preservation of Presidential papers.

It is appropriate at this point to record the committee's appreciation of the contribution of the committee staff to the success of the committee's efforts. The committee is proud of the high caliber of its staff and of the excellence of their work and their devotion to their duties.

Jesuits Ask Changes in United States Immigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Religious News Service, in its news report of Monday, July 18, published a dispatch from Rome reporting that the authoritative Jesuit magazine, Civilta Catholica, had published an article stressing the need to "abrogate or at least radically rewrite the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act."

The views expressed in this article, as reported by the Religious News Service, should be of great significance to all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this dispatch from Rome, as reported by the Religious News Service, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JESUITS ASK CHANGES IN UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION ACT

ROME.—Civilta Catholica, noted Jesuit magazine published here, stressed the need to "abrogate or at least radically rewrite the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act" of the United States.

In an article discussing the American immigration law, the periodical said that it should be changed "in the name of justice and charity, not to mention the American Republic's national and international interests."

"Justice," it said, "is the condition and obligation of a sincere Christendom, and charity, its essence."

Civilta urged the American people, through their elected representatives, to repudiate bygone stereotypes and adopt an immigration policy that is more Christian and that conforms to the democratic principles on which the country was founded.

Wisconsin's Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address made by me.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN'S OPPORTUNITIES

I am glad to report to you, through the courtesy of this station, on the great opportunities awaiting our State.

During this next quarter hour, I am going to answer a series of questions about the future of Wisconsin, as affected by developments in our Nation's Capital.

I am going to talk to you about matters of interest to you as an individual, and matters affecting your community and mine. That means Wisconsin roads, Wisconsin airports, and Wisconsin health; it means housing, fair taxes, old-age pensions, a worthwhile return for farming, and a wide variety of other necessary actions. Yes, it means peace for us and for our children.

I hope that you will enjoy this report, and I hope, too, that you will give me the benefit of your reactions to it.

AIRBASE IN KANSASVILLE

Question. First off, Senator WILEY, regarding Wisconsin's facilities itself, what are some of the major developments affecting the Badger State that you have been working on during the 1st session of the 84th Congress?

Answer. Perhaps the most important item was the completion of legislative action for the building of the new $16½ million jet airbase at Kansasville, in Kenosha and Racine Counties.

This Air Defense Command Base, will be located around 25 miles southwest of Milwaukee. It will cover around 4,000 acres. It will be named in honor of Wisconsin's Medal of Honor winner, the late Maj. Richard Ira Bong—a naming which I personally suggested in honor of this great hero.

This airbase, in Dick's honor, like the Nike-guided missile sites around Milwaukee—are necessary steps for the defense of our beloved country against possible enemy attack in this atomic age.

Question. Speaking of aviation, I know that Congress, too, has passed a major new Federal Aid to Airport Act, has it not, Senator?

Answer. That is right. Funds have been allocated for expansion of Wisconsin's and all America's airport system. And Wisconsin, will of course, gets its fair share of such funds.

Right now, airports all over our State could stand modernization and improvement. And we could stand new airports for many smaller cities which are not now served at all by airplanes. Modest-sized airports with small runways are now feasible; they can carry considerable passengers and cargo.

POPULATION INCREASE

Question. You look forward to a great increase in air traffic, don't you Senator?

Answer. That's right. In terms of future population alone, this great country of ours will number 225 million souls by 1975—just 20 years from now.

Four million babies are being born this year, and that means lots more mouths to feed and healthy babies to clothe over and above our present 165 million population.

Question. And for those 4 million babies, I know you feel that world peace must be our greatest goal?

Answer. Absolutely. No thinking person wants war, particularly an A-bomb—H-bomb war. Fortunately, thanks to the great leadership of President Eisenhower, we've made much progress toward peace. But we certainly dare not let our guard down or fall asleep.

CONNECTING CHANNELS ESSENTIAL

Question. We have looked at our population, at the problem of peace and at our peacetime and military airports. Now, how about water transportation, Senator?

Answer. Well, that brings up, of course, the vital issue of the Great Lakes connecting channels.

I am urging the United States Bureau of the Budget to set aside a million and a half dollars of engineering funds, commencing in January 1956. This will be to plan for the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels, west of Lake Erie. Once these engineering blueprints are prepared, final construction can begin. Then, the entire 2,300-mile Great Lakes Waterway will have become a reality.

Incidentally, in October, at Marquette University, it will be my pleasure to participate in a seaway conference.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

Question. We have looked at aviation and water, how about land transportation, Senator?

Answer. Well, unfortunately, the necessary bill for the President's highway improvement program didn't pass the Congress in the first session. The bill will have to come up next year.

This highway bill is tremendously important, becuase good roads mean highway safety. They mean low cost of transporting farm products, a healthy tourist industry, in addition to many cther advantages.

Fortunately, in spite of the delay on the new highway bill, work will continue on certain key Wisconsin highways.

Right now, Wisconsin receives around $20 million a year in Federal funds for all highway work. Around 452 miles of the Federal-State system of highways is in Wisconsin. Uncle Sam provides 60 percent of the funds for these vital roads, and the State of Wisconsin provides 40 percent.

Meanwhile, work on the rebuilding of Highway 41, south of Milwaukee to the Illinois border, and Highway 12, west to Eau Claire to Minnesota, will continue.

Question. Senator WILEY, you have referred to the highway bill as one of the major unfinished tasks of the Congress; would you tell us what other major subjects Congress is going to give its attention to when it starts its next session?

TAX REFORM

Answer. I am glad to do that, because there are quite a few bills which Congress is going to have to concentrate on. Let me list a few of them:

First, the time is overdue to take another look at heavy Federal taxes and the need for tax reform in general, in the light of modern conditions and changes.

Second, Congress must pass a bill widening social security and liberalizing its benefits. That means, for example, bringing lawyers, doctors, dentists, and other now-excluded professional people under Federal social security.

It means providing humanitarian aid to the totally and permanently disabled. It means lowering the age of eligibility for women. Thus, they could receive pensions at 60 years, instead of waiting the long years until 65. This liberal change is exactly what I have proposed in one of the bills that I personally have offered.

HELP THE FARMER

Question. What would you say is another major task for the new Congress?

Answer. Another task is to take a brand-new look at the farm-parity picture. As we all know, regrettably, Wisconsin milk checks have gone down and the farmer is in trouble.

With lowered farm purchasing power, the farmer can't buy the goods which the workers in the cities are manufacturing. The result is hardship all along the line. Obviously, therefore, the farmer must receive his cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Whatever level of parity support is necessary to do justice by the farmer should be set—whatever level in the vicinity of 90 percent. Why? Because if the farmer is damaged by inadequate income, the rest of the Nation is in turn quickly harmed. Purchasing power tends then to drop everywhere.

VETERANS' SURVIVORS BILL

Question. Well, that covers social security and farming. How about other major tasks for the new Congress? What about veterans' legislation, for example?

Answer. There is an extremely important bill, affecting our 18 million veterans, their survivors and dependents, known as the Hardy survivors' benefits bill.

It has been passed by the House of Representatives, but not yet approved by the Senate.

This bill should be very closely studied and improved. Then a version of it should be enacted into law, so as to modernize and liberalize the program of looking after those who fought for our Nation on the field of battle, as well as their dependents and widows.

Question. Social security, farming, veterans' rights. What other major bills await Congress' attention next year, Senator WILEY?

HOOVER BILLS

Answer. Well, we have got to enact more of the Hoover Commission recommendations. These Hoover reports will save the taxpayer very considerable sums of money. They will result in greater efficiency and economy in Government. I personally have offered several Hoover Commission bills. I am particularly in favor of the Hoover Commission recommendation for getting the Federal Government out—I emphasize "out"—of certain businesses which it has been operating in unfair competition with private enterprise.

Then, turning to another subject, Congress should pass juvenile delinquency control legislation. I personally have offered a bill to help reduce the staggering rate of crime among our Nation's youngsters.

Third, Congress should resist attacks against our national forests, against parks and wildlife refuges. Instead, we must preserve the great outdoor heritage of our people—the great heritage of field and stream.

Question. Senator, you have listed a great many issues where you are seeking constructive action, and you've just touched upon a possible danger—attacks against conservation. Are there other particular issues where you feel Congress should kill unworthy bills?

FIGHT GAS INCREASE BILL

Answer. Yes, very definitely. The principal example is the dangerous natural gas increase bill.

If that bill passes the Senate next year, as it has already passed the House, we, of Wisconsin will be paying, over the long run, literally millions of dollars more for natural gas in our homes and factories.

This increase bill would unwisely destroy Federal controls over natural gas. The result would be to leave the consumer helpless and at the mercy of a few monopolistic companies. And so I will continue my fight against this bill, which would do so much harm to the consumers of Wisconsin.

TOURING WISCONSIN

Question. Well, I know, Senator WILEY, that in the weeks and months up ahead you have a vast number of speaking engagements all over Wisconsin, and you have referred to one of them at Marquette University.

Answer. That is right.

During Congress' recess, I will be visiting many areas of our State, talking to folks, getting their opinions, addressing their organizations. In addition, I will be participating in the work of various congressional committees, because, as you know, the work of the Congress does not stop when Congress recesses. Our committees continue right on with their regular jobs—12 months a year; and that is as it should be. Committees are investigating monopoly, for example. They are investigating the dope traffic problem, the Communist problem, and other issues affecting America.

Question. Senator WILEY, earlier in the broadcast you referred to the problem of farmers.

We have just a few moments now before leaving the air. Could you tell us some other things which you think ought to be done for the purpose of making sure that Wisconsin agriculture remains in a healthy condition?

SEVERAL-POINT DAIRY PROGRAM

Answer. I am glad to do so. I have set up a dairy program with several points, and I will just list a few of the points now.

First of all is this matter of fair farm parity return, to which I have already referred.

Next, we must expand the Wisconsin school milk program, such as I have proposed in a bill in this Congress.

Third, expand the number of dairy automatic vending machines. These machines dispense cartons or cups of milk in factories, schools, theaters, and other public places. They're a great help in increasing the drinking of milk.

Fourth, enact the Wiley bill for a dairy research laboratory at Madison. This laboratory would help find new byproducts of milk and new uses for its components.

Fifth, continue and intensify research into livestock diseases like brucellosis and bovine tuberculosis, as well as diseases of crops which impair the farmer's purchasing power.

Sixth, encourage Americans to increase their personal consumption of milk, butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids.

Seventh, study the problem of lowering milk distribution costs. That means narrowing the difference in the price spread—the difference of 14 or 15 cents—between what the farmer gets at the farm and what the consumer pays for his milk in the city. Right now, the farmer is only getting around one-third of what the consumer is paying for the milk.

These, then, are just a few points in an overall farm program. Remember, they are not designed to give any special preference or favoritism, but merely to provide justice

for the farmer—for the one-seventh of all Americans who live on our farms—22 million Americans in all.

CONCLUSION

Question. Senator WILEY, you have referred to a great many issues of deepest interest to Wisconsin.

You have referred to Wisconsin airports, highway and water transportation, to conservation, fair taxes, the social-security problem, the veterans' pension problem.

You have pointed up your several-point program for Wisconsin farmers. You have discussed your continued opposition to arbitrary increases in natural gas rates.

I know that your listeners have enjoyed this broadcast, as I have in participating with you in it.

Answer. Thanks very much. It has been a real pleasure, through the courtesy of this station, to report to you.

I hope that you will be listening in later on when I deliver other addresses over this station.

Thanks very much for your attention, and good luck to you all.

This is your Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 84th Congress With Respect to Nationality Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the 1st session of the 84th Congress is about to come to a close. Many observations and summaries of the work of this Congress have been made. I have prepared an analysis of the achievements of the past Congress with respect to the interests of the nationality groups of this country. I have summarized both the accomplishments and the failures.

We can be proud of the accomplishments but we should be determined to remedy the failures in the next session.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared on this matter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 84TH CONGRESS ADDRESSED ESPECIALLY TO NATIONALITY INTERESTS

The recently concluded 1st session of the 84th Congress was remarkable for its accomplishments in the field of foreign relations. In this field the Congress showed a leadership which usually is vested in the President. In the absence of Presidential leadership, however, the Congress filled the vacuum and pointed the way to the achievement of substantial gains in regard to our relations with the other countries of the world.

There were, however, failures, too, both on the part of Congress and on the part of the Eisenhower administration.

The accomplishments were mainly in the direction of relaxing the tensions which have gathered in world affairs and of capitalizing at last on the gains for which the Truman-Acheson foreign policy of 1947–53 had laid the groundwork.

A treaty was at long last arrived at with Austria, and preparations made for the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country. The way is now clear for insisting that Soviet troops be withdrawn also from Rumania and Bulgaria, since the excuse for maintaining Soviet troops in those countries was for the purpose of maintaining a line of communication between Soviet Russia and Soviet occupation forces in Austria. This latter possibility, however, is without substantial significance since Bulgaria and Rumania remain securely pinioned behind the Iron Curtain.

A defense agreement was reached among the countries of Western Europe and the Federal Republic of Western Germany, firmly integrating Germany into Western Europe and making possible a German contribution to the defense of Western Europe. For the first time in this century an accommodation of relations between France and Germany has been achieved.

Authorization for the continuation of the reciprocal trade program was continued in the recent session of Congress, thus extending the possibility of decreasing barriers to world trade.

Authorizations and appropriations for foreign military and economic aid were again enacted.

Above all, however, the chief contribution of the recent session of Congress was in the support and leadership it gave for the steps leading to a relaxation of world tensions. The Geneva meeting at the summit was made possible—indeed it was originally suggested and advocated—by Senator WALTER GEORGE, the Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Democratic Congress not only gave unified support to the Big Four meeting and to the negotiations which ensued at Geneva, but effectively rebuked and forestalled the attempts of die-hard Republican neoisolationists to impede and jettison the Geneva Conference.

Democratic leadership successfully reversed the go-it-alone policy in Asia and overcame the effects of the phony unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek in January 1953.

The military strength of the United States was maintained in the face of administration recommendations for drastic cuts in our Armed Forces, including a proposed 10 percent cut in the strength of the Marine Corps. That proposed cut was rejected by the Democratic Congress.

The Democratic leadership in the Congress bottled up the Bricker amendment, designed to cripple and hamstring the President in his conduct of foreign affairs—unlike the Republican leadership in the previous Congress which allowed this proposal to come to a vote in 1954. On that occasion, the Bricker proposal was defeated by a bare one-vote margin. It is to be recalled that the Republican leader of the Senate, Senator KNOWLAND, voted for this incredible proposal.

The Democratic Congress went on record, in approving the McCormack resolution (introduced by Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, the majority leader in the House), in favor of independence and freedom for dependent and enslaved peoples.

Among the failures of the recent session of Congress—and most of these failures can be ascribed to the negative attitude of the administration and the obstructive tactics of a preponderant majority of Republicans—were:

1. The failure to ratify the Genocide Convention.

2. The failure to ratify the Human Rights Covenant.

3. The failure to amend the Refugee Relief Act.

4. The failure to amend the McCarran-Walter Act.

There were other failures, too, but the failures cited above were the most outstanding. These failures must be remedied in the next session. Only an aroused public opinion, indicating wholehearted support for prompt and effective action in these matters, will insure results.

Report on the Accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 1st Session, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, this has been one of the busiest sessions for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its history and the preparations we have made for continuing our work in the 2d session of the 84th Congress indicate that it is going to be an even busier and more important year.

The committee has jurisdiction over some of the biggest and most important industries in the Nation—communications, aviation, all land transportation, merchant marine and fisheries, and natural gas, and in each of these fields it conducted intensive hearings or investigations or initiated legislation.

To show at a glance what our committee has accomplished during the year, from the legislative standpoint, here is a table showing what we have done:

Number of Senate and House bills, resolutions, and amendments referred to committee	155
Number of bills reported by committee	46
Number of bills passed by Senate	43
Number of Senate bills pending in House committees	13
Number of Senate bills reported by House committee	20
Number of Senate bills passed House	21
Number of bills signed by President	23
Number of routine nominations referred to committee	572
Number of routine nominations confirmed	545
Number of major nominations referred to committee and confirmed	14
Number of executive meetings of full committee	18
Communications Subcommittee	1
Surface Transportation Subcommittee	2
Aviation Subcommittee	3
Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee	1
Automobile marketing	2
Total	27

Number of days of open hearings of full committee	21
Communications Subcommittee	2
Surface Transportation Subcommittee	4
Aviation Subcommittee	13
Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee	7
Payne subcommittee on S. 2060	1
Air Agreement Subcommittee	1
Freight car shortage	2
Total	51

In addition to work on these bills, we held long hearings on the bill amending the Natural Gas Act; on bills revising laws governing aviation; on multiple communications problems including television; on the necessity of providing quickly a second airport for Washington; on the trip-lease bill; on international air agreements; on the regulation of fish nets in Alaskan waters; on merchant marine bills; amendments to the Federal Airport Act and hearings on the Pacific coast tuna problems.

The committee reached no conclusion on the omnibus aviation bill before the committee and decided it would be better to postpone any decision until the next session when we may hold additional hearings.

The comunications problems are serious and our staff has been studying them intensively. In addition, we called in the outstanding manufacturers of television and radio sets in the country and discussed with them the acute problem raised by the use of VHF television and UHF television. We suggested that if the manufacturers would produce all-channels sets it would solve much of the problem facing the television industry today. The situation now is that of some 35 million television sets owned by viewers of this country, 5 million of them are UHF sets that cannot receive VHF signals and 30 million of them are VHF sets that cannot receive UHF signals. It is a tremendous investment our citizens have made—billions of dollars—and if we can alleviate the trouble no effort should be spared to do so.

Some manufacturers already have put on the market television sets than can be equipped at a small additional charge to receive both VHF and UHF signals and the older sets can be so converted at a small expense.

We also urged enactment of a bill to eliminate the excise tax on all-channel sets to encourage the manufacturers to produce them. This would about equalize the cost to the viewer with that of the UHF and VHF sets.

Carrying our study of television further, we have set up a voluntary ad hoc committee of the outstanding television and radio engineers in the country and they are studying means of making more room on the spectrum so that more VHF channels may be placed at the disposal of our people.

We are endeavoring, in our studies which will be pursued during the recess, to find a means of bringing television service to every part of the Nation and to the small communities which have had to resort to costly experiments in reflector stations and community-circuit television under which a signal is picked up from a distant station by an antenna usually at some high spot and redelivered to homes by cable. There are some 400 such services in this country that serve 300,000 homes who have an approximate investment of $25 million.

The Federal Communications Commission recently approved construction of low-powered broadcasting TV stations and this may result in bringing television to a wider audience and to smaller communities.

The Federal Communications Commission is also studying the proposals for pay-as-you-see television and a decision may be reached on this important subject next year.

In our studies of aviation, a point that stood out was the handling of our international air agreements. Our attention was attracted to this by the action of the Department of State and the Civil Aeronautics Board in agreeing to the International Air Agreement with the Republic of West Germany. Our committee was shocked to find that the two agencies had agreed to give the Germans permission to fly to Boston, New York, and Philadelphia and beyond. "Beyond," we learned, meant they could fly over our territory to Central America and South America and over the circle to Los Angeles and San Francisco and to other choice markets. Giving the Germans that right, we found, would be detrimental to our own lines who protested the action vigorously. Our airline officials had not been allowed to participate in the negotiations with the Germans and did not learn of the details until after the agreement was ready for signing.

At our insistence the signing was held up to give our airlines a hearing on their objections but 2 weeks after the hearings we were notified the agreement was being signed that day and was unchanged from its original form. The committee decided that Congress should know how international air agreements were reached, what privileges were granted the foreign airlines, and what this country received in return. Senator SMATHERS, chairman of our special subcommittee, is conducting our investigation into the international air agreements.

We initiated and the bill has been signed by the President to grant permanent certification to local or feeder airlines.

You know, of course, that we revived the Federal Airport Act and passed a bill granting $63 million a year for 4 years for construction, repair, and remodeling of airports throughout the Nation, which has been signed by the President.

In the aviation field we got extended for 5 years, until 1960, the Prototype Aircraft Act, which will provide Federal assistance in the development of prototype craft. We felt that Federal assistance is needed now in the development of air transports.

Our committee also took an interest in the wiretapping scandals divulged in New York, but decided to postpone action until investigations started by others were concluded.

We also approved bills for construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship and a bill for putting nuclear power into a presently constructed hull. We referred both bills to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Our staff, following requests of a year ago, has investigated all phases of automobile marketing, including the so-called bootlegging of automobiles. That investigation is going on and our staff is watching closely the sales that will be made in August and September, the time of the year that brings the greatest pressure on the automobile dealers. It has prepared a survey of the "phantom" freight rates charged the dealers and the customers.

We held hearings on the lag of construction of tankers authorized by the last Congress and only recently, after hearings we had called, the Navy accepted bids for the lease of 8 of 15 tankers that are authorized for construction by private builders and to be leased to the Navy for 10 years. We have not completed our investigation into the terms of the leases but intend to see that the construction of the vessels is speeded up.

Our committee protested the practice of the Military Sea Transportation Service in competing with commercial American-flag vessels in carrying passengers and cargo. The Hoover report, stating that the MSTS should stop the competition, was about the same sort of protest that members of our committee have made. We believe the Department of Defense can correct much of the competition through administrative action. However, if it does not, we will have to hold hearings and report legislation in the next session that will curb the Department's activities in its transportation policy.

Lately the committee has had to step into the problem of the Japanese dumping Japanese-caught frozen and fresh tuna on our west coast where the practice threatens the very existence of our fishing fleet. We have insisted the State Department take immediate action to alleviate the threat to our tuna fishing fleet and look forward to a positive program in a few weeks.

We have also protested the Department of Defense practice of setting up on the Pacific coast maintenance and repair shops for Government ships which take that work away from commercial shipyards in the area.

The shortage of boxcars for hauling our harvests is being felt acutely in parts of the country and is going to become worse as the season advances. We were deeply concerned and sought to find a means of alleviating the situation but the answer is that there are just not enough such cars to meet the demand during harvest.

We have received promise from the railroads they will expedite the unloading and return of cars to their original areas and that they will step up the repair of boxcars in their shops. This will be helpful but will not solve the problem which has been with us every year during harvest time and will continue to plague the American farmers until sufficient such cars are constructed.

Our committee also participated in preventing the scuttling of the 50–50 law which requires that half of foreign-aid shipments move on American-flag vessels. That action prevented writing into the foreign aid and Commodity Credit disposal programs provisions setting aside the 50–50 law which has been of such great help to our American-flag vessels.

Bishop Zuroweste Tells Editors They Must Influence Souls in Catholic Thought and Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, recently, the Catholic Press Association held its annual national meeting in Buffalo, N. Y. My attention has been called to the keynote address delivered on that occasion by the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste, of Belleville, Ill., assistant episcopal chairman for the press of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

A report of Bishop Zuroweste's speech appeared in a recent issue of the Illinois Catholic Messenger.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISHOP ZUROWESTE TELLS EDITORS THEY MUST INFLUENCE SOULS IN CATHOLIC THOUGHT, ACTION

BUFFALO.—The Catholic press was called upon here to extend its influence in the life

of the Nation, and three specific suggestions to this end were made to its editors and publishers.

Some 250 delegates from all parts of the United States and Canada, and visitors from New Zealand and the Philippines heard a bishop who had been a Catholic editor himself say:

"Your primary concern should be not only to reach souls but to influence souls in Catholic thought and Catholic action. It is not large numbers of subscribers which you need now, but readers whose lives are directed along the right way, the way of faith, because they read your product."

Delivering the keynote address at the 45th annual Catholic Press Association convention, Bishop Albert R. Zuroweste, of Belleville, Ill., told the Catholic journalists that they should:

1. Explain and defend the Catholic educational system.

2. Promote the instructions of the Holy Father regarding modesty in fashions, in motion pictures, and in entertainment in general.

3. Help to produce lay leaders by influencing readers in the proper approach to present-day Catholic porblems.

Bishop Zuroweste, who is assistant episcopal chairman of the press department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, spoke at the end of a day which saw a half score of separate meetings discuss problems confronting Catholic newspapers and magazines in this country and Canada.

The complete text of the bishop's address follows:

"In the absence of Bishop Gorman, Episcopal chairman of the press department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, whom I have the honor to represent tonight, I bring you the greetings and blessings of the bishops of the United States. The hierarchy of America is appreciative of the labors and zeal of the members of the Catholic Press Association.

"We are honored in the welcome extended to us by Bishop Burke, the beloved shepherd of this diocese, and we are indebted to Monsignor McPherson, the staff of the Victorian, and the entire local committee for their generous hospitality.

"Each year the members of the Catholic Press Association convene to consider the progress of the Catholic press, its current problems, and to study seriously ways and means of improving their product. Men and women, both cleric and lay, dedicated to the cause of the Catholic press, welcome this opportunity for discussion and are the first to admit there is always room for improvement. It is our hope that you will be inspired by the example of your fellow laborers and more firmly convinced that you are engaged in one of the most important apostolates of the church. Yours is a tremendous task, the producing of a Catholic paper or magazine geared to the needs of the moment.

"It is not necessary on this occasion to reemphasize the essential role of the Catholic press in the defense of the church today. The holy fathers, especially since the time of Leo XIII, have spoken plainly on this subject and have repeatedly stressed the importance of a strong and active Catholic press.

"The late Dr. Waldemar Gurian, former Notre Dame professor and international scholar, summarized the present duties of all engaged in the apostolate of the Catholic press when he characterized the Catholic publicist as one who tries to serve 'not just as a technical, day-to-day journalist, but as one who comprehends, clarifies, and influences his time.' Further, he stated: 'The Catholic journalist can no longer, as in the 19th century, be satisfied with a defensive position. * * * Mere defensive activity, confined to protecting the church by influencing public opinion, proves ineffective, however necessary it may be.'

"Since many of our diocesan papers have practically 100-percent coverage in their diocese, the potential for spreading truth and influencing Catholic thought is truly tremendous. Yet, I wonder if we are comprehending, clarifying, and influencing our times, I propose a few pertinent problems for your serious consideration.

"Today a field in which Catholic papers, magazines, and periodicals have a most important work to perform is the legislative one. Legislation introduced in local and State lawmaking bodies which is prejudicial to the rights of Catholics, in most instances is the result of bigotry founded on ignorance. Certain groups and organizations united to propagate the philosophy of separation of church and state have succeeded in building up fear in the minds of man. Laws or amendments to existing laws proposed for the benefit of Catholic children immediately are seized upon as a pretext to shout from the press, radio, and television that our American Constitution and Bill of Rights are being attacked. Writers and commentators wall loud and long that Catholics are endeavoring to divide the country, attempting to destroy religious freedom. These and many other false charges have filled the air in recent months. Fair and just legislation in behalf of Catholic children has been defeated in some States because legislators were influenced by anti-Catholic propaganda and lies. They were afraid because they were ignorant of the truth.

"The strength of the Catholic church is in its religious education system and today this system is the object of attacks from all sides. In 1952 Archbishop Noll said: 'The best thing we have in this country is our parish school system staffed by devoted religious men and women, yet 120 million non-Catholics have been led to believe that it is inefficient, divisive of our citizenry.' These words ring with more truth today than in 1952. And yet what have we done about it? Has there been a concerted effort on your part to give the true picture of Catholic education in this country?

"The Catholic press has a most important mission to explain and defend our education system. In this pressing problem the voice of the Catholic press must be heard also by the non-Catholic. The non-Catholic should be reached through the distribution of Catholic literature that will enlighten him and give him complete and exact information on this subject. Catholic laymen should be encouraged to subscribe to Catholic publications and send them to lawmakers, educators, and influential people in the community. If such interested laymen are not forthcoming, then Catholic publishers should undertake this mission themselves. This mission cannot be successful, however, unless Catholic publications breathe the spirit of Catholic doctrine and diffuse it in a clear, concise, and inteligent manner.

"Sometimes we wonder if the Catholic press is making even the Catholic aware of the blessings of our Catholic schools. Many Catholics are subjectively accepting many of the philosophies and theories of public education and public educators. We must beg our Catholic parents to provide Catholic higher education for their children while the opposite attitude should prevail. Catholic parents should be pleading with us to give more opportunity for Catholic higher education. The Catholic press can and should speak out logically, convincingly, and specifically on this point. We have nothing for which to apologize in our education system and the Catholic press need never compromise for one moment in expounding Catholic education and truth.

"Another problem that should be our concern is the failure of Catholic leaders to obtain an audience and make their voices heard above the din of confusion today. If one considers fashions, the movies, or the entertainment world in general, we find that little attention or heed is given to the Catholic voice or to the Catholic press. The shame of it all is that our own Catholic people seem unaware that the church has spoken on these matters. While many observe the legion of decency code, there are many, many more who completely ignore its recommendations. The trend of modern fashion to immodesty and violation of moral virtues is as prevalent among the Catholics as those who do not profess the faith. Not too long ago His Holiness, Pius XII, called attention of Catholics throughout the world regarding indecent attire and implored a return to Christian moral standards in dress. In spite of this, there still is prevalent a general disregard for the virtue of modesty. Catholic editors have an obligation to promote these instructions of the Holy Father and to exercise the greatest prudence when accepting advertisements for their papers and magazines. We cannot put the dollar above moral principles and virtues.

"Another question that should disturb us is the lack of Catholic lay leadership in the professional and college-educated group. True, there are some college graduates who are outstanding but they are the exception. Failure to produce Catholic leaders is a natural consequence of the materialistic philosophy of today which holds that man must attain a superabundance of this world's goods and not be burdened with spiritual and eternal things. There is a complete lack of the spirit of faith.

"The failure of Catholic college graduates to be of service to the church gives at least a semblance of truth to the oft-repeated statement that the church does not receive a fair return on its investment in Catholic education. Can you say as Catholic editors that the Catholic press serves the Catholic college graduate? Does it appeal to him? Much of this lackadaisical attitude toward the church and its program could be remedied if you strove constantly and courageously to influence your readers in the proper approach to present day Catholic problems.

"At the international congress of the international union of the Catholic press, held in 1954, the Holy Father in recommending personal virtues to the members said: 'The achievement of true service to the church must be consistently inspired by a lively faith.' The lack of this spirit of faith is the capital sin of society today. Its results are evident in the lives and conduct of Catholics everywhere. The spirit of faith shows us things as they are, in their true light and perspective, indeed as God Himself sees them. We are not forgetting for a moment that faith is one of the theological virtues when we emphasize that your obligation as Catholic writers is to present all things in the light of this faith and that this lively faith must ever be the source of your inspiration. Any other motive is unworthy of a Catholic editor or writer.

"While the Catholic press cannot be a book or a series of sermons, it nevertheless must teach Catholic doctrine and explain Catholic practice. Even in the human interest stories there must ever be the awareness of Catholic thought, Catholic faith.

"We realize that yours is a difficult task. Competing with over 1,780 daily newspapers that have combined daily circulation of more than 54 million copies, Catholic editors and writers must break through mountains of misinformation, propaganda, lies, and opposition to expound Catholic faith and morals. While the task may seem insurmountable, it is worth your best effort in every edition of your paper or magazine. If the spirit of lively faith penetrates more thoroughly and completely into the lives of both Catholic and non-Catholic, the results will astonish even the most optimistic.

"Recently I read in a Catholic Press Month article that the Catholic press is primarily interested in reaching more and more souls. I believe that your primary concern should be not only to reach souls but to influence souls in Catholic thought and Catholic action. It is not large numbers of subscribers which you need now, but readers whose lives are directed along the right way, the way of faith, because they read your product. While advertising campaigns and advertising copy are essential to a successful Catholic paper, you must spend yourselves with greater generosity in advertising the Catholic Church. Again I insist that the Catholic press must keep our Catholic people aware of current problems and give them the church's answer to these problems. It is well for you to remember that the work of the Catholic editor is a task which complements the work of the clergy of Christ.

"Yours is a special privilege to be called to labor in the Catholic press. You constitute the eyes, the ears, and the voice of the church. Too often we take you and your work for granted. And yet if we were deprived of your service, the loss would be tragic. We appreciate your spirit of loyalty to Holy Mother the church, to the Holy Father, and to the hierarchy. We are aware that each day brings a new challenge because each day reveals a new attack upon the church. There is no time when you can relax your vigilance because the enemy never sleeps. And yet the Catholic press offers a romance, an adventure that has its own reward. It is that unexplainable something that thrills the soul, invigorates the mind, and excites the will to give heroic service in the cause of truth and the divine depository of truth, the Catholic Church."

Proportional Representation (P. R.) in the Election of the President of the United States—No. 1 of a Series of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 1 in a series of seven statements on proportional representation in the election of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, statement No. 1 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No one thing in our constitutional and political system is more important than the principle of representation underlying the election of the President of the United States.

Senate Joint Resolution 31, widely known as the Lodge-Gossett amendment, proposes a constitutional amendment which would introduce a new method of electing the President on a principle of representation foreign to the Constitution and to the American political system. This principle is known as proportional representation and is commonly referred to by its friends and enemies as PR. This amendment has an interesting history which began long before Messrs. Lodge and Gossett came to the Congress or became associated with the proposal.

In 1937 the National Home Library Foundation in Washington, D. C., published a small book under the title "Proportional Representation: The Key to Democracy," by George H. Hallett, Jr. In the author's preface, Dr. Hallett writes:

"Some years ago I had the privilege of collaborating with C. G. Hoag, of Haverford, Pa., who is the real father of proportional representation in the United States, in a more comprehensive treatment of this same subject, published by the Macmillan Co. in 1926 under the title 'Proportional Representation'."

The first six chapters of Dr. Hallett's little book are devoted to the explanation of proportional representation and to a description of its use in various cities in the United States and foreign countries. Chapter VII is titled "How the Plan Should Be Used." Among the uses urged are:

Proportional representation for municipal councils.

Proportional representation for school boards.

Proportional representation for counties.

Proportional representation for legislatures.

Proportional representation for Congress.

Proportional representation for presidential elections.

On the last subject, proportional representation for presidential elections, Dr. Hallett writes:

"In theory there is no good reason why the principles of the single-house legislature and an executive appointed by it should not be applied even to our National Government when the National House of Representatives is made really representative. But any such development seems remote."

Then, Dr. Hallet continues:

"Congressman Clarence F. Lea, of California, is urging an amendment to the United States Constitution which would leave each State with its present number of electoral votes, but would divide them among the candidates in proportion to their popular votes. * * * For the choosing of presidential electors, of course, this simple arithmetical apportionment is quite as good as proportional representation with the transferable vote would be, for the electors are mere automatons. * * *

"Fortunately, the Lea amendment is a real possibility for the immediate future. In the 1933–34 session of Congress it was reported from committee unanimously, though it was prevented from coming to a vote by the pressure of other matters. President Roosevelt let it be known at that time that he was for it."

In his conclusion, Dr. Hallett writes:

"To sum up, proportional representation can be applied with great profit to all elected bodies whose business it is to make decisions on behalf of the voters. Its heartening victories so far should be only the beginning of a great nationwide adoption."

The earlier work referred to, Proportional Representation, by Clarence Gilbert Hoag and George H. Hallett, Jr., had been published by the Macmillan Co., 11 years earlier, in 1926. On page 325 of this work is set forth a draft of a constitutiondl amendment, which with certain modifications is now on the Senate Calendar as Senate Joint Resolution 31.

Proportional Representation was published 14 months before Representative Clarence F. Lea, of California, introduced in the 1st session of the 70th Congress (January 25, 1928), House Joint Resolution 181, which proposed a constitutional amendment to apply the proportional principle to the electoral votes in each State for President and Vice President.

Proportional Representation (P. R.) in the Election of the President of the United States—No. 2 of a Series of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 2 in a series of seven statements on proportional representation in the election of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, statement No. 2 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 31, now on the Senate Calendar, proposes to change by constitutional amendment the principles of representation of the executive branch of the Government of the United States.

This brief insertion, No. 2 in a series of seven, is from the Proportional Representation Review of April 1928, quarterly of the Proportional Representation League, and is titled "The Principle of Proportional Representation for Presidential Elections." The descriptive part of that article follows:

"THE PRINCIPLE OF PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

"A constitutional amendment proposed by Congressman Lea

"On January 25, Hon. Clarence F. Lea, of Santa Rosa, Democratic Congressman from the First District of California, introduced a constitutional amendment[1] to apply the proportional principle to the electoral votes of each State in the election of the President and Vice President.

"Under the provisions of the amendment—

"1. The electoral college is abolished.

"2. Each State retains a number of electoral votes for President and for Vice President equal to the number of its Representatives and Senators in Congress.

"3. Each voter votes directly for his favorite candidate for President and his favorite candidate for Vice President.

"4. The electoral votes of each State in the choice of President and in the choice of Vice President are divided among all the candidates in proportion to the popular votes cast for them within the State.

"5. The candidates receiving most electoral votes for President and Vice President are elected.

"Except in its provision for a plurality decision in case there is no absolute majority, this amendment is the same in principle as the one advocated in the Proportional Representation Review for July 1920 and July and October 1924, and in Proportional Representation by Hoag and Hallett (pp. 320 to 328).[2] It does not provide complete equality of voting power by doing away entirely with electoral votes by States (for the very good practical reason that such a change

[1] H. J. Res. 181.

[2] This amendment differed from Mr. Lea's in allowing the decision to go into Congress in case no candidate has a majority, as provided in the Constitution at present, making more equitable provisions than the present ones, however, to govern the congressional decision.

would have little chance of ratification by the small States, which now have more than their share of the electoral college), but it does have advantages over the present system which are of the most fundamental and far-reaching importance. Some of these advantages may be summarized as follows:

"1. It would make the vote of every voter count for his favorite presidential candidate whether he votes with the majority in his State or not. At the present time a Republican vote in Texas or a Democratic vote in Pennsylvania—or a hundred thousand of them for that matter—has no effect on the result, for all the electoral votes of the State are credited to the candidate of the majority. The proposed amendment would divide the electoral votes of each State among all the candidates in proportion to their popular votes and so make every vote count.

"2. It would thus stimulate voting and contribute to the political education of the electorate. When no one except a member of the locally dominant party can hope to accomplish anything by voting, it is not surprising that only half of the qualified voters register their votes and campaigning is largely confined to a few doubtful States.

"3. It would make the best qualified candidates of all parties politically available for nomination regardless of their places of residence. Under the present system a candidate who does not live in one of the few large doubtful States is not politically available because it is the polling of most votes in those States rather than of most votes in the whole country that decides the election. In the last 12 presidential elections the Republican and Democratic Parties have nominated for President or Vice President 30 citizens of New York, Indiana, and Ohio, and only 18 from all the rest of the country together.

"4. It would make a reversal of the popular verdict less likely. When the minority votes in each State are disregarded, there is considerable chance that a candidate with a majority of the popular votes will fail to win a majority of the electoral votes and be defeated. This has already happened on three occasions.

"5. It would remove the present tremendous incentives to fraud, promises of patronage, and excessive expenditure of money in the doubtful States with large blocks of electoral votes. How great these incentives are is indicated by the fact that on at least four occasions the change of less than a thousand votes in a single State would have elected a different President.

"6. It would remove the device of personal electors, which is not only useless but dangerous. If any of the electors should for any reason fail to carry out the very specific duties now prescribed for them by the Constitution, or should vote contrary to their pledges, it might easily change the result. The electoral college system has actually been responsible for gravely serious controversies on several occasions.[3] In 1856 the electors of Wisconsin were prevented from casting their votes on the prescribed day by a severe blizzard. In the famous Hayes-Tilden dispute the personal eligibility of one elector was a deciding factor. Surely in so important a matter it is unwise to take such risks unnecessarily."

[3] For a telling description of the troubles already caused by the electoral college system and its sinister possibilities for the future, see The Electoral System of the United States, by J. Hampden Dougherty (G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1906).

Proportional Representation (P. R.) in the Election of the President of the United States—No. 3 of a Series of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, No. 3 in a series of seven statements on proportional representation in the election of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, statement No. 3 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This chapter in the early development of Senate Joint Resolution 31 is from the Proportional Representation Review of October 1929, quarterly organ of the Proportional Representation League.

This publication was the organ of the Proportional Representation League, made up of apostles of a principle of representation foreign to the American political system.

The title of this article is "The National Elections of 1928," and applies specifically to the electoral college. In this article are included the most significant sentences of House Joint Resolution 106 of the 71st Congress, which language now appears in Senate Joint Resolution 31 pending before the Senate. The enthusiasm of the proportionalists for the application of this principle in the election of the President is clear from this article. The article follows:

"THE NATIONAL ELECTIONS OF 1928

"The electoral college

"The presidential election of 1928 illustrates well the defects of the system used. In Pennsylvania 1,067,586 and in New York 2,089,863 Democratic votes failed to elect a single presidential elector. The reason, of course, is that since each State votes for its electors on a general ticket, the party in the State that polls most votes captures all the seats, the ballots of all other parties in that State, whether few or many, being thrown away.

"In spite of the great element of chance in this system, it works out in most cases, of course, in giving the Presidency to the largest party. But not always; in 1876, for example, Tilden had most popular votes, but Hayes won the Presidency. The same thing happened on two other occasions.

"And that is not the only defect of the system; it also presents extraordinary temptations to corruption in States in which the scale is likely to be turned by a few votes. In the last election, though votes were worth but little in California where it would have required the change of 273,980 from Hoover to Smith to win that State's 13 seats in the electoral college, or 21,075 votes for each seat, they were worth a great deal in Texas where it would have required the change of only 13,003 votes to win the State's 20 seats, only 650 votes for each one. To go a step further, it would have required a change of only 416,055 votes in certain crucial States, out of a total presidential vote of over 36 million (or one-ninetieth of the votes cast) to have made Mr. Smith President rather than Mr. Hoover.

"The remedy for these grave defects in our system of choosing the President is explained fully in Hoag and Hallet's Proportional Representation,[1] pages 320–328. The chief change is the apportionment of each State's Presidential votes (the election of actual persons to serve as Presidential electors is not only useless but dangerous[2]) not all to one party but to the several parties in proportion to the votes they have cast in the election. For this apportionment neither the Hare system nor any other system of proportional representation is needed: all that is neded is to do a little sum in arithmetic as soon as the ballots have been counted. For example, in this last election, since in Texas Hoover polled 367,036 votes, Smith 341,032 votes, and other candidates 931 votes, Hoover would have been given, according to this plan, three hundred sixty-seven thousand and thirty-six seven hundred eight thousand nine hundred and ninety-ninths of the State's Presidential votes, and Smith would have been given three hundred forty-one thousand and thirty-two seven hundred eight thousand nine hundred ninety-ninths of them.[3]

"The most satisfactory way of bringing this change about is by an amendment to the Federal Constitution. A proposed amendment for the purpose will be found on pages 325–328 of Hoag and Hallett's book. A less comprehensive but excellent amendment with the same object was advocated in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Clarence F. Lea, of California, on June 7, 1929, and introduced by him for the second time,[4] as House Joint Resolution 106, on June 13, 1929. The most significant sentences of this resolution are as follows:

" 'The electoral-college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. * * * Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. * * * Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes of that State for such office, as the vote for such person in that State for such office bears to the total vote of the electors[5] of that State for all persons for whom votes were cast for President.'

"Representatives in Congress

"For many years the Proportional Representation Review has published, after each congressional election, a summary of the results based on official sources. That of the elections of 1928 will be found in connection with this article.

"As usual, the results show some of the more obvious weaknesses of the system of election used, which differs from that used for presidential electors in apply the plurality principle to single-member districts instead of whole States. For example, 1,564,000 Democrats in the southern States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia,

[1] The Macmillan Co., New York, 1926. On sale by the Proportional Representation League, for its benefit, at 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia.

[2] See The Electoral System of the United States, by J. Hampden Dougherty, New York, 1906.

[3] It may be asked why the President cannot be elected directly by popular vote. The answer is brief—because so many of the less populous States enjoy representation in the electoral college in excess of their per capita share that it would probably be impossible to make any change in the Constitution of that sort.

[4] See the Proportional Representation Review for April 1928.

[5] Voters.

Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas elected all of those States' 74 Representatives in Congress, whereas 1,769,000 Democratic voters in the northern States of Connecticut, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin, failed to elect a single one of their 69 Representatives.

"But this method of election not only fails to give the minority its share of the Representatives,, as in the cases of the southern Republicans and the northern Democrats, it sometimes fails to give even the majority its due. In New York the Democrats, with 1,989,000 votes elected 23 Congressmen, while the Republicans, with 2,072,000 votes elected but 20. Similarly in Maryland the Democrats, who cast 226,116 votes, elected 4 of the State's Representatives, and the Republicans with 234,848 votes elected only 2.

"Results of the congressional elections,[1] Nov. 6, 1928

State	Votes cast			Members elected			Members by proportional representation [2]		
	Republican	Democratic	Others	Republicans	Democrats	Others	Republicans	Democrats	Others
Alabama		165,023		0	10	0	1	9	0
Arizona	31,382	50,231		0	1	0	0	1	0
Arkansas	42,575	157,223		0	7	0	1	6	0
California	[3] 1,127,910	[4] 152,591	46,049	10	1	0	10	1	0
Colorado	210,838	141,005	949	3	1	0	2	2	0
Connecticut	297,651	250,526	3,217	5	0	0	3	2	0
Delaware	66,361	38,045		1	0	0	1	0	0
Florida	69,469	148,528		0	4	0	1	3	0
Georgia		200,188		0	12	0	0	12	0
Idaho	97,006	48,486	1,039	2	0	0	1	1	0
Illinois [5]	1,604,151	1,212,916	6,296	[6] 21	6	0	15	12	0
Indiana	770,317	641,498	2,078	10	3	0	7	6	0
Iowa	594,998	248,089		11	0	0	8	3	0
Kansas	375,500	218,182		7	1	0	5	3	0
Kentucky	526,194	412,421	113	9	2	0	6	5	0
Louisiana	14,661	152,816	22	0	8	0	0	8	0
Maine	145,955	61,890		4	0	0	3	1	0
Maryland	234,848	226,116	2,314	2	4	0	3	3	0
Massachusetts	753,391	[7] 686,700	5,152	13	3	0	8	8	0
Michigan	979,071	357,065	2,449	13	0	0	10	3	0
Minnesota	525,511	174,383	271,863	9	0	1	6	2	[8] 2
Mississippi		110,550		0	8	0	0	8	0
Missouri	790,044	726,500	187	10	6	0	8	8	0
Montana	103,478	77,669	826	1	1	0	1	1	0
Nebraska	289,899	232,994		4	2	0	3	3	0
Nevada	18,815	13,287		1	0	0	1	0	0
New Hampshire	108,284	75,845	186	2	0	0	1	1	0
New Jersey	870,883	564,621	914	9	3	0	7	5	0
New Mexico	61,208	56,048		1	0	0	1	0	0
New York	2,072,853	1,989,404	147,504	20	23	0	21	21	[9] 1
North Carolina	289,331	355,360		2	8	0	4	0	0
North Dakota	149,005	51,547		3	0	0	2	1	0
Ohio	1,442,859	931,103	2,290	19	3	0	13	9	0
Oklahoma	293,876	296,574	2,217	3	5	0	4	4	0
Oregon	196,539	85,553	11,478	3	0	0	2	1	0
Pennsylvania	[10 11] 2,068,258	[10] 910,969	28,346	35	1	0	25	11	0
Rhode Island	120,361	114,454		2	1	0	2	1	0
South Carolina		61,347		0	7	0	0	7	0
South Dakota	142,567	103,444	1,744	3	0	0	2	1	0
Tennessee	116,449	178,436		2	8	0	4	6	0
Texas	81,283	568,430	1	0	18	0	2	16	0
Utah	97,140	77,914	847	2	0	0	1	1	0
Vermont	91,223	36,451	1,684	2	0	0	2	0	0
Virginia	91,832	206,533	7,866	3	7	0	3	7	0
Washington	291,977	134,910	823	4	1	0	4	1	0
West Virginia	347,085	292,061	115	5	1	0	3	3	0
Wisconsin	568,072	234,604	63,942	11	0	0	8	3	0
Wyoming	38,935	35,972	333	1	0	0	1	0	0
Total	19,275,656	14,266,502	612,838	268	166	1	[12] 216	[12] 216	[12] 3

[1] Official figures as published by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

[2] The figures in this column have been calculated as if each State were a single congressional district electing its allotted quota of Members by proportional representation with the single transferable vote (Hare system), assuming that each voter voted for all the candidates of the party for which he actually voted and for no other. If proportional representation were actually used the largest States would probably be divided into 2 or more multimember districts, but that would not interfere seriously with the proportionality of the result.

[3] This is the total vote for the Republican nominees who call themselves Republicans. 7 of them, with a total vote of 774,830, received the Democratic as well as the Republican nomination.

[4] This is the total vote for the Democratic nominees who call themselves Democrats. 1 of them, with a vote of 56,381, received the Republican as well as the Democratic nomination.

[5] The total votes given for Illinois are the totals of the votes cast for district Representatives in the 25 congressional districts. 2 Representatives were elected from the State at large.

[6] 2 of the 21 Republican Members were elected at large.

[7] This figure includes 61,697 votes for a Democratic candidate who received the endorsement of the Republican Party.

[8] These seats should have gone to the Farmer-Labor Party, which cast 251,126 votes of those listed under "Others."

[9] This seat should have gone to the Socialists who cast 103,700 votes of those listed under "Others."

[10] A number of the Republican and Democratic candidates received the endorsement of the Prohibition, Labor, and Socialist Parties.

[11] This is the total vote for the Republican nominees who call themselves Republicans. 4 of them, with a total vote of 291,384, received the Democratic nomination as well as the Republican.

[12] A proportional assignment on the basis of the totals for the whole country instead of State by State would be: Republican 246, Democratic 182, other parties (if they were united), 7. The discrepancy is due chiefly to 2 factors: (1) The vote in the South is very small in proportion to population, so that the apportionment of Members to States on the basis of population gives southern votes a greater value than northern votes; (2) the number of Members allotted to a number of the smaller States is too small to allow a satisfactory proportional assignment on a State basis.

"Besides these more obvious weaknesses of the congressional election system there are, of course, others that are not shown by the returns at all. We refer to the fact that even of those ballots that do help elect the candidate marked, many, often the majority, do not help the candidate wanted. For the old single-shot ballot used for congressional elections—the ballot that gives the voter no opportunity to say what shall be done with his vote if it cannot help the candidate marked—forces many voters, often the majority, to mark a candidate who, they think, has some chance and is not quite the worst of the lot.

"Sometime, therefore, when the people are ready, we hope the present system of electing Congressmen will be supplanted by one that is suitable for the purpose.

Proportional Representation (P. R.) in the Election of the President of the United States—No. 4 of a Series of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 4 in a series of seven statements on proportional representation in the election of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, statement No. 4 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Another chapter in the history of Senate Joint Resolution 31 is an article from the October 1928 issue of Proportional Representation Review, quarterly organ of the Proportional Representation League. This article, The Next President May Be a Minority Choice, is further evidence that Senate Joint Resolution 31 is the child of the Proportional Representation League and is based on the principles which that league would

have introduced into every phase of representative government in the United States:

"THE NEXT PRESIDENT MAY BE A MINORITY CHOICE [1]

"It is entirely posible that Mr. Hoover will receive a handsome majority of the popular vote this fall and yet be defeated, or that he will fail to receive as many popular votes as Governor Smith and yet be elected. Already on three occasions a President has been chosen who had fewer popular votes than his principal opponent,[2] and analysis of the figures at the last election shows that a recurrence of minority rule this fall is not unlikely. In fact, so long as the votes of each State in the electoral college are all counted for one candidate and the popular votes cast within the State for other candidates are disregarded, there can never be any assurance that the majority will win.

"In 1924 President Coolidge had a plurality over John W. Davis of over seven million popular votes and 246 votes in the electoral college. The electoral college stood 382 for Coolidge, 136 for Davis, and 13 for La Follette. Overwhelming as this lead appears, examination shows that it could have been wiped out entirely by a change of less than one million votes in 8 of the 18 Coolidge States which have at least 1 Democratic United States Senator and which may therefore be regarded as possible Democratic territory this fall. In fact, if the Democratic Party can hold the States it won in 1924 and capture by however small a margin only six of the large doubtful States as indicated in the table below, it will elect the President regardless of the total popular vote.

"Basis of possible Democratic victory

"Twelve Southern States which Davis carried in 1924: 136 electoral votes.

"New York (now has Democratic Governor and two Democratic Senators): 45 electoral votes.

"Ohio (now has Democratic Governor): 24 electoral votes.

"Massachusetts (Senator last elected is Democratic): 18 electoral votes.

"Missouri (now has two Democratic Senators): 18 electoral votes.

"New Jersey (now has Democratic Governor and one Democratic Senator): 14 electoral votes.

"Kentucky (Senator last elected is Democratic): 13 electoral votes.

"Total: 268 electoral votes.

"Majority that insures election: 266 electoral votes.

"Any losses from this list might easily be made up from the following 15 States with a total of 90 electoral votes, each of which has elected a Democratic Governor or United States Senator within the last 6 years: Arizona[3] (3 electoral votes), Colorado[4] (6), Delaware[5] (3), Iowa[5] (13), Maryland[3] (8), Michigan[5] (15), Montana[3] (4), Nevada[5] (3), New Mexico[6] (3), Rhode Island[5] (5), South Dakota[4] (5), Utah[7] (4), Washington[5] (7), West Virginia[5] (8), and Wyoming[5] (3). There is ample opportunity for a Democratic victory without a Democratic majority vote.

"On the other hand, there is a possibility of a Democratic majority vote without a Democratc victory. The Democrats could even poll more votes than the Republicans without changing the electoral vote of 1924 in the least. In fact, if Hoover can hold the 15 States which Coolidge carried with pluralities of more than 100,000 over Davis, he will win, even if all the other States go for his opponent by overwhelming majorities, for these 15 States hold a majority of the votes in the electoral college.

Footnotes at end of speech.

"Basis of possible Republican victory

"(The 15 Coolidge States in which Coolidge led Davis by more than 100,000)

"New York: 45 electoral votes.
"Pennsylvania: 38 electoral votes.
"Illinois: 29 electoral votes.
"Ohio: 24 electoral votes.
"Massachusetts: 18 electoral votes.
"Michigan: 15 electoral votes.
"Indiana: 15 electoral votes.
"New Jersey: 14 electoral votes.
"California: 13 electoral votes.
"Iowa: 13 electoral votes.
"Minnesota: 12 electoral votes.
"Kansas: 10 electoral votes.
"Connecticut: 7 electoral votes.
"Washington: 7 electoral votes.
"Colorado: 6 electoral votes.
"Total: 266 electoral votes.

"Majority that insures election: 266 electoral votes.

"Of course, any losses in this list might easily be made up from the 20 other States, with a total of 116 electoral votes, which President Coolidge carried in 1924.[8] There is also ample opportunity for a Republican victory without a Republican majority vote.

"Under the present method of electing the President, as under the district method of electing Congressmen, it is not the number of votes for a party which counts but the number cast for it in an advantageous location. In Pennsylvania, the Democrats can take nearly half a million votes from the Republicans without gaining a single elector. But a smaller gain in New York would switch the State's 45 electoral votes from the Republicans to the Democrats, and so give the party a net gain of 90. In the 12 Southern States which gave Davis his 136 electoral votes more than 900,000 Coolidge votes were cast—almost half as many as were cast in those States for Davis—but they secured no representation in the electoral college. In the New England States, exclusive of Massachusetts, on the other hand, a smaller number of Republicans—less than 700,000—elected 26 electors.

"A practical remedy: Proportional representation for the electoral college

"To give effect to all votes, wherever they are cast, and so remove the danger of defeating the popular choice, two remedies have been proposed. The obvious remedy of direct election from the country at large seems at present impracticable because it would reduce the voting power of the smaller States, which are now overrepresented in the electoral college, and so could hardly be expected to receive support from enough of them to write it into the Constitution.

"Another remedy, almost as effective, was proposed in Congress as early as 1877[9] and brought forward again in the last session by Congressman Clarence F. Lea, of California, and Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts. It keeps the device of electoral votes but proposes to divide those of each State among the several candidates, giving each candidate the same share of the electoral votes that he has of the popular vote. For example, if Hoover polled four-ninths of the popular vote in New York, it would give him four-ninths of the State's electoral vote—20 out of 45—instead of none at all. And if Governor Smith polled six-nineteenths of the popular vote in Pennsylvania, it would give him 12 of the 38 electoral votes for Pennsylvania.

"This simple application of the proportional representation principle—which is now used for legislative elections in a large part of the civilized world and for electoral colleges in Finland and Denmark[10]—would give every voter a chance to make his vote count for the candidate of his choice. It would remove the distorted representation of the large States which is so likely under present conditions to upset the popular verdict.[11]

"A resolution by Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts

"Congressman Lea's resolution (H. J. Res. 181) for a constitutional amendment abolishing personal electors and providing for a proportional assignment of electoral votes was described in our April issue. Senator Walsh on May 8 introduced a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) calling on the States to adopt proportional representation for the electoral college of their own accord, which they already have a right to do under the Constitution if personal electors are retained.

"The resolution follows nearly word for word a resolution introduced by Senator Magnus Johnson (Farmer-Labor) of Minnesota in 1925 and printed in full in the Proportional Representation Review for April 1925. It is being sent by Senator Walsh and William C. Lee, of Washington, with a supporting memorandum by Mr. Lee which Senator Walsh had read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to all members of the legislature and a selected list of citizens in the States of Massachusetts, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Ohio, and Tennessee, in the hope that one or more of them may be induced to put its suggestions into effect. This could very easily be done by means of the simplest sort of party list system, even without the names of the candidates for electors appearing on the ballot.

"Of course the only thoroughly safe plan, for reasons outlined in our issue for last April, would involve the abolition of personal electors by constitutional amendment."

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] The substance of the first part of this article was sent out by the Proportional Representation League as a news release on June 21.

[2] When John Quincy Adams was elected over Andrew Jackson in 1824, when Hayes was elected over Tilden in 1876, and when Harrison was elected over Cleveland in 1888.

[3] Now has a Democratic governor and two Democratic Senators.

[4] Now has a Democratic governor.

[5] Now has one Democratic Senator.

[6] Senator last elected is Democratic.

[7] Now has a Democratic governor and one Democratic Senator.

[8] Or from Wisconsin (13 electoral votes), which has a Republican Governor and 2 Republican Senators and gave Coolidge a lead of 240,000 over Davis for second place in 1924; Oklahoma (10), which has 1 Republican Senator and went for Harding in 1920; and Tennessee (12), which went for Harding in 1920.

[9] By Representative Levi S. Maish and Senator Charles R. Buckalew, both of Pennsylvania. (See J. Hampden Dougherty, the Electoral System of the United States (New York, 1906), pp. 351 ff).

[10] In Finland the electoral college chooses the president; in Denmark it chooses the upper house of Parliament by proportional representation with the single transferable vote. In Sweden and the Netherlands also the upper house of Parliament is chosen by proportional representation by bodies (Provincial councils and other local authorities) which are themselves chosen by proportional representation.

[11] For fuller treatments of this proposal see Proportional Representation by Hoag and Hallett, pp. 320–328, articles in the Proportional Representation Review for July 1920, July and October 1924, and April 1928, and Mr. Dougherty's book cited in footnote 9.

Proportional Representation (P. R.) in the Election of the President of the United States—No. 5 of a Series of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 5 in a series of 7 statements on proportional representation in the election of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, statement No. 5 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This chapter is in the historical development of Senate Joint Resolution 31, which proposes to change the basis of presidential elections to the principle of proportional representation, is from the April 1930 issue of the Proportional Representation Review, which was the organ of the Proportional Representation League. This article welcomed Representative Clarence F. Lea's reintroduction in the 1st session of the 71st Congress his proposal to amend the Constitution with respect to election of the President and Vice President. The title of this article "Proportional Representation Proposed Again for Presidential Elections" is documentary evidence that the apostles of the proportional representation movement believed the plan for electing the President to be based on proportional representation. The article follows:

"PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION PROPOSED AGAIN FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

"A constitutional amendment[1]

"A measure before the present Congress which has been given far less attention than it deserves is the constitutional amendment by Congressman Lea of California[2] to abolish the electoral college and elect the President of the United States by popular vote without disturbing the relative voting power of the several States.

"Mr. Lea does not make the usual proposal of a direct nationwide plurality vote, for the very good reason that a sufficient number of the smaller States which would lose in voting power under that arrangement could not be expected to ratify it. He leaves each State its present allotment of electoral votes but distributes them among the candidates in proportion to their popular votes within the State.

"New York, for example, in the election of 1928, gave President Hoover 2,193,344 popular votes out of a total of 4,405,626. Since this was 22.403 forty-fifths of the votes in the State, Mr. Lea's plan would have given Mr. Hoover 22.403 electoral votes from New York, instead of all 45. And since former Governor Smith polled 21.346 forty-fifths, he would have received 21.346 of New York's electoral votes instead of none at all. Similarly in the States which Smith carried Hoover would have received his due share of the electoral votes, and the electoral vote for the whole country would have been much more nearly proportionate to the popular vote than it actually was.[3]

"Such a plan would have at least the following outstanding advantages:

"1. It would make a reversal of the popular verdict less likely. Three times already a candidate has been defeated for President who polled more popular votes than his successful opponent, simply because all the votes cast for him in States which he failed to carry were disregarded. In the last presidential election it would have required a change of only 417,000 votes in certain close States, or one-ninetieth of the total, to have elected Smith President, though Hoover would still have had a popular plurality of over 5 million. On the other hand it would have required a change of only 202,000 votes to have deprived Smith of all the electoral votes he did receive. A method of election under which the disposition of 2 percent of the popular votes can make all the difference between no electoral votes at all and election is obviously not to be trusted to elect the right man.

"2. It would give every voter the satisfaction of helping his favorite candidate for President whether he voted with the majority in his State or not. In the last presidential election three quarters of a million Republican votes in Massachusetts and 2 million Democratic votes in New York had no more effect on the result than so much waste paper.

"3. It would thus stimulate voting and contribute to the political education of the electorate. When no one except a member of the locally dominant party can hope to accomplish anything by voting, it is not surprising that only half of the qualified voters usually register their votes and that campaigning is largely confined to a few doubtful States.

"4. It would make the best qualified candidates of all parties politically available for nomination regardless of their places of residence. Under the present system a candidate who does not live in one of the few large doubtful States is usually not politically available because it is the polling of most votes in those States rather than of most votes in the whole country that decides the election. In the last 13 presidential elections the Republican and Democratic Parties have nominated for President or Vice President 31 citizens of New York, Indiana, and Ohio, and only 21 from all the rest of the country together.

"5. It would remove the present tremendous incentives to fraud, promises of patronage, and excessive expenditure of money in the doubtful States with large blocks of electoral votes. How great these incentives are is indicated by the fact that on at least four occasions the change of less than a thousand votes in a single State would have elected a different President.

"6. It would remove the device of personal electors, which is not only useless but dangerous. If any of the electors should for any reason fail to carry out the very specific duties now prescribed for them by the Constitution, or should vote contrary to their pledges, it might easily change the result. The electoral college system has actually been responsible for gravely serious controversies on several occasions. In 1856 the electors of Wisconsin were prevented from casting their votes on the prescribed day by a severe blizzard. In the famous Hayes-Tilden dispute the personal eligibility of one elector was a deciding factor. Surely in so important a matter it is unwise to take such risks unnecessarily.

"On March 14 the House Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, to which Mr. Lea's resolution was referred, held a public hearing at which Mr. Lea presented a mass of instructive evidence in favor of his proposal, which was received by the committee with sympathetic attention. Mr. Hoag and Mr. Hallett of the Proportional Representation League also spoke."

The Proportional Representation League was equally interested in electing Members of the House of Representatives on their principles.

[1] The first part of this article was sent out on April 18 with the weekly editorial service of the National Municipal League.

[2] H. J. Res. 106, 71st Cong., 1st sess.

[3] The total popular votes of the three leading candidates, as published in the official statement of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, were: Hoover 21,388,300 (58.1 percent), Smith 15,005,443 (40.8 percent), and Thomas 266,549 (.7 percent). The total electoral votes were Hoover 444 (83.6 percent), Smith 87 (16.4 percent), and Thomas 0 (0 percent). Mr. Lea calculates that the total electoral votes under his proposed plan would have been Hoover 291.398 (54.9 percent), Smith 231.251 (43.6 percent, and Thomas 2.872 (.5 percent).

Proportional Representation (P. R.) in the Election of the President of the United States—No. 6 of a Series of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 6 in a series of 7 statements on proportional representation in the election of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, statement No. 6 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have stated before in this series of items, which I have introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 31, now pending on the Senate Calendar and which proposes to introduce a new principle of representation in presidential elections, that the proponents of proportional representation were equally concerned with the election of House Members according to their plan.

Today's chapter in the historical development of Senate Joint Resolution 31 is in the nature of an aside from the Presidency because it deals with the election of Members of the House of Representatives. This article is titled "The Nation Misrepresented" and applies the principles of proportional representation to the congressional elections of November 1930. It is from Proportional Representation Review, quarterly organ of the Proportional Representation League.

It is especially important that this old article be brought to public attention. The adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 31 with respect to the election of the President will give impulse and force to the movement to elect the House of Representatives on the same principles. The article follows:

"THE NATION MISREPRESENTED

"An analysis of the last congressional elections [1]

"With the control of the next Congress still in the hands of Providence, it is pertinent to inquire whether the even balance in the representative body reflects a similar balance in the sentiments of the voters or whether the somewhat difficult situation which confronts the Nation is merely the result of faulty election machinery.

"A glance at the figures of last fall's congresisonal elections gives a first impression that the results were unfair to the Republicans: the Republican candidates for the National House polled 2 million more votes than their Democratic opponents.

"But this impression overlooks the fact that in large parts of the South the Democrats had no opposition and so did not need to poll their full vote.

"If, to avoid this error, one calculates State by State the proper representation of each party in proportion to the vote cast, it appears that the results actually were unfair to the Democrats: on such a proportional basis State by State the Democrats would have elected 225 Representatives to the Republicans' 204.

"But this also is inconclusive, for if the method of election had allowed due representation to minorities in conformity with the old American slogan about taxation without representation, hundreds of thousands of Republican votes would have been cast in the South and Democratic votes in the North which were not cast under present discouraging conditions. What the net result would have been no one can tell.

"The one thing certain from a careful examination of the figures is that the actual result was very much a gamble, depending on the disposition of a handful of votes in the close districts, and that the existing near-deadlock bears no necessary relation to the real wishes of the voters.

"Minority rule

"How defective is our present method of electing Congressmen as a means of reflecting public sentiment becomes very clear as the results are examined State by State.

"In two States the so-called majority system in single-member districts gave a majority of seats to the minority party. In West Virginia the minority party actually elected twice as many Represenatives as the majority, because its votes happened to be distributed more favorably in the geographical districts. Here are the figures:

"West Virginia

Party	Votes cast	Representatives elected	Representatives in proportion to votes
Republican	264,160	4	3
Democratic	264,951	2	3

[1] Analyses of previous congressional elections will be found in the Proportional Representation Reviews for October 1929, April 1927, April 1925, and earlier issues.

"Illinois [1]

Party	Votes cast	Representatives elected	Representatives in proportion to votes
Republican	1,002,947	15	13
Democratic	1,020,319	12	14
Others	5,808	0	0

[1] The total votes given for Illinois are the totals of the votes cast for district Representatives in the 25 congressional districts. 2 Representatives, 1 Republican, and 1 Democrat, were elected from the State at large.

"Minorities excluded

"Of course the minority party was more frequently underrepresented.

"In North Carolina the Republicans polled nearly two-fifths of the votes, but elected none of the State's 10 Representatives in Congress. This has been the usual state of affairs for many years, a temporary exception giving the Republicans two Congressmen (instead of their rightful four) in the Hoover landslide of 1928. The Republicans of North Carolina, by living in the State, increase its representation and so regularly contribute four Congressmen to the party they vote against.

"In Michigan the Democrats polled 170,000 votes—nearly a third as many as their Republican opponents—but elected not 1 of the State's 13 Members. Less than 170,000 Democratic votes elected 10 Members in Alabama, and 12 in Georgia.

"In Missouri the vote of the Democrats exceeded that of the Republicans by less than 10,000 in a total poll of nearly a million. Yet the Democrats elected three times as many of the State's Members.

"Missouri

Party	Votes cast	Representatives elected	Representatives in proportion to votes
Democratic	477,467	12	8
Republican	468,853	4	8
Others	743	0	0

"The results of many other States, summarized in the table on page 46 present incongruities almost as striking.

"With the minority votes in all districts, totaling many millions, going completely to waste, justice even to organized parties is not to be expected. Add the certainty of similar injustices in the primaries of each party and the failure of millions to vote as they feel or to vote at all because they have no hope of electing the sort of officials they really want, and the picture under present methods becomes hopeless.

"Representative government will not become a reality until the rules of the game are changed to assure all elements their fair share. This can easily be done without constitutional amendment when the American people realize its need. In fact, under the new apportionment act, any State could elect its members in the national House of Representatives by proportional representation, by act of its own legislature, without waiting for other States to do so.

"One-party elections

"Meanwhile the breakdown of the two-party system continues apace. The long-continued under-representation of the minority party has already, in most parts of the country, reduced it to a condition of innocuous desuetude. In four-fifths of the area of the United States a one-party system of government is, for practical purposes, in full effect.

"Under such conditions it is something of a stretch of the imagination to call either of the two great national parties either national or (if party be defined as in the Oxford dictionary as a body of persons united in a cause, opinion) a party. Each is an inharmonious aggregation of nearly all the warring elements in one part of the country. For the sake of participating in the primary of the major party, which has become the real election, low-tariff advocates in Pennsylvania register as Republicans and high-tariff advocates in Alabama as Democrats.

"How sharply and artificially the present methods of election have divided the country will be seen from the map on the back cover of this Review, and from the following tables:

"The solid South (Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona)

Party	Votes cast	Representatives elected	Representatives in proportion to votes
Democratic	1,999,638	107	80
Republican	761,143	[1]3	30
Others	3,083	0	0

"The solid Northwest (Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California)

Party	Votes cast	Representatives elected	Representatives in proportion to votes
Republican	3,693,043	74	57
Democratic	1,316,895	[1]7	20
Others	380,572	[1]1	5

[1] No more than 1 minority Member was elected in any one State.

"These tables make it clear that under proportional representation, even if no more opposition votes were cast than actually are cast under the present adverse conditions, there would no longer be a solid South or a solid part of the North. Each of the great parties would become truly national in scope.

"And since one could vote for the minority party without throwing one's vote away, there would be a real chance of an alinement on the basis of principles instead of mere geography.

"Results of the congressional elections,[1] Nov. 4, 1930

State	Votes cast			Members elected			Members by proportional representation [2]		
	Republican	Democratic	Others	Republicans	Democrats	Others	Republicans	Democrats	Others
Alabama	32,630	165,403		0	10	0	1	9	0
Arizona		52,342		0	1	0	0	1	0
Arkansas		145,108		0	7	0	0	7	0
California	[3] 964,690	[4] 130,106	2,275	10	1	0	10	1	0
Colorado	167,227	146,192	1,224	3	1	0	2	2	0
Connecticut	216,518	208,202	3,559	3	2	0	3	2	0
Delaware	48,493	38,391	127	1	0	0	1	0	0
Florida	11,819	84,070		0	4	0	0	4	0
Georgia	1,631	55,444	372	0	12	0	0	12	0
Idaho	80,869	45,661		2	0	0	1	1	0
Illinois [5]	[5] 1,002,947	[5] 1,020,819	[5] 5,808	[5] 15	[5] 12	0	13	14	0
Indiana	572,082	641,206	606	4	9	0	6	7	0
Iowa	321,702	207,686	858	10	1	0	7	4	0
Kansas	322,775	242,477		7	1	0	5	3	0
Kentucky	253,903	288,354	6,325	2	9	0	5	6	0
Louisiana	2,207	130,086		0	8	0	0	8	0
Maine	88,072	55,471		4	0	0	3	1	0
Maryland	189,815	275,461	780	0	6	0	2	4	0
Massachusetts	629,821	529,258	17,496	12	4	0	9	7	0
Michigan	567,203	171,402	5,822	13	0	0	10	3	0
Minnesota	412,888	65,490	[6] 281,385	9	0	[7] 1	6	1	[7] 3
Mississippi		34,899		0	8	0	0	8	0
Missouri	468,853	477,467	743	4	12	0	8	8	0
Montana	82,736	84,604	2,807	1	1	0	1	1	0
Nebraska	199,196	216,405		2	4	0	3	3	0
Nevada	18,279	15,343		1	0	0	1	0	0
New Hampshire	71,506	52,323		2	0	0	1	1	0
New Jersey	558,925	425,352	6,553	9	3	0	7	5	0
New Mexico	51,655	65,194	299	0	1	0	0	1	0
New York	1,304,010	[8] 1,532,413	[8] 188,759	20	23	0	19	22	[10] 2
North Carolina	198,310	334,376		0	10	0	4	6	0
North Dakota	126,678	52,284	3,538	3	0	0	2	1	0
Ohio	955,716	910,931	13,468	13	9	0	11	11	0
Oklahoma	173,944	282,629	166	1	7	0	3	5	0
Oregon	116,642	107,187	4,696	2	1	0	2	1	0
Pennsylvania [11]	[11] 1,421,634	[11] 566,594	[11] 31,143	[11] 33	[11] 3	0	26	10	0
Rhode Island	113,354	105,968		2	1	0	2	1	0
South Carolina		16,163		0	7	0	0	7	0
South Dakota	106,429	55,718	7,926	3	0	0	2	1	0
Tennessee	[12] 72,354	132,615	1,908	2	8	0	3	7	0
Texas	45,281	249,450		1	17	0	2	16	0
Utah	80,981	62,828	10,944	2	0	0	1	1	0
Vermont	49,074	23,741	7	2	0	0	2	0	0
Virginia	54,451	109,013	1,466	1	9	0	3	7	0
Washington	205,942	75,424	8,017	4	1	0	4	1	0
West Virginia	264,160	264,951		4	2	0	3	3	0
Wisconsin	395,887	72,451	[13] 51,080	10	1	0	9	1	[14] 1
Wyoming	44,890	24,519		1	0	0	1	0	0
Total	13,067,579	11,048,971	660,157	218	216	1	[15] 204	[15] 225	[15] 6

[1] Official figures as published by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

[2] The figures in this column have been calculated as if each State were a single congressional district electing its allotted quota of Members by proportional representation with the single transferable vote (Hare system), assuming that each voter voted for all the candidates of the party for which he actually voted and for no other. If proportional representation were actually used, the largest States would probably be divided into 2 or more multimember districts, but that would not interfere seriously with the proportionality of the result.

[3] This is the total vote for the Republican nominees who call themselves Republicans. 7 of them, with a total vote of 549,891, received the Democratic as well as the Republican nomination.

[4] This is the total vote for the Democratic nominees who call themselves Democrats. 1 of them, with a vote of 66,703, received the Republican as well as the Democratic nomination.

[5] The total votes given for Illinois are the totals of the votes cast for district representatives in the 25 congressional districts. 2 Representatives, 1 Republican and 1 Democrat, were elected from the State at large.

[6] Of these votes 271,599 were cast for candidates of the Farmer-Labor Party.

[7] Farmer-Labor.

[8] This is the total vote for the Democratic nominees who call themselves Democrats. 1 of them, with a vote of 39,340, received the Socialist as well as the Democratic nomination.

[9] Of these votes 163,286 were cast for candidates of the Socialist Party.

[10] Socialist.

[11] In the several Pennsylvania districts where the same candidate was nominated by 2 or more parties, the votes have been distributed to the proper parties but the election has been credited to the party to which the successful candidate actually belongs. 5 of the successful Republicans were endorsed by the Democrats, and 1 successful Democrat by the Republicans. In 5 cases the successful candidate had Prohibition, Labor, or Socialist endorsement.

[12] This total includes the vote cast for Republicans, 38,106, and for Independent Republicans, 34,248. Independent Republicans opposed the regular Republican candidates in 2 districts.

[13] Of these votes 47,520 were cast for candidates of the Socialist Party.

[14] Socialist.

[15] A proportional assignment on the basis of the totals for the whole country instead of State by State would be: Republicans 230, Democrats 194, other parties (if they were united), 11. The discrepancy is due chiefly to 2 factors: (1) the vote in the South is very small in proportion to population, so that the apportionment of Members to States on the basis of population gives southern votes a greater value than northern votes; (2) the number of Members allotted to a number of the smaller States is too small to allow a satisfactory proportional assignment on a State basis. See the opening paragraphs of this article.

Proportional Representation (P. R.) in the Election of the President of the United States—No. 7 and Last of a Series of Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 7 and last in a series of 7 statements on proportional representation in the election of the President of the United States.

There being no objection, statement No. 7 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In concluding these essays in the historical development since January 25, 1928, I submit a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 181, 70th Congress, 1st session introduced by Representative Clarence F. Lea, of California.

During course in the Congress some of its language has been rephrased by the committee of the several intervening Congresses. The language rephrased over the years is indicated by italics. All of the language in roman type remains unchanged today in Senate Joint Resolution 31. The document follows:

"House Joint Resolution 181

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

"That the 12th amendment of the Constitution of the United States be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE XII

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be voted for by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such presidential election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November *in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President.* Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within 45 days after *the presidential* election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, *the secretary of state* of each State, *or other corresponding officer of said State who, by the law thereof, has the custody of the official election returns thereof, shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President and of all persons voted for as Vice President* and the number of votes for each and the total vote of the electors of the State for all *candidates for such offices, respectively,* which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate—the President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted—each person *voted for as President or Vice President in each State* shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes *of said State for such office, respectively, as the vote for said person in said State for such office bears to* the total vote of the electors *of said State for all candidates for said office.* In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded *unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election.* The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President. *The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President shall be Vice President,* but no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"This amendment shall take effect on the *1st day of July following its ratification.*"

For comparison with the above document, I submit Senate Joint Resolution 31 as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate in this Congress:

"Senate Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

" 'ARTICLE II

" 'SEC. 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

" 'The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

" 'Within 45 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number be at least 40 percent of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person have at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

" 'The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

" 'The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the 12th article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the 20th article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification.

" 'SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'."

They Chose Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an article by Mr. Eugene Lyons entitled "They Chose Freedom" which has been recently reprinted and presented as a public service in the press of America by the International Latex Corp. I want to take this opportunity to praise the International Latex Corp. for its many public services and for publishing its many items of humanitarian and national interest for the American people to read.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY CHOSE FREEDOM

Inmates of a refugee camp in West Germany scrawled these words on their barracks: "We chose freedom. Come in and see what we got."

An American journalist recently accepted their wry invitation. Inside the barracks he found a crowd of wretched men, women, and children wasting their lives in squalor, stench, and disease, provided with barely enough food for survival. In talking to them he learned that they were bitter, despairing, hopeless.

Unhappily that camp is not an exception. It is typical of about 200 in Europe and the Near East, where tens of thousands who chose freedom—often at the risk of death—have received only misery compounded by the passing of bleak years. Some of the unfortunates have been in camps for as long as 9 years.

Hundreds of thousands of other fugitives from communism, outside the official camps, are no better off. They live in ruined buildings, abandoned railway cars, and rudely converted crates. * * *

Perhaps the most tragic among the unadjusted escapees to our side are the younger men and women, including defectors from the Red army of occupation forces. They looked forward not only to personal freedom but to a choice of active participation in a genuine movement to liberate their native lands. With few exceptions they have been deeply wounded by disillusionment. * * *

It was inevitable that sooner or later the Soviets would take advantage of this situation.

Ever since the end of the war, Moscow has spared no energy to abuse, terrorize, and demoralize its runaway citizens. * * * There have been enough shocking instances of kidnaping and even murder, to rob the life of the refugee of a sense of safety.

But within the last year Moscow moved to supplement terror with doses of honey. It has launched an intensive campaign of redefection, geared to lure fugitives to return home. The Soviet Government—so the story runs—has been moved to pity by the condition of its prodigal sons and daughters. Let them come home and they will be welcomed with open arms.

In East Germany, a Committee for Return to the Homeland has announced itself, allegedly composed of refugees who had changed their minds and redefected. * * *

A newspaper put out by the committee is reaching former Soviet citizens all over the world, the United States included. "Brothers

and sisters," it says, "return and the motherland will welcome you. Even those who are guilty before the motherland will be forgiven."

Many exiles have been receiving letters from relatives—self-evidently dictated by the secret police—urging them to retrace their steps. "We miss you and yearn for you," the missives declare. "Please come back quickly to those who love you." The process of softening-up by propaganda is often followed by personal visits from Soviet agents, who play on the victim's homesickness and make rosy promises.

Cynical and transparent though the redefection drive may seem, it is becoming increasingly effective. Hundreds have already returned behind the Iron Curtain, thousands seem of a mind to do the same. In the refugee camps, the aforementioned journalist estimated, about 25 percent seem prepared to go back. They still hate the Communist system and are full of forebodings as to what will hapen to them. But their misery and hopelessness make them reckless and breed hopes in defiance of logic. They are easy targets for the Soviet manipulators.

Every fugitive who returns to the Soviet prisonland is a resounding moral and political victory for communism and, by the same token, a great defeat for the free world. The growing success of the Kremlin's redefection campaign is the measure of Western bungling in this area. The free world has been politically shortsighted and humanly callous. It has not lived up to the duty and the opportunity represented by those who chose freedom, confident of our humane feelings and political common sense.

The United States has spent, and continues to spend, millions of dollars in radio broadcasts and other activities intended to widen the gap between the Soviet regimes and their subjects. The effects of this investment are being canceled out by the flow of returning and repentant fugitives.

Each of the returners seems a living refutation of our claims, and the Soviets are past masters in making the most of this. There have, of course, been some efforts by free governments and voluntary agencies to assist the hard-pressed fugitives from communism. But they have been inadequate, frequently niggardly, and as frequently constricted with redtape.

It is late, but not too late, for massive countermeasures to offset the redefection campaign. Those concerned with what is called psychological warfare have no more excuse for ignoring the challenge. Voluntary agencies such as the American Friends of Russian Freedom, must be given larger means to conduct work among the escapees that, within the narrow limits as yet possible, has proved effective.

This is at once a call to humanity and a call to political wisdom. (Eugene Lyons in AFRF News Bulletin, New York.)

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.)

Praise for House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to remarks of Mr. Bernard Baruch in commending the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee and congratulating its members for performing "a very difficult and very necessary job."

Mr. Baruch, making a surprise appearance at hearings on possible Communist infiltration of the entertainment industry, conducted by the chairman, Representative FRANCIS WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania; Representative GORDON E. SCHERER, Republican, Ohio; and myself, told our chairman:

You have a tough task to do and are doing it well. I have great respect for this committee, and because I happened to be in the neighborhood I thought I would come up and see what was doing today.

Later, discussing the hearings, he stated:

At a time like this no person should give aid or comfort to the Communists by what they say or do. Any person who has nothing to fear can answer anything. In this great country of ours, the only thing you have to fear is guilt.

Referring to the refusal of some witnesses to cooperate in testifying at committee hearings, Mr. Baruch added:

It is not a question of giving your associations, but of giving comfort.

The committee also drew support from the New York Herald Tribune which carried the following editorial:

A TIME TO SPEAK

It is difficult to feel anything but disgust and indignation toward the actors who have systematically refused to give answers to the questions put to them by Representative WALTER'S Un-American Activities Committee. These, after all, are citizens; and as citizens they have responsibilities as well as privileges. Not least of any man's responsibilities is to cooperate with lawful bodies bent upon lawful business for the country's good.

No one need assert that all congressional inquiries in the past have been conducted without flaw; nor even that there are no occasions when a man, struggling with his conscience or invoking a valid constitutional protection, may legitimately refuse to answer. But by every test the present occasion is one for cooperation. The time is to speak. Silence and obstruction cannot but carry an inference of conspiracy.

Let it be said at the start that the Walter committee, so long as it keeps on the track, is not trying to investigate the stage, or to establish a blacklist, or to prosecute individuals. It is tracing the outlines and the methods of the Communist attack upon American liberties. It follows that attack wherever the trail may lead.

The Congress, of course, does not have the right to make laws regulating the private entertainment business. But it does have the right, and the duty, to make such laws as may be necessary to safeguard the Republic against subversion and infiltration. To know the whole form of the Communist conspiracy, to see by what channels it operates, and to what degree it is effective in winning recruits—this is part of Congress' job. Representative WALTER is therefore engaged on a proper quest and he has pursued that quest within its due limitations.

In this light the studied insolence and calculated obstruction of the actors can surely not be justified. On Monday one declared to the chairman of the committee that "I will not join with you in an attack on the Constitution"; another protested that the committee was "invading my inner beliefs, my conscience and my associations." Such statements make mockeries of the facts. They take the old battle cries of liberty and pervert them to serve ends that, at best, are meanly personal and at worst are disruptive of the whole constitutional process.

Such an investigation as Representative WALTER is carrying on would have been extremely difficult to conduct with justice a year or so ago. Then an individual who admitted having fallen into the Communist trap, however briefly or however far in the past, too often found it difficult to get a job. But a balance has been restored, and it should be possible today to chart the nature of the Communist conspiracy without being unfair to the individuals whose testimony is sought.

If it proves not possible to do so, the blame must rest in large measure upon the kind of people who have been defying the present probe. By their willful denials they are stirring up again the worst of suspicions and passions.

The actors at Foley Square have done a disservice to themselves. What is infinitely worse, they have done a disservice to the cause of freedom, and to the cause of sanity and calmness and enlightenment.

Just How Silly Can Our Laws Become?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the July 27 issue of the Miami Daily News published an editorial entitled "Just How Silly Can Our Laws Become?" dealing with the application of the McCarran-Walter Act to a 4-year-old child, the daughter of an American citizen, who was ordered deported.

I ask unanimous consent that this interesting editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST HOW SILLY CAN OUR LAWS BECOME?

How ridiculous can our immigration laws and their enforcement get?

Witness this: A 4-year-old girl, Jane Edith Thomas, of Dayton, Ohio, has been ordered deported as an alien. Her father is an American. In fact, those who hail from the blue grass country would consider him an especially fine American since he was born in Kentucky. Moreover, her father was an American soldier.

While stationed in Italy, Pvt. Leslie Thomas fell in love with and married an Italian girl. Later, when he was stationed in Trieste, then under allied occupation, Jane Edith was born to the couple.

Thomas was told that his little American daughter was automatically an American citizen, just as if she had been born after he had returned to the United States with his wife.

The American consul in Venice issued an American passport to Jane Edith when the family returned to the United States in March 1952. But in June 1952, Thomas received a letter from the consul saying it was all a mistake. His little daughter wasn't an American after all. The reason was that a child of an American who is born abroad is a citizen automatically only if the American parent has lived 10 years in the United States, 5 of which must be after the age of 16.

Thomas was 20 years old when Jane Edith was born, so he had lived in the United States only 4 years after he was 16. Now

ex-Private Thomas must take his little daughter to Canada or some place out of the country and apply for her entry as an alien.

Ever hear anything sillier than that?

Statue Proposed To Commemorate Creation of United Nations in San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Arthur Robinson, of Volcano, Calif., which appeared in the July 21, 1955, issue of the Amador Ledger, Jackson, Calif. The article depicts a really inspired idea for a statue to be erected in San Francisco's Golden Gate to commemorate the creation of the United Nations in San Francisco and to serve as a symbol of the ideals and objectives of the member nations for all time.

The idea for the statue—a counterpart of the Statue of Liberty—was first suggested by Anthony Caminetti, Jr., district attorney of Amador County, Calif., some 10 years ago and since then has gained widespread interest.

In an effort to assist with the project, I expect to introduce legislation which would grant congressional approval to the creation of a nonprofit organization for the purpose of receiving contributions for the construction of the monument from all over the world.

Mr. Robinson's excellent article follows:

IT HAPPENED ON MAIN STREET, U. S. A.

(By Arthur Robinson)

It could have happened in Paris on a bench along the banks of the Seine where men discuss world affairs and perhaps women, or around a cracker barrel in a Vermont grocery, or in a pub in England, or anywhere else in the world where people breathe the air of freedom and love liberty. The simple fact, however, is that it happened here in Amador County, in Bill Tam's gents' furnishing store, on Main Street, in Jackson.

Ten years later the news would go out to the world by radio and television and telegraph and cable.

President Roosevelt had died only 2 months before. The war in Europe had ended. Hitler and his demonology were incinerated dust in the rubble of Berlin. The first atomic bomb had not yet been triggered. The American flag was still to be raised on Iwo Jima by marines under the command of Brig. Gen. Harry Liversedge, a friend and neighbor. Hiroshima had been targeted in macabre secrecy for destruction by a weapon which was to menace the future of civilization. The war with Japan was moving toward a climax. A martial audit, compiled by several international organizations and officially reported the year before by the Vatican, indicated the total number of dead and wounded—military and civilian—was 56,460,000.

In Volcano (population 128, by a finger-counting census) a sapling Christmas tree had been planted. A bronze plaque below it read in part:

"This Christmas tree was planted during World War II in the prayerful hope that the spirit of Christmas would forever rule the relations of all men and all nations."

And in San Francisco the United Nations was being organized.

The bright light of hope was beginning to flicker again in the war-darkened hearts of people everywhere. Maybe, maybe the United Nations would succeed where the League of Nations had failed so dismally after the First World War.

Bill Tam's store in Jackson is much more than a mere emporium. It's a Main Street institution, a kind of conversational fountain where men gather to refresh themselves in small talk and sometimes barbed debate. In the back, where Bill sits behind an old and wonderfully cluttered rolltop desk, miners in the old days preempted the chairs in the shoe department and dug gold which assayed $107 a ton in the underwear department. Local political campaigns, championship prizefights and major league baseball pennants have been won and lost in the back of Bill's store, and at times the temperature of the conversation has gone from hot to freezing so quickly the mercury in the thermometer oozed out at both ends almost simultaneously.

In peacetime, you met friends from other parts of the county there and amiably passed the time of day.

In wartime, you shared anxieties * * * and news about county casualties.

It was there—10 years ago—while the United Nations was being organized—that Anthony Caminetti, Jr., the son of an illustrious father who had served under Woodrow Wilson as Commissioner of Irrigation, told me he had an idea and wanted to know what I thought of it.

And the idea?

A Statue of Justice, to be set up in San Francisco's Golden Gate, as a sister statue to the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

Many years before, the people and children of France had reached deep into their hearts and shallow purses and pooled their frugal centimes in a fund which grew to such proportions that another idea which also seemed beyond realization at first became in fact and in spirit the visible and enduring embodiment of the basic principle on which the democracies of France and the United States were founded. Never before—in the sublimity of pure love—had one country sent to another such a gift as the Statue of Liberty.

Kipling had said, "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet."

Now, perhaps, with the Statue of Liberty in New York facing East and a Statue of Justice in the Golden Gate facing West, the twain would indeed meet in globe-girdling brotherhood and lasting peace.

I thought Mr. Caminetti's idea was a marvelous one and we went to work on it. I prepared some news releases and he collected $1,200—$250 of it the official contribution of the county by special act of the board of supervisors.

It takes time for ideas to ripen in the imaginations of some men. At San Francisco the statesmen of the world were too busy organizing the United Nations to add the weight of a statue to their grave burdens. The city of San Francisco authorities, on the other hand, were unwilling to carry the ball at the point at which we here in this small county, with our limited resources, were willing to hand it to them.

So the $1,200 remained in the bank.

And 10 years passed.

Several weeks ago, while listening to a broadcast from the commemorative sessions of the United Nations in San Francisco, I scribbled a draft of a telegram to Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., the United States representative to the United Nations. Then I phoned Mr. Caminetti, now the district attorney. He and I had been on opposite sides of a violent political battle in the intervening years, but, of course, this was no time for letting personalities or the past obstruct the urgencies of the moment.

He agreed to send the telegram and he and I and Earl Garbarini, chairman of the board of supervisors, signed it.

Here's the telegram:

JACKSON, CALIF., *June 25, 1955.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Ambassador to the United Nations, San Francisco Memorial Opera House, San Francisco, Calif.:

Respectfully suggest a United Nations Statue of Justice to be erected in San Francisco's Golden Gate as an appropriate expression of ideals and objectives of member nations and as a dramatic counterpart of Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. A fund of $1,200 raised here in Amador County specifically for such a purpose is available. Earnestly hope you will find it possible to submit suggestion for consideration of present commemorative session for such action as may be fitting. Please advise if you can accept our fund as first implementing step toward realization of idea. Perhaps people and children of all countries, as well as their governments, will want to join with the people and board of supervisors of this small California mountain county in such a worldwide undertaking of good will.

A. CAMINETTI, Jr.,
District Attorney for Amador County.
EARL J. GARBARINI,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors.
ARTHUR ROBINSON,
Volcano, Calif.

Copies of the telegram were sent to the top officials of the United Nations, to key figures in Washington, to Governor Knight, and Mayor Elmer Robinson, of San Francisco, and others.

Then things began to happen.

News about the idea began to crackle on the radio and television. U. N. delegates at the San Francisco Opera House were told about it. American and international news agencies sent stories about it everywhere in the world.

Main Street.

A small California mountain county.

It could have happened in Paris on a bench along the banks of the Seine where men discuss world affairs and perhaps women, or around a cracker barrel in a Vermont grocery, or in a pub in England, or anywhere else in the world where people breathe the air of freedom and love liberty.

For the record—proudly and humbly—it started here.

We have received many commendatory letters from those to whom copies of the telegram were sent. Two weeks afterward, Mayor Robinson of San Francisco announced the appointment of a local ways and means committee and requested the committee to submit a progress report not later than August 1. Mayor Robinson wrote us he has already received offers running into many thousands of dollars for a commemorative monument. We here hope that every member nation of the United Nations will support the idea financially. An implementing proposal to this effect, we believe, will be introduced at the next general session of the United Nations and, when that is done, a supporting resolution in Congress.

A hundred years ago, in a one-room law office in Springfield, Ill., an obscure man named Abraham Lincoln read aloud to his partner, Billy Herndon, from a slender book of poetry which had only a short time before been published. It was Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass. In the years to come Lin-

coln was to speak with the same impassioned simplicity at the dedication of a cemetery for soldier dead in a small Pennsylvania town. Here are a few selected lines of Whitman's that Lincoln read:

"I announce what comes after me.
"I announce justice triumphant.
"I announce uncompromising liberty and equality.
"I announce splendors and majesties to make all the previous politics of the earth insignificant."

Ten years ago, as the United Nations was being organized, the bright light of hope began to flicker again in the war-darkened hearts of people. The other day, before leaving for the Four Power Conference in Geneva, President Eisenhower asked us all to pray for the success of the conference.

In the hand of the Statue of Liberty a torch reaches toward the sky.

May the bright light of hope flicker into a flame and burn forever in peace and justice in the hearts of all men.

Everywhere.

Legislative Powers of Congress Usurped by United States Court of Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," is an age-old maxim being proven again and again in our expanding national economy.

The inquiries made by investigating committees of Congress have uncovered rank abuse and misapplication of well-meaning laws. Laws enacted by Congress to enhance the general welfare and promote the national economy.

Usually these abuses arise by a creeping expansion of Government agencies' power, and are often not immediately apparent.

Such has been the case of the Home Loan Bank Administration. Commencing in 1937, rules and regulations were changed slightly here and there, which eventually provided a means of confiscating the peoples' savings. A plan of confiscation which has prohibited the aggrieved citizens—the savings depositors—from having prior notice, or court trial, for the seizure and confiscation of their property.

By the creeping agency changes in regulations, expanding its own power, the agency assumed a purpose foreign to, and destructive of, the congressional intent. Congress, in its enactments of 1932–34, specifically stated the primary purpose of such laws were to promote the general welfare and provide a safe place for the citizens to place their savings.

It is obvious from the language and legislative history, Congress never intended to provide an entity, though which the citizens' savings could be seized and confiscated. There is nothing in the act that indicates the citizen's right to redress to the United States courts, should ever be cut off. Nevertheless, the agency expanded its power by its self-made regulations, and by such self-enacted regulations, cut off court redress.

Such agency managed to concentrate the whole diabolical scheme into one man's hands. When the 5-man bipartisan Board, created by Congress, was abolished, the resulting 1-man Commissioner, claimed he was responsible to no one.

Armed with their own self-expanded regulations, the agency, in 1946, seized a solvent and prosperous $26 million savings association. Congress, through its special committee, headed by the Honorable HOWARD SMITH, unanimously condemned such action. The congressionally created agency blatantly defied Congress and claimed the United States courts were without power or authority to intervene.

To this day the seized $26 million of cash, United States Government bearer bonds, and other negotiable assets, have not been fully accounted for.

Every citizen may justly ask, How can such infringement of human rights happen here? The answer is simple. The United States appellate court—circuit court—has failed, on numerous occasions to perform their functions. Such failure has perpetuated the agency frauds.

Specifically, in 1952, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, upheld the self-enacted agency regulations, which denied the jurisdiction of the United States courts to intervene or grant relief to the thousands of stricken homeowners, and the multithousands of savings investors, who were victims of the agency confiscation.

Congress, when it became fully convinced the courts had, in their ruling, disregarded the purpose and intent of the congressional enactment, attempted to correct the evil by adopting the Housing Act of 1954. Such act granted remedial and procedural rights to all aggrieved citizens. Such new enactment specifically granted jurisdiction to the United States district courts throughout the United States, to hear the claims of aggrieved citizens, and to enforce the laws of the United States.

The Government agency asked, but Congress refused, to limit this sweeping grant of remedial and procedural rights to new causes of action, and struck from the proposed bills all restrictive language. Thus, under the new law, old depositors as well as new, are given like protection under the law.

Congress, in its endeavor to protect its citizens against the misapplication of agency power, subordinated all conflicting laws in clear and specific language, as follows:

Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

This 1954 congressional enactment clearly subordinated prior United States circuit court rulings inconsistent therewith, and specifically granted to the aggrieved savings depositors and homeowners a right to a trial on the merits in the United States district courts, on their claims of fraud and confiscation against these Government agencies.

Nevertheless, the United States circuit appellate court, in defiance of the clear language of the congressional enactment and its legislative history, held, in July 1955, that such congressional enactment was inapplicable to the defrauded Long Beach citizens, and purely prospective. Thus, the circuit court denied our aggrieved citizens the protection of the laws enacted by Congress, and made applicable the language rejected by Congress. Thereby the circuit court has perpetuated the frauds and injustices perpetrated upon our citizens by a Government agency. The injustices and frauds of these Government agencies in the Long Beach seizure precipitated the remedial and procedural enactments by Congress in specifically granting jurisdiction to the United States district courts.

Congress did not create such appellate courts to supplant the wisdom of Congress in the enactment of laws. Congress, in creating the United States circuit appellate courts, did so with the intention, among other things, of upholding the constitutional guaranties to our citizens against fraudulent and capricious actions of agencies and bureaus.

Such courts, however, have not always proven capable. Congress recognized the fallibility of these appellate courts when it restricted such courts' power to hold unconstitutional congressional enactments by injunction.

Here, the United States circuit appellate court specifically denied our citizens the procedural and remedial benefits of laws enacted by Congress, and by injunction cut off the citizen's right to court protection and trial under the law. The citizen's constitutional guaranties against confiscation and seizure of their savings and property, are nullified. Self-expanded and self-created agency regulations are substituted for right and justice, and are sustained by the United States appellate court injunction.

The failure of the United States circuit appellate court to uphold the citizen's constitutional guaranty is plain. A full investigation of the congressionally created United States appellate courts is here indicated as a necessity. Perhaps a reorganization of such appellate judicial system may be a necessity in the light of its defiance of acts of Congress.

The example here emphasized is only one instance of the ever-mounting disregard of justice and equity by such courts.

Budget Estimates and Appropriations, 84th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I include herein certain tabulations showing results of the work of the 1st session of the

84th Congress on appropriation bills as compared to budget estimates submitted. The first tabulation is in the usual form by bills, and divides them as between fiscal year 1956, fiscal year 1955 and prior, and one item not considered but included here for sake of completeness. Permanent appropriations—those which recur automatically under substantive law without annual action in the appropriation bills—are also added for purpose of showing a complete total.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Title	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
1. Fiscal year 1956 bills:								
Treasury-Post Office:								
Treasury	$604,398,000	$595,818,000	$595,818,000	$604,398,000	$603,348,000	$603,348,000	$599,598,000	−$4,800,000
Post Office	2,754,817,000	2,685,700,000	2,685,700,000	2,754,817,000	2,754,104,000	2,754,104,000	2,721,720,500	−33,096,500
Tax Court of the United States	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	
Total	3,360,250,000	3,282,553,000	3,282,553,000	3,360,385,000	3,358,622,000	3,358,622,000	3,322,488,500	−37,896,500
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare:								
Labor	470,116,000	417,792,900	417,792,900	470,116,000	418,838,900	418,838,900	418,303,650	−51,812,350
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,949,465,861	1,907,403,361	1,907,403,361	1,949,465,861	1,972,890,700	1,973,740,700	1,942,886,850	−6,579,011
Related agencies	12,567,000	12,326,000	12,326,000	12,567,000	12,326,000	12,326,000	12,326,000	−241,000
Total	2,432,148,861	2,337,522,261	2,337,522,261	2,432,148,861	2,404,055,600	2,404,905,600	2,373,516,500	−58,632,361
Interior and related agencies:								
Interior	222,734,356	207,025,856	206,680,156	222,734,356	227,301,698	227,301,698	226,399,798	+2,334,558
Forest Service	83,453,060	84,536,690	84,536,690	84,623,000	93,826,690	93,826,690	90,315,129	+5,692,129
Related agencies	7,165,700	6,708,700	6,708,700	7,165,700	6,858,700	6,858,700	6,858,700	−307,000
Total	313,353,056	298,271,246	297,925,546	314,523,056	327,987,088	327,987,088	317,573,627	+3,050,571
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	897,684,574	880,260,050	880,260,050	898,384,574	884,393,923	884,433,923	883,051,623	−15,332,951
Independent offices	5,639,790,000	5,845,595,375	5,845,595,375	5,640,155,000	5,882,379,500	5,848,394,500	5,842,458,500	+202,303,500
State, Justice, and judiciary and related agencies:								
State	147,267,197	126,769,977	126,769,977	147,267,197	147,549,608	147,549,608	137,450,905	−9,816,292
Justice	201,485,000	197,525,000	197,525,000	201,485,000	200,445,000	200,445,000	198,735,000	−2,750,000
The Judiciary	30,279,715	29,603,250	29,603,250	30,279,715	30,640,810	30,640,810	30,116,510	−163,205
U. S. Information Agency	88,500,000	80,500,000	80,500,000	88,500,000	88,350,000	88,350,000	85,000,000	−3,500,000
Refugee relief	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	−1,000,000
Total	483,531,912	450,398,227	450,398,227	483,531,912	481,985,418	481,985,418	466,302,415	−17,229,497
Defense:								
Office of the Secretary	12,750,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,750,000	12,670,000	12,670,000	12,670,000	−80,000
Interservice activities	682,250,000	672,250,000	672,250,000	682,250,000	682,250,000	682,250,000	682,250,000	
Army	7,573,980,000	7,329,818,000	7,329,818,000	7,573,980,000	7,330,053,000	7,330,053,000	7,329,953,000	−244,027,000
Navy	9,180,157,000	9,071,834,000	9,071,834,000	9,180,157,000	9,071,785,166	9,118,179,556	9,118,179,556	−61,977,444
Air Force	14,783,678,000	14,401,904,000	14,401,904,000	14,783,678,000	14,739,763,170	14,739,763,170	14,739,763,170	−43,914,830
Total, Defense	32,232,815,000	31,488,206,000	31,488,206,000	32,232,815,000	31,836,521,336	31,882,915,726	31,882,815,726	−349,999,274
District of Columbia	(175,405,390)	(166,547,509)	(166,901,780)	(175,462,020)	(169,456,749)	(169,456,749)	(168,843,440)	(−6,618,580)
Federal payment	21,892,700	17,892,700	17,892,700	21,892,700	21,892,700	21,892,700	19,892,700	−2,000,000
Commerce and related agencies:								
Commerce	1,347,890,000	1,103,560,000	1,105,810,000	1,347,890,000	1,296,322,300	1,298,897,300	1,227,385,000	−120,415,000
Canal Zone	16,898,000	16,300,000	16,300,000	16,898,000	16,600,000	16,600,000	16,300,000	−598,000
Related agencies	1,695,000	1,575,000	1,575,000	1,695,000	1,695,000	1,695,000	1,675,000	−20,000
Total	1,366,393,000	1,121,435,000	1,123,685,000	1,366,393,000	1,314,617,300	1,317,192,300	1,245,360,000	−121,033,000
General Government matters	27,790,700	21,890,700	21,890,700	28,777,700	27,166,300	27,166,300	27,166,300	−1,611,400
Public works:								
Atomic Energy Commission	1,045,000,000	618,000,000	618,000,000	1,045,000,000	575,000,000	575,000,000	575,000,000	−470,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	27,550,000	26,214,000	26,214,000	27,550,000	27,053,000	27,053,000	27,053,000	−497,000
Department of Interior power administrations	24,297,000	22,944,000	22,944,000	24,297,000	23,660,000	23,660,000	23,610,000	−687,000
Bureau of Reclamation	179,616,000	145,090,442	178,745,000	179,616,000	180,095,000	180,095,000	179,995,000	+379,000
Army civil functions	512,702,000	473,497,800	526,219,800	525,002,000	571,683,000	571,703,000	559,955,500	+34,953,500
Total	1,789,165,000	1,285,746,242	1,372,122,800	1,801,465,000	1,377,491,000	1,377,571,000	1,365,613,500	−435,851,500
Legislative	67,572,138	66,298,175	66,298,175	92,692,911	92,924,027	93,025,527	92,808,972	+116,061
Mutual security	3,266,641,750	2,638,741,750	2,638,741,750	3,266,641,750	3,205,341,750	3,205,841,750	2,703,341,750	−563,300,000
The supplemental, 1956	1,927,785,868	1,648,876,128	[1] 224,276,628	2,123,351,072	1,826,111,614	1,830,078,614	1,656,625,802	−466,725,270
Subtotal, fiscal year 1956	53,826,724,559	51,383,686,854	50,047,368,212	54,063,157,536	53,041,489,556	53,062,012,446	52,199,015,915	−1,864,141,621
2. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1955:								
Urgent deficiency, 1955		25,000	25,000	160,000	993,950	1,013,950	1,013,950	+853,950
Second supplemental, 1955	920,523,454	855,212,429	857,187,429	952,002,718	938,402,835	945,412,835	898,805,875	−53,196,843
Department of Justice	750,000	710,000	710,000	750,000	710,000	710,000	710,000	−40,000
Second urgent deficiency, 1955	28,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475	28,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475	−3,000,000
House of Representatives		12,000	12,000		12,000	12,000	12,000	+12,000
Subtotal, fiscal year 1955 and prior	949,536,929	881,222,904	883,197,904	981,176,193	965,382,260	972,412,260	925,805,300	−55,370,893
3. Estimates not considered	156,500,000			156,500,000				−156,500,000
Grand total, session	54,932,761,488	52,264,909,758	50,930,566,116	55,200,833,729	54,006,871,816	54,034,424,706	53,124,821,215	−2,076,012,514
4. Permanent appropriations (estimate)							6,773,516,346	
Grand total, regular annual, supplemental, deficiency and permanent	54,932,761,488	52,264,909,758	50,930,566,116	55,200,833,729	54,006,871,816	54,034,424,706	59,898,337,561	−2,076,012,514

[1] Points of order made and sustained during consideration of the bill on the floor of the House reduced bill as reported by committee by $1,452,499,500. Amendments adopted on the floor increased bill by $27,900,000.

SUMMARY FOR THE SESSION

Budget estimates submitted to the House during the session totaled $54,932,761,488 against which the Committee on Appropriations recommended $52,264,909,758, or $2,667,851,730 less than the estimates. Bills as passed by the House totaled $50,930,566,116—below the committee totals only because of numerous items deleted from the supplemental, 1956 bill by points of order. Estimates considered by the Senate aggregated $55,200,833,729 and the bills as passed by that body totaled $54,034,424,706. Final amounts enacted aggregate $53,124,821,215, a total of $2,076,012,514 below the estimates submitted by the President.

Mr. Speaker, the reductions effected in the President's budget requests for appropriations are supportable. They are bona fide. They were made because there were reasons why they could be made. On the other hand, the totals appropriated during the present session for fiscal year 1956 as shown in the tabulation are not the final amounts. Supplemental estimates for 1956 are expected to be forthcoming in the next session. The final totals will be higher, but no one can now predict precisely how much higher.

COMPARISON OF REDUCTIONS

Mr. Speaker, at first glance the reduction of $2 billion plus in the budget estimates appears to compare unfavorably with the record of the 83d Congress. The 1st session of the 83d Congress reduced budget estimates by $12 billion and the 2d session effected cuts of $2.6 billion in the estimates.

But these bare totals do not reveal the whole story. It must necessarily be apparent to anyone acquainted with the facts that only within the Department of Defense could any wholesale budget adjustments of this magnitude be made. The reductions of $12 billion in the 1st session of the 83d Congress were composed in major part of reductions totaling $8 billion in the Department of Defense. The $8 billion reduction was made possible in turn by a cut of approximately $5 billion in the Air Force. In the 2d session of the 83d Congress the cut of $2.6 billion included $1.4 billion in the Defense Department.

Appropriations of the 1st session of the 83d Congress aggregated $54.5 billion. Appropriations of the 2d session were still lower, totaling $47.6 billion, or approximately $6.9 billion less. Following that same pattern, appropriations for the Defense Department in the 2d session were $5 billion below those for the 1st session.

The result of the reductions in defense in the 83d Congress is partially reflected in the estimates submitted by the administration to the present Congress. Total estimates submitted were $7.6 billion above appropriations voted by the 2d session of the 83d Congress. Requests for the Department of Defense were raised from $29.6 billion—the appropriation for 1955—to $33.7 billion for 1956, or $4.1 billion of the $7.6 billion total. The lion's share of the increase is for the Air Force.

The present Congress has met its responsibilities to provide for the national defense and has not therefore made any appreciable reduction in funds for defense. And, in so doing, it was necessary to appropriate above the reduced level of last year's appropriations—as the President requested.

The following table shows the situation I have just discussed:

Comparison of estimates, appropriations, and reductions, 83d and 84th Congs. (grand totals except permanent appropriations and miscellaneous private acts)

Congress and session	Estimates	Law	Decrease (−)
83d Cong., 1st sess	$66, 568, 694, 353	$54, 539 342, 491	−$12, 029, 351, 862
83d Cong., 2d sess	50, 253, 323, 985	47, 642, 131, 205	−2, 611, 192, 780
84th Cong., 1st sess	55, 200, 833, 729	53, 124, 821, 215	−2, 076, 012, 514

Department of Defense only (appropriations for defense military functions and military public works)

Congress and session	Estimates	Law	Decrease (−)
83d Cong., 1st sess	$42, 619, 931, 000	$34, 612, 317, 000	−$8, 007, 614, 000
83d Cong., 2d sess	30, 987, 055, 000	29, 617, 128, 486	−1, 369, 926, 514
84th Cong., 1st sess	33, 712, 815, 000	33, 076, 685, 026	−636, 129, 974

MAJOR NATIONAL DEFENSE ITEMS

Mr. Speaker, Department of Defense appropriations of course represent the preponderance of national security outlays. But substantial additional amounts appropriated annually either contribute directly to the national defense effort or result directly therefrom. Since the aggregate amounts represent about 80 percent of total appropriations, the following table is included in order to show the situation in more specific terms:

Major national defense and all other appropriations, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

[NOTE.—Excludes permanent appropriations]

	Estimates	Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Regular annual 1956 acts:			
1. Major national security agencies and activities:			
Department of Defense	$32, 232, 815, 000	$31, 882, 815, 726	−$349, 999, 274
Veterans' Administration	4, 452, 370, 000	4, 466, 128, 000	+13, 758, 000
Atomic Energy Commission	1, 045, 000, 000	575, 000, 000	−470, 000, 000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	76, 500, 000	72, 700, 000	−3, 800, 000
Selective Service System	28, 700, 000	27, 216, 000	−1, 484, 000
General Services Administration (Strategic and Critical Materials)	548, 900, 000	548, 900, 000	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	59, 300, 000	56, 350, 000	−2, 950, 000
Mutual security program	3, 266, 641, 750	2, 703, 341, 750	−563, 300, 000
Subtotal	41, 710, 226, 750	40, 332, 451, 476	−1, 377, 775, 274
2. All other agencies and activities	10, 229, 579, 714	10, 209, 938, 637	−19, 641, 077
Total regular annual 1956 acts	51, 939, 806, 464	50, 542, 390, 113	−1, 397, 416, 351
Supplemental and deficiency, 1956 and prior:			
1. Major national security agencies and activities:			
Department of Defense (military public works)	1, 480, 000, 000	1, 193, 869, 300	−286, 130, 700
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	300, 000	240, 000	−60, 000
Mutual Security	8, 000, 000		−8, 000, 000
Federal Civil Defense Administration	28, 050, 000	12, 325, 000	−15, 725, 000
Atomic Energy Commission	294, 700, 000	256, 327, 000	−38, 373, 000
Veterans' Administration	423, 720, 000	420, 611, 000	−3, 109, 000
Subtotal	2, 234, 770, 000	1, 883, 372, 300	−351, 397, 700
2. All other agencies and activities	869, 757, 265	699, 058, 802	−170, 698, 463
Total supplemental and deficiency, 1956 and prior	3, 104, 527, 265	2, 582, 431, 102	−522, 096, 163
Estimate not considered	156, 500, 000		−156, 500, 000
Total appropriations, session	55, 200, 833, 729	53, 124, 821, 215	−2, 076, 012, 514
Recapitulation:			
Major national security activities	43, 944, 996, 750	42, 215, 823, 776	−1, 729, 172, 974
All other activities	11, 099, 336, 979	10, 908, 997, 439	−190, 339, 540
Estimate not considered	156, 500, 000		−156, 500, 000
Total	55, 200, 833, 729	53, 124, 821, 215	−2, 076, 012, 514

DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, deficit spending continues. Not since fiscal year 1951 has the Government operated in the black. The budget for fiscal year 1956, submitted last January, forecast a deficit of $2.4 billions. Reductions made in requests for appropriations during this session will result in reductions in expenditures and if revenues hold to the January budget estimate of $60 billions, the deficit should be less than $2.4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has operated in the red in each of the 3 fiscal years of the present administration. The following tabulation shows the situation:

Estimates of budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit, fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956

[In millions]

Item	Fiscal year 1954, budget, 1956 (actual)	Fiscal year 1955			Fiscal year 1956, budget, 1956 (January 1955)
		Budget, 1955	Budget, 1956	Preliminary, actual, July 14, 1955	
Receipts	$64,655	$62,642	$59,000	$60,302	$60,000
Expenditures	67,772	65,570	63,504	64,494	62,408
Deficit	3,117	2,928	4,504	4,192	2,408

NOTE.—The last year in which a budget surplus occurred was fiscal year 1951 when, under a previous administration, there was a surplus of $3.5 billion.

The old debt ceiling of $275 billion was increased at the last session of Congress to $281 billion as a purely temporary measure. Failure to spend less than revenues taken in made it necessary during the current session to continue the $281 billion ceiling for another year and there is no convincing evidence of being able to return to the old ceiling by next year, much less going below it. All of this has happened when the Nation is at peace. We are not at war. Revenues are at the highest level in our peacetime history, yet expenditures continue to exceed them. The consequences are serious. The purchasing power of the dollar has been reduced, adversely affecting every American family. We cannot indefinitely continue spending more than we take in and expect to remain solvent. Furthermore, a sound, healthy economy is a basic cornerstone of our national defense program.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has already begun formulation of the budget which will be submitted next January. Unless the intervening months hold events now unforeseeable, it will be another peacetime budget. If the administration is to avoid further postponing fulfillment of its promise in the campaign of 1952, the next budget will have to be submitted in balance. It must be in balance if the purchasing power of family income and savings is not to be further reduced and further increase of the national debt avoided. If the President will submit a sound balanced budget, the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress will cooperate by holding down, and even further reduce, the spending requests. The appropriation bills returned to the President will be below the budget on which they are based, as they have been for many years.

SUPPLEMENTAL AND DEFICIENCY ESTIMATES

In 1950, the Congress approved the General Appropriations Act for 1951 which contained, as developed and recommended by this committee, a vastly strengthened antideficiency law. The control of the Congress over supplemental and deficiency estimates has improved considerably. In the present session, total supplemental and deficiency estimates for the fiscal year 1955 and prior fiscal years amounted to $985,276,193, and the ensuing laws appropriated $929,905,300. These amounts compare with appropriations previously enacted totaling $47,642,131,205 for 1955.

Of the supplemental and deficiency estimates for 1955 and prior years considered in this session, $928,500,000, or approximately 94 percent, represent items which are practically mandatory by virtue of substantive law. Appropriations in consequence of these particular estimates total $897,966,000, a modest reduction of about 3 percent in the estimates. Typical of the items largely beyond reach of the Committee on Appropriations are $420,611,000 for supplemental requirements of compensation and benefit programs for veterans; $238 million for added needs of the program of grants to States for public assistance; $99,375,000 for additional liquidation of contract authority for various phases of the highway aid programs; and $50 million in additional requirements for the payment of operating differential subsidies for merchant marine operations.

Aside from these major programs, items of purely contingent and deficiency nature considered in this session for fiscal years 1955 and prior totaled only $56,776,193, or one-tenth of 1 percent above the original estimates for the fiscal year 1955. Against these estimates, appropriations were made in the amount of $31,939,300, a reduction of nearly 44 percent below the estimates.

In recapitulation, of items submitted under the name of supplemental and deficiency estimates, the Congress made reductions of 44 percent in the less than 6 percent which were completely within the control of the committee and the Congress, but could only afford to make very conservative reductions of 3 percent in the 94 percent of the estimates which were based on spending programs more specifically established in substantive law.

As to supplemental estimates submitted during this session for the fiscal year 1956, and the Mutual Security Appropriation Act should properly be so considered, $5,203,347,412 out of the total of $5,385,892,822 resulted directly from legislation introduced during this same session. These large amounts include two major authorization bills, mutual security and military public works—estimates of $3,266,641,750 and $1,473,550,000, respectively—which were not passed until late in the session. Although reductions of about 15 percent in the estimates were effected, it should be apparent that proper consideration cannot be given, by either the committee or the Congress, to estimates of this magnitude with less than 4 weeks between enactment of the authorizing legislation and the adjournment date. The executive branch should submit the programs much earlier in the session so as to permit more adequate legislative consideration.

Defense Means Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an important article on civil defense written by Mr. Lewis A. Dexter appearing in the summer 1955 issue of the American Scholar entitled "Defense Means Protection."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE MEANS PROTECTION

(By Lewis A. Dexter)

Broadly speaking, we have in this country no grand strategy of defense. Defense means protection—for our basic warmaking strength, our industry, and our lives. We have provided effective measures of tactical defense for our Air Force and ground troops; we have given some thought to strategic defenses, once campaigns have been launched; but where is our grand strategy of protection?

In the past, great nations have had such a grand strategy. The British Fleet, for at least 250 years, protected the British people and industry from any serious threat of destruction. From Pepys to Admiral Lord Fisher, from Charles II to George V, the fleet served by design as a guaranty that England would still stand. For a considerably longer period of time, the Roman legionnaires on the frontiers made sure that the great metropolitan cities of the empire could not be attacked effectively by barbarian invaders.

The only grand strategy of defense which we now have in the United States is the grand strategy of deterrence. This means either that we hope we can frighten the enemy away by massive retaliation—if he does not get his punch in at our glass jaw first—or that we hope we can, by a well-organized system of continental air defense, make the cost of getting his bombers through on target very high.

Informed estimates, however, are in complete agreement that continental air defense under present or probable future circumstances cannot prevent some bombers from getting through on target. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg estimated in 1951 that 70 percent of an attacking enemy's planes could accomplish their mission. If a few score planes could get through and deliver atomic or hydrogen bombs, or if these bombs could be exploded in various other ways, the greater part of the industrial productivity of the United States would be disrupted, and a very substantial number of us would be killed.

There seems to be no real hope of using the air arm as a means of defending ourselves from air attack, except to make it very unpleasant for the attacker. The approach, most recently put forward by Mr. Finletter, that we should deter the Russians by saying, "You can hurt us, but we can hurt you too," sounds as though it has much to recommend it. We say, "You can kill a quarter of our people and destroy half of our warmaking power. So what? We can kill as many of your people and destroy more of your warmaking power."

But, by itself, this policy is essentially unrealistic. Obviously, as writers like Walter Millis have pointed out, we are not going to run the risk of all-out atomic war if the Russians decide to occupy all of Vienna or to seize Sweden's mineral resources, because we are too clearly aware of how they might

retaliate. Presumably the Russians realize this. Is the bombing of Russian cities for the purpose of protecting Swedish resources worth provoking what could be the vaporization of Chicago or Detroit?

In any case, all our talk of retaliation leaves the timing up to the Russians. If they attack us, atomically, at the moment they choose, we shall answer back. But if they take the initiative, they can offset any advantages we may have, for in this kind of war, initiative is a tremendous value. It enables the attacker to exploit any weaknesses of his enemy. A vividly remembered recent experience serves to illustrate the point. If the Russians had attacked the cities that actually did give aid to areas damaged by hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, they would have compounded the effect of their attack.

Of course, all plans for continental air defense ought to be, and probably are, under constant reexamination. Improvements in warning systems, interceptor devices, capacity of fighter planes, and similar means of protection are greatly needed. However, there is one grave limitation in all apparent plans for continental defense. They accept as a basic hypothesis that decisions will be made both instantaneously and correctly, allowing no margin for error. Yet a few seconds snafu or a few hours delay, such as that which occurred at Pearl Harbor, would give the Russians all the leading time they need for decisive destruction.

Inevitably, human nature being what it is, delays and blunders can take place. Folly in higher command was not abolished after Pearl Harbor; inefficient commanders, delays in communication, fatigue, failure to define responsibility, and such will remain with us. Thus, a system of protection which assumes that everybody will act correctly, quickly, and wisely is not an effective shield. Any effective system of protection must allow a fairly large margin of error. This is a somewhat different situation from that which confronted the British Navy for several generations. It is true that Admiral Lord Jellicoe, like several of his predecessors, could lose the war in an afternoon by a wrong decision; but at least that decision had to be a positive one. Jellicoe had to be taunted or cajoled into staking everything on an attack which might fail. He could not lose the war in an afternoon merely by inaction. The American continental air-defense system may be ineffective simply because somebody fails do something quickly enough. This is certainly not an argument against continental air defense. On the contrary, it suggests that there is a great need for discovering more nearly foolproof methods for defending the continent. Incidentally, one of the advantages a democracy enjoys over a totalitarian regime with ideological motivations is that in a democracy, it is much easier to plan a program which can anticipate folly and inefficiency at command levels.

There is another approach to the problem of real defense which may give us a larger measure of protection, an approach which will not be invalidated by bungling or venality of normal proportions. This approach goes back to a basic, and usually overlooked, question: Why are we unsafe?

Note the formulation of the question. Not: Why can the Russians attack us effectively? Not: How many Russian planes can get through? How can we prevent them from getting through? These questions are vital, but they are secondary to that first asked: Why are we unsafe?

We are unsafe because (1) we are gathered in a few metropolitan concentrations; (2) we have developed an economy which is organized in terms of geographical specialization and division of labor; and (3) we have an elaborate network of communication and transportation, dependent on all kinds of delicate interrelationships, which underlies this system of geographical specialization and urban concentration.

By way of contrast: except by sheer luck, atomic warfare would not profit anyone trying to conquer the wandering Indians of South America who live off the countryside, have built no artifacts, no canals, railroads or factories. In other words, they offer no targets.

In China today the Communists have developed a mass army and guerilla techniques of warfare. They certainly would suffer from the devastation of some targets; but after an atomic attack, their basic military economy would continue to be more nearly capable of vigorous effective action than would ours.

Compared with today, towns in the United States in 1819 were relatively self-sufficient. They could keep going under their own steam for a long time. If Boston had been destroyed in 1815, Worcester, Nashua, and Providence could have continued to feed, clothe, govern and even arm themselves with reasonable effectiveness. All over the eastern United States, small, deserted furnaces exist. These were once metallurgical plants which could provide locally some of the weapons of war. During the War of 1812, when the British occupied Washington, how many producers were left without needed guidance? Very few. Today, in the age of the telegraph, Government contracts, railroads, and airplanes, how many industries would find it possible to make their own decisions if Washington were vaporized? Yet even Washington does not provide indispensable machinery parts like Detroit, Chicago, or Toledo, parts without which factory wheels all over the country would stop moving. To be sure, the Federal Civil Defense Administration in Battle Creek supposedly has plans for such an emergency, but the vast and sublime indifference of almost everyone to its efforts has meant that there are many holes in its program.

Today urban specialization, this setting up of targets for the enemy to destroy, is quite needless. Nineteenth century technology may have made the big city essential for big industry; the pasteurization of milk, the purification of water and the development of effective methods for sewage and garbage disposal made the big city livable for millions in the 1870–1900 period. The big city had for many an appeal which the smaller town did not have. For those to whom "variety is the spice of life," the city became the place to live. As most readers will realize, it is in the big cities that groups of like-minded people can find the supplies and companionship they crave. The scholar who needs a constant supply of new books, the medical researcher who must have a constant supply of new patients, the artist who simply seeks the company of his fellows—all these have for the most part flocked to the large cities.

But automobiles, airplanes, helicopters, the development of electricity and of natural gas pipelines, telephones and the two-way radio—all mean that the big city is no longer a technological necessity or a unique source of social satisfactions. The advantages of a city, with the possible exception of certain economic advantages of seaport cities in handling heavy goods, are not now particularly great. In fact, traffic congestion and the difficulty of building heliports in large cities mean that from an economic standpoint a ring of smaller cities could do business more effectively than large metropolitan areas. The constant push to the suburbs, migrations to Florida and to smaller towns show that in terms of pleasantness and attraction the metropolitan cities "have had it."

There is now no economic or social need for us to stay collected like so many lambs ready for the slaughter. We can spread out and thus very much reduce the danger of being crippled or destroyed by the vaporization of a few target cities. This was recognized on paper by the President's National Dispersion Policy, announced in 1951, but there has been little attempt to put that program into effect. Among many reasons, one of the most important is our intellectual and imaginative failure to grasp the fact that there can be a grand strategy of protection. American children shoot their playfellows when they play war games, but they devote litle thought to shielding themselves. Grown-up Americans often protect themselves from the reality of the current threat by thinking in terms of millions killed—sometime in the future—in Moscow or New York. While talking in such terms, they are indulging in political speculation without an uncomfortable sense of personal involvement and fate. No matter how learnedly they discuss the politics of the situation, they are exemplifying Riesman's description of political apathy.

The threat of war becomes immediate, however, if we start to plan the removal of our company or research project, or even work of literary criticism, from Boston or Washington to Canton, N. Y., or Cumberland, Md. We will then no longer think of the threat in terms of science fiction. Moreover, the consequent uprooting creates a problem for any individual or family. I tried to persuade a friend who teaches literary criticism that it would be desirable for his and his children's safety to take a job which he had been offered at a small college some distance from a target area instead of remaining in the big city where he now works. His immediate response was, "Well, they have no library there that specializes in my field; I'd have to do without books or borrow them on interlibrary loan, and that's a nuisance. People like you who try to get people to disperse are a menace." And his wife said, "Oh, I couldn't live in a small college town; I'm sure people gossip about you more there."

Of course, most people cannot automatically move to a town which is safely outside the target area. For the last 2 years I have been seeking suitable employment in fields in which I am capable, where I can be outside the target area. While I have heard of some 40 or 50 attractive openings in the heart of target areas during this period, I have not been told of one in a relatively safe city or town. Individual situation-wanted advertisements do not meet this problem, because in many types of activity almost all desirable jobs are concentrated within target areas.

For individuals to move out, institutions and industries have to move out. The fact that a large number of people in every institution and industry is reluctant to think about moving means that dispersion is likely to be put off, even though it is thought to be desirable academically. It is ridiculous in terms of the national interest for some of our great technical research agencies to be in the heart of probable target cities. The men who work there cannot be replaced. However, even if these men can be persuaded to take themselves and their families out from under the gun, the schools and institutions which support them cannot afford the loss of plant and equipment involved.

So, for a dispersion policy to be effective, there must be compensations and inducements to the vital institutions, industries, and people to duplicate their facilities or spread themselves out. Necessarily, such a program will cost a good deal of money, though probably less than an atomic armament, massive retaliation program carried to extremes. Certainly it would cost a lot less than the vaporization of big cities.

Nobody has appropriated any real money for a national dispersion policy yet. Aside from some pressure exerted on Government contractors and the removal of the Federal Civil Defense Administration from Washington to Battle Creek, nothing significant has been done by anybody anywhere to promote dispersion. The problem is to deter-

mine who must be moved outside target areas, how this can be done, what sort of inducement shall be offered and where facilities need to be duplicated in case of destruction. In the New Leader of November 29, 1954, Congressman RICHARD W. BOLLING and I discussed some of the inducements necessary to get industries and institutions to spread themselves out. Basically, however, what is needed is a careful investigation of these problems, the establishment of priorities and development of precise inducements. Congressman BOLLING, in a resolution introduced into the House, asked that a Joint Committee on the Economics of Atomic Defense investigate these issues. Senator HUMPHREY has introduced a similar (though not identical) proposal in the Senate. Undoubtedly, such a congressional exploration of the situation is imperative, but research by private institutions and agencies and by the executive departments is also to be hoped for.

Such research presumably should focus on issues like those just listed, but there are important additional ones. For instance, subsidization of the helicopter truck and bus industry might speed up materially the process of dispersal and make industrial spreading out very much more feasible; yet, so far, the Federal Government has been fairly timid about backing this industry. Similarly, the probable development of guided missiles with atomic war heads might change the problem of dispersal to some extent, just as the hydrogen bomb forced a radical revision in the early postwar industrial dispersion program which had assumed that everyone could move within the same market area. (The wider range of hydrogen-bomb destruction makes that assumption extremely dubious now.) Even so, we would be infinitely safer than we now are if the Federal Government had declared in 1946 that all new buildings must be outside the probable range of destruction of the atom bomb. If even this had been done, the Russian threat to us now would be far less than in fact it is.

Just as it would have been wiser in 1946 to take the development of superbombs into account as a possibility, so today it would be wiser to plan our programs of dispersion not only in light of what we know today's weapons can do to us, but also in view of what we may reasonably have to fear from those of tomorrow.

Perhaps, and this can never be answered certainly, tomorrow's weapons may really be absolute. In the history of organized warfare, men have forever been discovering weapons which puzzled and horrified them until they discovered some way of circumventing or partly circumventing their effects. Greek fire and gunpowder and even the Yankee habit of shooting directly at a man as a target were regarded as the most wicked possible military developments. Some people thought Napoleon could not be resisted, and the West waited for the grandsons of Genghis Khan very much as a rabbit waits for a boa constrictor.

The scientists who popularized the notion of the absolute weapon were utterly unfamiliar with the history of warfare and of military doctrine and were appalled by their own brainchild. Those who report today that atomic blasts may upset the genetic structure of the human race had their forerunners in the fearful men who foresaw the railroad as forcing women to beget monsters or miscarry.

All the ills and dangers we fear today may come to pass, but they are certainly less likely to take place if we attempt to find out how grand strategy and military commonsense may help us. Conceivably, it might be an argument against proposals which of themselves are unpleasant and disruptive to say, "After all, there is so little reason to hope, let's eat, drink, and pass social security laws, for tomorrow we die." But, by and large, a program of national dispersion would permit us to catch up with 20th-century technology.

Once we write off the dead hand of the past in the form of antiquated buildings and plants, city debts, obsolete roadways, and all the other things which keep us in cities, the spread-out population which is now possible could really enjoy life more. Almost every vital scientific research laboratory in a metropolitan university, for instance, could be rebuilt somewhere in the country and become a more pleasent and effective place to work. Once the difficulty of moving from one place to another is over, most scientists would find better living conditions for themselves. For one thing, they would rid themselves of the strain of traffic or the daily journey by public transit systems; for another, they could eliminate metropolitan noise.

"War," said Clausewitz, "is a continuation of politics." Defense and protection in 20th century America are also a continuation of politics in the widest sense—politics in terms of rural and urban redevelopment, national land use, helicopter transport subsidies, tax rebates, and the like.

If the reader has noticed that this article was written before the most recent announcements about radiation effects and the superbomb, I would like to point out that this new information does not, of course, alter at all the general point that defense means or should mean protection. Nor, in fact, does it alter the arguments for much dispersal. It seems to be the case that there is still a substantial possibility of securing survival through building shelters for those 15 to 20 miles beyond the point where the superbomb hits; but present expectations that each man will build his own bomb shelter involve a fantastic disregard of the advantages of mass production and cooperative action. However, there is at least a possibility that the best way to deal with the superbomb may be dispersal, on the one hand, for those who are not prime objects of enemy attack; and on the other, concentration for a small number of especially important military or productive factors—following in this instance the analogy of the castle town of the ninth century which served as a protection against Viking sea raiders. Concentrations for particularly important factors might be rendered especially defensible in various ways, provided that the rest of the population and of industry did not seek the same degree of protection. But in the absence of information, such possibilities are to be regarded as speculations. A major point for consideration is that there is obviously good reason for concealing from potential enemies the weapons and techniques for attacking them. But is there any good reason for concealing from ourselves what we must do—on rather a large scale—to protect ourselves? Would we not be able to figure out much better what kind of defense would protect us, what degree of dispersal is necessary, what sort of concentration is possible, if we had the information and background for continuing and widespread analysis of the system of defense and protection? In other words, if defense means protection, and protection means public participation and cooperation, perhaps defense also means public access to knowledge about protection.

The Late Paul Shafer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker—

I sometimes hold it half a sin
To put to words the grief I feel;
For words, like Nature, half reveal
And half conceal the soul within.

But, for the unquiet heart and brain,
A use in measured language lies;
The sad mechanic exercise,
Like dull narcotics, numbing pain.

In words, like weeds, I'll wrap me o'er,
Like coarsest clothes against the cold;
But that large grief which these unfold
Is given in outline and no more.

Mr. Speaker, almost 1 year ago—on August 17, 1954—an earthquake hit me and left me buried. Paul Shafer died. Just now I am struggling to dig out or get my head above water. I have not known whether I have been on land or sea.

Members of this House and all outside who knew us well said that Frank Fellows, Paul Shafer, and Dewey Short were a grand trio. It may be doubtful as to how grand we were, but certainly we were a trio. Bound indissolubly together by a common faith, purpose, and philosophy, we were a unit.

When Frank died, Paul and I went to his funeral in Maine. Paul and I would have preferred attending our own. We did not get to do all that we had promised and wanted to do on that particular occasion, because there were too many people present, and we knew some would not understand.

After our dear and beloved Frank left us, Paul and I were called the Gold Dust Twins. Though I knew his ill health and immeasurable grief over the death of his dear wife, Ila, only 6 weeks before his death, I was not prepared for the shock that hit me like a ton of bricks when Paul was cruelly snatched from me.

Life in Maine, Michigan, Missouri, and all over the world has not been the same to me. It never will be. The moon has dimmed, the stars have gone out, and the bright sun casts only a shadow and pall over me. My heart is heavy and heavier than the heart can bear.

But I know the sun still shines. God is in the heavens and all is right with the world.

Today I miss Frank Fellows and Paul Shafer more than ever before in my life. It is only the tender ties and precious memories of them that enable me to carry on. I shall carry on to the bitter end or unto the perfect day.

Though I paid a feeble tribute to Frank, unworthy of a great and good man, which had to be read by our good mutual friend, Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS

of Tennessee, I have said nothing, until this moment—almost a year after his death—about Paul Shafer. Nothing I can say now would detract from his honor or add to his glory.

When Paul died, I did not go to his casket nor did I attend his funeral. I wanted to remember him in life, because he was so full of life. Though he is dead, he yet lives. Forever his good deeds will be a requiem sung by the angels.

Mr. Speaker, we treat our enemies with mean and contemptuous silence, but our friends with a silence that is sacred, that song can never sing, that tongue can never tell.

At this late date, almost 1 year since his death, I cannot begin to express what is in my mind and in my heart about Paul Shafer. He defies description. Rather should I "pronounce his name and let it go shining on in deathless splendor."

On this first anniversary of his death, I can only say that the dearest, sweetest, kindest, and best personal and political friend left me. Oh, what an aching void. In one sense it seems ages ago, and in another sense it seems only yesterday. He was closer to me than hands and feet, and I can now almost reach out and touch his smiling face. Paul had a heart bigger than a cow and a smile that would melt the stoniest faces. He loved people and people loved him.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Shafer with all his foolishness and playfulness—thank God he had it—was a great and good man. He fought the battle of life the hard way and understood people. He battled against heavy odds for high principles and never stultified his conscience. He believed that every person should paddle his or her own canoe but was always helpful to anyone in need. He sided with the weak, the poor, the wronged, and lovingly gave alms to people less fortunate than himself.

Paul Shafer never asked what he could get in return for his good deeds, but he had faith, knowing that whatever bread he cast upon the waters would return to him after many days. He was quick to anger at wrongdoing, but he was also quick to forgive. His big and generous heart could not carry a grudge for long. Paul Shafer loved his God, was devoted to his country, and was loyal to his friends. Honor and loyalty, Mr. Speaker, are about the highest virtues. Paul Shafer had both. His greatest pain was that he could not do more for his family, his friends, and his country. I have seen him on innumerable occasions suffer because he could not do more. Bless his soul.

Many are the times we disagreed without being disagreeable; often he repremanded me, usually to my benefit, and I have said harsh words to him, only to receive a big broad smile and a warm hug that melted my heart. True friends really understand. We did.

Mr. Speaker, methinks that perhaps I could pronounce a grand encomium upon Paul Shafer, but I know if I did, he would rise up in his simplicity, sincerity, humility, and honor from the ashes of his dust to strike me down. Already, I know he feels embarrassed.

I know it is now time to stop—maybe long overdue—but in closing, I want to bow down and thank our God that it was my rare privilege to have known and worked with one of the finest spirits, greatest souls, and best men ever born.

I loved Paul Shafer in this life and will love him increasingly throughout eternity.

Mr. Speaker, as I began these remarks with a quotation from Alfred Lord Tennyson, so I conclude with his immortal poem:

Break, break, break,
On the cold gray stones, O Sea!
And I would that my tongue could utter
The thoughts that arise in me.

O well for the fisherman's boy,
That he shouts with his sister at play!
O well for the sailor lad,
That he sings in his boat on the bay!

And the stately ships go on
To their haven under the hill;
But O for the touch of a vanished hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still!

Break, break, break,
At the foot of thy crags, O Sea!
But the tender grace of a day that is dead
Will never come back to me.

Professional Boxing Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, last June I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a select committee to investigate professional boxing. I regret that this proposal has not been acted upon. There is abundant evidence that such an investigation is warranted and needed. As of today, millions of sports fans believe they are watching rigged matches. Whether they are or not, only a full-scale investigation can determine. Those involved in the sport should welcome it, and the American public has a right to know the truth, whatever it is.

This is a job which can only be done by Congress, and in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it can be done properly only by a select committee. No standing committee of the House can do more than investigate a single angle, but this is a many-angled problem. Three States—New York, Pennsylvania, and California—have launched investigations, but their jurisdiction stops at State boundaries, while boxing is national in scope, complex in its ramifications. Similarly, the standing committees of the Congress are limited by law as to the areas they can investigate, but this is a problem with many facets. Among the phases of it which should be looked into, for example are monopolistic practices in the staging and promotion of bouts, and in the use of communications facilities, particularly television; concealed ownership of fighters; gambling, tax evasion, and underworld influence in fight promotion; possible violation of interstate commerce statutes, and problems of intergovernmental relations.

I hope and trust that when the 2d session of the 84th Congress convenes, it will make the creation of a select committee to look into this matter a first order of business.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a series of excerpts from various publications bearing on this matter:

[From Sports Illustrated of November 1, 1954]

SPORT OR DIRTY BUSINESS?

(By Budd Schulberg)

The Gavilan-Saxton turkey trot deserves a thorough airing. In fact, it may be time to ask again, as responsible sportswriters have been asking so long, whether boxing is going to be a legitimate sport or a dirty business? Jim Norris, the personable president of the IBC, as an honorable man and a true fight fan should welcome an investigation of the dark underside of boxing. It can destroy the sport as the Black Sox conspiracy might have ruined baseball if an effective commission had not been set up to protect our pastime from its inside jobbers. To say this is not to attack boxing but to attack the boxing racket.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of June 9, 1955]

THIS IS A FEDERAL JOB

If Congress runs out of things to investigate it might take a look at the boxing racket and the farflung interests of James D. Norris, president of the International Boxing Club. Mr. Norris' face is familiar to millions of television viewers who must look at it as a preliminary to watching the fights. His other connections with professional sports are less familiar to the home folks.

Recent testimony of Mr. Norris before the New York State Boxing Commission dealt with his acquaintance with Frankie Carbo, a nether-world character who is reputed to be a secret fractional owner of a number of fighters. Some of Carbo's fighters are even matched against each other with predictable results known only to Carbo.

Mr. Norris owns the controlling interest in Madison Square Garden and the scent from the recent commission hearing was too much for six highly reputable businessmen who have served on the Garden's board of directors. They resigned in a body Tuesday, complaining that they were captives of Mr. Norris.

Besides the Garden, Mr. Norris and his partner, Arthur Wirtz, control the Chicago Stadium and the Detroit Olympia. Mr. Norris is president of the Chicago Blackhawks in the National Hockey League and also controls the New York Rangers. A member of his family owns the Detroit Red Wings which does not make the competition particularly keen.

Discontent among the Garden directors is not confined to irritation over some recent fight scandals. They are also perturbed over the fact that the Garden no longer gets the big fights but has been reduced to the status of a TV studio for second-rate fisticuffs.

Since Mr. Norris and his associates control the fight business from coast to coast any single State boxing commission is helpless to do much about cleaning up the mess that has grown up since the fight game moved from the clubs into the front living room of a few million homes. A State commission's power is limited to barring dubious characters—either fighters or managers—from the local rings. If it went too far all that would happen would be the end of the fight game in that State. Either Mr. Norris' fighters perform for television or nobody does.

And this brings us back to our suggestion that Congress give the highly odorous fight business an airing. Involved are federally controlled communications and interstate control of the whole dubious business. The entire mess falls within the purview of Congress. Only Federal legislation will cure the situation.

[From Time magazine of June 20, 1955]

AT THE GARDEN GATE

The sudden and simultaneous resignation of six directors from the board of a big corporation is a pretty good sign that somewhere the gears are clashing. Not so with Manhattan's Madison Square Garden Corp.—or so said resigning Board Chairman Bernard Gimbel last week when he and his old friend and fellow director, James Dougan Norris, fist-fight promoter extraordinary, parted financial company.

A longtime fight fan, and an amateur boxer himself in his younger days, department store magnate Gimbel, 70, had served on the Garden board for 25 years, been its chairman for 10. But Barney Gimbel said firmly that his resignation had nothing to do with State Athletic Commissioner Julius Helfand's investigation into the affairs of Jim Norris' International Boxing Club, which has a stranglehold on big-time professional boxing. Yes, Gimbel was aware that Sports Illustrated had exposed the connections between multimillionaire Norris and underworld characters such as Frankie Carbo. Yes, he had heard Norris testify to his friendship with Carbo. Still Barney Gimbel insisted, "I do not know the man [Carbo] nor do I know who he knows or what he does. What I do know is that I had contemplated this move for 2 or 3 years becausing of increasing outside activities."

REBELLIOUS CAPTIVE

Other retiring directors had even less to say. For the record, Stanton Griffis, onetime United States Ambassador to Spain, was in Paris. Investment banker Jansen Noyes and motor millionaire Walter P. Chrysler, Jr. were "out of town." Financier William M. Greve, a man who temporarily gave up his United States citizenship in the 1930's, then returned home hurriedly from Liechtenstein just two jumps ahead of Hitler, was keeping his own counsel. One of the departing directors, demanding anonymity, told reporters: "We figured we'd get out while the getting was good." Only Wall Street investor (Goldman, Sachs) Sidney J. Weinberg, 63, a dollar-a-year man in Washington during World War II, spoke out. Norris and his friends, he said, had arbitrarily cut down the size of the Garden's executive committee from 8 to 3, making it clear that he wants a free hand in operations. "When 1 or 2 people control a company," said Weinberg, "you become a captive director."

MAN-SIZE JOB

Personable Jim Norris, whose inherited wealth is estimated conservatively at $50 million, has influence far beyond Manhattan. His assets run from Canadian wheat and West Indies sugar holdings to horses, hockey teams, Great Lakes steamships, sports arenas, and questionable friends. He and Ice-Show Promoter Arthur Wirtz control the Chicago Black Hawks hockey team and the Chicago Stadium. His brother and two sisters have a firm hold on Detroit's Olympia Arena and the Detroit Red Wings hockey team. Madison Square Garden owns the New York Rangers hockey team. (The Rangers, Black Hawks, and Red Wings make up half of the National Hockey League.) Norris' IBC has exclusive rights to promote prize fights in the Garden, Yankee Stadium, the Polo Grounds, the Detroit Olympia, and the Chicago Stadium. Just running the Garden is likely to be a man-size job from now on. To assist him, President Norris will have as new chairman of the board the Garden's former president, Brig. Gen. (retired) John Reed Kilpatrick, Phi Beta Kappa and two-time All-America end (Yale, 1909–10). Norris and Kilpatrick, along with Iceman Wirtz, own 60 percent of the Garden stock.

This ownership is not without its problems. The IBC, which can scarcely be distinguished from the Garden management by the naked eye, is faced with an antitrust suit challenging its monopoly of boxing matchmaking. And Commissioner Helfand's investigation, stirred up by the shabby boycott against Welterweight Vince Martinez (Time, June 6), is hardly likely to cool off just because Norris' boys last week finally found Martinez a fight.

[From Sports Illustrated of July 11, 1955]

Boxing society in New Orleans opened its arms to visiting New York mobster Frankie Carbo, who helped Blaise D'Antoni open his new saloon and watched politely as D'Antoni talked of new boxing and horseracing activities.

[From the New York Post of July 21, 1955]

HELFAND WILL HEAR BANNED RING PILOTS

Four suspended fight managers will be given a hearing by Julius Helfand, chairman of the State athletic commission, at an early date to answer written charges that will be filed within a few days.

The four managers, suspended for refusing to testify at the recent commission investigation of the Boxing Guild of New York, are Charley Bauer, Cus D'Amato, Bobby Melnick, and Bobby Nelson. They will be given hearings. No mention was made of two other suspended managers, Bill Daly and Tex Peite.

The investigation of guild activities was reopened by Helfand who questioned Joe Arata, former promoter at Eastern Parkway. Arata said his TV contract called for a maximum payment of $12,150 from a network and the guild imposed a minimum TV fee of $2,900 for each main event fighter. Arata said he complained but was told by the guild take it or leave it.

Arata said he understood the St. Nicholas Arena was paying only $2,100 as a TV minimum while receiving substantially the same money from a different network. Arata added his fee later was cut to $2,500 and still later to $2,100.

St. Nick's minimum later was sliced to $1,500, its current level. Eastern Parkway went out of business in May.

[From Sports Illustrated of August 1, 1955]

"HONESTY RATING"

Dr. George Gallup has published a poll which should interest boxing. "Do you think that any of the boxing matches you see on television are 'fixed' or not?" he asked. The replies:

	Percent
Yes, some are fixed	40
No	27
Don't watch TV fights	14
Not sure, no opinion	19

Says Gallup: "That adds up to about 41 million Americans who give the sport a questionable honesty rating."

Coal Exports Through Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since October 1954 the following coal purchases have been made from foreign aid funds:

	Tons
Colorado	22,400
Kentucky	224,000
Alabama	67,200
Illinois	179,200
Washington	66,080
Utah	67,200
West Virginia	44,800
Indiana	112,000
Oklahoma	44,800
New Mexico	11,200
Pennsylvania	156,800
Pittsburgh seams	134,400
Total	1,130,080

Most of this is destined for Korea; some will go to Indochina, Greece, and Yugoslavia.

Through normal commercial channels an additional 3,201,184 tons have been purchased, of which 1,321,600 tons have been procured through the operation of a revolving fund.

A small additional amount has been bought out of foreign aid funds by the United States Government.

In all, the purchase of 4,653,824 tons of coal has been authorized for fiscal year 1955.

Exports of coal from October 1953 to September 1954 were 14,100,000 tons.

For the period October 1954, through June 1955—9 months—exports were 17,800,000 tons.

Anniversary of the Birthday of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, August 28

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate an event which took place over 200 years ago, the birth of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe on August 28, 1749.

This great German poet was also dramatist, novelist, philosopher, statesman, and scientist. He is honored throughout the world, for his fame has traversed both time and nationality. He has been called the last universal man of the Western World.

The rise of any man from humble beginnings to the heights of renown appeals strongly to our imagination. Goethe, however, was born of a well-to-do and long-established family, with every facility for education. Temptations to an easier life must have been numerous, but his life's story discloses that he refused to tread the pleasant paths that opened to him, and took the way which led over the rough road of toil and action.

Goethe has left us in his autobiography an unforgettable picture of his childhood. The library, the art objects, and antiquities of his father's home in Frankfort-am-Main kindled the quick intelligence and imagination of the young boy. His education was carefully planned. In the earliest stages it was

conducted by his father and later was supplemented by tutors. He then studied at the universities at Leipzig and Strasbourg. There was hardly any field of study which Goethe did not survey. Meanwhile his literary powers were developing, as was evidenced in his letters and in his poetry.

When in 1775, at the age of 26, he was called to Weimar to serve the young duke, Karl August, as companion and tutor, there began for him a course in the practical application of his education to life. Here Goethe would have been free to devote much of his time to his poetry and writing, but, instead, he chose the role of servant to the people and the court. He remained in that service for over 50 years. As a public servant he worked hard as government official, administrator, theatrical manager, mining engineer, collector of art, and university chancellor. But at the same time he was furthering his studies in a number of fields. The literary results of these years are well known to all of us. Goethe incorporated more types of learning and more forms of spiritual discipline into his art than any man of his day—or of our own day, for that matter. He gave the world many pages of beauty as well as power, not only in thought but in form and style. The harmony, the balance, and the classicism that are associated with Goethe's work were not qualities that were bestowed upon him. They represent a mighty achievement, for, although Goethe spent his life in a small village and never stirred from Europe, yet he developed universal interests and universal sympathy. He will always be an inspiration to us because he transcends the narrow specialization of our day. Faust, his masterpiece, has had a great influence on literature and the arts the world over.

In examining Goethe and his varied life we like to think of those aspects of the man's character which we feel are relevant today, for, in celebrating this anniversary of his birth, we are not merely celebrating the fact that he was a great poet. What fascinates this mid-twentieth century about Goethe is, above all, the man himself. His energy and ability were remarkable. He possessed a powerful, ever-active mind. Perhaps most important of all was the fact that he did not make his life's journey over the much-traveled roads, but thought and acted independently and with originality and imagination. His life and work were remarkably creative accomplishments.

Goethe was devoid of affectation; he possessed that entire simplicity of manner and way of life which is the crowning result of the highest culture and the finest nature. His ideal of humanity and his never doubting belief in the dignity of the individual man have greatly influenced succeeding generations. The universal greatness of Goethe cannot be disputed. The inspiration of his greatness will remain a thousand years hence, for Goethe belongs to all ages and to the whole world.

Remarks of Dr. Joseph Lifshitz at Reception in Office of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on July 23, I had the honor of receiving a group of new Americans who belonged to the Workmen's Circle of New York. The occasion was inspiring and moving. Almost all of those in the delegation had come through years of suffering, persecution, and brutality in Nazi or Communist concentration and labor camps. They know from personal experience the terrors and the evils of totalitarianism and appreciate more than many others the blessings of our free land. They have been here only a few years, but already they are all American citizens. I believe that virtually all of them are gainfully employed and are loyal, hard-working, devoted citizens of our country. Their leader, Dr. Joseph Lifshitz, spoke in behalf of the group. His remarks were so eloquent and convincing that I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF DR. JOSEPH LIFSHITZ AT RECEPTION IN WASHINGTON OFFICE OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN, JULY 23, 1955

My dear Senator LEHMAN, it is my privilege to have been assigned the honor of speaking for our group of the Schlome Mendelsohn branch of the Workmen's Circle.

First, we would like to express our thanks to you for your warm and gracious reception.

When we first discussed with the general secretary of the Workmen's Circle, Mr. Nathan Chanin, the matter of being received by a representative personality in American political life, our unhesitating choice was Senator LEHMAN. But this was not because you are the Senator of our home State, New York, but rather because more than anyone else we could think of, you personify the forces of democracy which contend against intolerance and tyranny and stand for a liberalized American immigration policy. It is through such a policy that it is possible for us and others like us to leave the places where we have been victimized and oppressed and find an open door to this great free country of America.

Having found the door open we eagerly entered through it and now in a very genuine sense we feel ourselves to be new-born souls, knowing for the first time what it really means to be free. Our gratitude for this, to you and to America, is beyond words to describe.

For who more than we can appreciate and understand what it means to be able to live, breathe, and to work as free citizens, as free human beings? We, the oppressed and hunted, we who were the objects of derision, we who were stepped upon, and who through miracles somehow survived the crematoria readied for us by the Nazis, crematoria, and gas chambers and firing lines, which had already destroyed six millions of our fathers, our mothers, our brothers, our sisters, and our children? And the same miracles which enabled us to survive the Nazis also enabled us to escape the police state, and the prison camps, and the brutal totalitarianism of Communist Russia.

With how much deep feeling, therefore, do we stand before you attempting to give words to our thanks and to the great esteem we have toward you, Senator LEHMAN, for the outstanding role you have played in our emancipation and for the democratic community which you represent in this country?

It was you and the American people who opened the gates to us, received us so warmly, and gave us the opportunity to rebuild our lives, to become productive citizens of this country, and to begin to give of ourselves, our talents and our devotion, and our energies, to the ever-increasing greatness of these United States in the same way as have so many immigrants before us.

We here are members of a branch of the Workmen's Circle, a fraternal organization of 70,000 members throughout the country, which was formed and built by earlier immigrants. For the 55 years of the organization's existence it has made considerable contributions to the economic, social, and cultural life of this country. We know that you are acquainted with the Workmen's Circle and we need not tell you about it.

You also know about the role the Workmen's Circle has played in molding the countenance of Jewish life in America and in being helpful to Jewish life all over the world.

Our own branch carries the name of Schlome Mendelsohn, one of the noblest figures of our old home life in Poland. He was our revered teacher and cultural leader and a builder of the modern, progressive Jewish school movement in Poland. He was able to emerge from the hell of nazism together with us, and came here to America only to pass from our midst in 1948. Our own branch was formed in 1950, and as new Americans, as survivors of the Nazi tyranny, as escapees from communism, as fighters of the underground, of the partisan movements, and of the ghetto uprisings against the Nazis, we deemed it appropriate to name ourselves after one of our most beloved comrades, Schlome Mendelsohn.

We want to state that we feel ourselves very much at home in the Workmen's Circle where we have joined those who were immigrants of earlier decades. Having entered such an organization, we feel ourselves already integrated into the American community, and even in the short number of years that we are in this country we have all become citizens of America and feel in this citizenship a pride and a triumph which we joyously proclaim.

Thus far I have only spoken of our gratitude, but we also want to express our assurance to you and to our fellow citizens of this country that America will find in us the loyalty and trustworthiness it has a right to expect from every citizen, and we shall give ourselves wholeheartedly to the defense of this country and the enrichment of its traditions and institutions.

We earnestly hope that the priceless opportunity given to us to enter this country and become citizens will also be given to those who are still refugees from tyranny—who, wherever they may find themselves, have little hope in life except to be received in a land of freedom and to breathe as free men as we do now in this country. They, as well as we, look principally to America as a haven of refuge for the oppressed and as a homeland for those who not only believe in freedom but wish to live in freedom. What greater tribute than this can be paid any country?

Again, Senator LEHMAN, with the greatest respect we thank you wholeheartedly for receiving us and adding so richly to this visit we are making to the Capital City of our country. Having come here to learn more about our institutions and our form of government, this visit with you has also made it possible for us to come face to face with one of the greatest exponents of American democracy. This occasion will always be one of our happiest memories.

The Military Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Quarter of a Loaf" concerning the military reserves bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A QUARTER OF A LOAF

A military reserves bill has now emerged from Senate-House conference and will go to the floor of the two Chambers for presumptive approval this week. On the ground that even a quarter of a loaf is better than no bread it will probably receive the reluctant signature of the President.

This compromise with a compromise is slightly better than no bill at all for two reasons. First, it recognizes, at least in principle, that we ought to have a trained Reserve force. Second, it recognizes that something ought to be done to distribute the burden of service more equitably, and it attempts, therefore, to provide against a double obligation on the part of those who have already served their country.

Beyond this the measure does not go far. Not even the most optimistic can believe that it will attain its supposed objective, a pretrained Reserve of 2,900,000 men by 1960. And even the most hopeful can hardly imagine that its roughly 3 months of training on a strictly voluntary basis can supply really adequate preparation for an emergency. Moreover, the deliberate by-passing of the National Guard as a primary element in our Reserve strength may have temporarily spared a controversy but it seriously weakens the measure.

The presentation and adoption of any bill designed to provide a Reserve force recognizes the twofold character of a defense establishment. One component is the active forces. The other is the Reserve. They are equally vital. The strength of the Reserve becomes especially significant if there is any thought of cutting down on the active force.

Unfortunately, we have approached this two-pronged character of our defenses in what seems to be confusion. We have accepted the principles of universality of obligation and compulsory service in respect to the active force. We have now evaded these principles in respect to the Reserve force. The result, as embodied in the present legislation, is both contradictory and unrealistic.

Our legislators are obviously fearful of this bugaboo of universal service or training. We believe this apprehension to be entirely unfounded. Repeated public opinion polls have shown that Americans are willing to make the required sacrifices for the sake of national safety and national strength. Thus, in spite of the election year mentality, we believe that the next Congress has a clearly indicated duty. It must take up this measure again and put some substance into it. A quarter of a loaf isn't good enough.

For Distinguished Service in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times of July 24, there appeared a most interesting article written by former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, a most distinguished American, whose penetrating and fruitful mind continues to be of benefit to all of us.

In this article, former Senator Benton cogently analyzes the duties and functions of Members of Congress, and proposes distinguished service awards to be given to Members of Congress for outstanding performance in the unsung day-to-day labors of the Congress which are so necessary but which receive so little public notice.

While I have some questions about some aspects of the proposal by Senator Benton, I think his article a most useful and arresting one. Surely it deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this thoughful article by former Senator Benton be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN CONGRESS—MANY A CONGRESSMAN DEVOTES HIMSELF QUIETLY TO THE PUBLIC WELFARE AND THE PUBLIC NEVER HEARS OF HIM—HERE IS A PROPOSAL TO REWARD THE UNSUNG LAWMAKER

(By William Benton)

As Congress lumbers toward its summer recess, the season of appraisal opens. Which Senators, which Representatives turned in the best performances, those most in the national interest?

How many questions are potentially more important than this—and on how many do we do a more careless, slovenly job? As a nation we dote on rating our athletes and our actors. We gladly debate the merits of writers, dentists, junior and senior executives, ministers of the Gospel, storekeepers, and even scientists. Do we lack the resourcefulness to assess key political policymakers and to bring them out in the open so that we can better judge their deeds and know who they are?

Reelection is no indication of outstanding national performance. Repeated reelection certainly demonstrates ability of some kind, but there are many second-raters among the old hands. Skill in getting things done for friends or hoped-for friends may determine a Congressman's reelection, but it is no gage of his performance in the national interest. Congressmen and Senators are flooded with requests from individual constituents. They often battle manfully for special benefits for their own districts or States and such services tend to be duly rewarded at the polls.

Nor is the amount of publicity a Congressman receives necessarily a clue to his national value. For lack of better routes to recognition, too many Members of Congress, in the battle for survival, struggle too hard for newspace and headlines. That they do cannot be blamed entirely on the newspapers. The newsmen who cover Capitol Hill average high in ability, but they are limited by the requirements of their craft. They don't seek to give ratings to Congressmen. Their news stories focus on controversial figures, or on that handful among the 531 Members of Congress who as party or committee leaders—usually by virtue of seniority—wield great influence.

In November of 1953 the Harry Dexter White case was in the headlines nearly every day, with Senator JENNER's committee centered in the spotlight. The House Un-American Activities Committee announced it was going to subpena, or request, former President Truman to testify about White. One of the House committee employees explained that the committee wanted to get into the act.

He was candid, if crude. For among all the crafts and professions, politics and the theater are the two in which personal publicity seems most important. Just as a good press is converted into ticket sales at the theater box office, so also is favorable publicity translated into votes at the polls.

The politician's thirst for attention is not inconsistent with democratic theory; one of his jobs is to discover and formulate and clarify what is on the public mind. Another is to try to give leadership to the public opinion. The danger arises when headlines are hunted cynically, when ignorance and prejudice are deliberately exploited, when phony or futile issues are raised merely for the sake of publicity.

A sorry example is Senator MCCARTHY'S recent offer to take part in a commando raid on the mainland of China to rescue American fliers, "if the Air Force will provide adequate cover." A light-hearted example is Senator NEUBERGER'S proposal for an investigation of the treatment of squirrels on the White House lawn.

The headline-aimed statement of the legislator is now far less commonly made on the floor of either House, or in any speech. In form, it can be a press release, or an interview, or a phone call to a columnist. An accusation or an attack is often good for space. So is a demand for an investigation.

An eye-catching bill or resolution can be tossed into the hopper for its 1-day story value. The alert solon with a flair for publicity can ride the news ticker with statements—and score a fair percentage of hits. And of course such statements often obscure the moderate and informed discussion that forms the solid substance of congressional activity. Thus the national distinction of a Congressman can in no sense be measured in column-inches.

Most Senators and Representatives, like other human beings, act out of a mixture of motives, and under a variety of pressures, among which publicity-pressure is only one. But if a given action will produce fast and favorable attention for themselves, many Members of Congress are quick to see its validity and importance. If the action promises hard work and no public recognition, it takes some of them longer to discern the same virtues in it.

This brings me back to my opening question, which can perhaps be reformulated like this: Is there a way to help rectify the imbalance of the headlines by providing a "moral equivalent" which in itself would be personally rewarding to the Congressman; which would generate publicity that in turn would be translatable into votes at the polls; and which would help elevate the tone and quality of the Congress? I have a suggestion toward this end which will be discussed later.

Where shall be look for the unsung—or unappreciated—heroes of Capitol Hill? Three types seems to stand out.

First, there is a kind of guild of professional craftsmen in Congress, men and women who without fanfare do the bulk of the heavy work of legislation—and rarely get so much as a stick of news-type for their pains. Chief among them are the committee specialists. They master the detailed and complex problems of legislation and of its impact on the executive branch.

Hours of solitary study, and faithful attendance at often tedious committee sessions lie behind the construction of appropriation bills, tax measures and major substantive legislation in all fields.

This is the nonglamorous drudgery which is the heart of effective work by Congress. Both Houses of Congress are sprinkled with Members who devote themselves to this work, and it is they who lead and educate their newer colleagues—or the lazier—or those who spread themselves too thin.

Perhaps, without injustice to anyone, Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, may be singled out to symbolize those in Congress who have performed magnificent services for years on end while remaining virtually unknown to the general public. Senator HAYDEN entered the House in 1912 when Arizona, our newest State, was admitted to the Union. Since 1927 he has served in the Senate, and now ranks second in seniority among the 96 (only Senator GEORGE is left ahead of him).

He speaks seldom, always softly, and never with the slightest tinge of rhetoric or passion. He is a tireless worker and his influence within the Senate is enormous. He has played an outstanding part in framing massive appropriation bills, more important on the average than any other task in Congress.

His advice is sought and heeded by Members of both parties. He is trusted by everyone. On a list of influential and effective lawmakers, no name would rank higher than his. Yet he is little known outside of Arizona and the city of Washington.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, has been an acknowledged master of revenue and taxation problems for a generation. The Republican counterpart for Senator GEORGE is Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado. He, too, has a command of finance and revenue issues. One of his Democratic colleagues describes Senator MILLIKIN as the ablest advocate of the conservative viewpoint on revenue and financial policy who has appeared in the Senate in this generation.

The House boasts its full quota of greatly respected stalwarts. Until he assumed the chairmanship of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in a Republican Congress, the public had rarely heard of Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York. The record of Representative COLE's contributions to the upbuilding of the Nation's nuclear defenses has been necessarily buried in the secret archives of that committee.

My second group of unappreciated heroes are by nature the reverse of headline-hunters. They are the pros. Senator HAYDEN and GEORGE and MILLIKIN were old pros long before their seniority put their names in the news columns as committee chairmen. Thus I am here talking about temperament and industry, plus the attitude toward politics that it is a great profession and a life's work.

The pros were described by one experienced congressional observer as "the men who keep their shirts on." They are rarely reformers. They may lack talent as speakers. Their power lies in their character and the force of their personalities, in the confidence they inspire in the minds of fellow Members.

These are the men who put out the fires and curb any latent tendencies to hysteria. They realize that hasty and ill-advised action by Congress can cause incalculable damage, and so they tend to advise patience and delay, and because they are respected their counsel is usually taken.

I shall make my point more clearly in this category, as in the former, if I pick names identifiable by the public even if not highly publicized except through long years of service and seniority. Two Massachusetts Congressmen can perhaps symbolize the pros: JOHN MCCORMACK and JOSEPH MARTIN, or the two Texans: SAM RAYBURN and LYNDON JOHNSON.

My third classification consists of those who risk their political fortunes to champion unpopular causes simply because they believe the cause is right. Very few of the pros are ever in this group. These are the men and women who seek to blaze the trail—to demonstrate the underlying justice of what they advocate. Their immediate reward can be a fusillade of personal abuse and billingsgate, or it can be merely the enlistment of a few more enemies. The end result can be, and sometimes is, defeat at the polls.

A personal experience of my own, in my early days in the Senate, may serve as a minor illustration.

When I was a very junior Senator in 1950—in fact, at the very bottom of the seniority ladder—a batch of Hoover Commission proposals for the improvement and reorganization of the Federal Government came before the Committee on Expenditures.

To my surprise, many of these worthy proposals had no Senate champion. I leaped into the breach, not, I like to believe, without some success on some of the Hoover proposals. One columnist said of me he couldn't decide whether I was a Sir Galahad or just naive.

Senator Kenneth Wherry helped me gain understanding of my lonely role. The proposal under debate by the Senate was to reorganize certain aspects of the Treasury Department's relationship to the banks. I was the only Senator to speak for this Hoover Commission proposal, which was opposed by the banks and which had no friends or supporters with any political impact. After my speech came the vote. The proposed reorganization mustered only seven "ayes."

Senator Wherry left his front-row seat as Republican leader and walked to my back-row seat, No. 96. We were personal friends from my State Department days. He said:

"Bill, your speech reminds me of my first as a Senator; I prepared it carefully; as I spoke I saw the old and distinguished heads nodding in approval; I thought I was doing fine; but when the vote came, I wasn't there. I didn't have the votes, and I remembered that as I walked off the floor Senator Reynolds, of North Carolina, came up to me and put a consoling arm around my shoulder. 'Kenny,' Senator Reynolds said to me, 'Kenny, we was with you as long as you was talking.'"

I learned that, more professional and experienced than I, the old hands in the Senate knew there was no political sex appeal in reorganization. There was little publicity in many of the proposals and almost no incentive in terms of popular support, meaning votes in the following election. But there could be real and terrible penalties in terms of the organized opposition of those who thought they stood to lose—whether they were bankers or railroads or Government employees or veterans. If no friends are to be won, and enemies are to be made, the choice for the Congressman can be difficult indeed.

Can we devise means of rewarding and drawing public attention to the work of the quiet—but invaluable—Senators and Congressmen? One suggestion I herewith propose is that the American Political Science Association each year, perhaps about September 1, award five citations for distinguished service in Congress to Members for outstanding unpublicized (or inadequately understood) performance as Members of the Senate or House during the session that began in January. No Member could win a citation more than once in 5 years.

The Political Science Association, which is controlled by scholars and students of government, is experienced in administering awards. Perhaps the association would conduct an advisory secret poll among the Members of Congress itself, another among the accredited correspondents in the congressional press galleries, and a third among the 200 or 300 top employees of Congress and its committees.

If the association is unwilling or proves unsuitable to administer the awards, perhaps the responsibility should go to the National Committee for an Effective Congress.

Such citations, I believe, would be greatly coveted. What would be at stake would be far greater than a medal or scroll or even the thousand dollars that might come with it. The citations would help reelect men and women who would not otherwise get the public credit they deserve. The awards would cause other Congressman to emulate the kind of congressional service which won the plaudits of the association. They would thus strengthen and improve the Congress. Doubtless there are better ideas toward this end; I hope my suggestion will stimulate them.

The Members of Congress are the most remarkable group that I have ever met anywhere; and in integrity, intelligence, and hard work they rank above any other group with whom I have ever worked. That is as great a tribute as I know how to pay to men and women who are so frequently kicked around, abused, misunderstood, and unappreciated.

Yet the prestige of Congress is slipping, and this is something far more serious than personal misfortune for the individual Members. (One butt of continuing attack by Communist propaganda is our Congress.) A loss of prestige for Congress is a national loss. Carried far enough, it could be a disastrous loss.

I am suggesting one way of helping our people achieve a better understanding of our Congress and how it works. At the same time my suggestion would, I believe, develop the prestige of the Congress and of those Members who contribute most to making it the great and effective body it is. Finally, I would hope that it would encourage an even larger percentage of the Congress to concentrate on those activities which promise to make our legislative process even more effective and to function ever more successfully in the public interest.

National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the majority of the Members of the House are anxious to have a good highway bill.

The President's proposal, along with the Fallon bill, was brought up in the last few days of the session without proper consideration. The President's proposal was not satisfactory to many Members, including me, because it would have cost the taxpayers $11½ billion in interest over a period of 30 years.

The Fallon bill was not acceptable, and I opposed it, because it provided for a tax in a legislative authorization bill which would be establishing a new parliamentary practice in the House of Representatives. The tax-writing function of the Congress is in the Ways and Means Committee exclusively and not in the ordinary legislative committees. In addition to that, there was a closed rule and no amendments could be offered to that taxation provision.

There is no doubt in my mind but what a good bill could be passed as everybody appreciates the necessity for it.

Some newspapers have been violently criticizing Members of Congress for submitting to the trucking lobby. I wish to say for the record that I was not approached by a single member of the lobby. I received some telegrams, yes, very few from my district; but there was nothing unusual in the number compared to the number of telegrams I have received on other controversial matters.

Verne D. Mudge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the attached memorandum in appreciation of the fine service Mr. Verne D. Mudge has rendered the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate from 1947 until the present time as professional staff member.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Verne D. Mudge has been a professional staff member of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate from 1947 until the present; and

Whereas during this period of service he has demonstrated exceptional competence in assisting the committee under the chairmanships of Senator Chan Gurney, Senator Millard Tydings, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, and Senator Richard B. Russell; and

Whereas he has given the committee the benefit of his broad military experience while maintaining scrupulously a viewpoint of complete objectivity; and

Whereas by the energetic application of his talents Verne has contributed immeasurably to committee and Senate action on the many items of legislation affecting the Department of Defense and the national security enacted during the period of his service; and

Whereas he has endeared himself to the members of the committee and its staff by his outstanding ability, his wise and friendly counsel, and his loyalty to the members and staff of the committee; and

Whereas after 8 years of service Verne is resigning from his position on the staff of the committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services expresses its profound appreciation to Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge, United States Army, retired, for his dedicated service of the highest quality, and extends its sincere wishes for his future health and happiness.

Reflections on the Yalta Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the July issue of that most eminent and respected publication, Foreign Affairs, there appeared an article entitled "Reflections on the Yalta Papers" written by Dr. Raymond J. Sontag, professor of history at the University of California.

Dr. Sontag, in this article, makes an assessment of the Yalta papers, both as leaked and as formally published, which should be read by every thinking American who has concerned himself with the controversial questions arising out of the famous Yalta Conference.

It is a fair article, written from the hindsight of the historian which, at the same time, undertakes to present the perspective of those who actually participated in the Conference. Thus we see Yalta not only by hindsight, but also through the eyes of those who were there.

I do not share some of Dr. Sontag's views concerning the naivete of Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I believe they were much more aware of the dangerous possibilities of Soviet intrasigeance and conspiracy than Dr. Sontag indicates. They felt, however, that an honest effort had to be made to prevent a split between the West and the East and to establish a climate of peace in the world. The failure of their effort did not dishonor that effort, as Dr. Sontag, himself, indicates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this very thoughtful article by Dr. Sontag be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS OF THE YALTA PAPERS
(By Raymond J. Sontag)

The Yalta papers could not have appeared under worse auspices. The decision to publish them was colored by partisan political motives. The leakage during the process of selection and editing of sensational passages throws a strange light on the supposedly tightened security regulations of the Department of State. The circumstances under which the documents as a whole were released to the press in the form of uncorrected galley proof were, to put it mildly, peculiar. Finally, it is doubtful whether all the important papers in the Pentagon files have been included.

The most unfortunate effect of the release of the documents to the press in proof form, months before publication of the finished volume, is that attention has been focused on the minutes of the Conference itself. This is inevitable because the minutes have by far the greatest interest as revelations. Of the preconference documents, which fill almost half the volume, only a few have attracted attention. Yet it is only from these papers that a clear view of the world as seen by the American negotiators, and of the objectives of American policy, can be obtained.[1]

The foreign-policy objectives of the United States in 1944–45, as set forth in the preconference papers, can still be studied with pride by Americans; and they should be placed by the rest of the world in contrast to Soviet policy as it has unfolded over the last decade. To see that contrast it is necessary to cite only a few examples. On Italy: "United States policy toward Italy is, briefly, to encourage the development of Italy into a democratic and constructive force in the future Europe and to assist Italy to become politically independent and economically self-supporting as quickly as possible." On Iran: "Our policy in this case is based on the American Government's recognition of the sovereign right of an independent nation such as Iran, acting in a nondiscriminatory manner, to grant or withhold commercial concessions within its territory." On liberated countries: "Insofar as the United States is concerned, the following 2 criteria could be applied to any proposed interim government: (1) that it should be dedicated to the preservation of civil liberties; (2) that it should favor social and economic reforms."[2]

These are not isolated instances. Through every statement of policy in the period preparatory to the conference there is evident the conviction that American interests would be best served by the independence and the economic revival of other nations, by the liberation of subject peoples, by the spread of social reform, and by the free cooperation of all countries in the United Nations. And throughout it is evident that the one central problem was believed to be to obtain Soviet support for the attainment of these objectives. That support obtained, the conviction was general that the world would enjoy peace.

Yalta was the supreme effort of the United States Government to obtain Soviet support for these objectives, an effort which ended in disastrous failure. The Yalta papers, for the first time, give the American people an opportunity to understand clearly why the effort was made and why it failed, and it is vitally important that we should achieve this clear understanding. The present writer had no part in the formation of policy during World War II, and at the time he viewed what was known of our policy toward the Soviet Union with foreboding. Examining the record a decade later, however, he is driven to the conclusion that in the circumstances of the time, and given the accepted military view of the probable duration of the war and of the distribution of power in the world after the war, no other policy was possible. One can go further and say that if the policy of the American Government in 1944–45 had not been attempted, wholeheartedly and to the point where its failure was clear without a shadow of doubt, the firmness of will and the serenity of conscience with which the American people today face a world full of ominous portent would have been impossible to attain.

In the winter of 1944–45 the duration of the war was uncertain. For planning purposes, it was assumed that the European war would be over, at the earliest, by July 1, 1945.[3] At the time of the Yalta Conference, the Russian armies seemed to have a clear road ahead of them across the great European plain; the western armies had not yet crossed the Rhine. In this situation, it was possible that the end of the war would find the Russians in possession of most of Germany, as they were already in possession of nearly all of what we now call the satellites.

Beyond the ending of the European war, there stretched the unknown duration of the Pacific war. For planning purposes, the end of the war against Japan was set at 18 months after the defeat of Germany.[4] While

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

this date was tentative and set merely for logistical purposes, there is clear evidence that the Joint Chiefs saw a hard fight ahead, as indeed there was. The probability that one atomic bomb would be ready by July 1, 1945, and more by the end of the year, was known.[5] But there is no evidence that the military had yet assessed the probable effect of atomic weapons on the length of the war, either in Europe or Asia.

If the war developed in this way, the whole strength of the United States would be concentrated in Asia for some time after the ending of the war in Europe, and if, during this time, the Russians were in undisturbed occupation of most of Europe north of the Alps and east of the Rhine, how would they use this time? Ambassador Harriman reported that, "the overriding consideration in Soviet foreign policy is the preoccupation with 'security'. * * * The Soviet Union seeks a period of freedom from danger during which it can recover from the wounds of war and complete its industrial revolution. The Soviet conception of security does not appear cognizant of the similar needs or rights of other countries and of Russia's obligation to accept the restraints as well as the benefits of an international security system."[6] This was ominous.

The situation in Asia was even more ominous. Within China, according to the briefing book papers of the Department of State, "there is now Kuomintang China, Communist China, and puppet [i. e., Japanese dominated] China. Kuomintang China is being weakened by dissident elements and widespread popular discontent. Communist China is growing in material and popular strength. Puppet China is filled with pockets of Communist guerrilla resistance." A continuation of this situation would be "detrimental to our objective of a united, progressive China capable of contributing to security and prosperity in the Far East." There was an even more dangerous possibility. If the U. S. S. R. entered the far eastern war, one line of attack might be from Outer Mongolia; Soviet troops could strike east and take over all of north China and Manchuria. The Department believed that as yet there was little to substantiate the fear that Russia intended to establish an independent or autonomous area in north China and Manchuria, but an open break between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists would tempt Russia to abandon her declared policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of China. "It is our task to bring about British and Russian support of our objective of a united China which will cooperate with them as well as with us."[7]

Reading these documents, one sees clearly that the American policymakers, civil or military, had no confidence in their ability, while the war continued, to compel the U. S. S. R. to accept the American plans for the organization of the Asiatic mainland. Moreover, our Government was eager to secure early Soviet military intervention in the war against Japan, and recognized the necessity to pay for it. The problem as seen in Washington was both to insure early Soviet intervention and to bring the U. S. S. R. to recognize that a strong and friendly China was the best guaranty of Soviet security in Asia.[8]

Even after victory over Japan, in the view of American policymakers, the power of the United States directly to shape the future would be very limited. The strategic situation expected after the war is most clearly outlined in a letter which Admiral Leahy wrote to Secretary Hull on May 16, 1944, giving the view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a British proposal for the disposition of the Italian colonies.[9] While this letter was written many months before Yalta, it was accepted as the basis for policy by the Department of State in the briefing book for the Conference, and, so far as can be determined from the available evidence, the views of the Joint Chiefs had not altered during the intervening months. The central theme of the letter was the "revolutionary changes in relative national military strengths" resulting from the war, and particularly the phenomenal development of the Soviet strength, absolutely, and relative to the impaired strength of Britain. The situation which was expected to result from this shift now seems so remote that it is almost forgotten, but it must be recalled if American policy in 1945 is to be understood. Admiral Leahy wrote:

"It would seem clear that there cannot be a world war, or even a great war, which does not find one or more of the great military powers on each side. At the conclusion of the present war, there will be, for the foreseeable future, only three such powers—the United States, Britain, and Russia. Since it would seem in the highest degree unlikely that Britain and Russia, or Russia alone, would be alined against the United States, it is apparent that any future world conflict in the foreseeable future will find Britain and Russia in opposite camps. * * *

"In a conflict between these two powers the disparity in the military strengths that they could dispose upon that continent [i. e., Europe] would, under present conditions, be far too great to be overcome by our intervention on the side of Britain. Having due regard to the military factors involved—resources, manpower, geography, and particularly our ability to project our strength across the ocean and exert it decisively upon the continent—we might be able to successfully defend Britain, but we could not, under existing conditions, defeat Russia. In other words, we would find ourselves engaged in a war which we could not win even though the United States would be in no danger of defeat and occupation.

"It is apparent that the United States should, now and in the future, exert its utmost efforts and utilize all its influence to prevent such a situation arising and to promote a spirit of mutual cooperation between Britain, Russia, and ourselves. So long as Britain and Russia cooperate and collaborate in the interests of peace, there can be no great war in the foreseeable future.

"The greatest likelihood of eventual conflict between Britain and Russia would seem to grow out of either nation initiating attempts to build up its strength, by seeking to attach to herself parts of Europe to the disadvantage and possible danger of her potential adversary. Having regard to the inherent suspicions of the Russians, to present Russia with any agreement on such matters as between the British and ourselves, prior to consultation with Russia, might well result in starting a train of events that would lead eventually in [to] the situation we most wish to avoid."

Seen in the light of Admiral Leahy's letter, much that is puzzling in the Yalta period becomes understandable: Mr. Roosevelt's elaborate efforts to avoid the appearance of intimacy with Britain, even to create the impression of friction between Britain and the United States; American opposition to the delimitation of Anglo-Soviet spheres of influence in southeastern Europe; what seems now the shortsighted preoccupation of the Department of State with the possibility that the British and Soviet Zones in Germany might be administered along divergent lines. These and other aspects of American policy should be seen in relation to the conviction that, in the future, war between the United States and U. S. S. R. was "in the highest degree unlikely," that Anglo-Russia enmity was the one likely cause of war, and that the United States must avoid appearing to line up with Britain on questions of direct interest to Russia "lest postwar disunity of the three great powers be thereby fostered with all the possibility of ultimate impact upon the military position of the United States which such a disaster would entail."[10]

It is probable that one can go farther. On many questions Mr. Roosevelt's position at Yalta seems to waver, even to involve contradiction. When Mr. Churchill insisted that France must participate not only in the occupation of Germany but also in the Control Commission, Mr. Roosevelt at the outset joined Marshal Stalin in opposing the British proposal, and made disparaging remarks about the French which, read now, cause justified resentment. At the end of the conference, however, Mr. Roosevelt moved to the British position. Surely, in such cases the position of a statesman should be judged, not by isolated remarks on a single occasion, but by his long-term policy, and the policy of his responsible advisers. Mr. Roosevelt had shown himself a friend of France, and historians of the future are likely to describe American policy toward France, before and after Yalta, in the words the Secretary of State addressed to the President:

"It is in the interests of the United States to assist France to regain her former position in world affairs in order that she may increase her contribution in the war effort and play an appropriate part in the maintenance of peace. * * * In the long run this Government will undoubtedly gain more by making concessions to French prestige and by treating France on the basis of her potential power and influence, than we will by treating her on the basis of her actual strength at this time."[11]

Similarly, the real state of Anglo-American relations in 1945 cannot be determined on the basis of a few quips made by Mr. Roosevelt to Marshal Stalin; much more can be learned from the few words with which General Marshall justified his refusal to insist on precise formulation of American right of access to Bremen: "The broad policy had been decided and the good will was there."[12]

What requires explanation is the fact that, at the end of the Yalta Conference, the American delegation was convinced (so far as can be determined from evidence set down at the time, and not from undocumented afterthought) that Soviet support had in fact been won. In the last days a note of relief, even of rejoicing, breaks through the cold summaries of the proceedings.

To understand this rejoicing it is necessary to stress, not the concessions made by the Americans and the British, but the attitude and the promises of the Russians. On Poland, the Americans and the British stood firm until Stalin said that free elections could be held in about 1 month; then agreement was quickly achieved. On Germany, what seemed important at the time was that the Soviet Union agreed to a single administration for all the zones, thus apparently eliminating the possibility of disastrous friction between the occupying powers. On the Far East, the concessions to Russia in Manchuria, Sakhalin, and the Kuriles seemed justified not only because they insured Soviet military intervention in the war against Japan; these concessions also set limits to Soviet expansion in an area where there was no effective force to oppose Soviet expansion; finally, these concessions brought a Soviet promise to support the government of Chiang Kai-shek. When Molotov agreed to accept the American proposal that in the United Nations the veto should not be used in questions involving the peaceful adjustment of disputes, Mr. Roosevelt felt that this was a great step forward, and Mr. Churchill echoed the President's words, adding that the decision "would bring joy and relief to the peoples of the world."[13]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Over and above concrete concessions, there were Marshal Stalin's repeated protestations of his determination to "create for the future generation such an organization as would secure peace for at least 50 years," [14] and, in contrast to earlier exchanges between the allied governments, his disarming friendliness and apparent eagerness to continue the wartime cooperation into the years of peace which lay ahead. Even Mr. Churchill, whose detestation of communism went back to 1917, was persuaded to hope that "we were all standing on the crest of a hill with the glories of future possibilities stretching before us," while Mr. Roosevelt felt that the atmosphere "was as that of a family," and it was in those words that he liked to characterize the relations that existed between our three countries.[15]

Seldom in history has deception been so successful and so decisive as that perpetrated at Yalta by the Soviet leaders at the expense of Britain and the United States. Immediately after the conference closed, evidence began to accumulate that the Soviet promises were worthless. If the Americans alone had been deceived, one would be driven to conclude that they were deceived only because they were blind to the nature of their antagonists. Blind they certainly were. Nowhere in this volume is there anything which suggests that American statesmen were conscious that they were dealing, not with Russian national leaders, but with Communist revolutionaries determined to outwit and eventually destroy their allies, allies not from choice but because of the mad decision of Hitler to attack the Soviet Union.

Even those who urged a firmer policy in dealings with the U. S. S. R. did not make it clear that Russia was now, not a national state pursuing national interests, but the center of a revolutionary movement dedicated to the creation of a Communist world ruled from Moscow. Gen. John R. Deane believed that for the United States always to be "at the same time the givers and the supplicants" was "neither dignified nor healthy for United States prestige." But he also believed "we have few conflicting interests, and there is little reason why we should not be friendly now and in the foreseeable future." [16] Ambassador Harriman shared General Deane's views on the need for tougher bargaining with the U. S. S. R., but he also felt strongly "that the sooner the Soviet Union can develop a decent life for its people the more tolerant they will become. * * * I am satisfied that the great urge of Stalin and his associates is to provide a better physical life for the Russian people, although they will retain a substantial military establishment." [17] Such statements did little to undermine the belief, dominant in Washington, that Russian and American interests were identical, and that the only problem was to bring the Soviet leaders to a recognition of this fact.

But it was not just the Americans who were deceived at Yalta. Churchill also was deceived, and that was indeed a triumph for Soviet duplicity, for Churchill's denunciations of "the foul baboonery of bolshevism" are among the most magnificent examples of sustained invective in the English language. Here we touch the real root of Soviet success at Yalta: British and American consciousness of the consequences of failure to reach agreement with the Soviet Union. Churchill stated the cast with his customary precision when he presented the Yalta agreements to the Commons: "I decline absolutely to embark here on a discussion about Russian good faith. It is quite evident that these matters touch the whole future of the world. Somber indeed would be the fortunes of mankind if some awful schism arose between the Western democracies and the Russian Soviet Union."

The awful schism did arise. This volume makes abundantly clear that in 1944 and 1945 the American Government made an honest, a desperate, effort to secure Soviet friendship. At Yalta, the professions and promises of Stalin and Molotov convinced the American negotiators that Soviet friendship had been won, that Soviet good faith was assured. Almost immediately after Yalta the conviction was shaken, and slowly, much too slowly, it was destroyed by Soviet aggression. But if that honest and desperate effort had not been made at the outset it is hard to believe that we could now accept unflinchingly the tragically unfolding consequences of the schism between East and West.

The schism is not of our making. So much consolation we can derive from our failure at Yalta. Farther we need not go, and should not go.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] The preconference documents make untenable Mr. Byrnes' belief that Mr. Roosevelt "had made little preparation for the Yalta Conference," as well as the less directly stated suggestion that Mr. Roosevelt had no knowledge of the contents of the briefing book prepared for him by the Department of State (James F. Byrnes, Speaking Frankly. New York: Harper, 1947, p. 23). The briefing book consisted of papers summarizing the status of the problems likely to be discussed at Yalta, and stating American policy, or making policy recommendations, on each problem. It is almost certainly true that Mr. Roosevelt did not read most of the papers. However, there is clear evidence that the main points of many of the papers were known to him, and that he was familiar with the policy statements or recommendations in most of the important papers. I have used the statements of policy as given in the briefing book only when it seems clear that the statement was, in fact, American official policy.

[2] As only the galley proofs of the Yalta papers are available at this writing, and the precise title of the volume is uncertain, location of a paper within the volume can be given only by chapter and section within the chapter. The first quotation above is from a briefing book paper on United States Policy Toward Italy, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "The Italian Cabinet Crisis"; the second is from a dispatch from Stettinius to Harriman, October 30, 1944, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "Iran"; the third is from a briefing book paper on liberated countries, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "Liberated Europe and Spheres of Influence."

[3] February 9, 1945, Report of the Combined Chiefs of Staff to President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, par. 18, printed in ch. 8.

[4] Ibid.

[5] December 30, 1944, Groves to Marshall, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "Entry of the Soviet Union Into the War Against Japan."

[6] January 10, 1945, Harriman to Stettinius, printed in ch. 4.

[7] Briefing book papers on Political and Military Situation in China in the Event the U. S. S. R. Enters the War in the Far East, and Unity of Anglo-American-Soviet Policy Toward China, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "China."

[8] Ibid. It should be emphasized that the American objective was not simply to bring the U. S. S. R. into the war against Japan: "Russia's entry at as early a date as possible * * * is necessary to provide maximum assistance to our Pacific operations" (January 23, 1945, the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the President, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "Entry of the Soviet Union Into the War Against Japan").

[9] May 16, 1944, Leahy to Hull, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "Liberated Europe and Spheres of Influence."

[10] Ibid.

[11] January 4, 1954, Stettinius to Roosevelt, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "The Role of France."

[12] February 6, 1945, meeting of the combined Chiefs of Staff, printed in ch. 8.

[13] February 7, 1945, fourth plenary meeting, Bohlen minutes, printed in ch. 8.

[14] February 6, 1945, third plenary meeting, Bohlen minutes, printed in ch. 8.

[15] February 8, 1945, tripartite dinner meeting, Bohlen minutes, printed in ch. 8.

[16] December 2, 1944, Deane to Marshall, printed in ch. 4.

[17] January 6, 1945, Harriman to Stettinius, printed in ch. 2, section entitled "Proposed United States Loan to the Soviet Union."

Amending Natural Gas Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6645) to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended,

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, and strongly urge that it be defeated.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I attended the many hearings that lasted for more than 3 months which were held on the bill we are considering today, namely, a measure to exempt natural-gas producers from control by the Federal Power Commission.

While I do not claim to be an expert on this subject, after listening to the voluminous testimony produced, both pro and con, it is my considered opinion that passage of this bill would not be in the best interest of the consumers. I voted against the measure in committee and shall do so again on the floor today.

Testimony before our committee has revealed that regulation of the natural-gas industry is necessary. It was developed that an urgent need exists for a study of the operations of the pipeline companies, the distributors, as well as the producers. My constituents and most of the people of the great city of Baltimore feel that if the producer is not controlled, prices charged to the consumers would then be substantially increased.

I am personally very much alarmed by the great variations in the price of natural gas at the consumer level. I should very much like to know why the distributor in Baltimore charges $1.14, while in Chicago the price is only 89 cents, in Detroit 55 cents, and in Cleveland only 27 cents.

Until such studies can be accomplished, I deem it our duty to protect the consumers by voting against this bill. After such a thorough inquiry will have been completed, we will then be in a much better position to regulate the industry in the best interests of all concerned.

Record of Activity of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 1st Session, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives submits its record of activity during the first session of this Congress. As chairman of the committee, I do this in the knowledge that its contributions to the achievements of the 84th Congress could not have been effected without the concentrated work and devotion of the members of the committee and the staff.

Of the 8,843 bills introduced in the House, a total number of 3,959 were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, thus giving this committee about 45 percent of the total number of House bills.

Among the 3,959 referred to this committee are the following: 817 public House bills, 12 public Senate bills, 2,815 private House bills, 315 private Senate bills. Thirty-three public House bills reported by the Committee on the Judiciary were pending in the Senate at the time of adjournment. Twenty-three public bills acted upon by the Committee on the Judiciary have been enacted into law. Three hundred and twenty-seven private bills were enacted into private law.

The committee held a total of 114 hearings during the session on 3,959 bills.

We believe it is a good record and we invite review of the detailed account of the work of the five standing subcommittees into which the committee itself is divided, as hereinbelow set forth:

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER BILLS AS ASSIGNED, SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Public bills: Subcommittee No. 1 had 104 public bills referred to it for action.

A group of nine bills dealing with the transportation and distribution of obscene matter were considered by the subcommittee. H. R. 3333, amending chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the provisions barring the transportation of indecent and obscene matter, was reported by the subcommittee. A similar Senate bill, S. 600, was amended on the floor of the House by the substitution of the provisions of H. R. 3333. That bill, approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, became Public Law 95.

H. R. 2854 to increase the penalties for seditious conspiracy, advocating the overthrow of the Government and conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the Government was recommended favorably by the subcommittee. The bill was reported, passed the House, and was pending in the Senate at the close of the session.

The subcommittee drafted and recommended for enactment a bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of wives and children of Spanish sheepherders who had been admitted under laws authorizing the admission of such sheepherders. The legislation also provided for a more humane approach to the waiver of minor criminal offenses of persons seeking to enter the United States. The subcommittee incorporated into the bill an amendment to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, so as to apply that law to refugees in Spain. An additional committee amendment was designed to correct a situation involving a number of aliens admitted under the displaced persons laws, who misrepresented their nationality or country of birth to avoid forced repatriation to Communist-controlled countries. The bill, H. R. 6888, was reported to the House, and was passed on July 30, 1955. The bill was not acted upon by the Senate prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee, after hearings at which representatives of the American Bar Association and the State and Justice Departments appeared, recommended an amended bill to provide for a commission to conduct a study of the problems in the field of international legal procedure with the purpose of formulating suggested rules of international judicial procedure. A clean bill was introduced embodying the recommendations of the subcommittee and reported to the House, H. R. 7500.

The committee has heard from a large number of witnesses in the course of hearings on H. R. 3, a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of the acts of Congress on State laws. It is contemplated that hearings on this legislation will be continued at the next session of this Congress.

The subcommittee held 33 meetings, 8 of which were hearings on public bills.

The extent of work of this subcommittee cannot be appreciated without a review of its activity in the area of private legislation. The following table sets this forth:

House bills:	
Private laws enacted	270
Bills pending in Senate	99
Adverse action by Senate committee	2
Reported in House, Senate bills substituted on House floor	5
Passed by Senate, amended, in which the House has not concurred	3
On House Private Calendar	1
Recommitted	2
Tabled by committee	291
Bills disposed of by inclusion in two omnibus bills	64
Bills rejected under committee rules	37
Departmental reports submitted, no action taken	935
Departmental reports requested and not received	283
Number departmental reports requested	199
Total House bills	2,191
House joint resolutions:	
Private law enacted	1
Private law pending	1
Total joint resolutions	2
Senate bills:	
Private laws enacted	131
Vetoed	1
Tabled by committee	15
Pending	151
Total Senate bills	298
Total number of bills and joint resolutions	2,491
Total number of private laws	[1] 412

[1] Ten Senate bills, not referred to the committee, were called up on the floor of the House and have become private laws.

In addition, final congressional action was taken on several concurrent resolutions, as follows:

Three House concurrent resolutions, approving the favorable recommendation of the Attorney General in 611 cases submitted to Congress pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

Two House concurrent resolutions, favoring the granting of permanent residence in 409 cases submitted to Congress by the Attorney General pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

Two Senate concurrent resolutions, approving 256 cases submitted to Congress by the Attorney General in which suspension of deportation was recommended.

Two Senate concurrent resolutions, withdrawing suspension of deportation in two cases.

One Senate concurrent resolution, providing for the reenrollment of S. 195.

Totals: 5 House concurrent resolutions, 5 Senate concurrent resolutions.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED, SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

During the session the subcommittee conducted hearings on 14 different days. These covered public as well as private claims measures. Consideration was given 296 bills.

The following tabulation indicates the workload of this subcommittee in connection with claims against the Government:

Referred to subcommittee:		
Private, House bills	599	
Private, House resolutions	15	
Private, Senate bills	12	
		626
Public, House bills	68	
Public, House joint resolution	1	
Public, Senate bills	3	
		72
Total		698
Reported to committee:		
Private, House bills, favorably	194	
Private, House resolutions, favorably	14	
Private, Senate bills, favorably	7	
		215
Public, House bills, favorably	17	
Public, Senate bills, favorably	1	
		18
Total		233
Private, House bills, adversely	66	
Private, Senate bills, adversely	1	
		67
Public, House bills, adversely	2	
Public, Senate bill, adversely	1	
		3
Total		70

Reported to House:		
Private, House bills	227	
Private, House resolutions	14	
Private, Senate bills	6	
		247
Public, House bills	17	
Public, Senate bill	1	
		18
Total [1]		265

[1] This total includes 33 private House bills reported under rule 7 of the committee, which authorizes the chairman to report bills which have been favorably reported by the committee in the previous Congress.

Passed House:		
Private, House bills	212	
Private, House resolutions	14	
Private, Senate bills	7	
		233
Public, House bills	16	
Public, Senate bill	1	
		17
Total		250
Pending in Senate:		
Private, House bills	168	
Public, House bills	15	
Total		183
Public laws enacted (claims)		2
Private laws enacted		57
Bills vetoed		3

A substantial amount of the subcommittee's time was devoted to the bill (H. R. 4045) relating to the Texas City disaster. This legislation concerned some 8,000 claims against the United States for death, personal injury, and property damage. As a result of the disaster over 570 people were killed and 3,500 more injured. The claims were litigated for over 5 years in the Federal courts under the Tort Claims Act.

The subcommitte held extensive hearings in which it heard not only the representatives from the Department of Justice, but also the attorneys who represented many of the claimants. It also studied and examined the record of the court litigation, which consisted of over 39 volumes and some 40,000 pages. In addition, the subcommittee held some 10 executive sessions on this legisltion. As a result, it recommended legislation substantially different from the bill as introduced, and as changed, it was passed by the House late in this session of the Congress. Because the House disagreed with the Senate's recommendations, it was necessary to go into conference. However, both Houses adopted the report of the conferees and the legislation has been cleared for Presidential action.

The subcommittee has scheduled 4 days of hearings in California on H. R. 7763, a bill looking toward the early settlement of the Japanese-American evacuation claims. As a result of the evacuation and exclusion of people of Japanese ancestry from the west coast during World War II, the Government recognized claims by people who suffered losses due to the evacuation. There remain over 2,500 claims unsettled, totaling approximately $60 million. It is hoped that the hearings on this bill will result in providing additional methods for the expeditious settlement of these remaining claims. It is some 13 years now since the evacuation of these people, and it is felt that it is only proper and fair to recompense the remaining claimants as speedily as is reasonably possible to help them rehabilitate and readjust themselves.

GENERAL JURISDICTION

In addition to claims bills, Subcommittee No. 2 handled a number of pieces of general legislation. These included civil rights bills, bills to establish a public defenders system in the courts of the United States, legislation concerning criminal laws, mileage allowance increases for marshals and their deputies, proposed modification of the Lucas Act—Public Law 657, 79th Congress—and bills to provide a remedy for persons who are slandered or libeled by Members of Congress.

Hearings were held on July 13, 14, and 27 on 51 civil-rights bills before Subcommittee No. 2. These bills would provide extensive Federal protection of civil rights. Among the proposals considered were the following: The creation of a Fair Employment Practices Commission to eliminate racial and other discriminations in employment, prohibitions on racial and other discriminations in federally supported housing, federally supported education, interstate transportation and the armed services, prohibitions on interference with the right to vote, and other rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and anti-lynching, anti-poll-tax, and anti-peonage legislation.

Other bills would create a joint congressional committee on civil rights and establish a Federal commission on civil rights to gather information concerning the protection of civil rights in the United States and report annually to the President. In addition, there are proposals to reorganize the Department of Justice by providing an additional Assistant Attorney General to head a civil rights division and to authorize additional FBI personnel to enforce civil-rights legislation.

Hearings were held on a number of bills to authorize the establishment of a public defenders system in the courts of the United States. Full time or part time defenders would be appointed to represent indigent defendants charged with Federal crimes. These bills are now under consideration by the subcommittee.

A number of bills concerning the criminal laws have been before Subcommittee No. 2. H. R. 5205, a bill to include all members of the armed services in Federal criminal law protection now afforded the members of the Coast Guard, was favorably reported by the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee and is now pending on the Consent Calendar of the House.

Hearings were held on other legislation concerning the criminal law. H. R. 4930 and H. R. 4932 would provide the defendant with an appeal against an excessive criminal sentence while H. R. 799 and H. R. 5264 would establish the making of contradictory statements under oath as perjury. These bills are now under consideration by the subcommittee.

Preliminary hearings were held on two bills, H. R. 4299 and H. R. 5753 to modify the Lucas Act—Public Law 657, 79th Congress. These bills would render less stringent the requirements as to requests for relief so as to make more World War II contractors' claims eligible for consideration.

The subcommittee held hearings on two bills, H. R. 271 and H. R. 641, to provide remedies for persons who are slandered or libeled by Members of Congress. These bills were adversely reported by the subcommittee and tabled by the full committee.

In view of the fact that all other Federal employees received increases in mileage allowances for travel on official business, Subcommittee No. 2 favorably reported H. R. 4019, to authorize an identical mileage allowance increase for United States marshals and their deputies. This bill passed the House on July 25, 1955, and an identical bill, S. 2592, was then substituted for it.

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee	79
Number of hearings held	7
Number of public bills reported to full committee	14
Number of reports filed	2
Number of public bills passed House	0
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	0
Number of Senate bills disposed of	0
Number of public bills approved by the President	0
Number of public bills pending approval of the President	0

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

The primary functions of this subcommittee are three. It processes all bills of a general nature which are assigned to it. It also handles legislation relating to patent, trademark, and copyright laws. In addition, it has jurisdiction over the revision of the laws, classifying the general and permanent laws, as they are enacted, into the 50 titles of the United States Code.

Out of a total of 69 days which were available for subcommittee hearings, 23 days of hearings were scheduled. In other words, this subcommittee held hearings on an average of 1 for every 3 days. In addition, the subcommittee held 14 executive sessions.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

With respect to general legislation, the workload of Subcommittee No. 3 was substantially increased during the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Aside from patent, trademark, copyright, and codification bills, which are treated, for subcommittee purposes, as special legislation, there were referred to the subcommittee during the 1st session 30 bills relating to general legislation. Among the general judiciary bills handled by this subcommittee was one—H. R. 3882—requiring the registration of persons trained in the espionage service and tactics of foreign governments. This legislation will give important assistance to our law-enforcement agencies in combating subversive activities in this country.

Important assistance to our defense agencies is expected to result from the enactment into law of H. R. 3885—Pub-

lic Law 60—which permits the waiving of performance and payment bonds in connection with Coast Guard contracts.

The subcommittee also processed the bill, H. R. 3702, which passed the House but has not been acted upon as yet by the Senate. That bill amends the Motor Vehicle Theft Act by making it a crime to transport stolen truck trailers and semitrailers in interstate commerce.

Following full public hearings, the subcommittee took favorable action on a bill, H. R. 5649, which will restrain the abuse of the use of the writ of habeas corpus in the lower Federal courts by prisoners convicted in State courts of State crimes. This bill was recommended by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and has the approval of both the State and Federal judiciaries.

H. R. 3233, which passed the House, relates to the Fugitive Felon Act, and makes it a Federal criminal offense for anyone to cross State boundaries to avoid prosecution for the crime of arson.

Another bill which was enacted into law—Public Law 136—on which this subcommittee acted, was H. R. 4221, which authorizes certain staff personnel to administer oaths and take acknowledgments of inmates in Federal penal institutions. This legislation will not only result in the savings of time for our Federal prison officials but will also eliminate the necessity of moving inmates in and out of the prison offices.

The House also passed H. R. 5417, which broadens the class of postal workers who are prohibited by law from seeking to increase the compensation of postmasters through the sale or pledge of postage stamps.

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

Another important phase of this subcommittee's work relates to patent, trademark, and copyright laws. One of the major pieces of legislation regarding patents has been the bill (H. R. 7416) to increase the fees payable to the Patent Office for the registration of patents and trademarks. Extensive hearings were held on this legislation and the committee favorably reported a bill which would increase patent and trademark fees generally. This legislation it believed necessary for many reasons, among which is to help expedite and therefore shorten the period for processing patent and trademark applications.

A piece of legislation which this committee reported to the House—H. R. 2128—concerned the extension of the terms for certain patients whose exploitation and use was curtailed during World War II and the Korean conflict. As in the case of patent-fee increases, extensive hearings were conducted on this legislation, and it is presently pending in the Rules Committee, where a rule has been requested.

An inventive contributions award bill—H. R. 2383—also passed the House in the closing days of this session, which will foster invention for our national defense by authorizing monetary awards to those people who make meritorious inventive contributions to our Government in aid of our national defense.

The subcommittee also reported out and the House favorably acted upon H. R. 5876, a bill to amend the copyright laws to permit the deposit of photographs in lieu of the actual works for people seeking copyrights.

REVISION OF THE LAWS

The primary work of the subcommittee with respect to the revision of the laws—the classification of public laws to appropriate titles of the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code—has been carried on currently in conformity with the policy of classifying the laws immediately upon their promulgation. With the large volume of bills awaiting the President's signature the total number of public laws will undoubtedly exceed 450 for this session. The last laws will be classified as soon as practicable upon their receipt from the Government Printing Office.

As soon as possible after the classification of all of the laws of this session, copy will be forwarded to the Government Printing Office for the printing of Supplement III of the United States Code and Supplement IV of the District of Columbia Code. It is hoped that these supplements will be available in the early part of next year.

The law revision functions of the committee consist, in part, of promulgating and keeping up to date the official United States Code which now consists of 6 volumes comprising over 10,000 pages. Supplement II to the code containing the additions to and the changes in the laws enacted during the 2d session of the 83d Congress has been prepared from editorial copy consisting of nearly 28,000 cards to be inserted in the text of supplement I. Delivery is expected within the next month. It will consist of 1 volume of 1,563 pages, an increase of 1,000 pages over the prior supplement.

The work of preparing Supplement III to the District of Columbia Code containing the laws to January 4, 1955, was completed early during this session. The supplement contains notes to decisions of the court from January 3, 1951, to July 1, 1954. It consists of 2 volumes totaling approximately 500 pages.

Supplement IV of the District of Columbia Code containing the laws to the end of the first session of the 84th Congress and the notes to the court decisions as of July 1, 1955, is also in the process of preparation and should be ready for delivery during the latter part of this year. It will also consist of two pocket parts to be inserted in the two volumes of the 1951 edition.

The other phase of the law-revision work—that of preparing bills to enact into law separate titles of the United States Code—has been going forward steadily. Since the last report of the subcommittee, title 13, Census, has been enacted into law and subcommittee action has progressed on title 16, Conservation and Reclamation; title 20, Education; title 23, Highways; and title 43, Public Lands. Only recently a bill—H. R. 7768—was introduced by me to revise title 39, the Postal Service. The draft for this bill was prepared in cooperation with the Post Office Department over a period of almost 1 year. In addition, bills to revise title 21, Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics; title 10, Armed Forces; and title 32, National Guard, have already passed the House and are pending in the Senate. It may be of interest to mention that title 10, Armed Forces, has been in preparation for some 7 years and consisting of 817 pages, is almost the largest bill ever introduced in the Congress. This bill first consolidates the present title 10, Army and Air Force; title 34, Navy; and the provisions relating to the Department of Defense into one title to be known as title 10, Armed Forces; and second, enacts the laws relating to the National Guard as title 32.

In addition to the codification bills that have been introduced, a committee print has been prepared and published covering the proposed codification of the laws relating to reclamation and conservation, title 16, United States Code. A committee print of a proposed report of this bill has also been printed and given wide distribution with the view of introducing a bill early in the next session of the 84th Congress. Also progress has been made on the draft of a bill to enact title 44, Public Printing.

The subcommittee has cooperated with the other subcommittees of this committee and with other committees of the House with respect to the form and style and legislation affecting titles of the United States Code which have been enacted into law.

Subcommittee No. 3, Committee on the Judiciary

Bills referred	68
Hearings held	23
Bills reported to full committee	20
Bills reported to House	14
Bills passed House	11
Bills pending in Senate	8
Senate bills processed	1
Bills which became public law	2
Bills awaiting Presidential action	1

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED, SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER BANKRUPTCY AND REORGANIZATION

To improve the administration of the bankruptcy laws, Subcommittee No. 4 held hearings on and favorably reported bills authorizing increases in the compensation of referees and trustees in bankruptcy. These bills are designed to make highly qualified persons available as referees and trustees. H. R. 4791, pertaining to referees' compensation, passed the House May 17, 1955, and H. R. 5047, pertaining to trustees' compensation, passed the House on August 1, 1955. These bills are now pending in the Senate.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress, Subcommittee 4 held hearings on and favorably reported other bills designed to improve particular aspects of the bankruptcy laws. H. R. 256, clarifying the definition of "salesmen" in the priorities section of the law, passed the House on July 5, 1955, and H. R. 6247, conforming the handling of unclaimed bankruptcy funds with other unclaimed funds of district courts, passed the House July 30, 1955. These bills are now pending in the Senate.

General legislation assigned to Subcommittee No. 4 has covered a wide range of subjects. For example, there have been before the subcommittee more than 100 bills concerning holidays, celebrations, and the incorporation of patriotic and other organizations. In addition, action has been taken on general legislation dealing with the temporary extension of various emergency statutes, the amendment of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, the amendment of criminal laws, and the restoration of court jurisdiction over certain civil cases.

The emergency legislation on which Subcommittee No. 4 held hearings and took action concerns title II of the First War Powers Act and war-risk hazards. Public Law 58 extends the effectiveness of title II of the First War Powers Act to July 30, 1957. This legislation authorizes expeditious contracting procedures essential to national defense. Public Law 125 extends to July 1, 1956, legislation providing benefits for civilian employees who are injured, killed or captured by enemy or other military action. These war-risk hazard and detention benefits are essential for effective recruitment of qualified civilian personnel for overseas employment, such as construction work on military installations.

The criminal laws concerning threats against the President were amended by Public Law No. 53 to include the President-elect and Vice President in their protections and subsequently the House passed H. R. 6621 to include the Vice President-elect in this protection and to clarify the law. This bill is now pending in the Senate.

Subcommittee No. 4 held hearings on and favorably reported two bills to rectify certain injustices. H. R. 7418 was ordered favorably reported by the subcommittee on July 27, 1955. This bill would amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to give miners of strategic minerals during World War II an opportunity to have their claims for fair compensation determined on the merits by the contracting agencies involved. H. R. 5862 was ordered favorably reported by the subcommittee on July 27, 1955, to restore court jusrisdiction over cases involving claims for overtime pay during World War II. A 1951 statute inadvertently deprived courts of jurisdiction over these then pending cases.

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee	168
Number of hearings held	11
Number of public bills reported to full committee	24
Number of reports filed	16
Number of public bills passed House	15
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	5
Number of Senate bills disposed of	1
Number of public bills approved by the President	8
Number of public bills pending approval of the President	1

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED, SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER ANTITRUST MATTERS

This subcommittee exercises jurisdiction over a variety of subjects with special jurisdiction over antitrust matters. Among the subjects assigned to this subcommittee were such matters as congressional and judicial salaries, with Federal judicial administration, wiretapping, and antitrust problems.

During the first session of the 84th Congress this subcommittee had referred to it 62 bills on which 49 hearings were held. Nine bills were favorably reported to the full committee of which 8 received favorable action in the House. Five of these bills were approvad by the President.

One of the bills enacted into law provided for a Commission on Security to make a study and report of the Government's security program both within the Government iself and in private industry insofar as national defense and security are involved.

This subcommittee also managed the bill which increased the salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judiciary.

Two bills relating to antitrust were also enacted into law. One of these bills increased the penalties for criminal violations of the antitrust laws. The other was of a twofold nature and provided for a uniform statute of limitations with regard to antitrust litigation and also created a right of action on the part of the Government to recover actual damages in antitrust suits.

At the close of the first session of the Congress this subcommittee had reported to the full committee a bill providing for Federal control over wiretapping. This measure was recommended to the full committee after lengthy hearings had been held and a clean bill written.

Another measure enacted into law abolished the divisions in the judicial district of Nebraska.

This subcommittee also conducted a series of hearings which will be reopened at the next session of Conress on a number of bills relating to the Federal judicial system throughout the country as well as a number of bills providing for additional judges in the circuit and district courts.

ANTITRUST MATTERS

The Antitrust Subcommittee carried out a comprehensive series of hearings on current problems in the antitrust field.

The purposes of the hearings were to examine current antitrust enforcement, recommendations made by the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws, the forces involved in the merger movement, the growing problem of industry concentration and to secure up-to-date information from political, industrial, agricultural, and labor leaders concerning the new monopoly problems which they face because of the new forces transmuting the economy. Hearings on these matters extended over a period of 18 days in the course of which 55 witnesses were heard representing all points of view. For example, a number of Members of the House and Senate experienced in the field offered their counsel. Various leading professors in economics and antitrust law gave their observations and recommendations. Leading governmental officials testified regarding current antitrust enforcement. Leaders in the fields of business, labor, farming, and banking, in their various branches, made available their detailed and practical experience of the economic life of the country. Testimony was adduced from experts regarding the impact, or lack of it, of the antitrust laws in the field of foreign trade.

As a result of the testimony received it is possible to isolate many antitrust problems facing the country and possible solutions to these problems. A committee report is currently being prepared for these purposes.

These exploratory hearings resulted in a number of bills being introduced: One of these bills, H. R. 5948, is designed to bring asset acquisitions by banks within the purview of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950 and thus check the current wave of bank mergers which is causing the demise of a large number of strong, independent competing banks. The bill was approved by the subcommittee and the full committee and reported favorably to the House, after hearings held to obtain the views of all interested parties.

Hearings were also held by the subcommittee on H. R. 6875 which would remove the provision for mandatory treble damages in private antitrust suits and provide the judge with discretion as to the extent of damages. Where the violation is willful it would be mandatory under the bill to assess full treble damages. Final subcommittee action has not yet been taken.

The subcommittee has been concerned with the problem of businessmen serving in key Government posts without compensation. These so-called w. o. c.'s receive salaries from their usual employers while on loan to the Government for service in such agencies as the Department of Commerce. Hearings held by the subcommittee on this subject have demonstrated the dangers presented by the conflict of interests involved for w. o. c.'s and the possibility of Government abdication of policymaking functions to the representatives of groups having a particularized interest in the continued increase of economic concentration.

An important series of bills referred to the subcommittee are H. R. 11 and a number of companion bills which would remove "good faith meeting of a competitor's price" as a defense against a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act where the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition. The subcommittee has requested various governmental agencies to submit their views on these equality-of-opportunity bills.

Several bills have been introduced to cope with the increasing number of industrial mergers which has been occurring in recent years. One bill would require any corporation with assets over $1 million to give 90 days' notice to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission before consummating a merger. Another bill would require not only advance notification but suspend a merger in the event a complaint is filed by the enforcement agencies. Still an additional bill would give the Federal

Trade Commission authority to seek a temporary restraining order preventing a merger pending Commission determination of its legality.

The subcommittee has also been concerned with the increasing degree of concentration in the textile industry which has been caused in the main by merger activity. A detailed staff report on this subject has been issued which examines in detail various mergers which have occurred together with the factors which gave rise to those mergers.

SUBJECT MATTER OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS

First. Industrial mergers and economic concentration.

Second. Administration of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950 by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission.

Third. Bank mergers.

Fourth. Retention of mandatory treble-damage provision in private antitrust suits.

Fifth. Composition and organization of Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws.

Sixth. Recommendations of Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws.

Seventh. Government personnel serving without compensation—w. o. c.'s.

Eighth. Government advisory groups.

Ninth. Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce.

Tenth. Operations of the petroleum cartel and the Iranian consortium.

Eleventh. Comparison of per se and rule of reason approach to antitrust law interpretation.

SUBJECT MATTER OF GENERAL INVESTIGATION

First. Price discrimination and the Robinson-Patman Act.

Second. Exclusive dealing contracts under the antitrust laws.

Third. Retail distribution practices and the antitrust laws.

Fourth. Resale price maintenance—fair trade—laws.

Fifth. Patent antitrust problems.

Sixth. Antitrust injunctive procedures and legislation.

Seventh. Attorney General's Advisory Opinions.

Eighth. Antitrust consent decrees.

Ninth. Antitrust aspects of automobile distribution.

Tenth. Monopoly problems in the airlines industry.

Eleventh. Antitrust aspects of foreign trade.

Twelfth. Antitrust problems affecting brokers.

Thirteenth. Antitrust problems concerning the petroleum industry, the aluminum industry, the steel industry, the cement industry, the dairy industry, private utilities.

Fourteenth. Economic bigness.

Fifteenth. Antitrust problems affecting small business, labor, agriculture, cooperatives.

Sixteenth. Industries exempt from antitrust laws.

Seventeenth. Exclusive dealing contracts under the antitrust laws.

Eighteenth. Federal incorporation statute.

Nineteenth. The effect of Government procurement on economic concentration.

Subcommittee No. 5

Number of bills referred to subcommittee No. 5	62
Number of hearings held	51
Number of bills reported to full committee	9
Number of reports filed	9
Number of bills passed House	8
Number of bills pending in the Senate	3
Number of Senate bills disposed of	0
Number of bills approved by the President	5

Civil Defense and Adams County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, although it is appropriate that Congress has considered legislation to provide for a civilian medal of merit to those in our Nation who have contributed greatly to its welfare, it sometimes strikes me as incongruous that we do not make a blanket presentation to those honored and industrious citizens who give of themselves and their time unstintingly for service in the Ground Observer Corps. These people are truly the unsung heroes of the cold war who, notwithstanding the general apathy of the Nation toward potential defense measures, have given and will give a full measure of devotion to their volunteer duties, assuring that those of us who are more complacent will have adequate warning of any possible aggression.

I am indeed proud that in my congressional district reside groups of citizens who have an outstanding record of accomplishment in this regard. One such group is located in Adams County, Pa. The Adams County volunteers of the Ground Observer Corps have not only adhered to the pattern throughout the Nation in providing personnel for manning the observation posts, but they excel by far the normal pattern by providing a full 24-hour coverage. This is indeed a unique accomplishment because all too often we hear and read of Ground Observer Corps posts which are manned only part time. Some, unfortunately, have no coverage at all. The good citizens of Adams County have taken on this duty as they do other requisites of American citizenship, not halfheartedly or on a part-time basis but fully and without thought of material reward.

Although any attempt to give personal credit would perhaps detract from those who hold no particular positions of official responsibility, I believe that proper notice must be taken of the contribution of Mr. W. H. Armor, who is the Ground Observer Corps chief for Adams County. Undoubtedly, the inspiration which he has given to others is, in great part, responsible for the outstanding work being done by the volunteer observers. It gives me additional pleasure to report that through the cooperation of Mr. Fred Rettace, burgess of Littlestown, Pa.; Mr. Gerald Daley, supervisor for Ground Observer Corps at Littlestown, and with the active cooperation of the junior chamber of commerce, the commissioners of Adams County are financing the construction of an all-aluminum, prefabricated Ground Observer Corps observation post, which will be installed atop the high school in Littlestown. This is, to my knowledge, the first such type installation in the Nation, and highlights the fact that the Adams County organization has made a forthright step in creating and holding the interest of the people in the importance of the work being done by the Ground Observer Corps.

I believe it to be appropriate that proper notice should be taken of the accomplishments of these fine people, who sacrifice without reward for the defense of this Nation, and I am pleased to do so as their Representative in Congress.

Mutual Security Appropriation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a detailed analysis of Public Law 206, providing appropriations for mutual defense assistance. This was prepared for my study by Elizabeth Edward, American Law Division of the Library of Congress. I think it will prove of value for reference to my colleagues.

The analysis follows:

Public Law 208, 84th Congress

(Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956)

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE

Military assistance:	
Appropriation	$705,000,000
Unobligated and unreserved balance	33,900,000
Total, military assistance	738,900,000
Direct forces support	317,200,000
Defense support:	
Europe	85,500,000
Near East and Africa	113,700,000
Asia:	
Appropriation	800,000,000
Unobligated balance	25,000,000
Total, Asia	825,000,000
Total defense support:	
Appropriation	999,200,000
Unobligated balance	25,000,000
Total	1,024,200,000
Total mutual defense assistance:	
Appropriation	2,021,400,000
Unobligated balance	58,900,000
Total	2,080,300,000

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	
Near East and Africa	$73,000,000
South Asia	51,000,000
American Republics	38,000,000
Total, development assistance	162,000,000
TECHNICAL COOPERATION	
General authorization	$127,500,000
United Nations program	24,000,000
Organization of American States	1,500,000
Total, technical cooperation	153,000,000
OTHER PROGRAMS	
Special Presidential fund	$100,000,000
Special assistance in joint control areas	21,000,000
Intergovernmental Committee for European migration: Appropriation	12,500,000
United Nations Refugee Fund	1,200,000
Escapee program	6,000,000
United Nations Children's Fund	14,500,000
United Nations Relief and Works Agency:	
Appropriation	58,366,750
Unobligated balance	3,633,250
Total	62,000,000
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	3,700,000
Ocean freight charges:	
United States voluntary relief agencies	2,000,000
Surplus agricultural commodities	13,000,000
Total	15,000,000
Control act expenses	1,175,000
Administrative expenses	33,500,000
President's fund for Asian economic development	100,000,000
Total other programs:	
Appropriation	366,941,750
Unobligated balance	3,633,250
Total	370,575,000
Total, mutual security appropriation	2,703,341,750

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Authorizes the use of funds for (a) rents in the District of Columbia, (b) expenses of attendance at meetings, (c) employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad, (d) maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft, (e) purchase of automobiles, (f) entertainment with in the United States up to $15,000, (g) exchange of funds, (h) expenditures up to $50,000 of a confidential character other than entertainment, (i) insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, (j) rental, lease, repair, and alteration of quarters outside of the United States to accommodate Government employees, (k) expense of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons or members of families of persons who may die while participating in activities under the Mutual Security Act or other act directly related to the purposes theerof, (l) purchase of uniforms, (m) employment of chauffeurs, (n) medical examinations of dependents of overseas personnel or candidates for overseas positions on the same basis as for employees or candidates, (o) per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons participating in any program of furnishing technical information and assistance while in countries other than their own and other than the continental United States, (p) expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act, (q) ice and drinking water for use abroad, (r) services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey with certain limitations herein prescribed, (s) travel expenses with certain restrictions herein prescribed.

2. Requires a semiannual report to Congress of engineering fees in excess of $25,000 to any one firm on any one project.

3. Limits to $25 million the amount of foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the United States which shall remain available until June 30, 1956, without reimbursement to the Treasury, for liquidation of obligations incurred against such currencies or credits prior to July 1, 1953, pursuant to authority contained in the Mutual Security Act and other acts pursuant to which funds were authorized.

4. Directs that foreign currencies generated under the provisions hereof shall be utilized only for the purposes for which the funds providing the commodities which generated the currency were appropriated.

5. Prohibits the use of funds generated as a result hereof for payments on account of the principal or interest on any debt of any foreign government or on any loans made to such government by any other foreign government.

6. Prohibits the obligation and/or reservation of more than 20 percent of the funds made available hereby during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

7. Makes funds available from July 1, 1955.

8. Requires an accounting of funds allocated to the Department of Defense for military assistance.

9. Continues antistrike provisions.

Amending Mutual Security Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this debate on American foreign policy and what we should do in the mutual security program in support of that policy—has been going on at this time of year for about 8 years now. It comes this year during a period that is particularly interesting and crucial.

For 8 years we have been fighting a sort of trench warfare. We began with our backs almost against the wall for we had disarmed after World War II. Once in a while you hear somebody say, "You can't blame the Soviets for being suspicious and difficult. They have to arm and extend their control over their neighbors in order to defend themselves against United States encirclement."

We should not let anybody get away with that charge because the facts deny it totally. At the end of the war the United States had greater military, industrial, and economic superiority over any potential enemies than any country in history ever had on the land, in the air, on the sea, and under the sea. If we had had in our national soul a single grain of imperialistic design on any other country, we could have imposed our will on the Soviet Union and on the Communists in China easily.

What did we do with our military superiority? You know the answer—and so do the Communists. We took it to pieces within 1 year and threw it out the window.

When we began reluctantly to rearm and to build this program of aid to other threatened countries in 1948 and especially after Korea, we really made great strides. But everything we have done in all these years has been the belated consequence and not the cause of Soviet aggression and imperialism. We have been in the trenches, so to speak, defensively fighting back, trying to save ourselves and a free world.

Now, in trench warfare you can hold back an enemy and keep from getting run over; but you cannot win a war in trenches. Some day you have to move out of the trenches and try to get a victory in the relatively open field of maneuver.

That is the point at which we have arrived as we discuss this year's program. Our leaders are going now to a conference at the so-called summit. We are moving out into a more open field. The dangers there are greater than they have been at any time in the last 8 years because one wrong step, one miscalculation, one succumbing to the clever tricks or wiles of the enemy could lead to disaster. But on the other hand, getting out into the open after having built up a stronger position than we occupied a few years ago, gives us a chance, perhaps, to win a victory.

It has been said here today that we cannot foresee what will happen if we continue this program. That is right. I cannot foresee exactly what will happen or how long it must go on, and neither can anyone else. But I can foresee what will happen if we do not continue the program, and so can you. The free world will go down.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has just said that there is no stopping the Communist conspiracy and that the Soviet Union, like every other aggressor in history, will not stop and cannot stop until it is checked. I could not agree with him more. But how does the gentleman propose to check the aggressor? That is the question. As my distinguished and beloved chairman [Mr. RICHARDS] has already asked: how does the gentleman propose to check it?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Evidently, the gentleman does not understand my position at all. My point is that you do not check him by this program.

Mr. JUDD. What program does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. DIES. While this program after World War II was essential and was helpful because of the weakened condition of many of the countries, like many

other programs, once it begins, it never ends. My point is there is no justification for the permanent continuation of this program, and you are making it a permanent program.

Mr. JUDD. It must go on, my friend, until we win. The alternative is to lie down and surrender. The gentleman, I am sure, does not suggest that.

Mr. DIES. Suppose that Russia decides to prolong the cold war. Suppose that Russia since she profits by the cold war because she gets money from her allies and carrying on the cold war is not a liability to her because her allies are not a liability, but are a source of revenue—suppose Russia decides to prolong the cold war.

Mr. JUDD. There is reason to believe Austria, today, and perhaps East Germany also, have become a liability to Russia; and so she has let Austria go, under the guise of promoting peace, making a virtue out of a necessity.

Mr. DIES. Suppose that Russia wanted to continue the cold war for another 50 years; do you advocate the continuation of this program for another 50 years?

Mr. JUDD. I hope the gentleman will listen and I will try to deal specifically with that very question.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I merely want to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that the gentleman from Texas has not answered his question.

Mr. JUDD. No, he has not.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Some of us would like to have the answer as to what the gentleman from Texas would suggest.

Mr. DIES. If you would give me some time, I would tell you what I propose to do. If you had listened to me 15 or 20 years ago, you would not have had this thing.

Mr. JUDD. Others of us can say that also—and with equal truthfulness. But that does not help us with our present problem.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that Austria was a liability to Russia and that she got out of there for that reason?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, there is a lot of evidence to show that Austria had become a liability to the Soviet Union in her new peace posture.

Mr. GROSS. With the millions of dollars that she has collected in reparations and will continue to collect?

Mr. JUDD. She is still getting those reparations, but Austria and East Germany to some extent have become more of a liability than an asset to the Soviets. They know they cannot count on the East Germans. And the men in the Kremlin are smart enough to try to get rid of a liability, especially if they can gain an advantage thereby. They will always trade off a pawn, such as Austria, if thereby they think that maybe they can fool us into letting them have the king, which is a neutralized, demilitarized Germany. Does the gentleman want to let that happen?

Mr. Chairman, this program has certainly cost us a lot of money—but it has also produced a lot of good results.

You are not satisfied, and I am not satisfied, with those results. But there is nothing to gain by underestimating or denying them. When we started in 1947, Greece was wavering on the fence. Turkey has hanging in the balance. Everybody was holding his breath with respect to Italy. France was on the ropes. Without our aid none of them could have made it. Then Germany would have been surrounded on three sides, England isolated, and all Europe behind the curtain, working for the Kremlin against us.

Look at them today. Some, to be sure, are still not in too healthy condition. But Greece is free. Turkey is free, Italy is free. France is free. The Low Countries and Denmark and Norway are free. West Germany is free, stronger than anyone could have expected, and on our side. Best of all, they are united. And England too, has joined the European team for the first time in centuries. Anything in that record to be ashamed of?

In the Far East, South Korea is still in bad shape because of mistakes in judgment we and our European allies made in 1951 in not seizing victory there when it was within our grasp. But the Republic of Korea is still free. The patient is not well—but he is alive.

Japan is still free—and what would Japan's prospects be if Korea were not free?

Formosa is still free—and strong and steadfast. Free China never could have made it without this program of assistance.

The Philippines are still free. Most of southeast Asia is still free.

I do not like some of the statements of Mr. Nehru, but more important than his statements is India. He will not be there forever, but India will be. And India is free.

How can anyone say the mutual security program has failed? Show me any results from any other program, comparable to these. Actually it has saved us money—given us more defense at less cost.

I will take my guidance on this point from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I ask you to read our hearings, beginning on page 239, where Admiral Radford said:

> First of all I would like to state that the military aid program is part and parcel of the United States Defense Department program. The expenditures abroad in support of our alliances do not differ in purpose, scope, or objective from our own military expenditures. The fact that this part of our program is not included in the Defense Department budget is more a matter of procedure and administration than of substance.
>
> In this connection, I can assure you that were it not for the strength which has been generated in the past 5 years by our allies, and in most instances made possible by our military aid programs, the requirements of our own program would be much larger.

You vote against this mutual security program and you vote to spend more money, not less. This is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff telling you what it would cost us to build strength of our own:

> The United States and its allies have established a series of bilateral and multilateral defense alliances designed to deter aggression and to prevent war. These alliances must be given full support by all participants if they are to be effective. Our participation cannot be limited to the buildup and maintenance of our own Armed Forces. The provision of military assistance to our allies, when combined with the resources which they contribute, results in the development of collective military strength much larger than the United States could provide or maintain on its own.

Mr. Chairman, that is the justification for this program. You can find plenty of mistakes in it, as in every program. It is our duty to police it, discover and eliminate the waste, try to plug the loopholes, adjust to meet new situations, correct bad judgment, and so forth. But the basic philosophy is sound. Why abandon what is succeeding?

Some complain that this ally or that leader does not like us. May I say once again that the objective is not to make other people like us? It is to help them stay free, to give them the capacity to maintain their own independence, to enable them to keep their country out of the hands of the Kremlin, so that their territory, their manpower, their resources, their strategic bases cannot be used by the enemy against us.

I asked the gentleman from Texas what he would propose that we do. Let me for a moment analyze the possible courses, just as a doctor sits down and examines all the things that he might conceivably do for a sick patient.

What are the main possible courses that we might follow? There are about five, it seems to me.

First, we could give up. Peace is the easiest thing in the world to get. You can have it any day, if you are willing to surrender—the peace of enslavement. But we will not do that. We are not that kind of people. So I pass that one by.

What is the second possibility? A showdown now. Mr. Churchill says there may be about 3 years in which we will still have atomic superiority. Well, then, why not settle the issue now, finish the thing up while we can win it?

If we were strictly logical and had only electronic brains instead of human minds and hearts, doubtless that is what we would do. But we are not strictly logical. We are not mechanical devices. We are human beings. We have a certain kind of culture, and if we were to start a preventive war, we would have abandoned that culture and would be destroying the very things that we talk about and say we are arming ourselves to defend. We could do it, but we will not. You know it, and I know it. So it is unrealistic to spend any more time on that course.

What is the third possibility? We could continue to do what we have done too often, namely, drift—stumble is perhaps a more accurate word—from one

crisis to the next. We get into a jam, and we take a strong, firm stand until it begins to get results. Then what do we do? The Kremlin pulls out its bag of tricks, and we tend to abandon the strong, firm policy which is working, and go back to the soft, weak policy which always fails. We have done that again and again.

Contrast our conduct with that of the Kremlin. When the Communists are winning they are as hard as nails. They would not give the French even a 24-hour truce at Dien Bien Phu to evacuate the wounded, but when they are losing or in trouble, as the gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out, oh, they become so gentle and so friendly.

When you watch a prizefight on television, you sometimes see one fighter along about the eighth round suddenly become very affectionate with his opponent. How ardently he embraces him. But you do not misunderstand that maneuver. You do not imagine that means the first fighter has decided he does not want to win the fight, that he loves his opponent so much he just wants to give up. You know that a clinch means the boxer is in trouble. He clinches so that he can rest, or recover from a blow, or gain time in order to be able perhaps to come back in the next round and knock the opponent out. A clinch is not to end the fight, but to try to win it.

What does his opponent do? Does he obligingly help him out? No; he knows that is the time to pour it on, keep the weakened man in trouble, press him to the ropes, and win the fight.

I do not remember much from my military training in World War I. But I do remember a maxim to the effect that the most profitable operation in war is to pursue a retreating enemy.

But we generally do not follow that maxim in diplomatic and economic warfare. In fact, we do the opposite. When we are losing, we are tough; we get up off the floor after our Pearl Harbors, tighten our belts, and go to it until we win. But when we are winning, that is the time we go soft. The Commies know it. That is why we are now turning on the charm. Their truculence made us firm and strong. We have gained ground. They want us to let up, to become soft and weak again.

When people ask us what we should do, now that the Commies seem to be getting human, seem to want peace, the answer is not to weaken or abandon the firmness and strength that are getting results, but rather to stick to them, to keep doing resolutely just what we have been doing.

What is in the Communist bag of tricks with which they hope to beguile us again as they have on several previous occasions?

The first and easiest trick is to smile. That does not cost them anything at all and it has proved singularly effective in the past. When Vishinsky was their representative at the United Nations and things were going badly for them anywhere, he would return from Russia, smile for reporters, shake hands, speak civilly for as long as a week; and thousands of good Americans would say, "Why, they are getting real friendly, there must have been a drastic change of policy in the Kremlin, they now want peace, too." And away would go at least 25 percent of our resolve.

Molotov has been using it on his present mission to San Francisco. He tries on a cowboy hat instead of scowling. Chou En-lai used the same trick with great success at Bandung, as he had with our representatives in Chungking in 1945–46.

The object always is to disarm us, to put us off guard, to make us hesitate or waver. But if we look at it coldly, we know that any change of attitude on the part of the Communists has come about not because of our weakness, but because of our strength and the strength of the free world. Let us not foolishly abandon the cause of our success at the very moment when it is beginning to achieve success.

The second trick that the Kremlin pulls to soften us up is to offer trade. Lenin said: "We can always count on the cupidity of the capitalists."

They used it in 1933. It was a time of mass unemployment and economic depression in our land. Litvinov smiled and said: "Why not recognize the Soviet Union? We will be glad to expand greatly our trade with the United States and help you out of your depression—if you will just recognize us."

We recognized them. What was the result? Did our trade increase? No; it promptly decreased. It has never been as high a single year since 1933 as it was each of the 5 years prior to 1933. Why? Because trade to the Communists is a weapon, just like a bomb or a bayonet. They do not trade as we do, for commercial reasons, to better the lot of their people, to improve relations with other countries. Their objective in 1933 was recognition. Having achieved that, why should they help us out of our depression? They loved it that we had mass unemployment. They hoped it would get worse, that we would crack up, have riots and disorder, even revolution.

When the Reds were being pushed back in Korea and they wanted to liquidate that blunder on their part, Moscow announced a big trade conference in Moscow. We did not go; we were beginning to wake up. But some of our European allies rushed right over. They urged us to make a deal with the Communists in Korea in order to expand everybody's trade. The Kremlin promised that it would increase its trade with the free world more than 300 percent in 1 year. What happened? The West gave up its advantageous position in Korea and accepted a stalemate there more readily, I am sure, than Moscow expected. So trade between Russia and the free world, instead of going up 300 percent as promised, went down 40 percent. It is a good trick. And it is being pulled again right now.

The third trick the men in the Kremlin and their colleagues in Peking use—the cruelest one—is the prisoner-of-war trick. To let out some prisoner of war does not cost them anything. That is what they have been saving the prisoners for—to use them for bargaining purposes when the going gets rough.

If they refuse to release our prisoners, we are tempted to make greater concessions in order to get our boys home. If they do release a few, we are tempted to make greater concessions in order to show our gratitude. The Reds win either way.

They worked the trick with great skill in Korea when they were losing there. Remember Little Switch? That was used to get us into negotiations for Big Switch. But they did not let all the prisoners out in Big Switch as they promised. They held some back to buy us off the next time we might perhaps get the upper hand.

And just to keep us from forgetting those still held, they let out a few occasionally as a means of tantalizing and torturing the relatives, squeezing the hearts of the mothers whose sons are prisoners of war. It is a cold, calculating exploitation of the concern we have for our citizens, for any human beings. They do not care about the men or what happens to them, but they know we do care. We already have paid a big price at Panmunjom, supposedly to get these prisoners home. But if they can make us buy them again with concessions in the Formosan Straits, or admission of Red China into the U. N., why not? It is a wonderful trick, the prisoner-of-war trick. But I do not believe we are going to fall for that one again.

We come now to their fourth trick, another old one, but perhaps the most successful—the "peace" trick. Lenin taught them that it is just as important to know when to retreat as it is to know when to advance. But he counseled that if they must retreat, then they should try to make it look like an advance. If they must accept a defeat, camouflage it as a victory.

In the spring of 1951 they were licked in Korea; 2 or 3 of their divisions were demoralized; they were overextended and overstrained. The Trans-Siberian Railway, bringing supplies, had broken down. Their aggression had failed. They had to give up the effort. But how could they extricate themselves and make their defeat look like a victory? First, they got our allies to pressure us to withdraw MacArthur and handcuff Van Fleet in order, so it was said, "to avoid extension of the war."

Even so, our forces and the South Koreans fought with such bravery and skill that finally in June of 1951 Malik had to get up and propose "truce talks." But did he suggest that the Reds wanted a truce because they were defeated in battle? No, indeed. It was only because Communists are so opposed to bloodshed. And then they started the chant, all over the world, "We want peace. We want peace. We want peace."

They are doing the same thing again today and millions of high-minded sincere people are falling for it—I do not criticize, I am trying only to analyze and to urge that we keep awake and understand the situation this time. Millions

are tempted to say, "Well, since they want peace let us have it."

But genuine peace is not what they want. They want victory and talk of peace is the means by which they hope to get, not peace, but the fruits of victory.

As I said here last January during the debate on the Formosa resolution, quoting Chou En-lai:

A truce is the military equivalent of the political tactic of coalition.

A truce to us means a step toward ending a war; to them it is a military tactic designed to win the war. Why should we fall for that trick again?

Does that mean we should refuse to talk with them? Of course not. We have no ulterior motives or designs, nothing to be embarrassed about, nothing to hide. We should always be willing to present our case—with the maximum objective of a genuine agreement that will end aggression and liberate the enslaved; and the minimum objective of making clear to all the world that if no just agreement can be reached, then it is they, not we, who are blocking peace.

I must add frankly that a study of Communist theory and practice makes one doubt an agreement based on liberty and justice can be reached. But I am sure they will want an agreement to talk further, because indefinite, long drawn-out talks can be to their advantage. Remember it was during the 2 years of Communist stalling in the talks at Panmunjom that they got the H-bomb and thereby drastically reduced our military superiority.

It is right that we should talk but we must not yield on matters of honor, justice, or human liberty. On protocol, yes; on principle, no.

Jesus talked even with the Devil but He did not give in to him.

We have every right and duty to go and present our position, but we must never again take Communist words as a substitute for deeds.

Because we in the West are accustomed to settling disputes by negotiations and then signing pieces of paper, we insist that procedure is the only alternative to a war with the Communist bloc. So in the past when we went to a conference, we generally got a piece of paper while they got a piece of territory. Whereupon we would have another conference, at which we got another piece of paper and they got another piece of some one's territory. And then still another conference so that we could get still another piece of paper and they another piece of someone's territory. Naturally they would like to have us do it again.

Fortunately, I think our present administration is awake to this situation and does not intend to fall into that sort of trap.

What is needed for our representatives to win for freedom at coming conferences? Two things: One is strength; the other is skill in the use of that strength. We here cannot do anything about the skill. That is in the hands of our Chief Executive and his team. We trust and hope and pray that he will have adequate skill and resourcefulness with God's help. I think he will.

Recently I sent to the President a statement I had made elsewhere of some views on certain aspects of this subject. He wrote back in part as follows:

I do not construe your letter and enclosure as divergent from our present policies, although you do seem to be apprehensive that we may be outfoxed one way or another. We shall do our best not to be.

I read that here for the benefit of any others who may be apprehensive. Our President was a careful, but resourceful and brilliantly successful soldier. He has had plenty of experience in Europe with this present adversary. It was he who organized free Europe to resist it. We can be sure he does not intend as he puts it, to be outfoxed now.

But he cannot win without strength. This is the ingredient we in Congress can do something about. The Commander in Chief and his associates have got to do the talking and the maneuvering but no matter how great their skill, it cannot be successful unless we provide the strength. We shall determine today what kind of cards they are to have in their hands tomorrow. For this is not a poker game, where bluff may be a decisive factor. Our representative cannot win by bluff because the Communists know very well what our cards are. Our men have got to have the cards; and a sound and strong mutual-security program is one of the strongest cards that we can possibly put into their hands.

Mr. Chairman, it is said we must have peaceful coexistence with the Communists. But how can you coexeist with a tiger?

One way is inside the tiger.

Another way is to have the tiger in a cage—containment.

Still another way is to be strong enough to compel peaceful coexistence. No man who understands tigers goes into the cage empty handed, trusting to the good will of the tiger. For it is not the nature of tigers to deal with men on the basis of good will.

So no man who wants to live ever gets into a cage with a tiger without a chair to hold the tiger off, a whip to divert the tiger's attention, and a gun to use if worst comes to worst. He has to be strong enough to compel peaceful coexistence.

Likewise, no sensible person gets into the same room with a man who is trying to kill him—unless he is strong enough to restrain the would-be murderer.

That is the fourth possible course we can follow with the Communist enemy; and because of the nature of that enemy, its will to deception and conquest, it is the course we must follow. Not surrender; not preventive war; not drifting and vacillating. But steady, patient, consistent firmness and strength to compel peaceful coexistence and to defend human freedom.

Until when? Until the Communist conspiracy fades or changes.

It will fade or change ultimately, I am completely confident, because of its own inherent cruelties, contradictions, and immoralities. We cannot now know when that will be; but however long the time, we have got to be united, firm, and strong to compel peaceful coexistence until the forces of religion, of education, of human desire for freedom can change the nature of the Communist movement.

That is the fifth course and the only ultimate solution. Mankind will not have a secure peace until the Communist movement abandons its program of world conquest. That can happen only when it ceases to be Communist. That is the truly fundamental task—to change Communists, which means to change men. To change men is the business of religion and education. Private forces must work at that while governments are following the fourth course, doing all they can to provide greater opportunity for religion and education to function.

Governments can hold back armies, governments can feed hungry millions, governments can help other governments, governments can buy time. But governments seldom win people, or change them.

So let us not fool ourselves. We must not overestimate this governmental program of building strength any more than we should underestimate it. What we must do is to pursue it with intelligence and vigor in order to hold back the forces of destruction and slavery until they can be changed, until we and the free world can create such better conditions for human beings that their attraction and appeal cannot be kept from penetrating to those now cut off behind the Iron Curtain, and cannot be indefinitely resisted by those who erected that curtain.

To pursue the course of patient firmness and strength with intelligence and vigor requires that in addition to keeping ourselves strong here at home, we must help keep the free world free. How can we keep the free world free? It has two parts, the strong countries and the weak.

The first step in the Communist's program is not war; that is the last step. The first step is subversion. Since they cannot readily subvert the strong countries, they concentrate their efforts on subverting the weak. Where are they? Mostly in Asia and Africa.

What do they do with the strong? They seek to divide the strong.

That has been and still is their world program: To divide the relatively strong countries—mostly in Europe and around the North Atlantic; while seeking to subvert the weak countries—mostly in Asia and Africa.

That tells us what our program must be—we must not let them succeed in either dividing the strong or subverting the weak. We must, if possible, hold together the coalition of the strong around the North Atlantic, while preventing any more losses to the Communists in Asia. Or, to turn it around, we must reasolutely work to build greater strength and unity among the peoples still free in Asia, while blocking the skillful efforts of the Reds to break up NATO and our other alliances with the stronger countries in the west.

That means the President and the Secretary of State must, in a sense, carry water on both shoulders. We cannot do all our western allies would like—or we would lose Asia. We cannot do all we

could and would like to do in Asia, for example, with respect to Free China and Vietnam—or we might jeopardize our ties with certain western allies, particularly Britain and France.

We could have complete unity around the North Atlantic, for a time, if we were willing to let Asia go. Or we could concentrate largely on Asia, where some European allies do not cooperate too well, and possibly be alienated from those allies.

Neither of those results would be good for our own security. So we have to go ahead with a two-pronged policy, because our own security requires that both Europe and Asia be in the hands of friends, rather than of enemies.

It is a tough job—and it is easy to find fault with us. One group charges us with "selling out" Asia to please England. The other group charges us with endangering our alliances in the west, "going it alone," in order to "save Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee"—as they put it. Yet we see with increasing clearness that we must keep both Europe and Asia free, if we are to save either. The planet is now one strategic area. A major breakthrough on any front will have disastrous effects on all the others.

How can we prevent subversion of the weak? The answer is simple, though very difficult. Help the weak become strong.

How can we help the weak become strong? To many the answer was to give them lots of American money. That was our first instinct. Naturally we tried it and of course it did not succeed.

Then the idea was to give them American goods—millions of tons of food, fertilizer, fiber. That helped, but of course it too was not enough. It was like a transfusion that tides a patient over an acute emergency, it keeps him alive until these forces can perhaps be brought into operation that will enable him to start building his own blood. He cannot live indefinitely on somebody else's blood.

Then many said, "Let us give them our tools and our know-how." But, that too was not enough. For our money, our goods, our tools are all results; what they need most is the causes—so they can produce those results for themselves.

What are the causes which have led to our superior tools and machinery, more productive know-how, more plentiful goods, and greater wealth? It is not that we are smarter than they are, or have greater basic resources. It is because of a philosophy of life and Government, a political and economic system you and I inherited from our forefathers which gives opportunity and incentive for every man to get ahead, to improve his lot. The really unique thing we have to contribute is not just the results of the system, but the secret of it. It is certain of our ideas that they need most. In our preoccupation with sharing our gadgets, we almost forgot for a time that others would not use our machines efficiently until they had the ideas; and once they have the ideas, they will produce more and more of their own tools, goods, and wealth.

The main thing, as the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said earlier, is to share with them the ideas, the spiritual concepts, the concern for individual human beings and their welfare that are the real source of all the greatness that has been achieved here.

Once again, we have to have a two-pronged program, a judicious balance as we seek to contribute both the fundamental concepts and values, and the concrete results of those concepts and values—with the former increasing and the latter decreasing.

But are all these enough? No. In addition to keeping ourselves strong, and helping the weak to become strong, our foreign policy must have also the negative objective of trying to prevent any more gains by the enemy. We must not let it win any more victories—whether political, diplomatic, economic, or military. That is why we have in this bill another reaffirmation of American opposition to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. It is not just because there is no legal or moral basis for admitting a declared lawless aggressor into a union of supposedly peace-loving states; but because such admission would be a tremendous, perhaps decisive, political victory for the Communists.

Most of the governments of Asia are still young and shaky. Our purpose is to enable them to become strong enough to resist Communist pressures and blandishments. But how can we expect small, weak countries right across the border from giant Communist China, to defy her, if the U. N. accepts her? How can the weak resist if the strong embrace? To admit Red China to the U. N. would be to give communism the ball game in Asia.

It is because the countries there know this, even if we do not, that some of them are flirting with Red China. If the West is ultimately going to recognize the Communist regime—as so many shortsightedly advocate—why should the Asians not get in on the ground floor, and perhaps thereby gain some good will from the Reds? It will not succeed. Recognition would not satisfy the Communist objectives. It would only increase their capacity to gain their objective which include all of Asia. But if a good many in the West are fooled, why should anyone be surprised that some Asians are taken in too?

Mr. Nehru, for example, is not pro-Communist; he is scared, and he imagines he is a realist. He obviously is convinced the Chinese Communists are going to prevail. Why then should he not try to make a deal or a compromise with them that will perhaps save him and his own country?

We also cannot let the Communists achieve any more economic victories. That is why we cannot resume or expand trade with them. If they are not an enemy, why are we drafting our boys and taxing our people to build stronger armies, navies, and air fleets against them? If they are an enemy, how can anybody seriously suggest that we do anything to make them stronger? And what they need most right now in addition to a breathing spell and relaxation of our pressures on them, is a chance by expanded trade to overcome their grave deficiencies.

Mr. Chairman, there is one more component we must not forget as we plan a foreign policy adequate to the problems and dangers we face. Our concern for the free is not enough; we must also keep faith with the enslaved.

When any proposal is made, no matter from what source, we should first test it by this criterion: What would its probable effect be on the more than 800 million people behind the Iron Curtain? We must never forget them. Because they are our strongest allies; they cannot be fooled; and they are in a position to do the enemy most damage at the right time—which means they are the most important allies we have. They must be encouraged and enabled to resist from within as the free world resists from without.

Right now they are demonstrating both their will to resist the Communist tyrants and the effectiveness of their resistance. Why are there severe food shortages in Russia and the satellites? It is not because of drought, it is not because of floods, it is not because of insufficient land; those are countries that have always had agricultural surpluses.

It is because the people there obviously want freedom more than they want food. They are deliberately cutting down food production, even at the expense of their own calories, in order to weaken the despotic regime over them.

Mr. Chairman, we must never do anything to destroy the hope or weaken the will, or strike despair into the hearts of the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain. And, they cannot be expected to continue to weaken the tyrants from within if we help those tyrants from without. Our true hope is in the oppressed, not in the oppressors.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here we are moving out of the trenches into open field maneuvering. The payoff of years of effort is at hand. This is no time to hesitate or falter. I recognize fully all the difficulties and the dangers and the weaknesses and the inadequacies of the mutual security program. But I do not see how anyone can study the whole situation and escape the conclusion that must of our hope for the future lies in continuing and constantly improving that program.

When people ask, "What shall we do in view of the Kremlin's recent shift in tactics?" The answer is, "Keep on doing what we have been doing—only better." It is what we have been doing that is responsible for the shift in tactics. Hold fast to the course which is beginning to succeed. If we do that, please God, we may be nearer an end of this awful struggle than we realize.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me summarize the three paths we are being urged by various groups to take.

Some say we should be prepared just to continue this cold war for 30, 40, or even 50 years. I doubt that we could or would do that. It would be too costly and frustrating for Americans to accept.

Some say that since we cannot continue for decades, we have to end it now. But the only way we can end it

now is on terms that would mean we had lost it.

Rather, we have to win the cold war. And we have to win it before they are in a position to start a hot war. If we do not do that, if we just continue the cold war without decision until they can become strong enough to start the hot one, we will have failed. For to win the cold war then, would only precipitate the hot war which it is our hope and purpose to avoid.

Mr. Chairman, the only way to end a war with this kind of an enemy anywhere is to win it.

To win the cold war requires that we weaken the capacity or the will of the enemy—or both—to start a hot war. That will have been accomplished when he no longer has hope of victory.

This bill is dedicated to helping win the cold war as the surest way to end it and to prevent the atomic war we want so desperately to avoid if we can without loss of honor or freedom. It is the surest way to make possible the dawning at last of the peace for which so many millions have longed and labored, a peace that will last because based on justice and freedom and human brotherhood.

Battle for the Minds of Men

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to inform the House on the proposal that will be presented early in the 2d session of the 84th Congress for a new and simple approach to the problem of winning the battle for the minds of men.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress we have given major attention to the strengthening of our defense and the solidifying of the protective forces of the nations of the free world. But we realize that the conflict between two ideologies will be determined, not on battlefields, but in the minds of men.

This is a report of progress as well as a statement of future plans.

It will be recalled that when the appropriation bill for the Department of State was under consideration, I offered an amendment to include an item to make available to men and women everywhere, in inexpensive editions and translated into native languages, the classics of American democracy.

What I had in mind as comprising the classics of American democracy were those writings that had fired the early Americans in the periods of the conception and development of our own democracy. In a sense they may be compared to the books of the Bible, which were written by different men and at different periods and later were selected, with some but relatively small differences in versions, as constituting the foundation sources of a faith. It is proposed to select those classic books that constitute the foundation sources of American faith in democracy.

WHAT ARE THESE CLASSIC BOOKS?

What were the writings that inspired the minds of Americans in the beginning of our democracy and in the succeeding stages of its development? To what sources now shall turn the peoples in other lands who are searching for the eternal truths of self-government?

I am not referring to present-day writings. They are interpretations and evaluations, many of them of excellent quality. They may be regarded, however, in some quarters of the world, where the battle for the minds of men is keen and close, as propaganda for an American nationalism. Moreover, they are copyrighted works and not available except by arrangement.

The classics of democracy that hold the eternal truths of government for, by, and of the people now belong to all the world. All that is necessary is, first, to make the proper selection; second, to translate them into native languages; third, to print them in inexpensive paperbound editions; and, fourth, to give them grassroots sales distribution.

INTEREST IS WIDESPREAD

Many Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle have shown heartening interest in the program to make available in this manner to all peoples everywhere the classics of democracy that inspired our forefathers. Several of our most distinguished colleagues, whose reputation for constructive statesmanship is of the highest, have been most active in the preliminary spadework.

My own interest was whetted by reports from the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News to which I shall refer later. Following the publication of these reports, I moved an amendment to an appropriation bill to permit the immediate start on a classics-of-democracy program. It was ruled out of order, because there was no previous authorization. Judging from its reception by my colleagues, and the many pledges of support volunteered, I think the amendment would have been adopted.

Since that time much work has been done in preparation for presenting to the session convening in January the proposal for authorization and the request for adequate appropriation to launch the program. I wish at this point to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the able chairman of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, for his friendly interest and cooperation. Also to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], a pioneer in this field and extremely well-informed in all phases of the problem. Congressman FEIGHAN participated with me in many conferences with Dr. Theodore C. Streibert, the Director of USIA, and members of his staff, all of whom were most gracious and helpful.

Expression of appreciation likewise goes to the editors and foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News, including Paul Leach, for many years the very able head of the Washington Bureau, and Van Allen Bradley, the literary editor, to Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century, to Jerome G. Kerwin, chairman of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation at the University of Chicago; to Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy at the university and a State Department visitor to universities in India; to Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus of the University of Chicago; to Thomas B. Stauffer, instructor in houmanities at Wilson Junior College, and to Leland G. Stauber.

HOW CLASSICS WILL BE CHOSEN

I think it will be of interest to my colleagues to learn that the first phase of the program is now under way and will be completed by the time we reconvene in January. That is the selection of the classics of American democracy that enlightened American opinion would present in translated and inexpensive editions for the reading of the world.

The list we thing should not be the compilation of one person or of one group. Hence Congressman FEIGHAN and I have undertaken to correspond with a large and representative list of educators, editors, and leaders of religion, labor, industry, patriotic women's, and other organizations. They are being asked each to submit a list of 20 classics of American democracy. The works receiving the greatest number of votes can be accepted as bearing the stamp of American public approval. As to the writings that are included in all lists there can be no question. Congressman FEIGHAN and I are being counseled and aided in this survey by Dr. Fey, Mr. Kerwin, and Mr. Stauffer.

Some of the classics of American democracy that have been suggested are:

Emerson, Moral and Political Essays.

Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography.

Jefferson, Writings.

Abraham Lincoln, Writings.

Madison, Hamilton, Jay, the Federalist Papers.

John Lock, Of Civil Government.

Judge Learned Hand, the Spirit of Liberty—USIA has world rights in this publication.

John Stuart Mill, Considerations on Representative Government—On Liberty.

David Thoreau, Walden, Writings on Liberty.

Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America.

Thomas Paine, Common Sense.

Rousseau, Social Contract.

The Constitution.

The Declaration of Independence.

These merely are suggestions. It is possible some should be omitted, certain that others should be included. The poll of the editors, educators, leaders in all activities, will decide the official list.

WHY PROGRAM IS NECESSARY

Theodore S. Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, Inc., recently returned from 6 months' study of information and propaganda methods in the Orient, Near East, and Europe under the auspices of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship, makes these comments:

Millions of people in free Europe and Asia look upon the Soviets as idealists, and Americans as dollar-mad materialists.

To many, the Communists are the champions of the common man. America appears to champion nothing but its own safety. * * *

Our propaganda program needs to use more of the skills and talents of America.

Along the same line, Evangelist Billy Graham was quoted—Christian Science Monitor, May 24, 1955:

America ought to do something about the bad and false impression many foreigners have of her. The general picture of America abroad as fostered by the press, tourists, and moving pictures is that of a land of murder, crime, and violence, sexual excesses, and general immorality.

These reports coming from two widely separated sources, in juxtaposition with the fact that the 84th Congress has just appropriated $2,703,341,750 for mutual security, an appropriation including technical assistance designed to raise living standards in Asia, Africa, South America, and Eastern Europe, indicates the need for an objective review of our propaganda methods.

COMMUNIST DOMINATION GROWS

While events at Geneva may mean that the sun of a better day is rising on the international horizon, we must never lose sight of the fact that the Soviets are masters of the technique of conquest by infiltration and subversion. Moreover, that world conquest is their long-range goal even though it may temporarily seem to be eclipsed by a jovial diplomacy and an international sweetness and light.

While the free world is endeavoring to hold its own, Communist domination has been growing. Today one-third of the world's population is under Communist control. Of 800 million Communists, 600 million have been added since World War II, 89 million are numbered among the European satellites; the others are Asiatics.

Most of the Asiatics living in the free world are enjoying a new but tenuous freedom. For example, there is India. At one time its people, living on the edge of want, blamed their distress upon the British. Today the British are gone, but not poverty and all attending ills.

The bright ray of hope in this picture, we find at Manila and Bandung. The leadership of the Filipinos at Manila gave living proof that the United States is not to be classified as an exponent of colonialism and exploitation, despite some diplomatic misadventures. At Bandung, representatives of the nations of Asia and Africa quoted the language of the Declaration of Independence, the Magna Carta, and the Gettysburg Address.

HERE IS THE WORLD PICTURE

Why have the Communists succeeded in presenting themselves as idealists, champions of the common man, despite the fact that Africans and Asiatics have quoted the philosophy of domcracy? There are several answers to that question, but one is obvious: communism has made its literature easily available all over the world. It has spent millions spreading the literature of its ideology wherever anyone can read.

The Chicago Daily News has requested its foreign correspondents abroad to report upon the sale and availability of standard works presenting the philosophy of democracy on the one hand and communism on the other. Here are some of the results.

ENGLAND

From the letter of Ernie Hill, Chicago Daily News correspondent, London, England:

1. There are numerous bookstores that sell Marx and company at low cost. The Communist Party itself operates 36 regional bookstores and sells at below cost. Then there are several privately run stores that sell Communist literature at a profit * * * but still the costs are extremely low because they get them for almost nothing. Chief among these is Collett's. The manager recently wrote a letter to the Manchester Guardian stating that neither he nor his help were Communists, that they were selling Communist books because there was a demand for them. He pointed out that they also sold American books, although their trade is largely in Communist literature.

They sell Howard Fast's most venomous books at less than they sell American books. The Communists publish Howard Fast in London and send his books everywhere in the world to be sold at prices below normal.

Central Books at Red Lion Square also is in this business. It currently is advertising a new Russian book, A Book for Parents, at 7 cents a copy. It also is pushing a booklet, Public Education in the U. S. S. R., for 10 cents.

Nowhere can you buy Jefferson, Adams, Lincoln, for anything like these prices.

2. Communist pamphlets are very cheap and are given away in some of the 36 Communist bookstores. Prices range from 7 to 10 cents. A similar American paperback runs at least 30 cents.

3. There is considerable discussion of basic political philosophy at the London School of Economics, Oxford, and Cambridge. In London, the Socialist Party discusses little philosophy. It is a straight question of the working man against the investors, management, and inherited wealth.

Generally the people of England understand the basic philosophy of Marxism.

They also understand the basic philosophy of democracy in the United States. Since their own form of government is just about as democratic as ours, they are inclined to take these things for granted.

Collett's bookstore I have discovered is usually crowded with Indian students from the London School of Economics. They are generally very left wing and form a bloc of malcontents in Britain. There are something like 50,000 Indians in London and environs.

4. Practically everything from the United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is available in London. In English of course.

5. American information libraries are rather inadequate to meet the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics challenge. There are only three—London, Manchester, and Edinburgh. The London library has 40,000 volumes but the other two only 4,000 each.

Manchester and Edinburgh are outposts of the London Library and handle mail requests for books to be loaned.

It is probably unfortunate that the London USIS library is in Grosvenor Square, one of the most expensive and exclusive districts of London. Very few people from East and South London ever come to Grosvenor Square, even to borrow books from the USIS. I have noticed that in some of the other world capitals the USIS library is located in a downtown area where all classes of people pass daily.

Grosvenor Square now houses the American Embassy's five buildings, the United States Navy's large establishment, and the American school for children up to 11, three residences of Indian millionaires, and a few assorted British millionaires and peers.

The library is a good one with adequate reference books but it perhaps is badly located to give the maximum benefits.

The USIS people say the trend is toward reducing library facilities rather than expanding them. * * *

The fact remains that we have nothing to compare with their (U. S. S. R.) cheap books distribution plan and are not likely to have anything. * * *

The world's opinions of the United States largely are formed from the motion pictures they see. Some of the pictures we export do us more harm than 100,000 anti-American Russian pamphlets.

ITALY

From the Chicago Daily News Bureau, Via Oreste Tommasini 13, Rome, Italy, comes this report:

1. There are many Communist bookshops in Rome, usually near neighborhood Communist headquarters, which have club rooms and reading rooms. All the Communist classics as well as later writings on Communist education for children, Communist education for workers, labor unions, etc., are available in Italian, at approximately half the price of the paperbacks in Italian on American political and economic thought.

2. There are no American bookstores, though there is a commercial English bookstore which stocks American writings and orders them. Italian bookstores handle American books in English and in translation. The State Department has a program whereby Italian publishers translate and print American books. Instead of giving a subsidy, the Americans promise the Italian publisher they will buy a few thousand copies. These copies are then distributed free to libraries and universities in Italy, and among the people the Embassy calls public opinion molders.

3. There is a tremendous difference between the distribution methods of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The Soviet Union subsidizes books in Italian with broad mass appeal, at a very low price, through the large Communist Party and the books are available in neighborhoods. The Americans, on the other hand, concentrate on getting their books into the hands of the intelligentia, students, and professional classes. For example, three recent books on American political thought, translated into Italian by Italian publishers, for sale in Italian bookshops and also distributed free to Italian libraries by the USIA are: The U. S. and the Permanent Revolution (cost paperback about $2.50); Peter Drucker, the New York Society (cost paperback about $3); David Hutton, the Promise of Productivity (cost paperback $3.50). That is a lot of money for an Italian earning about $100 a month. The printing is good, the paper is nice.

4. The Soviet Union's information library is run for them in the Communist Party headquarters. We, on the other hand, have a beautiful, quiet, restful library on the Via Veneto, the smartest street in downtown Rome. It is full of lawyers, doctors, economists, students, etc., but no ordinary Italian would have the nerve to walk in, even though it is on street level and a sign says "free entrance." I accompanied a young Italian architect who wanted to see some of our architectural magazines because he couldn't believe he wouldn't be thrown out of such a smart place. Now he goes there all the time and the building and House and Garden type of magazine is his joy in life. I fear there are many Italians like him who would not have gone in unless introduced or accompanied by an American.

The American fashion magazines are slit to pieces by Italian women who go in with razor blades to cut out pictures of clothes, furniture, interior-decorating ideas. Also little ads concerning gadgets get cut out, indicating that Italian manufacturers take them, because they often appear on the Italian market within a few months after such a product is advertised in one of our home magazines. I think this is fine and shows our magazines are read. However, our librarians deplore the fact that the magazines get messed up and clipped. I think we ought to supply more of these magazines and let them clip away. It's cheap enough propaganda.

Here are the facts on the books Italians drew out of our American library during 1954.

A. Fiction: 21,229 withdrawals. This included Hemingway, Faulkner, Dreiser, and 19th century classics such as Melville, etc. There are no mystery books or purely popular fiction.

B. Literary criticism, poetry: 3,846.

C. Books on art: 3,781.

D. Political philosophy and psychology: 1,105.

Under political philosophy and psychology I found, in Italian: George Kennan's American Diplomacy; John Dewey, Democracy and Education; James Byrnes, Speaking Frankly; Walter Lippmann, The Good Society; Tom Paine by Dos Passos; a translation of the American Constitution; biographies of Jefferson, Franklin, but not their works; John Foster Dulles' War or Peace (looked like it had never been read, but it was there in Italian).

"Question. Why are not the Italian intelligentsia interested in our books on political philosophy?

"Answer. We judge America on what she does, not on what she says. We know all about that anticolonialism theory, but it does not work out that way in the U. N. (He was referring to our backing of France in Indochina and North Africa.)"

On the other hand, there is interest in American economic theory. Here Italians believe we practice what we preach. Almost all the books on the American way now being distributed in universities and asked for concern our economic theory of productivity, etc.

NOTE.—During 1954 the American Library drew 87,198 readers during the 227 days of the year it was open. The American Library closes on all Italian as well as American holidays and during the siesta hours between 1 and 4. This is a mistake; it could draw five times as many readers if it were open on holidays and during the siesta hour. Working Italians, apart from students, cannot possibly visit a library and browse during the hours when it is open: 9:30 to 1 and 4 to 7 excepting on Saturday afternoons when it is closed. All around the world I have found American libraries closed during the time when most people have leisure. This makes no sense to me.

The Communist bookshops and reading rooms, I notice, are always open on workers' holidays, when ordinary people have time to read.

The United States has two libraries in Italy, in Rome and Milan. The Soviet Union has its publications available through the Communist Party in every village and hamlet. Mass distribution of Communist literature is successful, because it goes into the towns and hamlets. We concentrate on the biggest cities. We think public opinion molders of Italy are in Rome and Milan. I am not so sure.

FRANCE

From Bill Stoneman, Chicago Daily News Bureau, 23 Rue de la Paix, Paris, France:

1. There are at least six bookshops in Paris which are devoted almost exclusively to the sale of Communist literature and which offer the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin in either Russian or French.

Two volumes of Marx-Engels which cost 24 rubles ($6) in Moscow cost 360 francs ($1) in Paris. Das Kapital, which costs 20 rubles ($5) in Moscow, costs 360 francs ($1) in Paris.

Works of the basic American political philosophies are difficult to buy in France because of the high cost of American books and the current shortage of American foreign exchange available for the purchase of books.

It is possible, however, to obtain practically anything one wants at Galignani's on the Rue du Rivoli where English books have been sold since 1800. Prices are excessive from the French point of view. A book costing $5 in New York is priced at 2,250 francs, the equivalent of $6.40.

However, a vast volume of good American literature is available in English through British publishing houses. They sell English and American classics in paperback pocket-size books at extremely low rates. The Nelson classics sell for 265 to 465 francs (80 cents to $1.40 approximately). The standard average price for a French paperback book is about 600 francs ($1.85). A very high percentage of American books are published in England and sold at less than half the price which is charged for American books.

Jefferson, Adams, and Lincoln are regarded here as peculiarly American figures many of whose ideas were acquired from British or French political philosophers. There is no natural market in France for their works or books concerning them. The principal British men of letters and formers of political thought are available in pocket classics at low cost.

There are reputed to be 38 French publishing firms, more or less controlled by the French Communist Party.

On the other hand most of the independent publishers in this country would normally turn out a large volume of anti-Communist literature because there is a heavy demand for it and, partly too, because of the influence of Catholicism.

2. The Communists churn out a lot of pamphlets and small-sized propaganda books, papers, and periodicals. They can be had in the half dozen openly Communist bookshops.

The United States alone turns out a number of giveaway publications which, on the whole, seem to be very well done and in any case are a lot more attractive than the Russian or Communist stuff.

American publications available here in France include Information and Documents, a twice-monthly periodical dealing with interesting developments in the United States and Franco-American relations; a series of brochures containing particularly significant statements by American leaders issued as part of the Plan of Peace series; and Problems of Communism, a very well-done booklet issued monthly and containing intelligent and telling attacks on the Soviet system by well-known writers of various nationalities.

The peace and liberty organization which is a militantly vigorous anti-Communist propaganda organization (financed by the United States) puts out a giveaway booklet called Defense of Truth also very well done.

3. France is a country of intellectuals and congenital philosophers and there is a greater interest in the study of political philosophy than in most countries.

The United States is not recognized as having any particular philosophy in the same sense that Russia lives on and by Marxist philosophy but the traditions of Anglo-Saxon liberalism and democracy are respected and understood. It is only when someone or something appears to challenge the fundamentals of the American system that the United States fails to enjoy the full respect of decent-minded Frenchmen.

4. Koestler's extremely damning books and Joseph Scholmer's violently anti-Communist book Vorkuta have been best sellers in France.

5. There is a large, well-organized, and heavily patronized American lending library with 15,000 volumes on the Champs Elysees. (This is presently being transferred to the left bank.) There are smaller libraries in Lyons, Lille, Strasbourg, and Marseilles.

GERMANY

From Chicago Daily News correspondent in Bonn, Germany:

The position in Germany is complicated. The Communist Party of Germany (KPD) is legal. It publishes several newspapers and maintains its own bookstores in several large cities.

By and large you won't find any of these publications in ordinary bookstores or newspaper kiosks.

There is a trial before the West German constitutional court to have KPD declared illegal (March 31, 1955).

Marx and Engels rank as German philosophers to whom a large number of non-Communist Social Democrats still pay lip service, although the Social Democrats no longer call themselves a Marxist Party. Their works can be obtained, but there isn't much demand for them, or so it seems. Postwar editions have been few and limited for the most part to scholarly as opposed to political purposes. One combined catalog, with which I checked, listed only a new edition of the Early Writings of Marx.

The Stars and Stripes Army bookstands often have a good selection of Modern Library Giants, sometimes including Das Kapital in English translation.

Everything published in the Soviet Zone of Germany has a pronounced Soviet slant.

There is no KPD as such; only the Socialistiche Einheits Partei, or Socialist Unity Party, the SED, a forced amalgamation of the Social Democrats and the Communists which is unrecognized in Western Germany although it continues to be legal in West Berlin and presented candidates in the December election.

The principal newspapers of the Soviet Zone can still be obtained by anyone with a reasonable excuse for having them. They are not on sale publicly in the West, but I get them every day, 2 days late, from my regular newspaper dealer.

Pravda and Izvestia are available through a similar arrangement.

The Soviet Zone maintains extremely close and strict control over western publications. * * * Simple possession of a Western newspaper has been enough in some cases to produce a charge of warmongering.

From time to time it is proposed that there be a freer exchange of cultural and scientific publications between West and East Germany, but not very much has been achieved.

Works of Lenin and Stalin in German translation can be obtained only in the Soviet Zone. They are available in Russian in several large bookstores that specialize in foreign publications. One of these, in Nuremberg, had a sizable display at a meeting of Soviet refugees near Munich last summer. There were not only the Soviet originals but also a number of anti-Soviet publications in German from the Nazi period. They are described as antiquarian.

At the end of the political spectrum there is no limit to what may be published under the guise of memoirs or experiences from the Nazi and wartime periods. * * *

Basic political books in English are available at United States and British reading rooms which are scattered throughout Western Germany and Berlin and are well patronized.

I am astonished also at the number of translations that can be obtained in bookstores. Bullock's biography of Hitler, Wheel-

er-Bennett's study of the Wehrmacht, Churchill, Chester Wilmot's Struggle for Europe come immediately to mind.

All of these are of British origin, for which there are two reasons. Dollar royalties still are difficult to manage for German publishers; comparable books do not seem to have been written about Germany or Europe in the United States of America.

CANADA

Frank Flaherty reports from Canada:

Regular bookstores stock Communist classics put out by Modern Library and they sell for about $1.25. Modern Library editions of United States political classics are also stocked. There is no Communist bookstore in Ottawa but there is one in Toronto and perhaps one other in western Canada.

Outside of certain academic circles I don't notice much interest in questions of fundamental political philosophy. Communist principles are rarely discussed, Communist tactics often. There is no feeling that the basic philosophy of the United States lacks expression. There is too little understanding of what it is.

FAR EAST

Somewhat in contrast with the experience of Mr. Flaherty stand the observations of our Study Mission to Southeast Asia and the Pacific after visiting the USIA libraries of the Far East:

The fact that they [the libraries] are heavily used is an indication of their worth. Moreover, they are not only visited by the student and the casual reader but in a number of countries they service government officials, civil servants, and academicians. Most of the works are in English. In contrast the study mission noted the large number of Communist works printed in local language on sale in local bookstores for small sums because of heavy subsidy. These books were attractively bound and printed on expensive paper. The study mission recommends increased efforts by our agencies toward the development of a vigorous program of translation, publication, and distribution. The market is there, as evidenced by the eagerness on the part of the population to absorb foreign ideas.

The Christian Science Monitor, May 23, 1955, noted that the Communists have built a new broadcasting station at Pyongyang, North Korea's capital. They announced that personal letters from North Koreans would be read to relatives and friends in South Korea. During the first quarter of this year 2 million books, many of them editions of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, were published or imported into North Korea.

Our own Congressional Library has given me a survey of Communist literature available in the Near and Middle East as well as an idea of its distribution. This survey I will refer to later in my remarks.

MEXICO

To Miss Joy A. Dickens, assistant to the cultural attaché of the United States Embassy in Mexico, I am indebted for a pamphlet, Lista General de Obras del Fondo de Cultura Popular, A. C. In this pamphlet are listed more than 100 Communist publications, including several pages devoted to the works of Stalin, Lenin, Marx, Engels. Miss Dickens writes:

The books are representative of the publications being distributed by the Communists through commercial channels. Their outlet is a local bookstore called Fondo de Cultura Popular. Most of the books are published in Moscow and generally sell for between 5 pesos (approximately 40 cents) and 12 pesos (96 cents). If these books were published as a commercial venture, they would be very cheap at double the price.

It might be interesting at this point to mention that about 12 percent of our books are published in Spanish; the Communist book list was 100 percent in Spanish.

NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

The following report on Communist literature in the Near and Middle East is furnished me by Robert F. Ogden, Chief, Near East Section, Library of Congress:

The amount of Communist literature in the languages of the area, Arabic, Turkish, Persian, etc., actually in circulation has varied greatly with the political fortunes of the Communist parties and institutions active in the area. When such organizations have been banned, the amount of literature available for purchase and actually in circulation naturally decreased.

Since World War II, Communist Parties have been active in the majority of the countries of the area, with the exception of Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and some of the smaller units. Such parties have been particularly active in Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and prepartition Palestine.

The literature used was at first locally printed but the trend is now toward Moscow imprints. The literature is of three general types: (1) Literature directed toward the idea of the peace movement and the propaganda through the orthodox churches; (2) literature dealing with the theory and accomplishments of communism, particularly the Soviet Union; (3) literature directly attacking the United States or the foreign policy of the United States.

This Section has not made a special attempt to collect such literature but some samples that have come to the Library of Congress usually by transfer are listed below. There are no examples in Turkish for the reason that Turkish control of printing and distribution of such literature has been particularly rigid and successful.

ARABIC

1. Translation: Conference of all the churches and religious sects in the Soviet Union for discussion of matters of the defense of peace.

No date or place of printing or author except the note "originated in the patriarchate of Moscow." The conference took place in May 1952.

2. Translation: America, the United States of America (in latin type), the country of the yellow satan.

3. Translation: The Way (magazine). Organ of the Israel Communist Party on problems and theory and practice. Published also in Hebrew.

4. Translation: That the Soviet people may go forward under the banner of Lenin-Stalin toward victory.

PERSIAN

5. Translation: The Great Civil War in the United States. (Moscow 1944.)

6. Translation: Orders of the High Command of the Grand Army. (Moscow 1945.)

7. Translation: Teymur and His Group (a boy's novel).

COMMUNIST PUBLICATIONS IN SOUTH ASIA

Horace I. Poleman, Chief of South Asia Section of the Library of Congress, furnishes the following report:

Communist publications fall into the three classes:

1. Russian classics (Tolstoy, Gorky, etc.) published in English in de luxe editions and sold for a few cents each.

These appear in all bookstores.

2. Pamphlets of 25–100 pages in English with attractive covers published in Russia and China and in the area of south Asia, interpreting life in Russia and China in most glowing terms. They are sold for a few cents each and appear in book bazaars everywhere.

3. Books and pamphlets in the principal vernacular (Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, Panjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam, Kanhada) interpreting in simple language the principles of communism and benefits communism would bring to the peoples of these countries. They are mostly by nature authors, published in the area and sold everywhere for a few cents each.

The Peoples Publishing House in Bombay, with branches in other large cities is the principal publisher and distributor of Communist publications in the area. It has bookstores and counters by the hundreds throughout the area. It is believed to be subsidized by the Russian Government. It publishes attractive pamphlet and book material in English and the vernaculars.

Since the educated people of the area are highly literate in English, Russian classics appear there only in that language. The material in the vernaculars is intended largely for people with little education.

Photographs of title pages of two books in English are provided, and a photograph of a title page of the constitution of the Communist Party of India in Hindi, all published by the Peoples Publishing House (Jana-Prakasana Grha).

COMMUNIST PUBLICATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The following report is by Cecil Hobbs, Reference Librarian for Southeast Asia, Library of Congress:

1. Thailand: The sale or distribution of Communist publications in any manner has been banned by the Thai Government. Prior to this ban the Ta Chung Wen Fa Co., later known as the Hua Chiao Bookstore, sold Communist publications issued by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow. The books and pamphlets were printed in English, Thai, or Chinese.

2. Burma: Communist books and pamphlets are sold freely in the bookstores and bazaar stalls throughout Rangoon. The subject presented in the publications deal with Communist doctrine in general and the story about the development of communism in China in particular. All Communist publications which appear in both English and Burmese may be purchased for a very few pyas or kyats (e. g., from 5 cents to 35 cents).

3. Indonesia: Communist publications—books and pamphlets issued in English, Indonesian, or Chinese—are easily purchased in the principal cities. Scores of bazaar stalls carry the Communist publications along with non-Communist publications, but in larger cities—like Medan, Djakarta, Soerabaja, and Bandung—there are a couple of large bookstores which stocked and sold Communist publications almost exclusively.

Four kinds of publications were stocked in these Communist bookstores: (1) Those which present the general Communist doctrines; (2) those which pertain specifically to communism in Indonesia; (3) those which tell about communism in China; and (4) Communist comic books of a propaganda nature. These publications are issued in English, Indonesian, or Chinese. In most instances the books and pamphlets are not in expensive binding, usually paperbacks, and are sold at a very low price.

The Communist publications in the English language carry the imprint of the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Peking and Moscow.

4. Malaya, Singapore, Indochina, and Philippines: Communist publications are rarely seen in the bookstores of these countries. Apparently firm controls are exer-

cised, although I know of no ban on Communist publications like that in Thailand.

While the picture I have presented is not complete it is derived from varied sources and covers a reasonably wide area. It is not reassuring, much less flattering; but it should jolt us out of our complacency. The world is changing. People who once stolidly accepted the status quo today are hungering for the philosophy which we enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and built into our Constitution. It is not enough that we are a world power. World leadership is within our grasp. We must reach out and seize the opportunity.

The struggle to win the hearts and minds of people all over the world is in progress. With confidence in the teachings of their own political philosophers the Communists are putting a book into the hands of anyone who can read, comic books into the hands of children. With confidence in the power of their political and economic philosophies they are sending Marx, Engel, Lenin, and Stalin into every village and hamlet where one person can read. Their books are within easy reach of the purchasing power of every worker.

Our own program is commendable but obviously inadequate. The reports which I have quoted indicate that we are not reaching the grassroots. Bandung has indicated an awakening in Asia and Africa which we must not underestimate. The democratic philosophy which was the inspiration of our own national beginnings cannot fail to fire those whose aspirations are like our own. Unless we act now we shall awake from our complacency to find that our effort has been too little and too late.

Mr. Speaker, I have now completed my report of progress. I have outlined what is intended when we reconvene. The program is as simple as simplicity itself. It is to win the battle for the hearts and minds of men in foreign climes with the same classics of democracy that won the hearts and minds of the men and women who built these United States. I look forward hopefully to the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

Summary of Legislation Considered by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, 84th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, there follows herewith a summary of the legislation considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency during the 1st session of the 84th Congress. For the benefit of the membership of the House each legislative act is preceded by a caption reference, together with the public law number, the House reports relating to the legislation, and the bill number of the legislation as considered in the House.

BANKING, CREDIT, AND FINANCE

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

(Public Law 350, H. Rept. No. 1299, S. 1894)

This act, approved August 11, 1955, authorizes the President to accept membership on behalf of the United States in the International Finance Corporation, authorizes the payment of the United States subscription of $35,168,000, contains several provisions of law necessary to make our membership effective, and provides for the coordination of the United States representatives to the IFC by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The bill requires the approval of Congress for certain major actions on behalf of the United States with respect to the IFC, namely, voting for an increase in capital or subscribing to additional stock, accepting amendments to the articles of agreement, and making any loan to the Corporation.

The International Finance Corporation will be an international organization, whose members must be members of the International Bank. It will be affiliated with the International Bank through common membership in their Boards of Directors and Boards of Governors. The President of the International Bank will be the Chairman of the Board of the IFC, and the management and operations of the two institutions will be closely coordinated in the interest of achieving maximum efficiency with a minimum staff. The authorized capital of the IFC will be $100 million. The amount available for subscription by each member will be proportionate to that member's subscription to the capital stock of the International Bank.

The objective of the International Finance Corporation will be to encourage the growth of private enterprises in its member countries, particularly the less developed areas, by:

First. Investing in productive private enterprise, in association with private investors without Government guaranties of repayment where sufficient private capital is not available on reasonable terms:

Second. Serving as a clearinghouse to bring together investment opportunities, private capital, and experienced management;

Third. Creating conditions conducive to and otherwise stimulating the productive investment of private capital.

These objectives were generally recognized and sought by the previous administrations.

The International Finance Corporation is intended to provide venture capital but is not authorized to invest in capital stock or to assume responsibility for managing an enterprise in which it has invested.

There is almost universal agreement that increased investment and development would be desirable in less developed areas of the free world. Many benefits would result to the people of those areas through raising their standard of living, often tragically low; the United States could anticipate increasing consumption of American agricultural and industrial products; and the entire free world would gain by relaxation of the discontent and unrest which make a fertile field for Communist activity.

It is hoped that by channeling private investment into the less developed areas the International Finance Corporation will lessen the need for public grants and loans.

Currently private United States and other capital flowing into the underdeveloped regions is concentrated in relatively few areas and industries, particularly oil and mining. Private capital for general industrial and commercial purposes in these areas is generally conceded to be inadequate.

One of the problems of the underdeveloped regions is the low rate of capital formation. What capital there is, all too frequently is invested in the more highly developed areas. It is hoped that the examples of productive and profitable enterprises which the IFC will help to start in these areas will generate local confidence and increase the available supply of local capital.

INSCRIPTION OF "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON ALL UNITED STATES CURRENCY AND COINS

(Public Law 140, H. Rept. No. 662, H. R. 619)

This act, approved July 11, 1955, requires that the inscription "In God We Trust" be placed upon the currency of the United States and requires that hereafter the same inscription also appear on all coins of the United States. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing is now undertaking, for purposes of economy, the designing of a new process for the printing of the currency which will require the preparation of new dies, rolls, and plates. In connection with this redesigning of the currency it will be possible to include the inscription "In God We Trust" in the new design with very little additional cost. In order that the Government not be faced with the substantial expenditure running into hundreds of thousands of dollars that would be required to make such a change if it were made other than at the time of redesigning the currency, the act provides that the inscription be incorporated in the new design at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

With respect to coins, the act would simply make mandatory the existing procedure of placing the inscription on all coins of the United States. Presently the inscription is only mandatory with respect to the denominations of silver coins on which it was inscribed prior to May 18, 1908, but in practice in recent years it has been placed on all coins.

NATIONAL BANK 20-YEAR REAL ESTATE LOANS

(Public Law 343, H. Rept. No. 1349, S. 1189)

Under section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, national banks are presently authorized to make mortgage loans secured by first liens upon improved real estate. The amount of any such loan may not exceed 50 percent of the appraised value of the real estate and no loan may be made for a period longer

than 5 years, except that any such loan may be made in an amount not exceeding 60 percent of the appraised value of the real estate and for a term not longer than 10 years if the loan is amortized and the installment payments are sufficient to amortize 40 percent or more of the principal of the loan within a period of not more than 10 years. National banks are also permitted to make construction loans for residential and farm construction, but the maturity may not exceed 6 months. Such construction loans are classed as ordinary commercial loans.

This act, approved August 11, 1955, makes three changes in these existing national bank loan authorities. In the case of 40 percent amortized residential mortgage loans not exceeding a 10-year maturity, the percentage of the loan to the appraised value is increased from 60 to 66⅔ percent. New authority is granted for national banks to make residential real-estate loans in an amount not exceeding 66⅔ percent of appraised value and for a term not longer than 20 years if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other instrument which provides for complete amortization of the principal of the loan within the 20-year period. The 6 months' limit on construction loans is increased to 9 months.

As a matter of practice national banks have been making real-estate residential loans in effect for an extended period through making a 10-year loan, 40 percent amortized within the period, and then at the end of the period recasting the unpaid balance into a new loan with a 10-year maturity. The 20-year maturity permitted by the new act is thus primarily for the interest of the borrower in that it enables him to definitely set his complete home-financing plan at the time he undertakes the obligation. The change from 6 to 9 months in the construction loan maturity is more realistic with actual conditions and may well serve to increase the availability of funds for such financing.

ADVERTISEMENT OF NATIONAL BANK LIQUIDATION

(Public Law 266, H. Rept. No. 1337, S. 1187)

This act, approved August 9, 1955, changes the advertisement requirements of existing law with respect to a national bank that is placed in voluntary liquidation. Under existing law whenever a vote is taken to place a national bank in liquidation the board of directors must cause notice of that fact to be published for a period of 2 months in a newspaper published in the city or town in which the bank is located, and also in a newspaper published in the city of New York. The New York City newspaper notice originally was required because national banks formerly issued notes which circulated as currency and because the circulation of these notes was often wide it was deemed desirable to have notice of a pending liquidation published in New York, then the financial center of the country, in addition to the notice to all creditors that was given locally. With the cessation of the issuance of such notes, every national bank having circulating notes outstanding deposited lawful money to cover same with the Treasurer of the United States and all such notes may be redeemed at the Treasury. Therefore the need for publication of notice in New York no longer exists. This act repeals that requirement but retains the local publication requirement and makes clear that local publication must be in every issue of the local newspaper so that all creditors will have notice to present their claims against the bank.

BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1955

(H. Rept. No. 609, H. R. 6227)

This bill, passed by the House on June 14, 1955, and not yet acted upon by the Senate, contains 5 major provisions.

First, the bill would set forth a declaration that it is the policy of the Congress (a) to control the creation and expansion of bank holding companies, (b) to separate their business of managing and controlling banks from unrelated business, (c) generally to maintain competition among banks and to eliminate the danger inherent in the undue concentration of economic power through centralized control of banks, and (d) to subject bank holding companies to examination and regulation.

Second, the bill would define a bank holding company as any company which either (a) controls 25 percent or more of the voting shares of 2 or more banks or of a bank holding company, or (b) is found by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, after notice and opportunity for hearing, to exercise a controlling influence over 2 or more banks. Certain exemptions from the definition of "bank holding company" would, however, be provided. These are as follows: (a) Any corporation a majority of the shares of which are owned by the United States or any State; (b) banks which own or control shares solely in a fiduciary capacity—except where such shares are held for the benefit of all or a majority of the persons beneficially interested in such bank; and (c) any mutual savings bank, or any nonprofit organization operating exclusively for charitable, religious, and similar purposes which would otherwise be a bank holding company by reason of its ownership of bank stock on the effective date of the act.

Third, the bill would require bank holding companies to obtain the prior approval of the Board of the Federal Reserve System before acquiring additional bank stocks or assets. The Federal Reserve Board, before granting approval of any application, would be required to ask for the recommendation of the agency that chartered the bank or banks involved, the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a national bank and the State supervisor in the case of a State bank. If such an agency denied approval within 30 days that action would be final, but if approval was granted then the Board in the light of the overall situation still could make its own determination.

Fourth, the bill would require bank holding companies within a maximum of 5 years to divest themselves of interests in nonbanking enterprises. Suitable tax relief on the distribution of such interests made at the order of the Board, or where because of such an order a company chooses to distribute its holdings of bank shares so as to cease to be a bank holding company, would be provided.

Fifth, the bill would prohibit a bank subsidiary of a bank holding company from investing any of its funds in, or lending any of its funds on the security of, the stock or other securities of the holding company of which it is a subsidiary, and other subsidiaries thereof, and would prohibit the bank from making loans to its bank holding company and other subsidiaries.

HOUSING

INCREASE IN FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

(Public Law 10, H. Rept. No. 66, S. J. Res. 42)

Early in the session it became apparent that the FHA mortgage insurance authorization would be fully committed in the first quarter of the year. Accordingly, the committee reported House Joint Resolution 202 which provided for a $1.5 billion increase in this authority to enable the FHA to go into the spring and summer building season without any interruption in mortgage insurance operations. A companion measure Senate Joint Resolution 42 was passed in lieu of House Joint Resolution 202 and became law on March 11, 1955.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

(Public Law 345, H. Repts. 913 and 1622, S. 2126)

The Housing Amendments of 1955, approved August 11, 1955, contain five title modifying existing law in several respects as noted in more detail in the summary which follows. Title I of the new act deals with FHA title I home repair and modernization loan insurance authority, FHA title II mortgage insurance authority, slum clearance, and urban renewal, public housing, independence of the Home Loan Bank Board and planning advances for community facilities. Title II relates to an expanded program for public facility loans. Title III broadens the college housing program. Title IV revises and extends the military housing program. Title V grants continued authority for the farm housing program.

FHA title I: FHA title I provides a system of insurance for home repair and modernization loans. Under this program more than 18.5 million home repair loans have been made since inception of the program in 1934. Currently the loans average about $550 in size and more than 80 percent of them are made to finance repairs to single-family dwellings. This program is continued to September 30, 1956, under the terms of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

FHA title II: FHA title II provides mortgage insurance programs for sales housing, multifamily rental housing, cooperative housing, and housing in urban renewal areas. The mortgage insurance authorization for this title of the act is increased by $4 billion over the outstanding balance of mortgages insured and outstanding commitments as of July 1, 1955. The size limit of an individual mortgage on a multifamily project built by a private sponsor is increased from $5 million to $12.5 million

and 2 of the project programs, section 213 (b) (2) cooperative housing and section 220 (d) (3) new urban renewal area housing are placed on a more liberal basis of valuation for mortgage insurance, the change being from estimated replacement cost to an estimated value basis.

Provisions added to section 213, cooperative housing, and section 207, rental project insurance, make clear that projects containing 8 or more dwelling units—rather than 12 or more under existing regulations—could qualify for these types of mortgage insurance. The FHA Commissioner is directed to appoint a special assistant with adequate staff to expedite operations under the section 213 cooperative housing mortgage insurance program. Authority is added to permit insurance under section 213 of mortgages on Government-owned housing being disposed of under provisions of existing law.

The section 221 insuring authority designed to assist in relocating families displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment operations is modified so that this liberal mortgage insurance also would be available to families in an urban renewal area even though the families are not required by governmental action to leave the area. The cost certification requirement of existing law is amended to make it inapplicable to sales housing insured under section 221 of the act.

A new insuring authority is provided to cover the insurance of mortgages on trailer courts or trailer parks. Such mortgages, however, cannot exceed $1,000 per trailer space or $300,000 per mortgage. The insurance will be written under FHA section 207 which provides that the FHA Commissioner may require regulation as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation, so as to provide reasonable rentals to tenants and a reasonable return on the investment.

A technical amendment permits the FHA to make final settlement of certificates of claim held by mortgagees any time after the sale or transfer of title by FHA on sales housing acquired by FHA through default on section 203 or section 603 insured mortgages.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Authority is given the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance function, to enter into advance commitments totaling not more than $50 million outstanding at any one time to purchase FHA cooperative housing mortgages—section 213 mortgages. Of this authorization a $5 million limitation is applicable to any one State.

DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The defense housing mortgage insurance program—a special program contained in FHA title IX—has now expired. To permit orderly conclusion of this program authority is granted for recognizing commitments on any project which has previously been designated by the President under the authority of the act.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

The new act makes three changes in the slum clearance and urban renewal programs. They are as follows: First, the amount of grant authority is increased by $500 million over a 2-year period; second, the amount of grant authority over and above the State limitation—10 percent any one State—is increased from $35 million to $70 million to be used in States where more than two-thirds of their limitation had been obligated; and third, limited loan funds are made available to assist communities in redeveloping open or predominantly open areas for commercial use.

URBAN RENEWAL IN TERRITORIES

The Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 is amended so that the Territories might take advantage of the financial assistance available for urban renewal activities as well as for carrying out slum-clearance and redevelopment projects.

PUBLIC HOUSING

An authorization is provided for new contracts for loans and annual contributions for an additional 45,000 low-cost public housing units up to July 31, 1956, under the United States Housing Act of 1937. Restrictions formerly in the law, that the community have a workable program, that a title I slum clearance or urban renewal program was being carried out, that the project was needed to meet title I relocation requirements and that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator determine the number of units neded, were eliminated. The public housing units authorized are thus made available to any communities which desire to participate in the program.

Authorization is granted the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to sell at fair market value a war housing project known as Welles Village to the housing authority of Glastonbury, Conn., subject to the approval of the legislative body of that town, for use as moderate rental housing.

During the war the Government constructed a large amount of temporary housing at Richmond, Calif. This was built under the Lanham Act. To facilitate the orderly redevelopment of this area the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to sell the underlying land to the city or local redevelopment agency upon terms calling for one-third down with the balance due within 1 year at 4 percent interest.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The new act reestablishes the Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency of the Government and changed its name to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Hereafter its annual reports will be made directly to the Congress rather than to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator as was the case when it was a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Act is also amended to make certain technical changes, including right to remove a member institution because of insolvent condition, more equitable apportionment of elective directors of a Federal home-loan bank, and clarification of the right of a Federal Savings and Loan Association to make FHA title I or VA property improvement loans to the full extent permitted by the FHA or VA. Provision is also made for charging an equitable admission fee of a savings and loan association becoming an institution insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

The Housing Act of 1954 provided for a 3-year program of assistance by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist communities in developing a reserve of planned public works. Appropriations of $10 million were authorized, and not more than 5 percent of the funds could be expended in any one State. The new act places this program on a permanent basis, increases the authorized appropriations to $48 million on a revolving-fund basis, and increases the State limitation from 5 percent to 10 percent. The salary of the Community Facilities Commissioner in the Housing and Home Finance Agency was made the same as for the heads of the other constituent agencies of the HHFA.

PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

The Housing Act of 1954 placed in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator authority to make public facility loans and authorized appropriations of $50 million for that purpose. The program has been inactive due in large part to the very limited amount of funds actually appropriated. Title II of the new act authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to establish a revolving fund for this purpose, not exceeding $100 million outstanding at any one time, from funds borrowed from the Treasury. The Administrator is authorized to make loans to political subdivisions for essential public works where financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. Such loans are to be of such sound value or so secured as to reasonably assure repayment. The maturity limit is 40 years. Priority in processing applications is granted to communities of 10,000 or less population for basic public works, including water, sewer, and gas systems for which there is urgent public need.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Title III of the new act amends the college housing loan provisions of the Housing Act of 1950 in the following respects:

First. The purposes for which such loans can be made is broadened to include other essential service facilities as well as housing and dining facilities.

Second. The terms of new loans is extended from 40 to a maximum of 50 years.

Third. The interest formula is changed, the effect of which is to reduce the rate on new loans or loans on which disbursements have not been completed from the present 3¼ percent rate to 2¾ percent.

Fourth. The test of existing law that the institution cannot otherwise obtain credit on generally comparable terms is changed to a test of equally as favorable terms. By regulation the Administrator had interpreted "generally comparable" to mean within one-fourth of 1 percent of the HHFA rate. The effect of

the change will be to make more educational institutions eligible for the loans from the Government.

Fifth. The amount of the revolving loan fund is increased from $300 million to $500 million of which not more than $100 million may be used for other educational facilities.

Sixth. The eligible borrower may also be a nonprofit affiliated building corporation established for the sole purpose of providing facilities for the institution as well as the educational institution itself.

Seventh. The loans may not be made on facilities completed prior to filing of an application for a loan.

MILITARY HOUSING

Title IV of the new act extends to September 30, 1956, the life of the existing FHA title VIII—Wherry Act—military housing program and amends it in the following major respects:

First. An insurance authorization of $1,363,500,000 is established for this program, in addition to the general FHA insurance authorization.

Second. Insurance is to be issued for units which the Secretary of Defense determines are needed to meet essential military requirements, or for personnel for whom adequate housing is not available at reasonable rentals within reasonable commuting distance of a military installation. If the Federal Housing Commissioner does not concur in the Secretary's determination, he may require the Secretary to guarantee the insurance fund against loss on the mortgage in question.

Third. The amount of the insured mortgage may not exceed the FHA estimate of replacement cost, including the cost of land, physical improvements, and onsite utilities; and it may not exceed an average of $13,500 per family unit for the part of the project attributable to dwelling use; and it may not exceed the lowest acceptable bid submitted by a qualified builder, as determined by the Secretary of Defense after consulting FHA. Also, the replacement cost of the property—including the estimated value of any usuable utilities within the boundaries of the property where owned by the United States and not provided for out of the proceeds of the mortgage—cannot exceed $13,500 per unit.

Fourth. The mortgage must mature in not more than 25 years, and bear interest at not more than 4 percent.

Fifth. The cost certification provisions of section 227 of the National Housing Act are made inapplicable to this program as contracts are let on competitive-bid basis.

Sixth. The program is extended to include the Coast Guard as well as the military departments.

The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase, and to purchase, service, and sell mortgages insured under the new military housing program, but the total amount of purchases and commitments outstanding at any one time could not exceed $200 million.

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into contracts with any eligible builder for the construction of housing on Government land at or near a military installation, after competitive bidding in accordance with the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. Under such contracts, the housing will be placed under the control of the Secretary of Defense as it becomes available for occupancy and the capital stock of the builder corporation will be transferred without cost to the Secretary. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to acquire unimproved land and, with FHA approval, existing Wherry housing, for purposes of the military housing program, through purchase or other transfer or through condemnation proceedings; and provisions are included to protect the interests of the owners in condemnation cases.

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to maintain and operate housing acquired under the program and assign quarters in such housing to military and civilian personnel. The military department concerned may use appropriations for quarters allowances or appropriate allotments, and rental charges to civilian personnel, to pay the obligations of the mortgagor with respect to the housing. Such payments cannot exceed an average of $90 a month per housing unit, and cannot total more than $9 million per month, nor more than $90,000 per month for housing for the Coast Guard. Maintenance and operation expenses are not to be paid in this manner, but are to be paid out of funds appropriated for the purpose.

Miscellaneous provisions of title IV of the new act provide for procurement of services of architects and engineers, authorize necessary appropriations, and contain saving provisions necessary to complete operations—including operations with respect to projects certified by the Atomic Energy Commission prior to July 1, 1956—under the existing Wherry Act.

FARM HOUSING

The Housing Act of 1949 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make, first, long-term loans to farmers having adequate farms who are nevertheless unable to obtain private credit on reasonable terms; second, similar loans supplemented by modest contributions for 5 years, where the farmer is unable to undertake to repay the loan in full and the farm is not adequate but capable of being improved to the point where it is self-sustaining; and third, modest loans and grants to help farm families on very poor farms to undertake minor improvements or minimum repairs to farm dwellings where necessary to remove hazards to the health or safety of the occupants, and modest loans for enlargement and development of farms.

Title V of the new act provides the following additional authorization for farm housing under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to be available on or after July 1, 1955: First, $100 million in the amount of loan funds which can be obtained from the Treasury; second, $2 million per annum in the amount of annual contribution commitments for housing on potentially adequate farms; and third, $10 million in the amount of appropriations authorized for loans and grants for improvements and repairs of farm dwellings and other buildings, and loans for the enlargement and development of farms.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN WAR HOUSING PROJECTS TO THE CITY OF WARWICK, VA., AND THE CITY OF HAMPTON, VA.

(Public Law 80, H. Rept. No. 664, S. 755)

This act authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to sell and convey at fair market value, as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real estate expert, war housing projects VA–44061 and VA–44067 located in the cities of Warwick and Hampton, Va., to the respective cities, or to a public housing authority for such cities. The sale could be made to the cities jointly or to an authority for both cities or to an agency or corporation jointly established or sponsored in the public interest. Project VA–44061, known as the Ferguson Park war housing project, consists of 1,188 permanent family dwelling units constructed in 1942 for war workers in the Newport News area. It is located in the city of Warwick, Va. Project VA–44067, known as the Copeland-Newsome project presently consists of 3,886 units of the so-called demountable-type housing of which 2,164 units are located in the city of Warwick and 1,722 in the city of Hampton. The provisions of the act are effective only during a period ending 6 months after the date of approval, which was June 16, 1955.

SALE OF CERTAIN WAR HOUSING PROJECTS TO THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BEAVER COUNTY, PA.

(Public Law 326, H. Rept. 1338, H. R. 6193)

This act authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to sell and convey to the Housing Authority of the county of Beaver, Pa., at fair market value as determined by him, for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income, seven war housing projects located in Beaver County. These 7 projects containing 1,130 dwelling units were built during World War II to house workers engaged in industries essential to the national defense effort. However, before any of these projects may be sold to the Housing Authority, it must first be offered by the Administrator to a duly organized mutual ownership or cooperative organization for not exceeding 120 days. Also no such project may be sold to the Housing Authority until the Administrator has received from the Attorney General of Pennsylvania an opinion that said Housing Authority has legal authority to acquire, pay for, and operate such project as a rental housing project for persons of limited income. Terms could not exceed 30 years with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate not exceeding 5 percent. The authority granted in this act will expire on the first day of the sixth month following the month in which the act is approved. The act was approved August 9, 1955.

SALE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY HELD IN CONNECTION WITH LANHAM ACT HOUSING

(Public Law 349, H. Rept. No. 1339, H. R. 6199)

This act, approved August 11, 1955, authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to sell to any agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons

of low income, at fair market value personal property of a war-housing project which is not sold with the project. Any sale would be made on a cash basis payable at time of settlement. This will enable a local housing authority to purchase equipment which it has been using in any combined operation of war housing and low-rent housing projects. Where a housing authority has been using equipment in such a combined operation, the sale of the equipment to some one other than the housing authority would require the housing authority to purchase at considerably greater expense new equipment to replace any items sold to others. This would in some measure increase the Federal subsidy for annual contributions to the project. Sale of such equipment to the local authority would obviate such increase and permit the authority to continue to have available the equipment which it has been using to service all its projects.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN WAR HOUSING PROJECTS TO THE CITY OF NORFOLK, VA.

(Public Law 284, H. Rept. No. 1341, S. 2351)

The committee reported H. R. 7073 a companion bill to S. 2351. In the House the reported bill was laid on the table and S. 2351 passed in lieu thereof. The bill became law on August 9, 1955. Under its provisions the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to sell at fair market value war housing projects VA–44075 and VA–44184, located in the city of Norfolk, Va., to the city of Norfolk, to the Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority, or to any agency or corporation established or sponsored in the public interest by the city. These projects of demountable-type construction presently contain 3,493 units. The city of Norfolk through its redevelopment agency is engaged in an extensive redevelopment program and has indicated that the projects are needed to house families displaced by this program. The authorization will remain effective during a period of six months after the date of approval of the act.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN WAR HOUSING PROJECTS TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

(Public Law 235, H. Rept. No. 663, H. R. 5512)

This act, approved August 4, 1955, authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to convey to the State of Louisiana projects LA–16011 and LA–16012 in consideration of the payment of $300,000 in three equal annual installments. These projects consist of 255 permanent dwelling units constructed early in World War II on land leased from the State of Louisiana to provide dwelling accommodations for military personnel assigned to the Alexandria Air Force Base. They were designed, with the aid of an architect employed by the State, in a manner which would permit their conversion to eventual hospital use. The State would be required to pay the first installment within 6 months after the date of approval of the act.

TRANSFER OF WAR HOUSING PROJECTS TO THE CITY OF MOSES LAKE, WASH.

(H. Rept. No. 1340, H. R. 6298)

This bill, which passed the House on July 30, 1955, but has not been acted upon by the Senate, would amend section 601 (g) of the Lanham Act so as to permit the transfer of 2 war-housing projects, Wash–45206 and Wash–45402, to the city of Moses Lake, Wash. These projects contain a total of 172 temporary family dwelling units. Moses Lake is one of the comparatively few communities in which on December 31, 1948, more people were living in temporary family accommodations than were listed in the census of 1940. In such cases transfer of the temporary Government-owned housing accommodations can be made to the community or local slum clearance agency without cost other than for payment of the land involved.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED HOUSING TO THE CITY OF HOOKS, TEX.

(H. Rept. No. 1554, H. R. 7540)

The committee reported this bill on July 28, 1955, but inasmuch as the Congress adjourned on August 2, action was not completed on this measure by the House. Under its provisions the appropriate Government agency is directed to sell and convey the North Village housing project—Texas–41142—whenever it is declared surplus to the needs of the Government, to the city of Hooks, Tex., at fair market value as determined on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real estate expert. The project consists of 248 housing units and was transferred to the Department of the Army on December 3, 1948, by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It has been used to house personnel at the Red River Arsenal, near Texarkana, Tex., but it now appears that the project is no longer required for that purpose.

CONVEYANCE OF A WAR HOUSING PROJECT TO THE BOSTON HOUSING AUTHORITY

(Public Law 217, H. R. 6980)

The committee held hearings on this bill but due to the fact the bill was passed by unanimous consent the same day the bill was ordered reported, no formal report was filed by the committee. This act, approved August 3, 1955, directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to sell and convey war housing project Mass–19051 to the Boston Housing Authority for use as a relocation project under applicable local law. The project contains 873 dwelling units. The sale would be at fair market value as determined by the Administrator on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real estate expert. Payment in full would be required within a 30-year period with interest on the unpaid balance of not to exceed 5 percent per annum. The authorization would be effective for 6 months after approval of the act unless such time limit was extended by the Administrator.

ECONOMIC

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955

(Public Law 295, H. Repts. No. 1343 and 1630, S. 2391)

The committee reported a companion bill H. R. 7470, the provisions of which were substituted for S. 2391. The conference substitute retaining the Senate bill number, extended the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to the close of June 30, 1956, and made certain changes therein. The declaration of policy of the act is amended to reflect the emphasis now being placed on preparedness programs. Authority is granted the President to make provision for the development of substitutes for strategic and critical materials when it will aid the national defense. Authority for allocation of materials in the civilian market is modified so that if this authority is again made use of a more realistic base period can be employed. Provision is made for an intensive study by the Office of Defense Mobilization of the share of procurement going to small business concerns. The voluntary agreements authority, under which there is exemption from the antitrust laws, is restricted to those covering primarily military items but permit certain existing nonmilitary agreements to continue subject to review by the Attorney General within 90 days after approval of the act to determine if they should be allowed to continue. The provisions of the law authorizing the use of industry employees serving without compensation from the Government and who are exempted from the conflict-of-interest statutes, are materially strengthened to prevent possible abuses. Authority is granted the President to provide for the establishment and training of a nucleus executive reserve for employment in Government during periods of emergency. The limit on the expenses of the Joint Congressional Committee on Defense Production is increased from $50,000 to $65,000 in any fiscal year and an increase to the going rate is authorized for stenographic reporting services. The act is made effective as of its previous expiration date. The act was approved August 9, 1955.

EXTENSION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

(Public Law 268, H. Rep. No. 1350, S. 2127)

This act extends the life of the Small Business Administration for 2 years until July 31, 1957. It also makes the following changes in the Small Business Act of 1953: First, the limit on an individual small-business loan is increased from $150,000 to $250,000; second, the interest rate on Small Business Administration loans—both direct and participation—is limited to not more than 6 percent per annum; third, the $250,000 loan limitation is waived on any loan extended to any corporation formed and capitalized by a group of small-business concerns with resources provided by them if such corporation is formed to produce or secure raw materials or supplies. If such a loan is for the purpose of constructing facilities, it may have a maturity of not to exceed 20 years plus such additional time as is required to complete such construction. These loans are to be made at an interest rate of not less than 3 nor more than 5 percent per annum. The employee limitation otherwise applicable to small-business concerns does not apply in the case of any such new corporation. Agreements pertaining to such a new corporation when approved by the SBA would not be subject to the proceedings of the antitrust laws; fourth, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration when requested to do so by any small-business concern—or any Government department or agency—is

required to issue an appropriate certificate certifying an eligible small-business concern as a small-business concern in accordance with the criteria expressed in the Small Business Act of 1953. Offices of the Government having procurement or lending powers or engaging in the disposal of Federal property or allocating materials or supplies, or promulgating regulations affecting the distribution of materials or supplies are required to accept as conclusive the Administrator's determination.

This act also makes it mandatory that all bids and invitations for bids under the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 contain specifications which will give a prospective bidder sufficient information to permit him to bid.

COMMODITIES

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

(Public Law 344, H. Rept. 1559, S. 2604)

This act increases the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $10 billion to $12 billion in order to enable the Corporation to carry out existing commitments by the Government for price support on 1955 crops.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is a federally chartered corporation and is the instrumentality through which price support is extended on farm commodities through loans, purchase agreements, and purchases, in accordance with existing legislation. The price-support operations constitute the major activity of the Corporation, but it also operates a storage facilities program, a supply and foreign-purchase program, and a commodity-export program. It also performs other activities authorized by Congress. The President's budget each year describes fully the various programs carried out by the Corporation, all of which are within the framework of laws enacted by the Congress.

The Corporation is managed by a Board of Directors which is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It is subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture who is, ex officio, a Director and Chairman of the Board.

As required by its Federal charter, the Corporation utilizes private trade facilities, including banks, cooperatives, commercial warehouses, handlers, and others to the maximum extent practicable.

TEXAS CITY TIN SMELTER

(H. Rept. 661, S. Con. Res. 26)

This concurrent resolution expresses the sense of the Congress, first, that the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., should be continued in operation until June 30, 1956, and as long thereafter as may be hereafter authorized by the Congress; second, that the President have conducted a study and investigation so as to make recommendations to the Congress upon the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States; third, that in making such study and investigation, the President shall consider the possibilities of private lease or sale of the Government smelter as well as continued Government ownership and operation of this facility; fourth, that appropriate arrangements be made so that the Texas City plant and facilities, as well as nonsecurity information concerning them, shall be shown to interested private persons; and fifth, that the President shall, on or before March 31, 1956, report to the Congress the findings of this study and his recommendations with respect to the future operation of the tin smelter.

MISCELLANEOUS

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN HOUSING PROGRAMS, THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT, AND THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

(Public Law 119, S. J. Res. 85)

This joint resolution providing for a 1-month extension of certain housing programs, the Small Business Act, and the Defense Production Act was necessary to prevent the expiration of these programs and acts while the Congress was completing action on the basic bills amending and extending these programs and acts. After informal consideration of the 1-month extension resolution by the committee, the chairman called up S. J. Res. 85 by unannmous consent in the House and it was passed by the House on June 28, 1955, and approved by the President on June 30, 1955.

MEDAL FOR DR. JONAS E. SALK

(Public Law 297, H. Rept. No. 1351, H. J. Res. 278)

This act, approved August 9, 1955, directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike an appropriate gold medal to be presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in recognition of his great achievement in the field of medicine for his discovery of a serum for poliomyelitis. The act also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike bronze duplicates of the medal to be sold at a price sufficient to cover the costs involved.

TEXAS COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

(Public Law 338, H. Rept. No. 1342, H. R. 7244)

This act, approved August 9, 1955, provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th aniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish at cost to the Texas Heritage Foundation, Inc., 2,000 medals of appropriate design and inscription. The act also authorizes the manufacture and sale by the mint to the public of bronze duplicates of this medal upon authorization from the Texas Heritage Foundation, Inc.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN MEDAL

(Public Law 259, H. Rept. No. 1553, S. 463)

This act, approved August 9, 1955, authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike 71 bronze medals with an appropriate design and inscription to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin occurring on January 17, 1956. Twenty-one scientific, educational, and welfare societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member are specifically designated to be recipients of medals. The remaining 50 medals are to be presented in cooperation with the 250th anniversary committee of the Franklin Institute to other enterprises, institutions, and societies founded or helped in their early development by Benjamin Franklin.

Need for Modernization of Old Apartment Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago we have the very serious problem of preventing the decay of old-established residential districts through lack of financing for the rehabilitation and modernizing of apartment buildings that were erected in a past era. They are substantially built, with many years of usefulness ahead of them, but they are not modern. Moreover, in the years of depression, of war, and the period of necessary retrenchments and controls, many of them were not kept up as would have been the case in normal times.

The situation we face in Chicago, and I presume there is a similar situation in other larges cities, is this:

First. With adequate financing these buildings can be restored, can be made attractive to renters, and profitable to owners, a credit to the neighborhoods in which they are located, or

Second. With such financing unavailable, the buildings will continue to deteriorate, and with their decay will drag down the communities of their location.

I have had much correspondence on this subject with many persons in the district I represent, including John Usher and other leaders in the fight to halt the blight of neighborhoods on the beautiful south side of Chicago. The housing bill that came from the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, offers some aid in specifying that valuation shall be based on estimated replacement cost rather than value. I think it should have gone further. The amendment I offered in committee, I thought more adequately to meet the situation, was referred to the Rains Housing Subcommittee for further study and report back with recommendations to the second session.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article in the June 1955 number of the NAHB Correlator, by William L. Slayton, assistant director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, to which my attention has been directed by D. E. Mackelmann, the very able deputy housing coordinator of the city of Chicago.

The article follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH URBAN RENEWAL?

(By William L. Slayton, assistant director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials; previously, he worked for the Division of Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment of the HHFA, and was assistant director of the Urban Redevelopment Study)

Section 220 of the Housing Act of 1954 has been hailed as the key to urban renewal. It is aimed at providing the financing for housing rehabilitation and for the construction of new projects in urban renewal areas. At this writing, not one loan has been insured under section 220, although the act was signed by President Eisenhower last

August 2. Nor does it seem likely that a loan will be insured under section 220 in the near future. This lag has created considerable apprehension.

The question in many minds: has FHA made section 220 unworkable, or does it not realize that merely writing new regulations for a new concept will not necessarily overcome the inertia of traditional inaction?

The fact that FHA has issued regulations which present great obstacles for the builder makes him uneasy, and never really sure that FHA and HHFA are willing to recognize, advocate, and support what it takes to make the 220 program work.

There are two kinds of 220. The first is most similar to section 203. It covers both new and rehabilitated housing, but is applicable only if such housing is in renewal areas. Terms under 220 for new housing are the same as for new housing under section 203.

The major question in 220 is valuation and this applies to both rehabilitation and new construction. Under section 220, FHA does not apply the economic soundness test; it applies the test of acceptable risk. A special insurance fund is set up for 220 mortgages. From the outset, Congress has recognized that 220 is specially designed for the properties in areas that need renewing; that it is different from the normal mortgage insurance program under section 203. FHA has recognized this distinction.

The question is whether FHA has recognized the distinction to the extent they must, if 220 is to be of any real help.

At present, FHA says that in valuating a structure to be rehabilitated, it will consider as completed those elements of the renewal plan which the city has authority to carry out. If the plan calls for parks, playgrounds, a school, etc., FHA will assume that these will be built and their valuation of the structure to be rehabilitated will reflect this assumption. FHA also will assume that if the plan calls for the enforcement of the housing code, all the structures in the area will be brought up to the minimum standard.

But valuating structures on the basis of neighboring structures being improved to the level of minimum standards only does not mean a very high valuation for the structure to be rehabilitated. The aim is to rehabilitate, where possible, considerably above minimum housing standards, but FHA won't recognize such an attempt in the urban renewal plan.

NO CREDIT FOR VOLUNTARY PROGRAM

A key part of an urban renewal plan is the program for voluntary rehabilitation, a program by which the city tries to encourage home owners to rehabilitate to levels above the minimum standards. Yet, FHA says that unless there is legal authority to require rehabilitation to standards higher than the minimum housing code, it cannot recognize such higher standards in its valuations. If FHA will not recognize the higher standards called for in the renewal plan, there is no encouragement to the home owner to achieve them, because FHA won't give him a valuation that would recognize the amount he puts into the rehabilitation of his home.

For example, the housing code calls for only a kitchen sink. If the home owner decided to undertake a complete modernization job, FHA would have to say under present regulations that it could not increase the value of the structure above the value that would be added by the installation of a sink alone. The reason? The character of the area holds down the value of the house, and FHA has no assurance that the area will be improved to standards above that of the housing code.

So, it becomes a vicious circle. FHA says it can't give higher valuations until the property in the area is actually rehabilitated to these higher standards; the home owner can't obtain high enough valuations to permit rehabilitation to the higher standards. If urban renewal is to provide rehabilitation to standards above the housing code, FHA is going to have to give. Maybe it needs some congressional prodding.

RENTAL HOUSING ALSO BOGGED

Section 220 also provides for financing new construction and rehabilitation of multifamily rental housing, particularly for slum clearance and urban redevelopment projects. Before the Housing Act of 1954, only section 207 was available for financing these structures, and 207 provided only 80 percent mortgages. Section 220 provides for 90 percent financing of these structures and consequently—on the surface, at least—encourages financing rental housing on redevelopment sites.

But valuation is still a question. The law specifies value rather than estimated replacement cost, and FHA, therefore, is concerned about the environment in which these projects are built. FHA will assume that the proposed redevelopment project will be completed as it is outlined in the plan, but it is hard for FHA not to overemphasize the character of the surrounding area. The fact that these projects are often located where the surrounding area is something less than desirable makes FHA feel that the value of the project should therefore be reduced.

A project may cost $1 million to build. A 90-percent mortgage becomes a 72-percent mortgage if FHA says the value of the project is but $800,000. FHA sets a value of $800,000, because the area in which it is located will produce rents which, when capitalized, will produce a value of only $800,000.

Section 220 for rental housing in redevelopment projects is not going to work unless value approximates estimated replacement cost (in this example, $1 million); and if this is to result, FHA must value the project on a self-contained unit basis, not on the basis of the character of the surrounding area.

These redevelopment projects are, in fact, large enough to provide their own environment. FHA could, if it wished, reach a value in most cases that actually approximates estimated replacement cost. But FHA appears to be somewhat sticky on this point.

Sponsors of section 220 applications for rental housing are being hurt on the question of value. They are also being hurt on the question of builder's profit. The law says that under cost certification, the cost of the project may include a reasonable allowance for builder's profit.

The Senate report on the Housing Act of 1954 indicates that this amount is not to exceed 10 percent of all other costs. At the time the report was written, it was clearly understood by many of us that FHA would allow a 10 percent builder's profit, recognizing that the profit allowed was based on more than just a contractor's fee, and that it represented equity created, rather than immediate cash return.

If builders are to be attracted to rental housing in redevelopment areas, FHA must recognize all of the elements that go into making the risk attractive. They must recognize the venture capital aspect of the program, and not think of it in terms of a builder contracting to perform a specific job, and being assured of receiving the fee specified.

The builder of rental housing is not in the same position as is the contractor bidding on a job. It is different also in that on a $5 million contract job, the builder receives his profit ($250,000–$500,000) when the job is completed. In rental housing under section 220, the builder's profit on a $5 million project ends up as equity in the project; not as an immediate cash return. In brief, if FHA were to allow a full 10 percent builder's profit, the builder would still have to put up about 3 percent of his own cash ($150,000 on a $5 million job) and his profit would constitute merely an equity in the project, unreturnable unless the project paid off. FHA, however, does not seem inclined to recognize this basic fact.

FHA, no doubt, would really like to make 220 work for both rehabilitation and redevelopment. After all, its success is important to the administration's housing program. But FHA must be made to realize that it cannot follow a policy of fearing criticism for following a realistic policy. The only reasonable solution is to have FHA and HHFA assure real leadership, stating clearly and unequivocally that if 220 is to work, the problems of valuation and builder's profit must be met head-on, and then proceed to adop regulations that will make the program work. In short, nothing in the law prevents 220 from working, but restrictive regulations and administrative policies do.

The Vital Need for Developing Inland Transportation Routes to Sources of Raw Materials on the American Continent

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by James M. Mead, formerly Senator from the State of New York, now a member of the Federal Trade Commission:

THE VITAL NEED FOR DEVELOPING INLAND TRANSPORTATION ROUTES TO SOURCES OF RAW MATERIALS ON THE AMERICAN CONTINENT

(By Hon. James M. Mead, member of the Federal Trade Commission, and formerly Senator from the State of New York)

America's growing dependence on foreign sources for raw materials, especially metals, presents a serious problem. It affects vitally the ability of our country to maintain its industrial strength and to be assured of having an adequate supply of materials essential to national defense.

We have been exhausting our mineral resources at a terrific rate. Today, we must go to far distant parts of the world to bring in many minerals and materials because we do not have enough here at home to meet the demands of our economy and the requirements of national defense. There was a time when the United States could be regarded as self-sufficient in most of the raw materials it required. But two world wars, and the tremendous expansion of our industrial production, have worked increasingly to deplete many resources of which we formerly had an adequate supply.

The great ore deposits of the Mesabi Range in Minnesota are no longer able to supply the growing requirements of our iron and steel mills, and we are already seeking foreign sources for needed iron ore. We must also look to overseas sources for many other essential materials, including metals that are vital to our national security. We are going farther and farther from our shores to obtain more and more of these raw materials. Our present lines of supply run to such distant areas as Malaya, South Africa, India, the Philippines, Australia, and other far-away places.

We shall continually need to look for new sources as deposits at home become exhausted, or as those in distant lands fall into hostile hands or otherwise become unavailable to us.

Long ocean voyages of freighters required to bring these essential supplies to our shores involve costly transportation. These lines of supply extend over thousands of miles of open seas. They are difficult if not impossible to protect in time of war. They are vulnerable to enemy attack at many points by submarine, mines, aircraft, and other weapons. They require large naval forces for convoy and patrol duty, thus tying down a great part of our naval strength that may be sorely needed to protect our coastal cities and harbors and to carry the war directly to the enemy.

Access to the needed supplies is essentially a problem of transportation. It is a problem of finding or establishing transportation routes that can be protected and kept open for bringing in a continuous, uninterrupted flow of materials without which our industrial strength, our free economy, and our national defense cannot be effectively maintained. Transportation becomes a vital and critical factor in our dependence on foreign sources for strategic and other needed raw materials. Even in peace time, transportation to bring raw material from distant foreign lands adds tremendously to the cost of production. Our mills and factories must necessarily pass this cost on to consumers, thus burdening all those who use or consume the products of our industries, and making it more difficult for American manufacturers to compete in world markets.

The vulnerability of overseas transportation in time of war presents a most serious situation. We need to prepare ourselves against it. Experience has shown that ocean transportation routes can be so menaced by submarines as to cut us off from vital materials, or to make it so difficult in getting supplies through as to handicap us in the prosecution of any war. These dangers persist, despite the use of tremendous segments of our naval forces for patrolling and defending overseas supply lines. Experts agree, as reported by a Senate subcommittee, that in time of war, "it will be at best so costly as to make it almost prohibitive in lives and vessels to ship strategic and critical materials for war across the major oceans from Europe, the Mediterranean, Africa, Far and Near East, and Australia." [1]

American industrial capacity constitutes one of our weapons of defense superior to that of any hostile nation that may be tempted to attack us. However, that superior weapon of production may become impotent if our foreign supply lines for strategic raw materials are cut off. If we cannot maintain the needed continuous flow of raw materials to our factories, our advantage in superior industrial production disappears.

Our danger in this respect may be relieved to some extent by stockpiling of strategic materials. However, stockpiling can at best be only temporary and partial relief in the long pull of a major war in which huge quantities are required to fed our furnaces and factories.

A subcommittee of the Senate in studies touching this problem has reported: "We must recognize our greatest weakness is the dependency on very distant countries across the major oceans for the needed raw materials, without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace." [1]

To lessen our dependence upon vulnerable and costly overseas supply lines, it becomes a matter of vital importance to the Nation that we develop sources of raw materials nearer home with access by overland routes which can be protected from enemy action.

Fortunately, there are possibilities open to us for developing such access by overland transportation to sources of needed raw materials on our own continent. These land routes would not be exposed to enemy attack at sea. Because of their inland protection, they could be maintained to bring us uninterruptedly a steady flow of needed raw materials. For this purpose, action should be taken without delay in three directions:

1. The unbuilt stretches of the Inter-American Highway, leading from the United States through Mexico and Central America to the Panama Canal and beyond, should be completed. This highway would afford overland accessibility to the rich mineral resources of the Central American countries and beyond to those of South America.

2. Additional and improved routes should be opened for more adequately linking the Alaskan Highway with the United States. Connecting feeder roads in the Alaskan Territory should also be completed for tapping the rich mineral resources in the interior of that region. Such extension of the northern highway would afford us a protected inland supply route for bringing the great resources of Alaska and northwestern Canada to the industrial centers of our two countries, thus lessening dependence upon sea lanes that are exposed to enemy attack.

3. The St. Lawrence seaway, which has now been authorized, should be completed as expeditiously as practicable, thereby making available efficient transportation in adequate volume to bring the great iron ore deposits of Labrador to the iron and steel producing plants in the Great Lakes area. Also, other Canadian resources of strategic materials can thereby be effectively channeled to this heart of American and Canadian industry.

To the south of our border, the Inter-American Highway has already been built in large part. It is routed for thousands of miles from the United States through Mexico, through the Central American states to Panama. Beyond Panama, it is projected in a course that would, when constructed, connect up the national highway system of South America with the United States, as well as with the intermediate nations. Filling in the unbuilt gaps would bring to completion an arterial highway binding together the nations of the Western Hemisphere and strengthening our natural bond of neighborly friendship.

The tourist trade alone would bring business and opportunity for understanding to the people of the Central American states. It would go far to protect these small nations against Communist infiltration.

Development of their natural resources would follow inevitably upon the establishment of accessible transportation. It would enable those countries to reap the benefits of their own economic wealth for the advancement of their people. It would result in their selling to us raw materials which our industrial plants require for continuous operations.

Completion of the Inter-American Highway would afford the United States a comparatively safe inland route over which to bring in strategic raw materials. It would relieve us in very substantial measure of our dependence upon ocean transportation which is most difficult to maintain in time of war. During World War II, it was a matter of great concern that we had no overland means of getting necessary raw materials where they could be found on our own continent. Our ocean supply lines to and from far distant sources were so costly to maintain and so menaced by the enemy that the Navy recommended the immediate completion of the Inter-American Highway. The highway was viewed as affording a land route to which we could resort and thus avoid the heavy losses of life, ship, and cargo from which we were then suffering due to enemy subs. Besides these terrific losses, the overseas supply lines were tying down large contingents of our naval forces on convoy and patrol duty when these were sorely needed to do battle elsewhere.

When, as a Member of the Senate, I succeeded to the chairmanship of its Truman committee, the Navy urged construction of the Inter-American Highway as a needed alternate route for raw materials. It recommended this construction work be completed notwithstanding the fact it would have added seriously to the manpower shortage we were then experiencing. The Inter-American Highway would afford us access to the rich, natural resources of the Central and South American countries by overland transportation. Enemy submarines could not cut us off from needed raw materials of the type we could bring by this overland route from our neighbors to the south.

Congress has appropriated small sums for cooperation with Central American countries toward furthering construction of the missing links. But these funds are so small as to provide little more than token assistance, leaving the work to proceed at such slow rate that many years would be required to bring it to completion. The project needs to be speeded up.

Much of the same considerations apply to the desirability of having the Alaskan Highway improved and linked more adequately to the United States; also to having more branch feeder roads leading from the northern end to interior areas where minerals vital to our war potential are obtainable.

This highway was built under emergency conditions at great expenditure of money and effort. It runs from Dawson Creek in British Columbia to Fairbanks, Alaska, a distance of over 1,500 miles. The most direct access is from Great Falls, Mont., over a rather circuitous highway leading north through Canada, a distance of some 1,000 miles. New and more adequate routes are needed for reaching the Alaskan Highway from the United States, and more feeder roads at the northern terminus are required for reaching the rich mineral deposits of the interior.

Such additional construction should be undertaken immediately. Joint agreement on the routes through Canada should be arranged with the Canadian Government as soon as possible. It is important that these additional routes as well as the feeder roads be pushed to completion without delay in order that vitally needed mineral and other resources of Alaska and neighboring Northwest Canada may become accessible by a protected overland artery of transportation. Raw materials can thereby be fed into industrial United States and Canada by such inland transportation, making both nations less dependent upon ocean routes which are costly and difficult to defend.

The St. Lawrence seaway is another project in an enlightened program on this subject. The seaway will aid materially to make available the vast iron-ore deposits which were recently tapped in Labrador, and also the great mineral and timber resources of eastern Canada. That waterway will afford abundant transportation for bringing such heavy and bulky materials in adequate quantity into the heart of the Great Lakes industrial area where so much of our raw material consuming industries are located. It will also serve as a further link with the Alaskan Highway for bringing materials from Alaska and northwest Canada into the Great Lakes industrial empire. It will form a part of an integrated system of transportation which will enable us to keep our own and Canadian industries supplied. They can thus be kept operating for the common defense of the continent and with unity of

[1] Report by Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, July 1954.

purpose to advance the economic well-being of all the people.

Transportation is vital. The economy of any area and its expansion and growth are perhaps more favorably influenced by transportation than by almost any other factor. It is indispensable to the opening up of resources of undeveloped territory. It provides the means for contact and business intercourse essential to that economic enlightenment of peoples which promotes peace, friendship, and understanding.

Completion of the three arteries of transportation—the Inter-American Highway to the south; the Alaskan Highway to the northwest; and the St. Lawrence seaway to the northeast, all on our own continent, will benefit our neighbors as well as ourselves. They form the parts of a program that should be pushed to completion with all possible speed to serve the needs of our national defense and to advance the prosperity and happiness of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

MINERAL DEPOSITS KNOWN OR REPORTED TO EXIST IN CENTRAL AMERICAN STATES

Costa Rica: Rare earths, gold, manganese.

El Salvador: Asbestos, gold and silver, lead and zinc, petroleum, mercury, sulfur.

Guatemala: Antimony, chromite, gold and silver, graphite, iron, lead and zinc, manganese, mica, molybdenum, petroleum, quartz crystals, mercury, sulfur, titanium.

Honduras: Antimony, bauxite (aluminum ore), gold and silver, iron, manganese, mercury, nickel, petroleum, zinc.

Mexico: Antimony, arsenium (arsenic), beryllium, bismuth, cadmium, celestite, chromite, fluorspar, gold and silver, graphite, iron, lead, manganese, mica, molybdenum, nickel and cobalt, petroleum, mercury, sulfur, tin, titanium, tungsten, uranium, vanadium.

Nicaragua: Antimony, copper, emetine, gold, lead and zinc, nickel, petroleum, mercury, sulfur, tin.

Panama: Manganese, quebracho, gold.

The Central American States are also sources of the following important agricultural products: Bananas, cacao, castor oil, coconut oil, coffee, cordage fibers, cork, cotton, kapok, lumber, chinchona bark, sugar, wool, rubber.

Major Actions of 1st Session of 84th Congress in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on the actions of the 1st session of the 84th Congress in the field of our relations with other nations.

The report follows:

BARRATT O'HARA'S REPORT FROM CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: As a world power, our relation with other nations is of importance. I will try to give you the complete picture of what the Congress did in this field in the year 1955.

Major legislative actions of the 84th Congress in the field of international affairs were eight public laws (66, 86, 91, 129, 138, 196, 285, and 350), 2 House concurrent resolutions, 2 Senate resolutions, and 7 treaties ratified by the Senate.

Public Law 66, continued to July 1, 1956, suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap. The others I will cover in order.

PUBLIC LAW 86

H. R. 1, reciprocal trade agreements

Public Law 86 extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act from June 12, 1955, the date of its expiration, to June 30, 1958. It probably is the most important enactment of the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Failure to extend the trade agreements would have been a serious blow to our economy and, I am afraid, to our national security. Chicago, in the center of a large industry area, would have felt the full force of the blow.

Nevertheless, Public Law 86 was enacted only after the bitterest of fights. The debate in the House was colorful and dramatic. Members sat motionless in their seats in rapt attention. On an early vote on a parliamentary move we actually were defeated by 29 votes, 178 to 207.

The reversal came only after Speaker RAYBURN had taken the well (where Members stand when addressing the House) on one of the few such occasions and threw everything that he had in eloquence and prestige into the scales. The result was we won the next rollcall by 2 votes, 193 to 191. At another critical stage, when defeat seemed imminent, former Speaker MARTIN took over for the minority leadership. This time we squeezed through by 1 vote, 193 to 192. There were 49 absentees—illustrating the importance of attendance. So with the full force of (1) the administration, (2) the majority leadership, and (3) the minority leadership, the victory was won only by an eyelash.

On the motion to recommit, the vote was 199 yea, 206 nay, and on the final passage 295 to 110.

Reason for strength of opposition was that old-school protectionists had teamed up with Members from the coal and other areas where unemployment was attributed to the importation of fusel oil, glassware, and some other articles.

The intensity of the Members from hard-hit West Virginia and the mining districts of Pennsylvania heightened the emotional atmosphere in which the battle was waged. They felt that they were fighting for home and fireside. (Major cause for decline in use of coal actually was dieselization of railroads. Another: We cut our importation of blue cheese from Denmark, and Denmark canceled her orders for United States coal and transferred them to Poland. World trade is not a one-way street.)

The bill passed by the House was the bill recommended by President Eisenhower on the Cordell Hull pattern. Senate amendments watered it down. This watering down was made primarily by changes in the "escape clause," the "peril point," and "national security" provisions. The escape clause previously applied to an industry adversely affected by foreign imports. It now applies to specific commodities produced within the industry.

Reciprocal trade agreements were inaugurated in 1934. The United States now has agreements with 42 nations carrying on 80 percent of world trade, totaling over $40 billion a year. The United States exports 20 percent of the goods in world trade, imports 15 percent. That means that while we furnish a rich and necessary market for friendly foreign countries, they actually buy 5 percent more from us than we sell to them. Furthermore, but for the reciprocal agreements these foreign nations would not have the dollar buying power to do business with us.

It is estimated by the Department of Labor that 4½ million jobs in the United States are dependent on the foreign market, both export and import. In 1951 agricultural exports reached $4 billion, representing the production of from 50 to 60 million acres of cultivated American farms. Since then the falling off of farm exports has resulted in lower farm prices, increased surpluses, acreage restrictions. Similar repercussions would attend the decline of our industrial exports.

But even more important: the surest path to security and peace is trade on a fair and equitable basis. During the past year Russie has negotiated many new reciprocal trade agreements with her satellites, some with neighboring European countries. We have entered into no new agreements. Meanwhile Red China flirts with Japan, knowing that Japan to eat must have imports and to exist industrially must have a market for her manufactured wares. I think you will approve my casting of your vote for Public Law 86.

PUBLIC LAW 91

H. R. 5695, import tax on copper

This continues to June 30, 1958, the suspension of the copper import tax. While the United States is the world's largest copper producer, it consumes (thanks in part to the auto industry) more than it produces. Countries that benefit from a duty-free market for their copper are Chile, Canada, Mexico, Peru, and Africa.

PUBLIC LAW 129

H. R. 5923, Inter-American Highway

This I rate among the constructive accomplishments of the first session of the 84th Congress. It authorizes the immediate appropriation of money sufficient to complete the construction of the Inter-American Highway (from the Mexican border clear through to the Panama Canal) within 3 years.

Total cost will be $112,470,000. The United States assumes $74,980,000 as its share. Combined share of cooperating countries is $37,490,000 on a 2-to-1 matching basis. A wise investment, I think, having in mind (1) hemispheric security and solidarity, (2) development of neglected and heretofore isolated areas, and (3) the closer knitting together of the peoples of Pan America in understanding neighborliness. It is to our own mutual interest that we should live with our neighbors south to the canal on the basis of real personal friendship.

Hence I regard the decision to hurry the Inter-American Highway to completion as a heartening advance in good international relationships. Moreover, to complete the project in 3 years will require an enlarged fleet of road building equipment with skilled operators and personnel from the United States, meaning jobs for workers here in our factories and on the site of the project.

I was interested in learning from the debate of the progress already made. In answer to a question Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN was assured that today he could drive from his district in Michigan to the northern part of Guatemala without leaving a good hard road. (Later I heard that the road approaching Guatemala is not too good, almost impassable during the rainy season from May through October.) It seems that Mexico completed her own road to the Guatemalan border entirely at her own expense, and that Guatemala extended a portion of the highway from her border at her own expense.

In all, Mexico has built 1,600 miles of highway. That left 1,590 miles to complete the highway to the Panama Canal. On this the United States has been working in cooperation with Central American republics since 1934, has spent $57.7 million to date. There remains to be completed 25 miles in Guatemala, 134 miles in Costa Rica, and 14 miles in Panama, which are now impassable.

Three years more and you can pack the family in your automobile and go sightseeing all the way to the Canal. Look for mobile

home settlements multiplying in tropical scenic locations in Central America. With the present blockstops removed, the highway will open up a new era for the Central Americans and our relations with them. It will stimulate development of new agricultural areas and of natural resources. New possibilities will be opened to United States capital and the promotion of trade.

Here are some interesting figures cited in the debate: In the year we started on the highway program our exports to Central America totaled $116 million. In 1954 our exports to those countries totaled $950 million. Imports grew in value from $78 million to $560 million. In 1954 American tourists in the Caribbean area spent over $1 billion.

Public Law 129 passed the House by a vote of 353 to 13. I think I used your vote wisely and as you would have approved in supporting the measure and opposing all delaying and weakening amendments.

PUBLIC LAW 138

S. 2090, Mutual Security Act

Public Law 138 is the basic legislation (the authorization, not the actual appropriation) for (1) military assistance and (2) technical aid to other countries in the fiscal year 1956. It also authorizes contributions (among others) to United Nations Technical Assistance Program ($24 million), Organization of American States ($1.5 million), United Nations Refugee Fund ($1.4 million), for CARE and surplus foods transportation ($15 million), for resettlement of refugees ($6 million), to U. N. Agency for Palestine Refugees ($65 million), to U. N. Children's Fund ($14.5 million).

Authorizations total $3,252,868,000. This is $486,993,000 more than similar authorizations for the fiscal year 1955, an increase of about $0.5 billion.

Briefly, this is the world picture as reflected in Public Law 138 and as presented in the debate:

Europe

Grants and technical assistance practically at an end. Present drive is to make friendly nations militarily strong. Please note this language: "The Congress believes it essential that this act should be administered * * * to promote greater political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe." Something in the nature of a United States of Europe would seem to be the indicated objective.

Further reason for military assistance to friendly nations is given in the statement of congressional policy (sec. 549): "To defend themselves against aggression and contribute to the security of the free world" and "to assume an equal station among the free nations * * * and to fulfill their responsibilities for self-government."

Under Marshall plan, inaugurated in 1948 exclusively as economic-aid program, $17 billion was distributed in 4 years, the peak being reached in 1950. This put our European allies on their feet economically. The 1956 authorizations for defense and military assistance exceed $1 billion, only $98 million for grants and direct technical assistance.

Spain, Yugoslavia, and the city of Berlin are the beneficiaries of the latter. Spain, now furnishing large military bases to the United States, needs improvement of railroad lines and powerplants, also irrigation and reclamation to bolster her agricultural economy. Yugoslavia, flirting but in her way holding the line in Eastern Europe in alliance with Greece and Turkey, will get some $46 million for technical assistance and machinery imports. A gesture with a calculated risk—keeping Tito independent of Moscow by giving him some United States help.

Asia

Aim is to help in development of resources and raising of living standards, to offset Soviet technique of conquest by infiltration and subversion. In this area (771 million people, third of world population) money so earmarked, no military assistance except for Korea and Formosa.

Illustration of tentative projects: development of Mekong River (of potential value to Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand), fisheries, minerals, transportation.

Providing for nonmilitary assistance to Asia is $1.4 billion. Loans rather than grants, wherever possible, is emphasized. Chairman Richards pinpointed the reasoning: "The people of India have blamed their lot on the British. Now the British are gone they are finding the problem of raising their standard of living both difficult and complex. If they cannot show results their ears will be turned to Moscow."

Near East, Africa, Latin America

Drive in these areas is on the development front. For assistance in building dams, powerplants, and other works to accelerate the fight on poverty and meager living conditions $73 million is earmarked for the Near East and Africa, $38 million for Latin America. In addition they will share in the technical cooperation and crop improvement program, $127.5 million direct United States aid, $153 million through U. N. This I think is a sound program. A world without poverty is a world without the tensions that breed wars, also a world of buying markets for our wares.

Red China

Section 12 of Public Law 138 declares it the continuing sense of Congress that Red China should not be admitted to the United Nations.

PUBLIC LAW 196

H. R. 6059, Philippine trade agreement

Until 1946 the United States had no experience in granting independence to a part of its territory. Trade with the Philippines had been on an inter-American basis. When we granted independence trade had to be transferred to the basis of one sovereign nation dealing with another sovereign nation. But economic relationships do not change spontaneously with those of a political nature. There must be a period for readjustments. So in 1946 we entered into a reciprocal free-trade agreement with the Philippine Republic. It provided (among other items) for gradual imposition of customs duties, beginning with 5 percent a year and reaching 100 percent by 1974.

In 1953 the new Republic, making real progress but having its own problems in rebuilding from the war, requested a revision of this agreement. Representatives of both countries met in Washington in the fall of 1954 and worked out the revisions covered in Public Law 196.

What Public Law 196 does is to give the Philippines a needed assist in building up her economy.

Importance of this legislation is, it (1) strengthens our friendship with the Philippines; (2) butresses a cathedral of democracy in the Far East; and (3) highlights the policy of our Government to help other peoples attain political independence and economic stability. The story of our treatment of the Philippines and our continuing friendship is the best answer to evil propaganda.

PUBLIC LAW 285

H. R. 6382, international claims settlement

American citizens have claims against Russia (dating back to the czars), Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Italy that total possibly more than $1 billion. They are based upon war damage, nationalizations, and prewar governmental debt (bonds). On hand to pay these off is $41 million; $9 million received from Russia in 1933; $5 million from Italy in 1947; and $27 million realized from the blocked assets of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

Public Law 285 authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to proceed with the distribution. Purpose of the legislation, recommended by the President, is to get the money (little in proportion as it is) to the claimants without further delay. There is only a slim chance, if any, of anything further being realized. A matter of clearing up the bankrupt estate of war and fallen dynasties.

PUBLIC LAW 350

S. 1894, International Finance Corporation

Presently there are two banks supplying capital for the development of backward areas under the point 4 programs: (1) The International Bank, to which the United States makes the largest contribution of any of the participating nations, and (2) our own Export-Import Bank. The latter has made an enviable record, with tremendous results achieved and at a substantial profit to the Federal Government.

Public Law 350 authorizes United States participation (with 42 other nations) in a third bank, the International Finance Corporation, to make risk loans not acceptable to the existing 2 banks. Capital of IFC, $100 million; our contribution, $35.1 million.

IFC concept was endorsed in 1954 by U. N. by a 50 to 0 vote, met with favor at recent Pan-American Conference in Brazil. Venture (risk) capital badly needed in countries South of us. Possible forerunner of consumer credit in Latin America, now under serious consideration to bolster buying power of those countries.

This measure was cleared through the Banking and Currency Committee, of which your representative is a member. In committee and on the floor of the House I gave it my full support, but only with the assurance that IFC would not compete (and ultimately undermine) the Export-Import Bank.

In committee I asked Secretary of Treasury Humphrey if it was the intention of IFC to raise additional capital by the marketing of its debentures. He replied he hoped IFC could be as successful in that regard as the International Bank.

In my remarks on the floor of the House (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 1, 1955, p. 10964) I stressed the advisability of caution against excessive offerings of bond issues since, in the case of the International Bank, about 85 percent of its debentures had been marketed in the United States. IFC is to make risk loans. Until we see how it works out, with the contribution our Government is making, I hope the risk will not be passed on to individual American investors. It is so easy for persons with modest savings and no financial advisers to get hurt.

RESOLUTIONS

Senate Resolution 93, disarmament

Creates a bipartisan committee of 10 Senators to make study of proposals for disarmament and control of weapons of mass destruction.

Senate Resolution 127, captive nations

Proclaims the hope of the Senate that peoples in "captivity of alien despotisms shall again enjoy the right of self-determination * * * and that the sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them all in accordance with the pledge or the Atlantic Charter."

House Concurrent Resolution 149, communism and colonialism

Declares that 'Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism constitute a denial of the inalienable rights of man." Expresses the sense of Congress that foreign policy and influence of United States "support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world."

House Concurrent Resolution 157, reaffirms hope for peace

This is the resolution adopted unanimously by House and Senate on the occasion of the meeting at San Francisco commemorating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. It "reaffirms the deep desire of the people of the United States for an honorable and lasting peace, and expresses the hope that the people of all the nations of the world join with the people of the United States in a renewed effort for peace." The President is requested by the Congress to convey an expression of such reaffirmation and such hope to the assembled nations.

TREATIES

Article II, section 2, paragraph 2 of the Constitution states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

During the first session of the 84th Congress by the required two-third votes the Senate ratified the following treaties:

1. Treaty for collective mutual defense of southeast Asia signed by United States, Australia, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, Great Britain, and France. Ratified February 1, 1955, by vote of 82 to 1.

2. Treaty for mutual defense signed by United States and Republic of China. Ratified February 9, 1955, by vote of 64 to 6.

3. Treaty signed by United States, England, France, and West Germany terminating occupation of West Germany and recognizing sovereignty of Federal Republic. Ratified April 1, 1955, by vote of 76 to 2.

4. Protocol to North Atlantic Treaty signed by 14 nation members of NATO admitting West Germany. Ratified April 1, 1955, by vote of 76 to 2.

5. Protocol of International Telecommunication Convention at Buenos Aires signed by Unitde States and 82 other countries cooperating in regulation of radio frequencies. Ratified April 1, 1955, by vote of 63 to 3.

6. Treaty for the reestablishment of an independent and democratic Austria signed by the United States, Great Britain, France, U. S. S. R., and Austria. Ratified June 17, 1955, by a vote of 63 to 3.

7. Conventions governing treatment of prisoners of war and protection of civilians in time of war, signed at Geneva, August 12, 1949. Ratified July 6, 1955, by vote of 77 to 0.

As your representative, I have had no part in treatymaking. I have added them merely to complete the picture of international affairs.

NOTE.—There is much talk in Washington of the growing national stature of Senator WALTER F. GEORGE and Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS, chairmen, respectively, of the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Affairs. RICHARDS' handling of bills on the floor of the House was masterful, attracted favorable comment of Members and observers. Congressman THOMAS GORDON, Chicago, is No. 2 man on the committee, next to RICHARDS. He is quiet, effective, a very valuable aid to the chairman.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

A Tribute to the Japanese American Citizens League on Its 25th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to take this opportunity to report to my colleagues in the Congress that I have arranged to have presented to the National Headquarters of the Japanese American Citizens League, in commemoration of their 25th anniversary as a national organization, an American flag which has flown over the Capitol of the United States.

My colleagues, both here in the House and in the Senate, who are acquainted with the membership and purposes of the Japanese American Citizens League, more popularly identified as the JACL, and who have supported, particularly after World War II, many of its legislative suggestions which have not only greatly enlarged the area of racial freedom and human dignity in this Nation but have also demonstrated our national and international good will toward those of Asian origin, will, I am confident, applaud this presentation of our flag, with all that it means, to this exemplary organization which has personified, as few organizations with similar objectives have, their slogan, "For better Americans in a greater America."

I know that many of my colleagues, of both political parties from every geographical section, join with me in congratulating the JACL on their first quarter century of dedicated service to our country, in general, and to our Americans of Japanese ancestry, in particular.

To appreciate just how much has been accomplished in the past 25 years, one need only look back in mind's eye to 1930, when the ill effects of the Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 were still clearly visible and Japanese Americans were suspect people concentrated only on our west coast. In contrast, examine their position today as accepted and assimilated fellow Americans who are known and welcomed throughout the entire land. To have accomplished so much, for any people, in such a short time, and against such odds of prejudice and discrimination, with so little in the way of financial and political backing, is not only a tribute to the leadership and membership of JACL but also to the system of government and the democratic processes which gave opportunity and incentive for such progress in human relations.

As we wish for JACL, its officers and its membership, another quarter century of successful attainment in the common cause of trying to make our land a better place in which to live and work, may I add the hope that the next 25 years to come will not be under the same trying circumstances either for our Nation or for Americans of Japanese ancestry.

JACL IDENTIFIED WITH JAPANESE IN AMERICA

Seldom can the history of a people be identified with a single organization. But, uniquely and unmistakably, the annals of persons of Japanese ancestry on the United States mainland during their most crucial and tumultuous quarter century, when their destiny in this country was secured for all time to come, is the story of JACL.

Indeed, had it not been for JACL, with its skillful use of the tools of democracy, it is doubtful that those of Japanese origin in this land would enjoy the healthy and promising status that is theirs today as integrated and loyal Americans.

JACL's record belies the facts that Americans of Japanese ancestry are among the fewest in numbers and the youngest in average age of all our many nationality groups, being only some 85,000 average about 30 years in age; that they are only one generation removed from the emigrants of an Asian land whose culture, language, and heritage are quite different from that of most Americans who trace their origins to Europe; and that they were persecuted and prosecuted as perhaps no other racial minority in our Nation's experience.

FIRST CONVENTION, SEATTLE, 1930

Over the Labor Day weekend in 1930, some 112 Nisei, or American-born citizens of Japanese ancestry, representing 10 local civic clubs in Washington, Oregon, and California, met in Seattle and organized the Japanese American Citizens League to encourage Americanization among both the citizen and alien Japanese and to promote the general welfare of the group by securing the repeal or nullification of racially restrictive State and Federal laws which circumscribed their opportunities for full citizenship and economic and social development.

Indicative of their spirit, even so long ago, was their insistence that there be no hyphen between the words "Japanese" and "Americans," for these Nisei declared that they were not hyphenated Americans with divided allegiances, but only loyal Americans. The word "Japanese," they carefully explained, was merely a descriptive adjective modifying the important noun "American" and was used only for purposes of identifying the special problems of the group.

At successive biennial national conventions held in Los Angeles in 1932, in San Francisco in 1934, in Seattle again in 1936, in Los Angeles again in 1938, and in Portland in 1940, JACL delegates met to review their program and progress and to chart new projects to make more meaningful for Japanese Americans the equality which should have been theirs as native-born citizens.

Each succeeding national convention witnessed a growth in membership and chapters, with the last pre-World War II conclave in Portland attracting almost a thousand delegates from over fifty chapters. In 1940, the national council, which is the policymaking agency, welcomed the intermountain district council, comprising Utah and Idaho, the first district council outside the West Coast where the overwhelming majority of all persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States resided.

PRE-WORLD WAR II DECADE

During their first decade of existence as a national organization, JACL was able to secure special legislation enabling alien Japanese who had served honorably in our Armed Forces in World War I to become naturalized citizens and providing for the expeditious naturalization of Nisei wives who had lost their citizenship by marriage to alien Japanese. But they were neither able to persuade the Congress to eliminate race as a qualification for naturalization, nor to repeal the Japanese and other Orien-

tal exclusion laws. Success in these efforts might conceivably have averted war in the Pacific.

On local, municipal, and State levels, JACL chapters were active in promoting economic and educational opportunities, in eliminating discriminatory and prejudicial practices and ordinances which were the outgrowth of the "yellow peril" hate campaigns of an earlier era, and in refuting vicious charges of unassimilability by demonstrating civic responsibility.

In spite of their youth and inexperience, in spite of voluntary, part-time work, for there was never any money for staff or offices, the JACL was remarkably successful even in the prewar period when their major attention was devoted to building up an organization with responsible membership and leadership.

In this connection it should be remembered that unlike most other nationality groups in this country, because the alien, parent generation from Japan was barred by Federal statute from the privilege of naturalization, the older, more experienced Japanese were not in a position to provide the leadership and guidance that proved so helpful to other national minorities in our midst in their earlier, pioneering days.

When it became apparent that international tensions between the nation of their birth and the land of their ancestry were increasing to the danger point, in August 1941, the national board composed of the nationally elected officers and the chairmen of the various district councils, who serve as the governing body between biennial national council conventions, met in San Francisco, voted for a modest budget, and appointed an executive secretary, a paid staff member for the first time in their history, to prepare if possible for any eventuality.

WORLD WAR II

But the war came before any real progress was made to build up the organization or to prepare the Japanese-American communities on the Pacific coast for the tragic events that were to follow.

Because these Americans with Japanese faces looked like the enemy, and because hate and hysteria were fomented against this defenseless segment of our population, all persons of Japanese ancestry, through no fault of their own, became suspect in the minds of their own Government as well as their neighbors.

The leading alien Japanese, who were subjects and nationals of Japan because by our laws they could not become naturalized citizens, were interned as a precautionary measure by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Japanese language and other community newspapers were closed down. The various Japanese settlements on the west coast were in confusion and in fear. And so, the leadership of the whole suspect population was thrust upon the JACL, still a relatively young organization dependent almost entirely on voluntary help. The average age of the American-born Nisei at that time, it might be noted, was still in the late teens.

To the credit of JACL, they did not shirk their responsibilities even under the most trying of circumstances.

JACL tried to persuade the Government and the American people to distinguish between enemy Japan and loyal Japanese-Americans, but in vain. Various interests, some legitimate, but most not, goaded the Army into ordering the mass evacuation of all persons of Japanese ancestry, citizens and aliens alike, to barrack camps in the interior wilderness, without trial or hearing of any kind, when martial law had not been declared and our courts were supposed to be functioning.

JACL AND THE EVACUATION ORDERS

JACL at first protested as best they could the validity and the necessity for the exclusion orders. But when the orders were described as having been dictated by "military necessity," even though disagreeing with that finding, JACL urged all its members and all others of Japanese ancestry to cooperate in their own removal as their ultimate contribution to the national defense, even though such cooperation would cause property losses in hundreds of millions of dollars and incalculable suffering, misery, and humiliation.

It was this unprecedented cooperation that resulted in the mass evacuation of some 110,000 civilians without incident and forced reappraisal of the so-called Japanese problem, for it was inconceivable that disloyal or dangerous persons would not have at least attempted to embarrass the Army and provoked bloodshed, thereby providing the enemy with valuable propaganda in its efforts to gain the support of fellow Asians.

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, now president of Pennsylvania State College, paid tribute to JACL's leadership in this matter when, as the first director of the War Relocation Authority, which was established by Executive order to supervise the detention program following the military removal phase, he testified before a congressional appropriations subcommittee in 1942 for funds with which to effectuate his task.

RIGHT TO SERVE IN MILITARY DEMANDED

Over the Thanksgiving weekend, 1942, long after the evacuation itself had been completed, delegates from all 10 relocation centers and from the "free zones" gathered in emergency national session in Salt Lake City, Utah, and, after reaffirming their faith in their Government, unanimously adopted resolutions demanding the right to serve in the Armed Forces which had been denied them by selective service after the outbreak of war, and the opportunity for those remaining in camp to leave and seek normal lives and employment to aid the national defense in the Midwest and in the East.

The first of these resolutions paved the way for the formation of the now fabled 442d Regimental Combat Team, that most-decorated military unit in American military history for its size and length of service, composed entirely of volunteer Japanese Americans from the Territory of Hawaii, where, incidentally there was no mass evacuation, and, more impressively, from behind the barbed wire fences of these desert camps where our own Government had incarcerated them. Seldom, if ever, has there been a greater demonstration of faith in country than this.

Other Nisei troops served in Combat Intelligence against the Japanese enemy in the Pacific and with other Armed Forces units in Europe.

Meanwhile, the War Relocation Authority initiated a program of gradual resettlement from the wilderness centers to midwestern and eastern communities which discovered that Japanese Americans, too, were human.

FIRST POSTWAR NATIONAL CONVENTION

After the end of hostilities, when many of its members who had served in the 442d and in G–2 in the Pacific returned to try to translate their wartime exploits into positive good for their parents and families, JACL held its first postwar biennial national convention in Denver, Colo., in the spring of 1946, and there determined upon a threefold program to secure the kind of acceptance and equality which would forever safeguard persons of Japanese ancestry in this country from a repetition of their World War II tragedies:

Legislatively, to secure equality in and under the law, and particularly in the matter of naturalization privileges in order that the alien parents of these gallant Nisei might share, at long last, in that precious United States citizenship which would nullify all of the hundreds of anti-Japanese laws sanctioned by that racially ineligible to citizenship classification in our Federal code; also, to repeal the Japanese Exclusion Act along with all of the remaining racial prohibitions against immigration from Asia.

Judicially, to seek in the courts the invalidation of all discriminatory statutes, and especially the alien land laws of some 13 Western States by which the Japanese had been denied the right to economic opportunities through the ownership and occupation of land; and

Educationally, to conduct nationally a public information campaign to publicize the wartime record of devotion and sacrifice of all persons of Japanese ancestry and to gain the good will and support of their fellow Americans for their legislative and judicial objectives.

That in the 9 years since the Denver convention the JACL has just about attained all of their major objectives is plainly evident, although just how remains a "miracle of democracy," as one old Japanese pioneer described it at a recent naturalization ceremony.

JACL has utilized the tools of a representative government in such an effective manner that they are today a model that can well be emulated by others seeking justice and equality of treatment.

MANY MEMBERS HAVE HELPED

Many Members of Congress, from the West as well as from other sections of the country, Republicans and Democrats alike, have actively participated in the enactment of these remedial and corrective statutes which have been enacted in the past decade.

Reading of the testimony before congressional committees and the RECORD on the debates in the Congress on the many bills which have given a new meaning to democracy to these recently "suspect" Americans amount to a testament of

recognition and esteem seldom voiced by lawmakers.

For my part, I am proud of having been associated with JACL's postwar program from the beginning. In fact, in Japan in 1925 I became convinced we must eliminate the racial barriers in our immigration and naturalization laws if we hoped to have lasting peace in the Pacific. I urged such legislation in my first year in Congress, 1943. But not until 1948 was it possible to get enough change in national thinking to give some hope for success. I then drafted and introduced the so-called Asian provisions of what is now the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. These proposals provided that all racial, though not numerical, exclusions to immigration be repealed and that the privilege of naturalization shall no longer be limited to specially designated races and nationalities. No person of whatever race or origin was to be ineligible to American citizenship because of race, color, or national origin.

SUMMARY RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

Those noncontroversial features of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, providing for naturalization and immigration privileges to the Japanese and other Asians, would not have been attainable so soon after the war with Japan without the remarkable efforts of JACL and hence represent its most noteworthy achievement. For through their enactment alien Japanese were, for the first time in United States history, invited to become naturalized citizens in the land of their choice, and the citizenship of their American-born became unqualified and untainted.

The Congress has also approved legislation providing some compensation for certain real and personal property losses suffered as a consequence of the evacuation. Some thirty millions of dollars have been paid to more than 20,000 exacuees as a token of congressional regret that the loyalty of the Japanese-American population was misjudged, and to provide restitution and simple justice. The claims program is not yet completed, however, and amendments to expedite and liberalize the remaining payments are presently before the Congress.

Through general and private legislation, I have been told, some 500 ordinances and laws that were once directed against persons of Japanese ancestry in this country have been repealed or invalidated and that at the present time there are no statutes anywhere in the land specifically discriminatory against the Japanese.

The JACL coupled their congressional campaigns with special activities in the various State legislatures concerned to eliminate the remaining vestiges of the "anti-Orientalism" of the early 1900's.

In the field of litigation, too, nationally and in the States, JACL has successfully argued the unconstitutionality of discriminatory laws which restricted the opportunities of persons of Japanese ancestry and subjected them to indignities. The alien land laws, the prohibition against commercial fishing, racial restrictive covenants, segregation in public places and schools, exclusion of jury lists—all these and more have been determined in favor of the Nisei and the immigrant generation, their new citizen-parents—not always pleaded alone by the JACL but in some cases in concert with others similarly seeking more equitable consideration as citizens in this democracy.

The American people now know and welcome Americans of Japanese ancestry. They are no longer confined in the main to the west coast but are to be found in every State in the Union, accepted by their neighbors and completely assimilated into their respective communities.

I have been advised by the JACL, as they prepare for their next quarter century of service, that Americans of Japanese ancestry enjoy a far better status in this country than ever before, even in the best of prewar days. Today they are confident of their future, for under the leadership of the JACL they are, in fact, better Americans in an America made greater by their contributions.

In 1930, JACL was a few hundred members in 10 small chapters scattered in Washington, Oregon, and California. Today JACL, based upon its solid record of accomplishment, boasts more than 15,000 active members in 88 chapters in some 32 States and the District of Columbia.

TOUCHSTONE OF DEMOCRACY

The JACL story for their first 25 years is an inspiring document of democracy in action at the best, an epic which could have been written only in America and which completely refutes the hate and race mongers of only a few years ago who charged that the Japanese, by their very character, were unassimilable into the American cultural pattern, which itself, as we all know, is made up of the cultures and the contributions of all the many peoples who have immigrated to these shores since time immemorial, as did the ancestors of all of us.

But perhaps even more important in the long pull of history is that what the JACL has accomplished here in the United States is living proof to all the free peoples of the world, and especially to those in the Far East who are so important to us as a nation today, that the democratic way is best, for it makes possible the correction of abuses and wrongs and the achievement of justice and redress on the basis of the complete record and of individual merit, not race, color, creed, or national origin.

Ours is an imperfect democracy, it is true. But the JACL has proved that it is a constantly improving one which continually strives to forge an ever more perfect union.

Congratulations to the Japanese American Citizens' League, their officers, and their members on this historic milestone in human relations.

All of us have learned much from their quarter-century history, and all of us can gain much by putting into practice, as they have so nobly done, their national slogan, "For better Americans in a greater America."

Report to the Voters of the 10th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of every session of Congress, I have reported to each enrolled voter of my district. It is my great privilege and proud responsibility to be the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of New York. I answer personally every letter written to me. I have served thousands of my constituents in their personal problems. It is an honor not only to be your Representative but also to be a ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, assigned as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe.

My office in Washington is open 6 days a week. Letters sent there receive my immediate attention. The address is: EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

I direct myself now to the report of the 84th Congress.

President Eisenhower's request for a Republican Congress during the congressional campaign in 1954 was rejected by the voters on Election Day. It was rejected because the American people had been accustomed to and they wanted a return to a pattern of constructive legislation instituted during Democratic administrations. During this period programs of farsighted social legislation had been accomplished by courageous men and women who fearlessly met the problems of the day. Many of these important measures, instituted for the benefit of the public welfare, were denounced as "too socialistic" by the Republican Party—the same party which gave unstinting support to the affairs of big business.

Thus the election returns of 1954 brought into being the 1st session of the 84th Congress, Democratic by a slight majority and under Democratic leadership. Many obstacles confronted this Congress, not the least of which was a review of the 41 Presidential commissions which had been established during the 83d Congress to evaluate policies of former Democratic administrations. It came as no surprise to the sponsors of these policies that they were not found wanting. What has surprised many is that, in the process of continuation or extension, policies became Republican with no reference to their Democratic foundation. Many Republican legislators reserved their previous stand not because of the intrinsic merit of the policy but solely on its sponsorship.

In my report I shall address myself first to issues relative to foreign policy—international—and, second, to the issues encompassing the domestic field—national.

INTERNATIONAL

It must be borne in mind that the foreign policy of the Republican administration is the basic foreign policy forged by the Democratic Party. This policy has been making history since 1945 when the United States, first, joined the United Nations; second, established the ECA program; third, enacted the mutual defense pact; fourth, initiated the mutual-security program, including point 4; fifth, ratified the North Atlantic Treaty and other regional pacts.

This is the policy that was called a "lack of foreign policy" by the Republican Party in the presidential campaign of 1952. They contended that the policy of containment of the Democratic Party was against the liberation of the enslaved peoples of the world. In their reappraisal they soon realized that liberation, as they saw it, could not be achieved without resort to war.

Coexistence is now offered to a hopeful world. In 1925 Stalin called for a period of coexistence as a temporary measure. In 1955 the smiling successors of Stalin put coexistence on one side of their scale of justice and on the other the enslaved people of small countries whose promised freedom is a mirage. Coexistence in that light is an impossible dream between the free and the slave world. It means appeasement—accepting the status quo of the world.

The mutual-security program, commonly referred to as foreign aid, authorizes and appropriates funds which implement the foreign policy of the United States. This year Congress gave $2.7 billion to the President to be used as our share toward the collective security of the free world. A Democratic Congress gave the President full authority to transfer these funds to any region of the world. Flexibility was deemed necessary to meet the many crises of the present day. This new money plus the carryover of past years amounts to over $12 billion.

Republican acceptance of the farsighted foreign policy of the past 10 years may be noted in excerpts from statements made during this session by leaders of the Republican Party before meetings of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles:

It (mutual-security program) has been unique in the whole history of the world • • • This program of mutual security continues to be an essential part of our overall policy of seeking to bring those rulers who now follow the line of international communism to see the futility of the policy of attempting world conquest.

Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, Harold E. Stassen:

The military assistance which has been furnished to our allies in NATO and to the other countries in the free world has provided a firm foundation for collective defensive strength and has served as an effective deterrent against Communist military aggression.

A provision of the foreign-aid program—MSA—requires that countries recipient of American aid permit continuous "inspection and review" of the use of the aid. This provision is based upon common sense. The Executive may give military or economic aid to any country if he deems it advisable for national security.

For this reason I want inspection of United States aid in all countries to be carried out by United States missions as ordered by Congress. Any nation refusing this inspection should be refused aid. Yugoslav military authorities have turned back every recent effort by United States officials to increase their observation of the military-aid program. Yet, with United States military aid Yugoslavia has been able to reequip her army, one of the biggest in Europe, with largely American material instead of Russian.

The premise upon which American policy toward Yugoslavia is based is that we want Yugosalvia to be a strong country with a free and independent citizenry. And deviation toward the satellite status it occupied in the Communist camp would of necessity change American policy. Recently, the mood of the Yugoslav dictator has been critical of the West and cordial to the Soviet Union. On July 29 a report come from reliable sources that Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union have equated their debts with each other.

Once again I introduced an amendment to the mutual security bill to cut off all aid to Yugoslavia, including new authorization of about $40 million and several hundred million dollars of undelivered materiel from previous programs. The United States has already given over $1 billion.

My amendment was not adopted, but the Appropriations Committee of Congress cut the assistance requested by President Eisenhower. There is great flexibility, however, under the terms of the MSA bill of 1955. The Executive is enabled to transfer funds on a global basis as crises arise. It is his sole responsibility now to discontinue assistance when and where the provisions of the law are violated.

One of the first acts of the 84th Congress was to grant authority to the Executive to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area. This mesaure, passed almost unanimously, presented to the world a united and determined people supporting their President in a moment of crisis. Such determination on the part of free people is the key to peace in this atomic age. President Eisenhower requested this authority when danger was imminent and it has not been rescinded. The Executive receives daily secret reports which are not available to Congress. Possessing this knowledge, he alone must decide what action to take in order to decrease the tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc.

I was a member of the ad hoc Committee on Foreign Affairs which reported on and had passed by the House H. R. 2097, a bill to adjust the annuities of Foreign Service officers who retired before July 1, 1949, and the widows of such officers. It provides for a $324 increase. No additional charge against government is made for this disbursement. The Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, to which the personnel contributed, will bear the cost.

This increase involves about 250 people, plus 90 who had not hitherto been eligible, all of whom are of advanced age. It adjusts their retirement pay to the equivalent of the cost-of-living increase given to Federal employees by an act of Congress in 1952. I was responsible for the amendment in the bill which included the widows of the officers and also for the across the board increase of $324 as against a percentage increase.

On other international issues the President had the confidence and support of the Democrats. This was given to prove to the world that Congress was unified in support of our President, while at the same time many of us realized that further implementation was urgently needed. Treaties ratified were:

First. South-East Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO.

This is a NATO-like collective security pact for the Far East. It is in the blueprint stage.

Second. Security Pact with Nationalist China.

Third. West Germany approved as sovereign State and a member of NATO.

Fourth. Restored independence to Austria.

This is the same treaty which was sponsored by the Democratic administration over 10 years ago and refused over 200 times by U. S. S. R. I believe that this treaty should have been changed in line with present conditions. Under its terms U. S. S. R. will take the same reparations as previously planned despite the fact that in the interim of 10 years Austrian economy has been drained by Soviet occupation. Will not the United States now be asked to help this independent nation economically, thereby helping to pay U. S. S. R.?

Fifth Vietnam.

In this country is one of the most critical situations in the Far East. I was one of several members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who guided the administration to continue their positive support of South Vietnam. We requested that the administration refuse cooperation with the French in undermining the new Ziem regime. Proof had been given us that the French Army was sustaining the anti-Government forces.

The reciprocal trade bill stands as a recognition of the real fact that the United States has accepted its role of political and military leadership of the free world. It recognizes that we cannot fight economic wars with our political and military allies. The importance of the extension of the reciprocal trade program which was initiated by the Democratic administration in 1934 is noted by the priority number 1 given it by the present administration.

Reciprocal trade was one of the most bitterly debated issues in the 84th Congress. In this legislation, the President is permitted to enter into mutual tariff reduction agreements with other countries. Hearings are held on the various commodities before this reduction action can be taken and the Tariff Commission must report when a peril point is reached so that serious harm to United States industry will be avoided. If the United States is to sell its goods freely in other countries, it must also buy

freely in those countries. This is only logical. The United States produces more than 40 percent of the world's total output of goods and services although only 5 percent of the world population is found in the United States. To those who feel that we are self-sufficient we must point out that we have to turn to other countries for our supplies of copper, chrome, lead, zinc, oil, manganese, and other vital commodities.

The greatest opposition to the President's request for this reciprocal trade legislation came from his own Republican Party. The bill was passed only because of the help given the President by the Democrats in the House led by Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Had President Eisenhower given forceful assistance and more active support for this famous program, a less protectionist bill would have been enacted. As finally passed, it is the weakest version of the program instituted by the late Cordell Hull two decades ago.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the category of national defense, the draft law was extended for 4 years and the draft of doctors and dentists for 2 years. The Reserve bill—Public Law 305—is not too satisfactory because of the National Guard features. The administration's proposed Reserve bill involved a reduction in the standing Armed Forces and an increase in quantity and quality of the military reserves. The reduction in standing forces is under way and should be completed within the year. In the bill proposed by the President, young men including veterans, would be required to give active service in the Reserve or National Guard. The present 800,000-man paid Reserve would be increased to 2.9 million trained and ready reservists by 1960.

The Congress objected to many features of the President's measure. It was felt that compulsion, particularly of experienced veterans, was unfair, and that the bill would open the door to compulsory military training. Also, this bill would have forced some of our citizens to serve against their wills in racially segregated National Guard units. When the bill was finally voted on by both the House and the Senate, little of the original wording remained. Under the enacted bill, almost all compulsion was omitted and no person who had served in the Armed Forces is required to participate in the Reserve program. Persons serving in the future have Reserve obligations up to 6 years, depending on their degree of active participation. Incentives were provided whereby young men would volunteer in their total draft and Reserve obligations.

Since 1952 the Democrats have opposed the $5 billion cut in the Air Force recommended by President Eisenhower. When the U. S. S. R. demonstrated this year that their air strength may exceed that of the United States, Congress took the matter into its own hands and as a result jet production has been increased by 35 percent. The cutback by the administration has set back United States air strength by 2 years or more. Certainly this is false economy on the part of the Republican administration.

In a similar manner and for the same reason Congress demanded that the Marine Corps strength be maintained. Forty-six million three hundred thousand dollars above the amount recommended by President Eisenhower was appropriated which will prevent a 22,000 manpower cut in this strategic service.

Public Law 141 authorizes $237 million program of Atomic Energy Commission projects.

Public Law 44 authorizes funds for expansion of existing research facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Public Law 161 authorizes $2.3 billion program for construction of foreign military bases and housing.

Public Law 211 authorizes $63 million grants-in-aid to States for airport construction for 4 years.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Early in this session, the Democratic-controlled House proposed a $20 tax reduction but this was declared by the President to be irresponsible. Yet, it was his Republican-controlled Congress which in 1954 gave tax relief to corporations and to coupon clippers at a far greater loss of revenue to the Government than would have been lost had the $20 tax reduction been allowed. The tax law of 1954 gave big business a method of tax forgiveness. This was detected by my Democratic colleague from New work, the Honorable HERBERT ZELENKO. The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress amended the Revenue Act of 1954 in an effort to help balance the budget next year. The following is a quotation from the remarks of Congressman ZELENKO on the floor of the House:

Under the act as it was written last year every big-business man in this country is this year getting a double deduction, and I say that is a tax reduction. It is a tax forgiveness. It adds up to about $5 billions. Here is the way it works, right from the act, and I will give it to you in small figures.

A business house having an income of $10,000 and expenses of $2,000 before the enactment of this statute would have a taxable income of $8,000. Under the act of 1954, this business can now estimate what its costs will be in the year 1955 in the way of expenses, at least what they were in 1954, another $2,000, making a taxable income of not $8,000 but $6,000, keeping the extra $2,000 in what is called reserve, which just means the Government does not get it. The Government will never recoup that money because in 1956, if this statute remains on the books, the business house will again estimate its future expenses for 1957, and on and on forever, so that in this particular year of 1954 I say there are $5 billions which the Government will never see because of some hocus pocus, high-powered accounting which was written into the 1954 act.

I was glad to support the repeal of this section.

Public Law 18 extends to April 1, 1956, existing excise tax schedules and the 52-percent corporate income tax.

Public Law 268 extends the life of the Small Business Administration for 2 years and increases its revolving fund for loans to a total of $175 million.

Public Law 135 raises the penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act from $5,000 to $50,000.

Under Public Law 124, a temporary increase of the debt limit from $275 to $281 billion to June 30, 1956, was effected.

Public Law 216 extends the Renegotiation Act for 2 years to December 31, 1956, to provide for recovery of excessive profits from defense contracts.

Public Law 137 grants the Federal Government the right of action to recover damages under the antitrust laws, and establishes uniform statute of limitations.

AGRICULTURE

Several bills in this session were of special interest to the farmers of our country:

Public Law 70 revises the formula for allocation of rural electrification loans.

Public Law 166 extends for 2 years the period for making emergency loans to farmers and stockmen.

In addition, steps were taken to curb commodity speculation and to curtail market manipulations in certain agricultural products. The House passed the bill to restore rigid farm price supports, but the measure was not considered in the Senate. The President had asked for a continuation of the flexible price-support program which is now in effect. The Senate Democratic leadership successfully resisted the drive by the farm bloc to restore rigid farm price supports at 90 percent of parity, although the House voted to restore the sliding scale with 90-percent supports for basic commodities. I opposed this action in the House and I will continue to do so. I regret that the fruits of farm labor, including perishables, are supported by a law which forces the Government to purchase and store these products. If necessary, the Congress should remain in session until it develops a plan feasible to consumer as well as farmer. It does not make sense that the taxpayer-consumer should pay taxes to keep food at a ceiling which prohibits consumption and forces purchase and storage by the Government.

As of August 3, 1955, the total value of surplus agricultural commodities stored by the Government was $5,370,029,000. As of that date, the Government inventory showed the following surpluses:

Butter, in excess of 184 million pounds at 63.9 cents per pound; total cost, $118,067,000.

Cheese, in excess of 272 million pounds at 40.3 cents per pound; total cost, $109,954,000.

Dried milk, in excess of 141 million pounds at 17.1 cents per pound; total cost, $24,192,000.

Wheat, in excess of 933 million bushels at $2.59 per bushel, total cost, $2,422,809,000.

Total, $2,675,022,000.

On the foregoing items, we have the following approximate storage charges per month: Butter, $324,348; cheese, $375,000; dried milk, $102,543; wheat, $15,348,000, approximately $511,000 per day.

The approximate monthly storage charges for all agricultural commodities amount to $23,723,000 or, a yearly expense of $284,676,000. This is what it costs to store $5,370,029,000 worth of surplus agricultural commodities in a year. No wonder then, that the Congress

was forced to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to $12.5 billion a year.

Public Law 387 increased from $700 million to $1.5 billion the funds for the sale of these surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. Further endeavor to reduce these surpluses through sale abroad was included in the foreign-aid bill which stipulates that not less than $300 million of the money appropriated in this law for the fiscal year 1956 could be used to finance the export and sale of these surpluses for foreign currencies. Neither of these measures is a solution to the agricultural problem which is critical. The problem is not insoluble, but it must be approached from a bipartisan viewpoint both politically and regionally. Then surpluses would be a blessing and not a burden.

HOUSING

Public Law 345 authorizes the construction of 45,000 public housing units which is 10,000 more than were requested by President Eisenhower but they are by no means enough to supply the needs in this critical social problem. This law provides for slum clearance and community redevelopment, as well as for FHA and military housing programs.

The passage of the Housing Act constituted a definite victory for the Democrats. The Republican opposition tried to repeat its action on the 1954 housing bill which killed public housing.

Public Law 343 permits national banks to issue real estate, residential and farm construction loans on a more liberal basis than the previous law had permitted.

LABOR

Public Law 381 increased the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act from 75 cents to $1 per hour effective March 1, 1956. President Eisenhower favored an increase to only 90 cents an hour.

Public Law 383 raises the limitation on the amount of railroad retirement annuities to spouses to the maximum payable under social security laws.

In this session, there was effected a complete revision of Federal salaries, including post office employees, classified workers, administration officials, Members of Congress, and Federal judges. Also, the retirement benefits of Government workers were brought to a more realistic level by increasing them between 8 and 12 percent.

HEALTH

Public Law 377 authorizes appropriations to supply polio vaccine free to the States for their State polio vaccination programs.

Public Law 159 authorizes a 5-year program of $3 million a year for research into the causes of air pollution.

Public Law 182 authorizes $1.25 million for study and research in the field of mental health.

WELFARE

Public Law 311 authorizes the expenditure of $15 million during the next 2 years for processing of wheat and corn into flour for distribution to States for needy families. The Eisenhower administration opposed this measure.

Public Law 61 improves the administration of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

Public Law 71 authorizes a survey of the New England area to determine the possibility of preventing loss of life and property from hurricanes.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The Congress this year enacted several measures of particular benefit to veterans and servicemen.

Public Law 7 to permit persons in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, to continue accrual of educational benefits;

Public Law 20 which provides incentive pay increases of 6 to 25 percent and allowances for members of our Armed Forces;

Public Law 88 which extends to June 30, 1956, the Veterans' Administration program for direct loans for purchase or building of homes and authorizes appropriations of $150 million;

Public Law 299 which applies retirement income tax credit provisions to members of Armed Forces;

Public Law 325 which provides social security wage credits for military service before January 1, 1956;

Public Law 180 which extends to July 15, 1956, the time for a Korean veteran to apply for mustering-out pay.

BUDGET

The Democrats claim cuts of $1.6 billion from the President's budget estimates. Including interest on the debt and other fixed charges, estimates total $60.8 billion. The appropriation bills carried $59.1 billion. It usually happens that cuts made in money bills in one session are restored in deficiency bills the following January. Only at the adjournment of the Congress, and not of its first session, can we estimate how much has been saved.

Table of appropriations, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount as enacted
1955 supplemental	$833,950	$25,000	$1,013,950	$1,013,950
1955 2d supplemental	920,523,454	857,187,429	945,412,835	898,805,875
1955 2d urgent deficiency	25,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475	25,263,475
Treasury	604,398,000	595,818,000	603,348,000	599,598,000
Post Office	2,754,817,000	2,685,700,000	2,754,104,000	2,721,720,500
U. S. Tax Court	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,170,000	1,170,000
Labor [1]	470,116,000	417,792,900	418,838,900	418,303,650
Health, Education, Welfare	1,949,465,861	1,907,403,361	1,973,740,700	1,942,886,850
Interior [2]	313,353,056	297,925,546	327,987,088	317,573,627
Agriculture [3]	897,684,574	880,260,050	884,433,923	883,051,623
Independent offices	5,639,790,000	5,845,595,375	5,848,394,500	5,842,458,500
State	147,267,197	126,769,977	147,549,608	137,450,905
U. S. Information Agency	88,500,000	80,500,000	88,350,000	85,000,000
Refugee relief	16,000,000	16,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Justice	201,485,000	197,525,000	200,445,000	198,735,000
Judiciary	30,279,715	29,603,250	30,640,810	30,116,510
Defense	32,232,815,000	31,488,206,000	31,882,915,726	31,882,815,726
District of Columbia [4]	175,405,300	166,901,780	169,456,749	168,843,440
Commerce [5]	1,347,800,000	1,105,810,000	1,298,897,300	1,227,385,000
Related agencies	18,593,000	17,875,000	18,295,000	17,975,000
Executive Office of President	8,780,700	8,670,700	9,747,700	9,747,700
General agencies	18,920,000	13,220,000	17,418,600	17,418,600
Public works [6]	1,789,165,000	1,372,122,800	1,377,491,000	1,365,613,500
Legislative	67,572,138	66,298,175	93,025,527	92,808,972
Mutual security	3,266,641,750	2,638,741,750	3,205,841,750	2,703,341,750
1956 supplemental [7]	1,927,785,868	224,276,628	1,830,078,814	1,656,625,802

[1] Also carried in this bill, but not included in above total, are appropriations for: National Labor Relations Board, $8,000,000; National Mediation Board, $1,187,000; and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, $3,134,000.
[2] Includes funds for Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. Funds for power administrations and for reclamation projects this year are carried in a public works appropriation bill.
[3] Figures are for cash appropriations only. This bill also carries $388 million in loan authorizations, and an advance authorization of $250 million for soil conservation subsidies.
[4] Includes direct Federal contribution of $17,892,700; balance to be derived from District revenues.
[5] Includes funds for Civil Aeronautics Board.
[6] Includes funds for Army civil functions (rivers and harbors, flood-control projects), $553,955,000; Atomic Energy Commission, $575 million; TVA, $27,053,000; and other power and reclamation agencies.
[7] Reduced in House by raising of points of order.

INCOMPLETED LEGISLATION

Final action on some very important issues was left for the 2d session of the 84th Congress. The reasons for this varied with the bills but in no case was it because Members of Congress were anxious to adjourn. Some bills of controversial nature were blocked in committee; others were recommended too late in the session and required further hearings and study. Many of these bills will be studied during adjournment and will be considered early in the next session.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY BILL

It must be borne in mind that the Democratic majority in Congress is slight and that within both parties are those who oppose new trends. By title, many programs were acceptable but certain provisions contained in the legislation caused the rejection of many bills. The Federal Highway bill is an excellent example.

Republicans and Democrats recognize the great need to increase the Federal investment in highways. The Presidential Clay committee recommended a $101 million Federal and State program for the decade ahead, and it was on this recommendation that the President's highway program was based. The Clay committee recommended financing by a Federal bond issue which would have increased the national debt. The taxes, in this method of financing, are hidden and the burden of the cost is placed on future generations.

The Democrats reported a pay-as-you-build plan, increasing user taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel tires. In the final test the nay votes of 128 Democrats and 164 Republicans defeated the Federal highway bill. As the Democratic floor

leader, Congressman McCORMACK remarked, "Everyone wants a road bill but no one wants to pay for it."

SOCIAL SECURITY

Extensive committee hearings and discussion took place in this session on the subject of social legislation but few of the bills considered were enacted. It is hoped that early attention will be given these measures when the Congress reconvenes in January. The most important of these bills is H. R. 7225 to amend the social-security laws. This bill passed the House but was not acted on in the Senate. The bill—

Lowers the retirement age for women from 65 to 62, bringing immediate benefits to 800,000 additional women;

Brings disability benefits to some 250,000 workers aged 50 of more;

Continues disability benefits for children even after they have reached age 18; and

Extends coverage, mainly to certain professional groups.

I introduced two measures on the subject of social security; one to lower the retirement age for all—men and women—from 65 to 60; and the other, to extend coverage to lawyers.

NATURAL-GAS BILL

The House of Representatives passed the natural-gas bill by a vote of 209–203. It was not considered in the Senate. I voted against this measure because I feel that Federal regulation of gas prices at the wellhead assures a more reasonable price to the consumer than otherwise.

The controversy on this bill did not include the method or pricing natural gas to the ultimate consumer. Local utilities which buy gas from the interstate pipelines and bring it into homes and business houses are monopolies and are regulated by local or State authorities.

Nor was the dispute over the prices which pipeline companies charge local utilities. These prices have been regulated for almost 20 years by the Federal Power Commission. The arguments on the bill were concerned solely with the method of pricing the gas which the so-called independent producers sell to interstate pipelines.

I believe that competition among pipelines seeking a supply of gas can have but one effect—an increase in the price of gas. Under FPC regulation the pipelines have done very well in profits for themselves. Federal control insures adequate protection of public interest.

SCHOOL-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

H. R. 7535 to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction was reported to the House on July 28 but was not reached for consideration before the Congress adjourned. This measure carried an authorization of $400 million a year for school construction. It must be borne in mind that New York City alone needs this amount to improve its schools. A great deal of study is needed on this very important legislation.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII AND ALASKA TO STATEHOOD

In reporting the bill for the admission to statehood of Alaska and Hawaii, the Rules Committee voted a closed rule which precluded the offering of amendments to the bill. The House, therefore, recommitted the bill to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. I favor the admission of these territories, and I have so voted when the opportunity has been given to me.

IMMIGRATION

In 1952 I voted against the passage of the Walter-McCarran Act, and I voted to sustain President Truman's veto of this legislation. In the 83d and again in the 84th Congress I introduced amendments to correct the inequities in this law. I am hopeful that in the coming session of this Congress the Judiciary Committee, under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague and neighbor, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, will grant hearings on my amendments or on similar bills so that the inequitable provisions of our immigration laws can be removed from the statute books.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

This law, also known as the Labor Management Relations Act, was not amended in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Many bills to amend the law—and a few to repeal it—were introduced in the session but the Committee on Education and Labor held no hearings on the subject and consequently did not report any bill of this nature.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

In this session, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 29 to establish a Senate and House Committee on Intelligence Matters. This resolution was not adopted, but along these lines, the Congress enacted Public Law 304, creating a Commission on Government Security to review the present security program and to make recommendations to Congress by December 31, 1956. There are many items on the credit side of the ledger in the concerted actions of the Democrats of the 84th Congress in this Republican administration—the administration which President Eisenhower predicted "will not tolerate any deviation from an uncompromising code of honesty and ethics in Government service." Democrats investigating alleged deviation demonstrated their maturity when they showed—in the words of Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, "a commendable disposition to weigh carefully" testimony given the McClellan subcommittee before passing judgment.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

I introduced H. R. 3228 to provide that women in industry shall be paid the same wages that are paid to men in the same type of work. Many other Members of Congress have introduced similar bills which undoubtedly will be a factor in helping me to obtain an early hearing on my bill in the next session.

CONCLUSION

The cold war predicted for a Republican Executive and a Democratic Congress did not materialize. The 1st session of the 84th Congress adjourned with a commendable record of achievements which far outweighed its shortcomings. Cooperation was given the President on all issues of benefit to our people.

It has been pointed out that clearer recommendations made to the Congress by the President would result in more expeditious enactments. Indecision and attempts to compromise the many intra-party differences has had deterring effects on many issues. It is to be hoped that these issues will be resolved in the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

A Tribute to Majority Leader John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to publish in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Telegram-News, of Lynn, Mass.

Members of Congress, because of their close association with the majority leader, are familiar with his hard work, his many accomplishments, and his undisputed ability as a leader of the Democratic Party.

It is good to know that our high opinion of him is also shared by the folks back home.

Reflected in may editorials, of which the one printed below is but a sample.

MAJORITY LEADER MCCORMACK'S REPORT

One of the ablest men to ever sit in Congress is Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK. The success of the 84th Congress is due largely to his efforts.

The Telegram-News today publishes the majority leader's report. It is a masterpiece and should be read as it is a fortright analysis of the major achievements of 84th Congress which "represents an era of enlightenment in the field of party politics that is unsurpassed in the history of America."

Congressman MCCORMACK explains clearly and with emphasis the reason for voting for many measures proposed by President Eisenhower. He says: "So that there will be no mistake, may I say we voted for those measures on the Democratic side of the House not because we favored and followed the President. We voted for those measures because we favored and fought for the public interest."

He also said: "The majority party refuses, as a matter of principle, to abandon the position it has already maintained as a party of the people. Nor will we change our course just because the President, a formerly devoted subordinate of President Truman, has embraced Democratic policies, lock, stock, and barrel unto himself."

The present Congress, under the leadership of Congressman MCCORMACK, worked in the interest and welfare of the people and to the defense of the country.

Congressman MCCORMACK ably points out what this Congress has done in the following statement: "This session has written a record of constructive action. The record clearly shows that partisanship has been subordinated to the good of the Nation and the welfare of our people; a record that is in sharp contrast to that of a recent Republican Congress under reverse circumstances."

Congressman MCCORMACK is an ideal leader of a great party. He is well qualified to

keep alive the fine traditions the party has established in American history.

Mrs. McCormack, his wife, is a gracious lady. She has been in Washington with the Congressman all the years he has served and has been a wonderful helpmeet during the many trying days.

Queen of All Christians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by the Honorable Elias F. Shamon, justice of the Boston Municipal Court, Boston, Mass., entitled "Mary Holds High Place in Devotions Among Catholics of Eastern Rites," which appeared in a recent edition of the Pilot, Boston, Mass.:

MARY HOLDS HIGH PLACE IN DEVOTIONS AMONG CATHOLICS OF EASTERN RITES

Eastern art, early in the history of the Catholic Church in the East had as one of its objects the teaching of the faithful the sublime role of Mary as the queen of the world.

She is depicted as an empress on a throne with her Divine Son instructing humanity from her bosom. She was known as Maryam, which is a Syro-Aramaic word denoting "Mistress of the Sea" and "Hope," also "The Brilliant One."

In ascertaining the place of Mary in the Near East, we cannot lose sight of the devotion to motherhood in that part of the world. The family, especially children, have always held first place in the life of the people of the Near East. Motherhood was sacred as it was obedience to God's command to increase and multiply. Hence, Mary, as the Mother of Christ the Man, and Christ the God, was sublime in the devotion to her of Near Eastern Christians.

It is true that the Scriptures do not devote too much to Mary, since her role as the Mother of God had been accomplished. Her place became obscured, though by no means unimportant. The faithful learned of her more, by tradition and the teaching of the church, which condemned and rejected many mythical accounts of Mary, spread by well-intentioned but uninformed theorists.

Works of Byzantine artists depict her as nursing the Infant Jesus. She is also shown with her arms extended, the Infant Jesus in her bosom. A common Eastern picture of Mary is one showing her looking into eternity, imposing, regal, and motherlike, seated on a golden throne. In pictures depicting her with angels, with the Angel Gabriel, the artist shows her not kneeling to convey the thought that she is superior to the angels, being higher in dignity. One of the earliest paintings of Mary is that of Our Lady of Perpetual Help.

OFFICIAL RECOGNITION

In Rome, by decree of Constantine in 314 A. D. officially recognizing the Catholic faith, the devotion to the Virgin Mary became public for the first time. This was more than two centuries after basilicas and churches in honor of the Assumption were built at Ephesus and Jerusalem. Such were also built in Antioch, Nazareth, Jerusalem and other places in the Holy Land. Devotions to Mary, were numerous in the Near East in the early centuries, and today, in the Lebanon, along the roads leading to the summit of the highest peaks, statues of Mary dot the countryside.

But it was after the promulgations of the Council of Ephesus, 431 A. D., which declared that Mary was not only the mother of Christ the Man, but also the mother of Christ the God, that the whole Christian world began a universal and open devotion to Mary. It is well to remember that the Council of Ephesus gave to the Western World the prayer, "Holy Mary, Mother of God—" in order to keep before our minds constantly the importance of its condemnation of the false doctrine of the Nestorians who thought that Mary was not the mother of God but only the mother of Christ the Man.

The Church at Rome always recognized and accepted fully the Eastern Church's deep devotion respecting Mary, and was deeply influenced by it and by liturgical feasts devoted to her. In fact, within the first seven centuries of the Church, seven Popes were from the Eastern Church and their influence being Eastern, they intensified the devotion of the Western Church to Mary.

ASSUMPTION

At the Church of the Assumption in Jerusalem in the East, the first official feast in honor of Mary was celebrated in 529 A. D. In the West, the Feast of the Assumption did not become official in Rome until the reign of Pope Sergius I (687–701 A. D.), an Eastern Pope of the Maronite Rite. In the East, Mary was looked upon as a martyr. Her birthday was celebrated on the day of her death.

The feast of the conception of St. Anne was commenced in the seventh century in the East, which was homage paid to St. Anne as the mother of Mary.

Although it was not until 1854 that the Catholic Church promulgated as a dogma of faith the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and the doctrine of the assumption was not declared to be a dogma of faith until the year 1954, the Eastern Church from the early centuries universally taught and believed the doctrine of the immaculate conception and the assumption. St. Ephrem, who was called the doctor of Edessa, and the harp of the Holy Ghost, preached throughout the East the doctrines of the immaculate conception and the assumption in the fourth century. He is pictured as saying, "Even my bones shall arise from the grave and proclaim that the Blessed Virgin Mary is the Mother of God.

Ireland, profoundly influenced by eastern liturgy, was the first country in Europe to celebrate the feast of the conception of St. Anne in the ninth century. In Egypt, the Hail Mary became incorporated in the Coptic liturgy, in which she was called the Source of Grace. The Moslems who conquered the Holy Land in the 7th and 8th centuries, had great respect for Mary, as they considered her the Mother of a great Prophet. The Moslems destroyed all images but spared those of Jesus and Mary.

In the Byzantine liturgy, common to both the Melkite and Greek Orthodox Churches, Mary is mentioned about 20 times.

Eastern poetry refers to Mary as "The New Ark of Noah," the "New Ark of the Covenant," "The Burning Bush of Moses," "The Son of Salvation," "The Fountain of All Grace."

The Catholic Melkites celebrate 9 feasts in Mary's honor, and the Greek Orthodox (Schismatic churches) also celebrate 9 feasts in Mary's honor; the Maronites, 10 feasts; the Armenians, 6 feasts; the Chaldeans 7; the Copts, 9.

In Lebanon the faithful abstain and fast on Saturday in honor of Mary, and during the month of May at the most beautiful shrine of Our Lady of Lebanon at Harissa, Maronite pilgrims sing this hymn:

"Blessed Mary. God has chosen thee from amongst the whole world, as He saw thee the most pure of all creatures. For 9 months He remained in thy womb, and from thy body, He has taken His own—Alleuluia.

Social-Security Amendments of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the House of Representatives by a vote of 372 yeas, 31 nays, with 2 Members voting present, approved legislation which would make important and meritorious changes in our social-security law.

The legislation, H. R. 7225, was designed to eliminate certain benefit and coverage gaps existing in the present old-age and survivors insurance system. The improvements with respect to benefits which would be accomplished by this legislation are that benefits would be available to women at age 62 instead of age 65, disability benefits would be made available to permanently and totally disabled insured workers who have attained age 50 and over, and benefits for disabled children beneficiaries age 18 and over of insured workers would be continued. The elimination of coverage gaps would be accomplished by extending coverage to self-employed professional groups—except physicians—who are now excluded, to certain farmers, to turpentine workers, and to employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority and Federal home-loan banks.

To improve the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance program and to compensate for the added cost to the system that would result from these important amendments, an adjustment would be made by H. R. 7225 in the social-security tax schedule.

In addition, an advisory council on social-security financing would be established by this legislation to review the status of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

For the information of the Members of Congress and other interested persons, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a summary of the principal provisions of the social-security amendments of 1955, H. R. 7225.

This legislation is now pending before the Senate Committee on Finance where it is expected consideration will be given to it during the forthcoming 2d session of the 84th Congress.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS AND EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1955, H. R. 7225, AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE ON JULY 18, 1955

GENERAL SUMMARY

The bill would make seven changes in the old-age and survivors insurance program. It would:

1. Reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which women (workers, wives, widows, and parents) may become eligible for benefits.

2. Provide cash disability benefits for permanently and totally disabled workers aged 50 and over.

3. Provide continuation benefits for disabled child beneficiaries over age 18 of insured workers.

4. Provide extension of coverage to the self-employed professional groups now excluded (except physicians), to certain farmers, to turpentine workers, and to two groups of Federal employees.

5. Increase the contribution rates of the program.

6. Set up an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing to review the status of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

7. Make certain technical amendments in the program.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

I. Eligibility age for women

A. The age at which women beneficiaries (workers, wives, widows, and parents) can qualify for benefits would be reduced from 65 to 62.

B. The change would be effective for the month of January 1956.

C. About 1,200,000 women would be eligible for benefits beginning with January 1956. About 800,000 could draw monthly benefits immediately; the remaining 400,000 are working or are the wives of workingmen who can draw benefits if their earnings or their husbands' earnings stop.

II. Disability insurance benefits

A. Benefits would be payable to qualified disabled workers who attain age 50.

B. Benefits would not be provided for dependents of a disabled worker.

C. To be insured for disability benefits the disabled worker would have to:

1. Be fully insured; and

2. Be currently insured; and

3. Have 20 quarters of coverage in the last 40 quarters ending with the first quarter of disablement.

D. The definition of disability would be the same as in present law for freezing the insurance rights of disabled persons (except there would be no presumed disability for the blind).

E. Where an individual is also receiving a workmen's compensation benefit or another Federal benefit based on disability, the disability benefit under the old-age and survivors insurance program would be reduced by the amount of such benefit.

F. In order to promote rehabilitation, an individual performing services in the course of a rehabilitation program carried on under an approved State plan would nevertheless be considered disabled (not able to engage in any substantial gainful employment) for a year after he first rendered such services.

G. The first month for which disability benefits would be payable would be January 1955.

III. Benefits for disabled children

A. The disability must have begun before the child attained age 18.

B. The child must have attained age 18 after December 1953 and must have been eligible for benefits before age 18.

C. The benefits would be first payable for the month of January 1956; a child who previously had been entitled to benefits and whose benefits had been terminated would have to file a new application.

D. Between 500 and 1,000 disabled children would become eligible on January 1, 1956. Some 250 to 500 children currently attaining age 18 would be continued on the rolls annually in the future.

IV. Extension of coverage

A. Coverage would be extended to:

1. Professional self-employed groups now excluded, except physicians—that is, lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, veterinarians, naturopaths, and optometrists (200,000 persons).

2. Employees of Federal Home Loan Banks (200 employees) and additional employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority (13,000 employees).

3. Agricultural workers engaged in the production of turpentine and gum naval stores (20,000 workers).

4. The above provisions would be effective January 1, 1956.

5. Rental income from a farm under certain conditions.

B. The status of share farmers covered under present law would be clarified to resolve any doubt in favor of their being self-employed for coverage purposes.

C. The following technical changes affecting coverage would be made in the Internal Revenue Code:

1. Employees of nonprofit organizations who were on the payroll when the organization elected coverage but did not elect coverage at that time would be given a limited time in which to elect coverage;

2. Nonprofit organizations would be enabled to acquire coverage for the quarter in which coverage is elected;

3. District of Columbia credit unions, whose employees are covered under OASI, would be subject to the OASI employer tax.

V. Tax rate changes

The schedule of tax rate increases would be accelerated and the ultimate rate raised above that in present law:

[In percent]

Years	Employers and employees		Self-employed	
	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed
1956–59	2	2½	3	3⅜
1960–64	2½	3	3⅜	4½
1965–69	3	3½	4½	5¼
1970–74	3½	4	5¼	6
1975 and after	4	4½	6	6¾

VI. Establishment of advisory council on social-security financing

A. Purpose: To review the status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the program.

B. Membership: Commissioner of Social Security as Chairman, plus 12 other members is to be appointed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare representing, to the extent possible, employees and employers in equal numbers and self-employed persons and the public.

C. Report: Report and recommendations, including recommendations for changes in old-age and survivors insurance tax rates, would be submitted not later than January 1, 1959, for inclusion in the trustees' report to be submitted to Congress by March 1, 1959.

D. Duration: Council to go out of existence after submittal of report. However, a new council, similarly constituted and with same functions and duties, would be appointed not later than 2 years prior to each ensuing scheduled increase in tax rate, and would report its findings and recommendations not later than January 1 of year preceding year in which the scheduled increase is to occur, for publication in next ensuing trustees' report.

VII. Technical amendments

Technical amendments would be made to aline old-age and survivors insurance requirements with change to April 15 date for income-tax reporting; to put computations involving disability periods on an annual basis; and to preserve relationship between old-age and survivors insurance and railroad retirement programs.

VIII. Costs

The level premium cost, on intermediate basis, as percent of payroll, is as follows:

	Percent of payroll
Present law (current estimate, 1955)	7.51
Increase in cost resulting from proposed changes:	
Reduction in retirement age for women	.56
Monthly disability benefits beginning at age 50	.37
Extension of coverage	—.01
Continuation of benefits to disabled child beneficiaries beyond age 18	(1)
Total	.92
Revised law	8.43

[1] Less than 0.005 percent.

IX. Benefit payments

Additional benefit payments under the bill on an annual basis are as follows:

[Amounts in millions]

First year (1956):	
Reduction in retirement age for women	$389
Monthly disability benefits	200
Extension of coverage and continuation of benefits to disabled children	2
Total	591
Long run (1980):	
Reduction in retirement age for women	1,292
Monthly disability benefits	859
Extension of coverage and continuation of benefits to disabled children	43
Total	2,194

Agricultural Progress, 1953–55

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Agricultural Progress, 1953–55."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL PROGRESS, 1953–55

Since January 1953, the United States Department of Agriculture has moved swiftly and aggressively to meet many complex and serious farm problems. Through well-timed purchase programs, special merchandising promotion, and other constructive action in commodity markets, the Department first slowed the fall, then brought relative stability to farm prices after a sharp 4-year decline.

When drought struck in widespread areas of the country in 1953 and 1954, the Department immediately made low-priced feed and liberal credit available to farmers.

The Department has helped producers and warehousemen undertake the greatest expansion of on-farm storage facilities and commercial-type storage capacity in history. The Department has helped increase export trade in American farm products by cooperating closely with other agencies that func-

tion in the international field, by making full use of existing and new foreign trade legislation, and by carrying on positive negotiations with foreign governments and commercial interests.

In the meantime, the regular functions of the Department have been strengthened. A sound reorganization of Department agencies has made it possible to meet the real needs of agriculture more effectively than ever before. A cooperative review of the departmental field services was conducted. The review indicated that the Department's field staff is doing a good job and that there is general public commendation for the services being rendered; but it also disclosed certain activities where improvements can, and will, be made. This survey was a phase of the continuing review of United States Department of Agriculture activities aimed at improving services to the public. Increased emphasis has been placed on fundamental research and education programs.

The principle of flexibility has at last been applied in price programs as contemplated by Congress in the Agricultural Acts of 1948, 1949, and 1954. Flexible price supports for the basic commodities, which become partially effective with the 1955 harvests and fully operative in 1956, are designed to work toward better balanced production. These supports, ranging between 75 and 90 percent of parity, are the highest ever written into peacetime agricultural legislation.

AGRICULTURAL SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

The economy is growing at a healthy rate, production is increasing absolutely and on a per worker basis, consumer incomes are rising, and higher average standards of living are in prospect.

Though the parity ratio of prices received by farmers has declined for over 4 years, nearly two-thirds of the drop occurred before the present administration took office.

Between February 1951 and January 1953 (23 months), prices received by farmers dropped from 113 to 94 percent of parity—a decline of 19 points. But from mid-January 1953, about the time Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson took office, to July 1955 (30 months), prices have fallen 10 points.

Realized net income of farm operators for the calendar year 1955 is expected to be close to $12 billion. On a per capita basis income of persons on farms rose slightly in 1954 over 1953. This was true both of income from all sources and income from farm sources alone.

United States agricultural exports in 1954–55 rose for the second consecutive year. Foreign markets took about 7 percent more farm products in the fiscal year 1954–55 than in the year earlier—which in turn had been 4 percent above 1952–53. Under current programs designed to export surplus farm products, further improvement in export outlets is expected.

Balance sheet

The financial position of United States agriculture continues good. Farm assets on January 1, 1955, totaled $163.5 billion, compared with $161.3 billion on January 1, 1954. The equities of farmers and other owners of farm property increased from $144.2 billion on January 1, 1954, to $145.5 on January 1, 1955. Total farm debt was $17.1 billion on January 1, 1954, and $18.0 billion on January 1, 1955.

Improvement in the dairy industry

The economic position of the United States dairy industry improved considerably after the spring of 1954, when Secretary Benson adjusted support prices on milk and butterfat to 75 percent of parity effective April 1, 1954. Production of milk has leveled off after having increased for nearly 2 years. Month by month, from December 1954 through April 1955 milk production was at a lower rate than a year earlier. During May and June, however, it slightly exceeded year ago levels.

Our people are using more dairy products. Consumption of milk products from commercial sources has increased, reflecting larger consumer incomes and lower retail prices since April 1, 1954. In addition, civilians consumed increased quantities of dairy products made available from Government stocks. Consumption of butter rose 6 percent in the 1954–55 marketing year. Cheese consumption rose 10 percent. CCC stocks of dairy products since the end of July 1954 have been reduced about 50 percent. CCC holdings of all dairy products at the end of July 1955 were about 600 million pounds and CCC butter purchases during October-July were 56 percent below the corresponding period a year earlier. By the end of 1955–56 marketing year, prospects are for comparatively small holdings of butter and nonfat dry milk and moderate quantities of cheese.

Improvement in the poultry industry

A policy of the Department in the past 2½ years has been to stimulate self-help programs. With the poultry industry beset by price troubles in the fall of 1954, the Department met with groups representing the egg, broiler, and turkey sections of the industry. Publicity following these meetings was an important supplement to regular outlook channels as a means of explaining to producers the influences which affect prospective prices.

During the early months of 1955, prices of broilers and farm chickens came back strongly. Average prices received by farmers for all chickens were between 87 and 90 percent of parity during April and May, as compared with about 75 percent of parity a year earlier.

At about the turn of 1955, broiler prices rose to a profitable level, and have continued so to midsummer.

Farmers raised fewer replacement pullets in the spring of 1955, and on June 1 the number of young chickens was 18 percent below the year before. After August, when current egg production would normally reflect the addition of new pullets to the laying flock, egg prices are expected to rise above last year.

The 1955 crop of heavy-breed turkeys is likely to be about up to the 1954 record, although the period of marketing in 1955 is likely to be more heavily concentrated later in the season than last year. On account of this change in timing, partly influenced by meetings with industry advisory groups, early fall prices are likely to surpass 1954. The poultry industry is setting its own house in order without Government subsidy or interference.

Plentiful foods program

The plentiful foods program achieved particular effectiveness in helping to meet marketing problems by increasing the movement of these foods through normal channels or raising the prices at which they moved. Beef, eggs, and dairy products are notable examples. Special merchandising programs on these items, conducted in cooperation with the industries, were instrumental in moving production of these commodities to consumers through regular channels of trade. The June dairy month program in 1955 stimulated increased consumption. Household purchases of butter were 14 percent above June 1954, and the customary May–June dip in butter consumption was virtually wiped out. Purchases of American cheese were up about 16 percent and Swiss cheese purchases almost 14 percent.

Beef

Early in 1953, beef prices were under strict Government control and grading of beef was compulsory. Beef prices were under immense downward pressure. One of the administration's first actions was to remove these restrictions—and beef began to move more readily into consumption.

A vast purchase program of boneless beef and carcass beef during the heavy fall marketing period helped stop and then reverse the price decline. At the same time, the Department in cooperation with the industry carried on an aggressive campaign to sell more beef through normal trade channels.

Thus the beef industry was helped to a sounder footing without resort to price supports on cattle and without undue involvement of Government in the livestock and meat industries.

Wheat

Following the approval by growers of wheat marketing quotas for 1956, Secretary Benson announced a 6-point program designed to improve the quality of future wheat crops and to minimize controls over production and utilization of this important crop.

He said the Department would:

1. Undertake to place in effect upon the 1956 wheat crop appropriate discounts in price supports for certain designated varieties of wheat, especially those suitable primarily for feed purposes. Premiums will be provided for quality wheat.

2. Continue its several programs aimed at achieving maximum practicable exports of wheat and flour.

3. Continue efforts to secure favorable congressional action authorizing the Secretary to broaden the noncommercial wheat area.

4. Continue efforts to secure favorable congressional action on legislation now before the Congress to exempt wheat growers from marketing quota penalties if all the wheat produced on their farms is consumed on the farms where produced.

5. Request legislative extension of special durum acreage provisions for the 1956 crop. Despite the excessive stocks of wheat, available supplies of durum wheat, used mainly for spaghetti and macaroni, are expected to continue short.

6. Give special consideration to programs which will further encourage farmers to make needed adjustments in their pattern of land use. This would be both on land ill-suited to crop production and on better lands where it would be advantageous to shift a part of the acreage to hay and pasture. The program now being developed for the Great Plains is an example of this.

The national wheat acreage allotment for 1956 will be the maximum permissible in view of the supply situation—55 million acres, the same as for 1955. Price support will be at not less than 76 percent of parity, or $1.81 per bushel, national average.

The problem of accumulated wheat stocks is a major one. The wheat carryover on July 1 was estimated at slightly more than 1 billion bushels, an all-time high. About 95 percent of this carryover was owned by Commodity Credit Corporation which had an investment of nearly $2.5 billion in wheat. This year's wheat harvest is expected to reach 860 million bushels.

Exports for the marketing year which ended June 30 hit 270 million bushels, an increase of more than one-fourth over the previous year. It is expected that exports for this marketing year will remain around the 270-million-bushel figure. This would mean a reduction of from 40 to 50 million bushels in the wheat carryover next July 1—the first decline in several years.

Cotton

Our carryover stocks of cotton practically doubled between 1953 and 1955, increasing from about 5.6 million bales to 11 million. By November 1955 it is estimated that the CCC will hold about 8 billion bales of cotton at a cost of about $80 million a year for storage and handling charges alone. The

trend of our exports on the other hand has been downward in the past 10 years.

The administration has endeavored to cope with this problem through acreage allotments and marketing quotas, as well as through extraordinary efforts to reduce the surpluses in being. For example, the USDA has given authorizations for the export of 600 million bales of cotton between August 1 and December 31, 1955, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Unfortunately, several measures recommended by the administration to help deal with the cotton problem were not enacted into law. Thus, cotton legislation, which would have facilitated the establishment of more realistic premiums and discounts for the various qualities of cotton, failed to pass. This change was needed to encourage farmers to produce grades and staples of cotton most desired by domestic and export markets. Legislation which would have permitted the Department to sell qualities of cotton in excess supply at less than the minimum price in effect under existing law also failed to pass. Authority is needed to permit adjustments in price-support levels to make our cotton more competitive with foreign cotton and synthetic fibers. Legislative proposals to permit greater flexibility in cotton prices did not receive final action.

Increases in per capita consumption of food

The Department assisted industry groups in stimulating demand for meat and dairy products and improving prices to producers with favorable results. In 1954 our people ate more beef, eggs, and chicken and turkey per person than ever before. Promotion programs increased the prices at which these products moved. The per capita meat consumption of over 153 pounds in 1954, the same as in 1953, was close to a record, being exceeded only in the period 1905–08. Preliminary indications at mid-1955 pointed to a level of per capita food consumption slightly above the 1954 rate—which was 2 percent above 1947–49 and 13 percent higher than in 1935–39.

Since the change in price-support level on butterfat and the institution of special departmental programs to encourage consumption of butter has risen about a half a pound per person; this is equivalent annually to about 80 million pounds of butter and 1.6 billion pounds of milk.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Eisenhower administration has built a solid and effective record of accomplishment in agricultural legislation. It has continued, improved, and expanded farm legislation fitted to present-day needs; removed regulations and restrictions made obsolete by changing economic conditions; and charted new courses designed to make American agriculture sounder, to promote the health and security of farm families and to conserve and improve natural resources. The legislative record includes:

1. A more workable and equitable price-support program.

2. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. In 1955 the authorization of sales under this act was raised from $700 million to $1.5 billion.

3. A measure to permit farmers to deduct some soil-conservation expenditures from farm income in computing income taxes.

4. A liberalized Farm Tenant Act to expand loan services for farmers to buy and improve family-type farms. The authority to make FHA emergency loans was also extended.

5. Public Law 482, providing additional health facilities of special importance in rural areas.

6. Drought disaster assistance.

7. Reestablishment of the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency.

8. Approval of Reorganization Plan No. 2, which gave the Secretary authority to streamline the Department for better service.

9. Increased funds for research and education.

10. Amendment of the mining law to prevent abuses of and to safeguard natural resources.

11. Measures to provide more soil and water conservation.

12. Extension of social security protection to farm families.

13. The return of the agricultural attachés to the direct supervision of the Department of Agriculture, which helped strengthen efforts to expand foreign markets for United States agricultural products.

14. Elimination of acreage controls for durum wheat.

15. All farmers made eligible for cost-sharing payments on conservation practices, regardless of their participation in crop-control programs.

16. Improvement in basic legislation governing Rural Electrification Administration; the State allotment formula was modified permitting more concentration of funds in areas where extension of electric power are most needed.

17. Increase in borrowing authority of CCC from $10 billion to $12 billion.

PRICE SUPPORTS

This administration believes that price supports should be flexible—adjustable to conditions of supply and demand—rather than rigid.

When supports at rigid 90 percent of parity were inaugurated during World War II, it was generally agreed that this was strictly an emergency program—to end when more nearly normal marketing conditions returned.

The platforms of both major political parties in 1948 endorsed flexible price supports. So did the then President of the United States. So did the then Secretary of Agriculture.

Flexible supports were the heart of the Agricultural Act of 1948. A year later they were the core of the Agricultural Act of 1949. When the Korean war broke out, Congress again postponed the effective date for flexible supports, but left this key provision for a long-range peacetime program in the law. What was done essentially in the act of 1954, passed by the 83d Congress, was to allow the major parts of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to take effect.

Rigid price supports encourage unrealistic patterns of production. When support levels are out of line, output tends to outrun demand. Downward pressure on prices develops and increased support activity becomes necessary. Surpluses move into Government hands. Government holdings of farm commodities on June 30, 1955, had a cost value of over $4.5 billion—equal to more than 15 percent of total farm cash receipts in 1954. In addition, the CCC had loans of over $2 billion on farm crops.

Programs primarily for the support of farm prices and farm income in fiscal 1954 required an estimated $962 million. This was more than the Department spent for all other activities combined—research, education, soil conservation, forest service, credit services, marketing services, inspection, regulation, and all the rest.

Surpluses are expensive to store. The Government's bill currently is a million dollars a day. Only small quantities can be sold in the open market at break-even prices; the bulk can be disposed of only through subsidized sales or donations resulting in large losses to Government. Furthermore, surpluses make necessary onerous production controls—acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

Recognizing the shortcomings of rigid supports, Secretary of Agriculture Benson said early in 1953, "Price-support laws will be carried out faithfully in every respect. There are mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity on the so-called basic commodities for 1953 and 1954. Other laws provide for supports on other farm products. While enforcing these laws, there will be formulated long-term programs which will more fully and effectively accomplish our overall objectives."

With the assistance of about 65 groups, including the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, farm organizations, agricultural colleges, and many other groups and individuals, a considerable number of farm program recommendations were brought together by the Department of Agriculture. These recommendations, submitted to Congress in January 1954 by President Eisenhower, became the basis for the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The new law, embracing the principle of flexibility, provides for supports on basic commodities in the range of 82½ to 90 percent of parity for 1955 crops, and 75 to 90 percent after 1955—the level of support to depend upon the size of the supply. New parity provisions, which previously were not allowed to operate for certain basic commodities, are scheduled to become effective on a transitional basis January 1, 1956. Set aside provisions, intended to lessen the impact of changing over from a rigid to a flexible price-support basis, already are in use. In the case of wool and mohair, the new legislation introduces a new system of incentive payments. The new program makes it possible for all domestic wool produced to move into consumption, assures equitable returns to growers, encourages efficient production and marketing, and requires a minimum of governmental interference with producers and processors.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL PROGRAMS

The Department of Agriculture has made good headway in developing practical disposal outlets for the surplus stocks it owns. In the January 1954 to May 1955 period, about $2,052,000,000 worth of surpluses were disposed of through the following channels:

	Percent
Domestic sales	26
Export sales	35
Sales to foreign governments	1
Transfers to other Government agencies	10
International barter	7
Donations	21
Total disposals	100

Domestic sales

Sales in the January 1954 to May 1955 period have totaled about $529 million. Feed grains, especially corn, and dairy products have been among the more important commodities sold.

Noncommercial sales

Disposals in this category, largely to foreign governments and international relief organizations, have amounted to $18 million. Wheat and nonfat dry milk have been the principal items sold.

Transfers

Legislation now in effect authorizes the transfer of commodities from CCC's price-support inventory to the International Cooperation Administration, Department of Defense, Veterans' Administration, and to schools for use in lunch programs. The value of items transferred during the 17 months total $202 million.

International barter

Commodities from CCC's inventories have been bartered for materials produced in foreign countries. Barter operations in the January 1954 to May 1955 period amounted to $148 million, consisting largely of wheat, corn, and other grains.

Donations

To prevent waste, section 416, Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes CCC to donate its food commodities for certain uses both in the United States and abroad. In the January 1954 to May 1955 period, donations have amounted to $430 million, largely representing donations of dairy products for school-lunch use in the United States and for relief purposes abroad.

School milk program

In the field of food distribution, a major achievement was successful introduction of the new special school milk program, to increase use of milk by children in school, in preference to moving it into Government purchase channels. During the fiscal year, this program resulted in children drinking well over 400 million additional half-pints of milk in schools. As a result of operating experience in the first year, modifications have now been made in the program which will make it even more useful next year in increasing the consumption of milk in schools.

School lunch

Participation in the national school lunch program showed another substantial increase. The number of children eating lunches under this program rose to a new high total of more than 11 million in more than 59,000 schools.

Export sales

Sales have totaled about $721 million in the January 1954-May 1955 period, wheat being the most important single commodity, although corn and other feed grains, cotton, cottonseed oil, linseed oil, and tobacco have been marketed in considerable quantities.

Public Law 480

Contributing to the heavy volume of export sales is activity under title I, Public Law 480 (the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954), which authorizes the sale of CCC-owned surpluses for foreign currencies.

Under title I of of the act, the Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to incur costs not in excess of $700 million over a 3-year period in financing the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. The act provided that such currencies could be used for the development of new markets for United States agricultural products, meeting United States obligations abroad, and other purposes beneficial to this country's foreign interests.

As of June 30, 1955, programs for the sale of agricultural commodities under title I reached a total of $468.8 (CCC cost) and $360.8 million (export market value). The commodities included under agreements with 17 countries involve about 53 million bushels of wheat, 62 million pounds of tobacco, 647,000 bales of cotton, and 141 million pounds of cottonseed oil.

Countries covered by these agreements were: Turkey, Yugoslavia, Chile, Peru, Pakistan, Spain, Argentina, Israel, Finland, the United Kingdom, Italy, Japan, Korea, Austria, Thailand, Colombia, and Greece.

Operation of title I utilized private trade channels to the maximum extent and, in accordance with the law's requirements, was carried out without displacement of this country's usual foreign marketings, without undue disruption of world agricultural prices, and with assurance that farm products sold would not be diverted to unfriendly countries.

MEETING THE DROUGHT

To battle the drought that persisted throughout about a third of the Nation, the Department took action on two fronts—immediate and longer term.

On the immediate front, departmental programs made it possible for eligible farmers and ranchers to get emergency credit, cost-share help in conservation work, hay at reduced transportation cost, and certain feed grains below the market price. Farmers and ranchers in 19 drought-designated States obtained some 50,000 loans, amounting to about $72 million. Of a total of $9,900,000 advanced to 18 States taking part in the hay program, $5,445,000 had been drawn by States as of June 30, 1955, to help pay hay hauling costs in 1,055 counties. In the feed grain program, 1,170,846 purchase orders were issued during the fiscal year to farmers and ranchers who bought more than 58 million hundredweight of grain through established feed dealers at a saving of $49,654,628.

On the longer range front, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, after a personal tour of drought-stricken parts of the Great Plains, called an emergency meeting of USDA specialists, representatives of the 10 Great Plains States land-grant colleges, and the governors of those States (Denver, May 30-June 2.) Proposals developed at this meeting were reviewed by a wide variety of interests. Later meetings sparked State programs designed to move the area's agriculture toward desired goals.

The USDA moved promptly to adjust its own programs to Great Plains needs. In cooperation with State experiment stations the USDA's Soil Conservation Service doubled the rate of soil mapping in the region, and made plans to further accelerate the work. SCS hopes to complete the survey of this vast area by June 30, 1959. Immediate attention is being given critical areas where soil survey data are needed at once as a basis for land use shifts.

Other USDA agencies are working out program modifications that will sharpen their effectiveness in making use of crop insurance, credit, cost-sharing in conservation work, research, and education and technical assistance as tools for use in development of a better land use program for the Great Plains.

CONSERVING OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

Conservation of soil, water, and forest resources has high priority in programs of the Department of Agriculture.

With assistance from USDA in research, education, conservation, planning and application, cost-sharing and credit programs, farmers and ranchers of the United States have become world leaders in protection and improvement of these resources.

Soil-conservation districts

Acting under provisions of State law, farmers and ranchers have organized 2,665 local soil-conservation districts, which include 90 percent of the Nation's farm and ranch lands. The Department is providing direct technical assistance in planning and applying conservation practices to more than 1½ million cooperators in these districts.

Cost sharing

Through the agricultural conservation program the public shared with farmers the cost of certain conservation measures to protect, improve, and make better use of soil and water resources. Special cost-sharing to augment the regular practices was made available to meet emergency conditions due to drought and floods.

It is estimated that total accomplishments since the beginning of ACP on some of the conservation measures for which cost-sharing has been approved are now about: 1.1 million miles of terraces for erosion control on 21½ million acres; 1¼ million dams and reservoirs for erosion control, livestock, and irrigation water; 1¼ million acres reforested, 110 million acres stripcropped, and 75 million acres of permanent vegetative cover established on crop or pastureland.

Protecting water resources

A significant extension of the Department's conservation program has developed under provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566) which was enacted in August 1954. Under this act, for the first time, the Department is equipped to help groups in small watersheds to build small dams and other water management structures needed for flood prevention as well as to make conservation planning more effective by extending it to entire small watersheds. In the first 10 months after its enactment, 347 watershed groups in 37 States had applied to the Department for assistance under terms of this act. By July 1, 1955, 68 of these projects in 33 States had been approved for planning.

Saving our timber

In the national forests, timber production reached a new high of 6,328,000,000 board feet in fiscal 1955. This sale of timber brought a return of $70,680,000 to the United States Treasury. The first pulp mill in Alaska began operation, with a continuing supply of raw material to come from the Tongass National Forest. National forest ranges provided 5,686,802 cow-months and 8,442,932 sheep-months of grazing. Recreational visits totaled over 40 million in 1954, more than double the highest prewar figure.

The Department cooperated with 43 States, also Hawaii and Puerto Rico, in the production and distribution of trees to farmers and other landowners for planting woodlands and shelterbelts. The 465 million trees produced in 1954 represented the highest production in the history of the Nation. The Department also cooperated with the States and Hawaii to provide organized protection against fires for State and private forest lands. Cooperative protection was extended during the year to 3½ million additional acres of privately owned land. Under a cooperative program between the Department and the State forestry agencies, technical advice in woodland management was given to 32,000 farmers. Technical assistance was also provided other public agencies, such as the Department of the Army, and large forest industries.

Significant results were obtained in numerous research projects during the year, aimed at finding better ways to manage and protect forests and ranges, improve the yield of usable water from forest watersheds, and determine new and better ways of using wood.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

In April 1955, Secretary Benson sent a report on low-income rural areas to the President along with a series of recommendations, which call for more technical and credit aid for small farmers, better training for their children, special research, more industrial investment in these areas, and a large measure of local control over the program.

In cooperation with the States, the Department has begun planning on the rural development program to raise levels of living in certain areas of the Nation where many farm families have long suffered from inadequate incomes. This is a program to assist those small farmers who have gained little or nothing from the price-support programs of recent years.

Bills have been introduced in the Congress for increased extension work and FHA lending authority to aid small farmers. And officials of the Department of Agriculture and other Federal departments have met with officials of 28 States to discuss cooperative planning and operations.

In fiscal 1956 pilot operations were planned for 50 counties. Committees of local people are expected to help the program in these counties. These pilot operations were designed to provide experience and information for use as the program is broadened. Unfortunately the funds requested to get the program operating effectively were not appropriated by the Congress.

MORE EMPHASIS ON RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

From fiscal 1951 to fiscal 1953, United States Department of Agriculture budgets for research operations were not increased. For fiscal year 1954, an increase of $2.6 million

was appropriated. For fiscal year 1955, we requested and Congress appropriated a further increase of $12.3 million for research. For fiscal 1956, agricultural research funds were increased another $8 million.

The additional research money helped to step up many lines of scientific investigation, including those to devise new uses and open wider markets for farm products, especially surplus commodities; to make livestock production more efficient and lower costs to farmers; to find better forage crops, especially for the Great Plains and southern areas; and to speed up soil conservation studies. More than half the additional funds went directly as grants to States to conduct experiments on local problems.

A stepped-up cooperative program with the States to eradicate brucellosis from the Nation's dairy and beef cattle herds got underway with a special $15 million appropriation augmenting other moneys available for this purpose. The long fight on foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, in which the United States Department of Agriculture cooperated with Mexican officials, was successfully concluded by eradicating the disease and the border again was opened to livestock imports.

Extension work in cooperation with State and county governments was further strengthened during the year to take research results, situation, and program facts to farm people and help them fit the latest facts together on their own farms.

An increase of more than $7 million in Federal funds and $3½ million more from State legislatures provided for employment of 915 additional county extension workers and 110 State extension specialists and supervisors. Major emphasis was placed on a total farm and home unit approach to the problems farm people face. The Department and the States signed new extension memoranda of understanding during the year with major emphasis on localized extension educational work.

Marketing research

In the field of marketing research much effort was directed to holding down costs and improving marketing efficiency.

Development of improved aeration and fumigation methods for stored grains is effecting savings amounting to millions of dollars a year. By recirculating methyl bromide gas through stored wheat, for example, the cost of the chemicals required to protect 1,000 bushels was cut from roughly $5 to $1. With a billion bushels of wheat now in the carryover, the actual saving in the marketing process is obvious. Aeration through recirculation of air, recently developed, also is preventing spoilage of grains in storage. Both these processes are applicable not only to wheat but also to corn and other stored grains.

A study of efficient equipment and methods in self-service meat departments in grocery stores showed that sales per man-hour rose one-fourth when suggested improvements were adopted in a group of test stores. In the check stores, where the changes were not made, there was practically no change in the sales rate. The study points the way toward a corresponding reduction of costs in many stores.

Another study showed that a saving of $80 a carload could be effected in packing and shipping lettuce from California to New York, by shifting from the old WGA wooden crate, ice-packed in the packing shed, to dry-packing in fiberboard cartons in the field of vacuum-cooling.

Other marketing studies pointed the way toward substantial economics and improvements in marketing many commodities. These include lower cost methods of storing seed cotton at gins, large savings through more efficient methods and facilities in storing grains, a way to reduce injuries and consequent quality loss in turkeys during the slaughter process, substantial reductions in costs of handling apples at packing plants, improved management for wholesale produce markets, and numerous other improved practices.

CREDIT

Agencies of the Department continued their problems of supplementing private credit in assisting farmers to operate, purchase, enlarge, and improve their farms, and to meet emergency credit needs.

During fiscal 1955, Farmers Home Administration launched a new loan program. The water facilities loan program, formerly operating only on a direct loan basis and only in 17 western States, was replaced by an expanded soil and water conservation loan program operating in all States and possessions. Loans in this program are for approved soil-conservation practices as well as for water conservation and use.

The use of private funds rapidly expanded during the year. Funds for soil and water conservation loans, as well as for loans to purchase, enlarge, or improve farms, come from (1) funds advanced by private lenders with repayment insured by the Government; and (2) appropriated funds. Loans from insured funds far outnumbered those from direct appropriations in both the soil and water conservation and farm ownership loan programs.

Production and subsistence loans continued to assist family type farm operators to operate their farms efficiently and on a sound basis. These loans are for seed, feed, fertilizer, equipment, livestock, and to pay other operating costs.

For all these loans borrowers had to be unable to obtain adequate financing from private or cooperative lenders. All were required to advance as promptly as possible to private or cooperative credit to meet their farming needs.

For farmers and ranchers unable to obtain credit elsewhere to meet operating expenses, special livestock loans that were first made available in 1953 were continued through the 1954–55 fiscal year.

In addition to the special livestock loans, emergency loans were made from a revolving fund to farmers in areas, designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, in which it was found that this type of assistance was needed. The loans were to help farmers continue normal operations when, due to production losses or economic reasons, they needed credit they could not obtain from other sources. A total of 1,607 counties in 35 States were designated for emergency loans during the 1954–55 fiscal year.

ELECTRICITY: A FARM TOOL

Rural telephones

Telephone loans approved by REA for improving and extending telephone service in rural areas amounted to $52,744,000 for fiscal year 1955. There were 147 separate loans to telephone companies and nonprofit associations in 33 States and Alaska. This brings to more than $234 million the total in REA telephone loans to 351 borrowers. More than half a million farms and other rural establishments will have modern dial telephone service as a result of these loans. As of June 30, 1955, 157 telephone borrowers had already used REA loan funds to place in service a total of 553 dial exchange offices for rural service.

Applications for telephone loans are being processed by REA at a rate which cut down the backlog to about half of what it was a year ago. This backlog reached a low of $46 million at the end of March 1955. An increased flow of applications since then has brought the amount of applications on hand to about $51 million.

Rural electrification

More than half of the Nation's electrified farms are served by systems financed by REA loans. In the 1955 fiscal year, REA made new loans of $167.5 million to meet rural power system needs and cut its backlog of applications down to $97 million, the lowest since 1947. The total amount of REA electric loans is now $3,050 million. REA electric borrowers have repaid more than 15 percent of the funds actually advanced to them, together with over $200 million in interest. Only 19 out of the 1,000 borrowers are behind schedule in their repayments. Overdue payments amount to less than $500,000.

Nearly a quarter of last year's loans were earmarked for generation and transmission facilities for borrowers in power-deficient areas of the country. These included two new power co-ops in Colorado which will integrate their output with that of nearby power company systems. The average amount of kilowatt-hours consumed on farms served by REA borrowers has doubled during the last 7 years.

Atoms for agriculture

Studies are under way to determine the practicability of atomic energy as a source of power for rural electrification. REA has a team of specialists cleared to study developments in the nuclear field. Several REA borrower groups have agreements with the Atomic Energy Commission for studying the engineering and economic possibilities of this new source of power. One REA borrower proposes construction of an experimental atomic-energy plant in its area.

While indications are that atomic energy is still not competitive with conventional fuels, the studies currently under way promise that as soon as nuclear power becomes feasible, rural electrification will be in a position to benefit from this development.

Foreign Aid: People Are Insisting It Should End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people who pay the taxes that go to pay for the foreign-aid program are way ahead of the Congress in insisting that it is time to terminate this policy.

As part of my remarks I am including an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette on the subject. The Gazette has always been an advocate of the program and at all times went along with it. The editorial, however, now raises the question of the end of foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, at this time in connection with this matter some Members of Congress are attempting to convince the public in speeches and in press releases that foreign aid is good for our economy, in that it takes surplus farm products off our hands and generally keeps men employed.

This is an unsound and fallacious argument, Mr. Speaker, because it is only half true. The prosperity that results from American handouts overseas must be paid for and that is done by the sweat of American taxpayers.

There is no profit, Mr. Speaker, for anybody, including the farmers, workers or business when one pays $5,000 for a $3,000 automobile.

Advocates of the giveaway foreign-aid program should be truthful and tell the whole story by admitting that this policy unless soon terminated, will continue to increase our national debt and compel the taxpayers to face a bigger tax burden in the future.

END MUST BE NEAR ON FOREIGN AID

Foreign aid appropriations, which represent the difference between a solvent American Government and one operating in the red, will come up in a broadcast and TV debate this week. In favor is Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama, Democrat, and against, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, the Indiana anti-Eisenhower Republican.

The arguments which they present, at the extremes of the issue, shed but little light on the problem. Senator SPARKMAN, for example, asks if it is in the national interest to disarm South Korea, or to give up our military bases in Japan, the Middle East, North Africa, Great Britain, and France. Obviously, we have no such intention.

Senator JENNER, on the other hand, says that foreign aid is a gigantic boondoggle, with those in charge of administration more interested in building a political machine for themselves and creating pressures for continued foreign spending than they are in American interests in the world.

Certainly there is a measure of truth—sometimes forgotten—in his comments that "what we call foreign aid buys American coal and books, wheat, and radio services, it gives orders to American manufacturers and farmers." To that extent, it undoubtely has support of groups which stand to gain. It is not nearly so clear, however, that we extend "no military aid to any country, for a purpose which the United Nations—that is, Soviet Russia—"might object to."

A good deal of the foreign aid serves a much less dramatic, though perhaps equally questionable purpose when it finally reaches foreign countries. A new report from Norway, for example, shows that the remaining unused funds from America have been allocated by agreement, 50 million krona for defense; 15 million for productivity purposes, and 24,400,000 for development projects.

Norway, it appears, has received $460 million in American dollars, nearly all in grants of aid, made available to importers in exchange for Norwegian currency. Says the Norwegian Government report: "Although Kr. 2,370,600 of the Kr. 2,460,000 in counterpart funds has already been used, the largest part, Kr. 1,931,000, went to pay off and cancel money bills issued by the Germans during their wartime occupation of Norway. Other major allocations included Kr. 325 million for defense purposes; Kr. 86 million for special investment projects; and Kr. 28,560,000 to finance the Norwegian Productivity Institute."

This gives a broad picture as to foreign aid for one of the dozens of nations helped. American dollars here prevented financial calamity.

The need for aid following the war was staggering. The United States shouldered the burden and the results have been amazingly good, at least from the viewpoint of world economic recovery. In retrospect, it appears that the job might have been accomplished effectively at substantially lesser cost. Inevitably, immense sums were unwisely or needlessly spent but most Americans will not criticize too strongly a task which now appears to be complete.

That does not go for the overgenerous gifts which Congress voted just before it adjourned. It was shown then that nearly $9 billion in foreign-aid money remained unspent, estimated to be adequate for 3 years. With this figure before them, the Congressmen nevertheless authorized three and a half billion more.

While we are willing to forgive some unwise spending and to acknowledge the need and the general success of the foreign-aid program in the 10 years since 1945, we are entitled now to assurance that this program is not a permanent burden. There must be an end somewhere, and that time is not when American has financed every possible need of every foreign nation. We have unsatisfied needs at home, and we should give attention to our own welfare and to tax relief for our citizens.

Excise-Tax-Structure Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, has established a Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems to make a basic study of our excise-tax structure with a view to correcting inadequacies and inequities that may exist in the administrative and technical aspects of that structure.

It was my privilege to be named chairman of this important subcommittee. My committee colleagues who will serve with me as subcommittee members are: The Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH; Hon. BURR P. HARRISON; Hon. A. S. HERLONG, JR.; Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS; Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON; and Hon. NOAH M. MASON.

Because this is the first comprehensive revision of our excise-tax structure to be undertaken by the Congress in contemporary times, I am sure that I speak for my colleagues on the subcommittee, as well as for myself, when I say that we view this important undertaking as a responsibility that is to be performed conscientiously and diligently.

At an organizational and agenda meeting of the subcommittee it was agreed that public hearings would be held by the subcommittee beginning October 4, 1955, to last for 2 weeks. In agreeing to these hearings the subcommittee decided that they would be limited to technical and administrative problems in the excise-tax area and that the question of excise-tax rates would not be considered by the subcommittee.

For the information of interested persons, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of the release which the subcommittee authorized me to issue announcing the public hearings and setting forth the scope and plan of the hearings:

HON. AIME J. FORAND, chairman of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems of the House Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on excise tax problems to begin on October 4, 1955. It is the firm intention of the subcommittee to conclude the hearings in not to exceed 2 weeks. Chairman Forand stressed the fact that the hearings would be limited strictly to technical and administrative problems and will not be concerned with questions of excise-tax rates.

Members of the subcommittee are: The Honorable AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, Rhode Island, chairman; Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, New York; Hon. BURR P. HARRISON, Democrat, Virginia; Hon. A. S. HERLONG, JR., Democrat, Florida; Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, Ohio; Hon. RICHARD M SIMPSON, Republican, Pennsylvania; and Hon. NOAH M. MASON, Republican, Illinois.

Representatives of the Department of the Treasury will be invited to open the hearings to present to the subcommittee those problems which have come to the attention of the Treasury Department and also to outline in detail the procedures followed in collecting and administering the various excise taxes. Following the testimony by the Treasury representatives, public witnesses will be scheduled in the order of the following excise categories in which they may be interested:

1. Retail taxes;
2. Manufacturers excises;
3. Excises on facilities and services (admissions, communications, transportation, etc.);
4. Documentary stamp taxes;
5. Excises on wagering, coin-operated devices, bowling alleys, etc., and regulatory taxes (except those on narcotics); [1]
6. Import taxes;
7. Taxes on distilled spirits, beer, and wines;
8. Taxes on tobacco products; and
9. Other excises.

Within each of these categories industry representatives and others desiring to testify on an entire category will be scheduled for first appearances. Other witnesses will be scheduled according to the order in which the taxes on which they wish to testify appear in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. In the interest of avoiding duplication of testimony, it is requested that to the maximum extent possible an industry group select one spokesman to present the views of that industry.

To facilitate the orderly consideration of excise tax problems by the subcommittee, witnesses are requested to divide their prepared testimony into three broad groupings to the maximum extent possible. The three groupings are:

1. Administrative problems, such as, but not limited to, those arising in connection with procedures followed with respect to publication of rulings, refund requirements, and the system of review of excise tax rulings;

2. Technical problems relating to broad groups of excises, such as, but not limited to, the determination of a fair manufacturers' price and the treatment of leases in the case of the manufacturers' excise taxes; and

3. Technical problems relating to individual excises, such as, but not limited to, the timing of the collection of the tax in the case of tires, the treatment of reclaimed oil in the case of the tax on lubricating oil, and the treatment of charitable and similar organizations in the case of the tax on admissions. A witness may testify on more than one of these groupings, but it is requested that each grouping be clearly separated and captioned in the copies of the prepared testimony.

Persons interested in appearing at these hearings may arrange to do so by writing to the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, room 1102, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., by not later than September 24, 1955. It is requested that prospective witnesses indicate in their letters to the clerk the categories on which they

[1] The subcommittee will not consider regulatory excises on narcotics in view of the existence of another subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means with jurisdiction over this subject.

will testify, and where pertinent, the sections of the 1954 Code on which they will testify. Witnesses should also indicate the minimum amount of time required for their testimony.

Statements may be submitted for the record in lieu of an appearance. A witness interested in more than one of the excise categories set forth above may testify on each category at the time of its consideration by the subcommittee. An an alternative to multiple appearances by a witness who is interested in more than one category, testimony may be given on the subject or subjects of major importance to the witness and briefs submitted for the record concerning other topics of interest.

Witnesses will be notified of the scheduled date of their appearance. The hearings will be held in the committee hearing room in the New Office Building and will begin each day at 10 a. m.

It is requested that witnesses submit 40 copies of their prepared statements to the committee clerk at least 4 days in advance of their scheduled appearance. In the event that a witness desires to make copies of his testimony available to the press, it is suggested that an additional 40 copies be submitted to the clerk for that purpose.

Failure of Our Foreign Policy in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Robert McCormick, of the NBC staff, is an outstanding authority on the European political situation. Recently he participated in a TV program entitled "Comment" and it was my privilege to have heard him. His first two sentences came as a shock to me and I immediately requested a copy of his statement for insertion in the RECORD. NBC graciously granted my request and Mr. McCormick's remarks follow:

COMMENT

(By Robert McCormick)

Perhaps the most disillusioned group in our foreign service is in Germany. The things that happened in West Germany, just before and just after she was made a sovereign nation, are sometimes difficult to believe.

We must remember that the Allies had 10 years to figure out what to do with their particular chunks of what was the Third Reich. They had more than 3 years for the specific planning that led to ratification of the Paris agreements.

Yet when sovereignty actually came to Germany, we were caught flatfooted on a number of issues that superficially may seem to have little international significance, but which are extremely important to our prestige in all of Europe.

For example: Sovereignty had literally just become official, when a phone rang in Army headquarters in Heidelberg; it was the office of the West German Finance Ministry, requesting an audit, forthwith, of the Army welfare fund. The welfare fund is made up of the profits of the Army-supervised PX, the liquor stores, theaters, and such, as well as the revenue from the monopolistic bookstores run by the Army newspaper Stars and Stripes. The funds are used to provide recreational facilities—bowling alleys, tennis courts, and so on, for the American soldiers who help defend Germany.

But the Germans wanted the audit so they could figure out how much to tax the fund.

About the same time, the Finance Ministry came out with a truly startling proposal; while the United States was figuring out how many millions of dollars worth of military equipment it should give the new German Army, Finance Minister Schaffer and his boys decided we would have to pay what amounted to an import tax, on all the military equipment we had ordered before sovereignty, but which would be delivered after sovereignty, and yet these goods were to be paid for, with occupation funds—the money defeated Germany had to put up, to finance the occupation.

The total bill presented us—between a million-and-a-quarter and two-million dollars.

Then came another surprise. Just about the time of the explosion over our agreement with the Lufthansa—an agreement under which the reborn Germany airline was to get extraordinary concessions in routes involving American territory—just at this time, Germans announced they were reimposing an old Nazi tax, a so-called turnover tax on all foreign air traffic over Germany. The tax would be 4 percent of the prorated revenue received by our airlines, for all freight and passengers carried over German territory. When I left, the argument was still going on, but the Lufthansa got its agreement.

Then there was the question of the State Department's PX, commissary, and clubhouse. The PX is a modestly stocked general store in the American community just outside the West German Capital of Bonn; the commissary sells food, much of it purchased on the German economy, and the club is just a club.

Such establishments are routine diplomatic establishments in almost every country in the world, even in Russia; but the Germans decided the PX and the commissary should be closed, and the club severely limited in its operations. They asked for an inventory of club stocks 1 day before sovereignty became official.

The action was based on another Nazi regulation, dating back to 1939, forbidding collective imports by diplomats; they can bring in anything they please individually, without paying import taxes, but they cannot import, tax free, goods for the use of all.

The American Embassy solved this embarrassing predicament by asking the Army to supply the two stores; the Army had been more foresighted, and worked out a written agreement covering its own installations.

So far as the club was concerned, it was technically divided into three parts: American, French, and British diplomats can drink tax-free American whisky and eat commissary food; other diplomats must bring their own; Germans cannot buy anything but beverages on which full taxes have been paid.

There are lots of other angles: Such as Germany's traditional severe restrictions on the importation of agricultural commodities, restrictions which we failed to get changed in 10 years of occupation.

The result of all this was simply that we looked awkward, and sometimes downright silly.

Yet in the midst of making concessions, we did other things that were quite out of character. Ambassador Conant, for example, had a private train, financed with occupation funds.

There are no longer any occupation costs for Western Germany, but when I left, Conant still had his three-car diesel train, to the tune of $109,000 a year.

The Ambassador's train was supported by the Berlin occupation funds by the beleaguered people of West Berlin, fighting for their existence, deep in the Russian Zone.

But on those other matters—taxes and PX's, and so forth—we realized, too late, that we made one mistake after another; one of our very top diplomats in Bonn told me bluntly, "Our only excuse is plain boneheadedness."

Another of those caught napping said ruefully, with a belated show of ferocity, "From now on, we'll just have to adopt different methods, in dealing with the Germans."

He was righter than he knew—and also later. The Germans cannot be blamed for extracting all they can from us.

But our lack of detailed preparation for sovereignty, as indicated by these incidents; our failure to stand up against unreasonable demands; disclose our naivete and inexperience in foreign affairs, for all of Europe to see. This experience shows up most sharply, in the day-to-day operations, where major policies laid down at the top, are actually carried out.

And that's the truly disturbing aspect, of our personal relations, so to speak, with sovereign West Germany.

Selective Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of Public Law 118, I have received many letters of inquiry from young men as to how they are affected by this legislation. I presume such has been the case with many of my colleagues.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the analysis of Public Law 118 prepared on my request by the Library of Congress and which I hope will prove as helpful to my colleagues as it has to me. The analysis follows:

PUBLIC LAW 118, 84TH CONGRESS (AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT)

Section 101:

(a) Exempts from training and service under provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act any person who serves on active duty subsequent to June 24, 1948, for not less than 18 months in the armed forces of a nation with which the United States is associated in mutual defense activities. Denies this exemption to nationals of country having no such reciprocal provisions for United States citizens. Credits active duty prior to June 24, 1948, in the armed forces of World War II allies with whom the United States is associated in mutual defense activities in the computation of the 18-month service period.

(b) Exempts from training and service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act one who (a) has served honorably in the Armed Forces for a minimum 1-year period on active duty after September 16, 1940, or (b) subsequent to September 16, 1940, was discharged for the convenience of the Government after having served honorably on active duty in the Armed Forces for a 6-month minimum period, or (c) served a minimum 24 months as a commissioned officer in the Public Health Service, or in the Coast and Geodetic Survey except during time of war or national emergency. Sub-

jects this provision to provisions relating to medical, dental, and allied specialist categories (U. S. C. 50 App.: 454 (i)).

(c) Exempts from training and service in the Armed Forces persons who enlist in the State National Guard prior to attaining age 18½ after such persons having reached age 28.

(d) Prohibits consideration of the shortage or surplus of an agricultural commodity in determining where a person should be granted a deferment on the grounds that such person's employment is necessary to the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest.

Section 102: Extends the regular draft for 4 years (until July 1, 1959).

Section 103: Extends the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years (until July 1, 1959).

Section 201: Extends the Doctors Draft Act for 2 years (until July 1, 1957).

Section 202: Exempts from induction under the Doctors Draft Act: (a) medical, dental, and allied specialists over age 35 who have applied for a commission in one of the Armed Forces in any such categories and have been rejected on the sole ground of physical disqualification; or (b) medical, dental, and allied specialists upon reaching age 46.

Section 203: Continues existing law which authorizes additional pay for commissioned officers in medical, dental, and veterinary corps of the Armed Forces serving on active duty.

Soviet Union Mobilizing Athletes Prior to 1956 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as further evidence of the efforts of the Soviet Union to befoul the Olympic games, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a very illuminating article which appeared in the sports columns of the New York Times on Sunday, April 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET UNION MOBILIZING ATHLETES PRIOR TO 1956 OLYMPIC GAMES—INTENSIVE DRILLS SLATED THIS YEAR—RUSSIA SETS UP VAST SPORTS PROGRAM, WITH TESTS TO BE HELD ALL OVER NATION

(By Clifton Daniel)

Moscow, March 21.—They say in Moscow that it has not yet been decided whether the Soviet Union will take part in the next Olympic Games in Australia. However, the Russians will be ready in '56.

Moscow's sports authorities have already been alerted by the showing of Soviet sportsmen in the past winter's competitions—they suffered reverses in speed skating, skiing, and ice hockey—and have begun to make plans for improving their performance.

Mentioning the Olympics, the newspaper Trud, publication of the trade unions, said today that "to carry the banner of Soviet sports through the coming international competitions with honor, serious, meticulous preparation is necessary, a mobilization of all the forces of the sporting organizations of our country."

Plans for such a mobilization have already been laid. During this year and next the whole sports manpower—and womanpower—of the Soviet Union will be assembled, reviewed, and tested in a vast series of competitions.

If Soviet athletes then appear in Australia, they should be formidable bidders for team supremacy. If they fail, it will not be for lack of preparation.

NOT CONSIDERED BY FANS

Even 5 years ago sports fans had scarcely considered the possibility the Soviet Union, which was so rarely represented in international competition, would emerge as one of the top contenders for world honors.

The appearance of Soviet athletes as serious challengers at the Helsinki Olympics, at ski meets in Switzerland, at the Henley regatta, and in almost every other field of sports took other contestants—and spectators—by surprise.

At Helsinki the Soviet competitors won 38 gold medals, 54 silver medals, and 16 bronze.

At the moment Soviet athletes claim 85 world records, not all yet confirmed by international bodies.

During the past 5 years, Soviet sportsmen have battered their own country's records—more than 2,000 times and have broken world marks more than 200 times, according to the record books here.

How did it happen?

The answer very simply is that the Soviet Union takes sports seriously, probably more seriously than any other country in the world. It spends more time, effort, and money on athletics than anyone else.

A POLITICAL ASPECT

This intense attention to sports, like almost everything else in the country, has a political and ideological aspect.

"The Communist Party and Government consider physical culture and sport as one of the means of Communist education of the working people, strengthening their health and their preparation for work and the defense of the Socialist fatherland," the daily newspaper Sovietsky Sport has remarked.

"Massiveness," it said, "is the characteristic feature of Soviet sport."

Facts and figures underline the point:

There are now in the Soviet Union 1,200 stadiums and 55,000 other physical culture and sports establishments such as gymnasiums, swimming pools, ski runs, hostels for hikers, and so on.

Physical education is compulsory in all schools. In addition, 120,000 children attend 180 special sports schools.

Theoretically, every able-bodied Soviet citizen should strive for some degree of proficiency in physical culture. The movement called Ready for Work and the Defense of the U. S. S. R. sets norms of athletic achievement for all ages up to and beyond 46.

VAST TRAINING PROGRAM

The country has 13 institutes for training physical education teachers and coaches. Instruction in physical education also is given in teachers' training institutes. Altogether, these institutes have 40,000 students.

There are 350,000 volunteer amateur physical education instructors, trainers, and coaches in the country.

Almost every large institution—whether factory, farm, Government office, or department store—has a physical culture "collective" to which all the athletes in the institution belong. Even the farmers have their organizations with millions of members.

The number of such "collectives" has grown from 37,000 in 1948 to 62,000 in 1954, and the number of members has tripled.

Sports clubs are organized under the auspices of the trade unions, which spend 20 to 25 percent of their funds for athletics. Every big trade union has its own nationwide network of clubs, the names of which—Dynamo, Spartak, and so on—are now familiar abroad.

Aside from trade-union funds, the Soviet Government has appropriated this year more than 30 billion rubles for public health and physical culture.

Sports activities of various kinds are coordinated for the country as a whole by the All-Soviet Union Sports Committee, which operates directly under the Soviet Council of Ministers—that is, the cabinet.

The committee oversees the expenditure of all Government funds for physical culture. It arranges the annual sports schedule and championships, determines qualifications for sportsmen, oversees the physical education program in the schools, supervises the training of coaches, conducts scientific research in sports problems, provides sports facilities for the general public, and so on.

The committee has branches throughout the country, and keeps on the lookout for competitors wherever they may be.

All this activity means that Soviet athletes are generally ready for competition at any time. M. M. Peslyak, one of the vice chairmen of the sport committee, remarked the other day, "There is nothing new or cardinally different in preparing for the Olympic games as compared with our general preparations."

THREE WEEKS TRAINING

Soviet athletes, he said, are expected to train all year. If, for example, an ice skater has no facilities for skating in summer, he is expected to maintain his general physical condition and to participate in some other form of competition to keep in trim for his specialty.

"If a sportsman doesn't keep to this," Peslyak remarked, "he isn't a sportsman at all."

If and when the Soviet Union decides to go to the Olympics, the various sections of the sports committee, each affiliated with its international counterpart, will select teams. These teams will have 3 weeks of special training before leaving for Melbourne.

In the meanwhile, the trade-union clubs will be holding competitions all over the Soviet Union this year. The games will come to a climax in August with an all-Union "Spartakiada" (the name is taken from ancient Sparta, whose people were renowned for endurance) in the Dynamo Stadium in Moscow.

Next year an even more comprehensive Spartakiada of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. will take place in a great new stadium to be built in a bend of the Moscow River.

Elimination contests will be held at factories and farms, in districts, towns, regions, and republics, among sports clubs and student groups.

Finally, teams of the best athletes from each of the 16 Soviet Republics and from the 2 largest cities, Leningrad and Moscow, will meet here in July and August for the all-Soviet Union championships in 20 different games and classes of sports.

The Spartakiada champions would surely present a formidable challenge at Melbourne.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, which follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Talk, talk, talk. Endless talk. Repetitious talk. Droning on, never seeming to stop.

That is often the popular conception of Congress at work, or, for that matter, of any legislative body outside the Iron Curtain or other totalitarian areas. Democracy in action seems to mean, and seems to require, millions upon millions of words and hours upon hours of debate to settle anything or to settle nothing.

We find it in the PTA meeting as well as in the township commission, city council, State legislature, or the Congress—in other words, wherever people who are free to do so gather to agree (if they can) on common action in their mutual interest.

Is all of this talk necessary? Perhaps yes, perhaps no. Of course, we must allow all sides to be heard, but must we encourage them all to speak at such great length? Is anyone convinced of anything about 8 minutes or 15 or 20?

Have you ever heard a speaker rise and say he really had nothing important to say—and then take a half hour to prove it?

On the other hand, have you ever had the delightful experience of hearing someone who had risen to speak reluctantly and after much prodding, as if fearful of wasting the listener's time, compress into a few minutes a whole philosophy, and a thrilling outlook on life, and leave you almost breathless in the inspiration you have felt from this?

I think we can agree that an experience of this kind happens quite seldom. Usually we are deluged with dull talk, bored to tears with the deadly use of stale phrases, made to feel almost on the edge of our nerves' capacity to endure by the long arguments over nonessentials.

On the other hand, out of this freedom to bore each other in public speech, and to argue endlessly with each other in public forums, comes the solid basis of our freedom, because—seldom though it seems to happen—out of this comes the occasional burst of brilliance which lights our way through difficult paths of public policy.

I sometimes fret over the excessive talk in the Congress and when I saw the official résumé of congressional activity for the period from January 5 through July 31 of this year, I shuddered in the thought of all of the millions of words we had to listen to.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in that period, carried more than 16,000 pages of proceedings and extraneous matter. Estimated roughly at about 2,000 words per page, it runs to nearly 33 million words.

Of course, not all those words were spoken. Much of this material is merely placed in the RECORD for the subsequent review by those Members interested in reading it. This took up 5,642 pages of RECORD Appendix. But the nearly 6,000 pages of proceedings in the Senate represent probably 10 or 12 million words actually spoken by the 96 Senators, whereas the 4,868 pages of proceedings in the House would represent perhaps 6 or 8 million words actually spoken by the 435 House Members. While we in the House did not talk as much as the Senators did, and while we maintain a strict limitation on debate in the House in contrast to the unlimited debate in the Senate, we still had 456 hours and 58 minutes of talk, talk, talk in the House in the 6 months up to July 31, and that does not count the many, many additional hours of debate and hearings in committee.

Some of the more critical Members refer to all of this by the somewhat inelegant term "yakity yak."

No matter what you term it, it is a lot of talk. Some would dismiss it as sound and fury, signifying nothing. But occasionally—just every once in a long while—there is meaning, and inspiration, and enlightenment, and the pure delight of fine speech and real eloquence in all of this wordage. And that makes it all worthwhile.

Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1st session of the 84th Congress is drawing to a close, it is appropriate that we look back over the past year and appraise the accomplishments of this legislative body.

In the field of Federal employee benefits, the 84th Congress has established an unprecedented record. It has approved more legislation than any similar session in history. As there are nearly 2½ million Federal workers in this country, this legislation will have far-reaching effects upon the economy and welfare of our citizenry. In order for the Government to serve its people effectively, it must be staffed by loyal and competent employees, and I believe that the laws enacted by this Congress will do much to restore, protect, and improve the dignity, prestige, and morale of those citizens who have chosen the Federal service as their life work.

As it is my honor and privilege to represent in the House of Representatives a State which has one of the highest percentages of Federal employees in the Nation, I have followed this legislation with a great deal of interest. I should like at this time to summarize the major beneficial laws that were enacted by this session.

PAY RAISES

A record number of pay increases were voted by this Congress. Raises were granted to 500,000 postal workers and to more than 1 million classified employees. The pay boosts to the postal employees were combined with a job reclassification system and averaged 8.1 percent. The classified employee received an across-the-board increase of 7.5 percent. This was the first general increase given to these groups since July 1951.

CARRIER STATUS

By the enactment of Public Law 380, more than 50,000 Government indefinite employees were given career status. The new law opens the way for career status to indefinite employees who have passed civil-service examinations and who have completed at least 3 years of satisfactory Federal service. The employees must be recommended by their agencies to the Civil Service Commission to obtain career status.

RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Two major measures were passed in the field of retirement legislation. The first bill would raise the pensions of Foreign Service members who retired prior to July 1, 1945, by 25 percent, and this increase would gradually be cut back to 5 percent for those who retired after July 1, 1948.

The second measure would increase the annuities of the 300,000 civil-service retirees and survivors. It provides for an increase of 12 percent on the first $1,500 and 8 percent on the balance for employees who had retired prior to July 1, and by lesser amounts thereafter for those retiring.

DUAL COMPENSATION

The approval of H. R. 5893 provided for an increase in the dual compensation limit for military retirees in both Federal civilian salaries and military retirement from $3,000 to $10,000.

S. 2403, which authorized dual employment of custodial employees in post-office buildings operated by the General Services Administration was also approved.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

Legislation was approved to increase the maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expense from $9 to $12 and to raise the mileage allowance from 7 cents to 10 cents a mile.

INSURANCE

Legislation was approved to authorize the Government to take over the 135,000 life insurance policies held by employee beneficial associations for present and former Federal employees.

SURETY BONDS

Approval of H. R. 4778 authorized Federal agencies to pay for blanket bonds to cover their employees. Prior to the passage of this measure, employees whose jobs required them to be bonded had to pay for their own bond premiums.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCES

The passage of Public Law 37 makes the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act applicable to all Federal employees who are required to wear a prescribed uniform, thereby extending the up-to-$100 annual allowance to additional employees.

LOYALTY PROVISIONS

The Congress wrote into a single bill the many provisions which appeared in the various appropriation bills to prohibit employment by the Government of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government.

STATE RETIREMENT

A measure to extend civil-service retirement benefits to former District and State government employees was passed by both houses but failed to gain the approval of the President. In his veto message, the Chief Executive said that he would substitute a proposal at the next session to bring Federal employees under the social-security system, thereby giving Federal and State employees the common base of retirements sought by this measure and avoiding the disadvantages of civil-service expansion.

Report to the Constituents of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to remain in close

contact with the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I have the honor to serve. I have attempted to let all of its residents know that the office here in Washington and the Brooklyn office in the Federal Building have been open to them at all times. It has been my aim to assist them in their problems with the Federal Government. At the same time I have attended, congressional duties permitting, meetings, functions and gatherings in order that I may know more intimately the people I represent in Washington. My aim is to cement a close relationship between the Congressman and his constituents.

On Saturdays I have been in my Brooklyn office to receive all who wished to discuss their problems with me personally. During the week, it was my pleasure to receive in Washington, the Brooklyn visitors who called on me.

I have made every effort to have some contact with as many of my constituents as possible. To this end, and shortly after President Eisenhower delivered his state of the Union message, I mailed a questionnaire to the voters of the district requesting that they express their opinions concerning the legislative program outlined by the President.

I deeply appreciate the assistance I received from the thousands of voters who replied. And in that connection, I should like to call attention to the wisdom of the great Irish statesman, Edmund Burke, who in stating what a Representative should be and what a constituent should expect of his Representative, one wrote:

> A Representative should live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitting attention * * * but a Representative's unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to any man, or to any men living. * * * Your Representative owes you not his industry only, but also his judgment.

Now that the first session of the 84th Congress has wound up its work, I consider it both fitting and proper that the people of my district should know how I have served them. I have therefore drawn up this report which I now submit to the House. It is my intention to have it circulated as widely as possible throughout the 12th Congressional District of New York so that the people may know of the activities of their Representative.

In the short span of 7 months, the length of the congressional session this year, my office has sent out a total of 163,000 pieces of mail. Of this, 150,000 were the questionnaire. The remaining 13,000 letters were in direct reply to mail received from the district, and my communications with the executive agencies. This total, when broken down further shows that an average of 86 letters per workday go out to and in behalf of the people I am privileged to serve.

During this session I have personally introduced numerous pieces of legislation. A vital measure which I am firmly convinced should be enacted is one to revise the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, so that foreign governments will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

Another very important piece of legislation which I have sponsored is an amendment to the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which wives and widows may qualify for benefits under the law.

Still another important bill I have introduced is an amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, to increase the annuities of retired Federal employees. This did pass the Congress and was signed by the President. The House bill did not carry my name, but rather a committee bill was acted upon; however, the provisions were identical.

Another bill I introduced is designed to prevent the pollution of waters in nearby regions. The passage of this legislation would make it unlawful to dump in the ocean chemicals and other materials harmful to fishing.

As a result of a bill introduced by me, President Eisenhower was authorized and gave to Irving Berlin in January 1955, a gold medal in recognition of his services in composing many patriotic songs, including God Bless America, which became popular during World War II. This was following a precedent created by a similar act in 1936, authorizing the presentation of a medal to George M. Cohan.

Among other legislation introduced by me and now pending before their respective committees are: An act calling for the erecting of a monument in honor of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid—through extensive research I have found that this famous naval hero is the actual designer of the American flag as it is today—he is buried in an unmarked grave in our own Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn; an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, which would increase the penalty for transmitting false distress signals by radio—I am sure everyone recognizes the necessity for the tightening of the present law, because of the recent hoax.

An accomplishment of which I am very proud is one involving the religious designation placed by the armed services on members' "dog tags." Formerly, any religion other than "C," Catholic; "J," Jewish; and "P," Protestant, was designated by a mere "X." Members of the Eastern Orthodox faith felt that this made them second-class personnel in the Armed Forces, and asked my assistance in getting the Department of Defense to permit the addition of "E. O.", Eastern Orthodox, as authorized initials for the tags. Though I introduced a bill to provide for this, it was not necessary to be acted upon, for I was able to persuade the Secretary of the Army that this was a reasonable request. The necessary regulations have now been issued providing that all religious denominations have a letter designation on the "dog tags" of the armed services personnel.

During this past session also, I was pleased that the culmination of my 3 years of work in behalf of the tenants of Vanderveer housing which resulted in the recent replacement of the old board of directors by members of the Federal Housing Administration. It is hoped that this will eventually improve the living conditions and lower the rents for the tenants of Vanderveer.

Although the 84th Congress was under the control of a Democrat majority, the Republicans have managed to get enacted much of the program requested by the President. The bulk of the administration's defense program was approved. So, too, was its housing program. We were able to defeat a Democrat-sponsored measure to restore the 90-percent-of-parity agriculture support bill. Its passage would have increased food prices to the consumers and in turn raised the cost of living.

The President's program for the distribution of the Salk vaccine to eligible children and expectant mothers was passed. Additional funds for the construction of schools were appropriated, for areas affected by Federal activities. Many measures for the benefit of veterans were enacted with bipartisan support. By this means also, we were able to obtain pay raises for Federal employees, postal employees, and an increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees.

It is pleasant at this point to note that the Republican administration has continued to wage the peace. This has been done by the initiation and persistence of a strong foreign policy based on firmness and strength.

On the domestic scene the Republican administration has helped to produce the greatest era of prosperity that the world has ever known. The transition from the war economy of the Korean conflict to a peacetime economy has taken place without sacrificing prosperity. Government wage, price, rent, and materials controls have come to an end. The cost of living has been stabilized.

In the preceeding paragraphs I have tried to show you, the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York how I have personally tried to serve you. You are the people who elected me to represent you in the Congress of the United States. If there is any way in which I can be of service to you in my congressional capacity, please do not hesitate to call upon me. Both my Washington and Brooklyn offices remain open. I have a competent staff, and my services and theirs are yours. I want you to know that even when the Congress is not in session, I am on the job.

Split-Level Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Split-Level Government," appearing in the July 11, 1955, issue of the Salisbury Times of Salisbury, Md., places the concept of Federal-State

responsibilities in unusually clear focus, particularly in the context of these times.

As a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, whose recommendations formed the basis of this editorial, I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPLIT-LEVEL GOVERNMENT

The long-awaited report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, most important of the commissions set up by the Eisenhower administration, was worth waiting for. It has cleared up a mischievous fallacy.

The fallacy is that friction between the Federal Government and State and local governments indicate they must always be in competition. This has caused thoughtless critics to reach the conclusion there should be steps taken to get rid of one or the other governments in order get rid of the friction.

Thus, home rule and State's rights zealots have blamed everything on the Federal Government and yearned to trim its wings. Ultranationalists have blamed everything on the provincialism of "local yokels" and yearned for Federal authoritarianism.

Under the moderate chairmanship of Meyer Kestnbaum, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—a group of 25 earnest experts—reached the moderate and obviously sensible conclusion that Americans rely equally on local, State, and Federal Governments and that each level of government should be strengthened, therefore, not weakened.

This runs contrary to the prejudice of everybody who yearns to knock out one level of government to enhance the authority of a competitor. It justifies the labor and the cost of the report, the first official study of its kind since the deliberations in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, when the issue of federalism versus nationalism first was debated.

In total effect, the report's recommendations all partake of the same philosophy—that only fools think there can be easy answers to difficult problems. The difficulties that almost baffled the Founding Fathers are still intact. The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has made numerous recommendations to regularize the operation of split-level government, but it has successfully resisted the temptation to think they can be solved by razzle-dazzle extremism.

Veterans' Administration Hospital in Washington, D. C., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of Col. Waldron E. Leonard, president, Metropolitan Area Council of Veterans' Organizations, I have received the unanimous resolution of the council urging the appropriation of necessary funds for the construction of a new veterans' hospital to serve this area. The need is real and with the civil-defense question clarified, I hope that we shall see definite progress toward achieving this goal during the current year. This hospital is listed in the Veterans' Administration long-range plan for replacement. Under permission previously granted, I include the text of the resolution and signers thereof:

Whereas veterans' organizations in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area have repeatedly gone on record of supporting a veterans' hospital in the metropolitan area; and

Whereas the Council of Veterans' Organizations of the Metropolitan Area, which membership consists of the commanders of veterans' organizations, did express unanimous approval to request funds be allocated and approved by the budget committee for the construction of a hospital in the metropolitan area: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this action be forwarded to the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives, with the request that he contact the Veterans' Administration and ask that this construction be included in their budget now being prepared; and that similar resolutions be made available to interested parties and Members of Congress, seeking their support for this project.

Louis G. Zindel, Jr., District of Columbia Department Commander, American Legion; Samuel J. Flicksinger, Catholic War Veterans of America, Inc.; Morgan D. Bingham, District of Columbia Department, Disabled American Veterans; John Wilson, Department Commander, USWV; W. G. Copley, Past Department Commander; Elvin M. Luskey, Past Department Commander; Paul E. Reider, Camp Commander, Astor No. 6; John A. Martin, Past Department Commander; Robert W. Livingston, Urell Camp; John F. MacAboy, Past Department Commander; Glen Seamans, Urell Camp; Peter Roesle, Hardin Camp No. 2, Wm. G. Stirb, Past Commander, Miles Camp No. 1; Wm. F. Smith, Urell Camp; O. Bailey, Past Department Commander; E. A. Johnson, Department Adjutant; W. Townsend Raplee, Commander, 10th District, American Legion, Department of Virginia; William A. Hickey, Jr., Irish War Veterans, United States of America; Sidney S. Haines, AMVETS, District of Columbia Department; James P. O'Laughlin, Mount Vernon Chapter No. 22, Military Order of the Purple Heart; Bernard Hipperman, Jewish War Veterans of U. S. A.; Francis C. Wood, Department Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Patrick T. Ryan, Army and Navy Legion of Valor; Robert L. Moran, Department of Virginia, 10th District, Veterans of Foreign Wars; David L. Brigham, Department Vice Commander, South Maryland District, American Legion.

Conservation of Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, on several past occasions I have commented on legislation enacted by the 84th Congress which provides for the multiple use of the surface resources of our public lands, provides for their more efficient administration, and amends the mining laws to curtail abuses of those laws by a few individuals who usually are not miners.

This legislation, which may be officially cited as the act of July 23, 1955—Public Law 167, 84th Congress, 69th Statutes at Large, page 367—deals with a matter of vital interest to the people of Nevada and our other Western States. It is of interest to all of the people of the United States because the resources of the public domain belong to them.

The House Interior Committee, in reporting H. R. 5891, and the Congress in approving this bill which became Public Law 167, made clear their determination to assure maximum utilization, and conservation of all of the public domain surface and subsurface resources—minerals, materials, timber, grass, recreation, water, fish, wildlife, and waterfowl. Operation of this new law with respect to vegetable and mineral values was discussed in my remarks of July 30, 1955. Today, I address myself to its effect on our fish, wildlife, and waterfowl resource values.

EFFECT ON HUNTING, FISHING, AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT OF MINING LAW ABUSES

In our report accompanying H. R. 5891 to the House, the Interior Committee pointed up some of the abuses under the mining laws at which this legislation is aimed. Examples cited, together with testimony on the bill, make it clear that detrimental effects on hunting, fishing, and wildlife management come about primarily because of the activities of two groups of pseudominers which I will call first, antifishing and antihunting mining locators; and, second, antimining fishermen and hunters.

In the first group are those miners who make a location, promptly post it with a "no trespassing" sign, and thus deny access to the located lands by agents of the Federal Government charged with the responsibility of managing wild game habitat or improving a fishing stream; blocked, too, is access to adjacent lands. Mining claims located astraddle fishing streams, or flanking hunting areas—when posted—serve to thwart effective management and the desirable controlled harvest by hunters and fishermen of our fish and wildlife resources.

In the second group are those individuals who combine a desire to hunt or fish with a declared interest in mining. A group of fishermen-prospectors will locate a good stream, stake out successive mining claims flanking the stream, post their mining claims with "no trespassing" signs, and proceed to enjoy their own private fishing camp. So, too, with hunter-prospectors, except that their blocked-out mining claims embrace wildlife habitats; posted, they constitute excellent hunting camps.

The multiple effect of activities of both such groups is obvious; a waste of valuable resources of the surface on lands embraced within claims made for a purpose other than mining; for lands adjacent to such locations, fish, wildlife, and recreational values wasted or destroyed because of increased cost of manage-

ment, difficulty of administration, or inaccessibility; the activities of a relatively few pseudominers reflecting on the legitimate mining industry and, of course, nothing added to our mineral or material wealth through mining activity.

The provisions of Public Law 167 deal directly with such abuses.

OPERATION OF PUBLIC LAW 167

Subsection (b) of section 4 of Public Law 167 is aimed directly at ending abuses such as those described in the foregoing comments. It provides that hereafter located claims under the mining laws shall be subject, prior to patent issuance, to the right of the United States to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources thereof and to manage other surface resources, except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws. This subsection also makes such claims subject, prior to issuance of patent, to the right of the United States, its permittees and licensees, to use so much of the location surface as may be necessary for access to adjacent lands.

With respect to the reservations in the United States to use the surface and surface resources, particular attention is called to the proviso which qualifies them:

Any use of the surface of any such mining claim by the United States, its permittees, or licensees, shall be such as not to endanger or materially interfere with prospecting, mining, or processing operations or uses reasonably incident thereto.

I do not believe I can improve upon the statement by Mr. Charles H. Callison, the eminent and articulate conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, with respect to the effect of section 4 (b). In his appearance before our committee, after citing examples of abuses at which this particular provision is directed, Mr. Callison declared:

We interpret the language of section 4 (b) * * * as corrective of this situation. A claimant who files pursuant to this act will not be able legally to post his claim against trespass by hunters or fishermen. He cannot deny access to the Federal Government or its licensees or permittees when access is intended for the purpose of harvesting or otherwise managing the fish and wildlife resources, so long, of course, as such access does not "endanger or materially interfere with prospecting, mining, or processing operations or uses reasonably incident thereto."

The foregoing applies to mining claims located after July 23, 1955.

With respect to claims located before the effective date of Public Law 167, dealt with in sections 5 and 6 of the act, the restrictions and limitations of section 4 would apply only in two instances: First, when—after compliance by the responsible Federal agency with the carefully drawn notice requirements—the claimant actually receiving notice of the initiation of the quiet title action provided for—fails to submit a statement setting forth pertinent information as to his claim, and thereby constructively waives his right to not come under the provisions of section 4; and second, when, under the provisions of section 6 of the act, the owner of any unpatented mining claim made before the date of the act, actually waives and relinquishes his right to not come under the restrictions and limitations of section 4.

Understanding on the part of the public of these desirable provisions of Public Law 167 will, I am confident, add substantially to our ability to conserve and utilize to the maximum all of our public domain resources.

H. R. 6263

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has added an amendment to H. R. 6263 changing the definition of "personal holding company" in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Section 542 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—defining the term "personal holding company"—provides for treating charitable foundations or trusts as "individuals" in determining the stock ownership test for personal holding companies. This provision was new in the 1954 code and is so broad in its wording as to include investment companies which have been wholly owned by charitable foundations for many years and would thereby for the first time require treatment of such investment companies as personal holding companies.

Certain long-established charitable trusts have, solely for business reasons, owned and controlled certain of their investments through the means of a separately formed investment company. Such company is, of course, subject to payment of the customary Federal income taxes and is used as a matter of convenience in the businesslike handling and development of enterprises requiring additional capital from time to time in their expanding activities. If such organzations are to come under the rule for personal holding companies then they would become subject to the penalty tax applicable thereto. This would make it impracticable to conduct their activities on a normal business basis involving carefully planned reinvestment to provide required capital to meet the needs of growth situations such as public utilities with resulting expansion of income. The alternative would require dissolution of such investment companies which would deprive the Federal Government of the income tax now being paid by such companies.

The Senate amendment amends this provision of the 1954 code in a limited manner so that certain long-established charitable foundations may retain the tax status under which they have operated for many years.

The Senate amendment amends section 542 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which deals with certain charitable foundations. Three conditions must be met. The foundation must be organized or created before July 1, 1950. Second, at all times on or after July 1, 1950, through the close of the taxable year such foundation must own all of the common stock and at least 80 percent of the total number of shares of all other classes of stock of the corporation. Thirdly, such foundation must not be denied exemption under section 504 or such trust must not be denied the unlimited charitable deduction under section 681 (c) and, for this purpose, the income of the investment company is treated as though distributed to the foundation or trust to the extent of their proportionate interest in income available for distribution as dividends. Also, for purposes of this last condition it is provided that the restrictions in sections 504 (a) (1) and 681 (c) (1) of the 1954 code against unreasonable accumulations will not apply to income attributable to property of a decedent dying before January 1, 1951, which was transferred, either to an inter vivos trust during his lifetime or was transferred under his will to such trust.

This Senate amendment applies only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

Mr. Speaker, a bill to accomplish the same purpose as the Senate amendment was introduced by my distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH]. I might also state that I brought the problem to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means, where it was considered fully. I have no hesitancy in stating that our committee would have favorably reported out a bill to take care of this problem had not the Senate adopted this amendment. Under these circumstances, I urge the House to accept the Senate amendment.

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Nassau County, N. Y. It is a continuing pleasure for me to represent such a fine district, and I feel that my constituents should have readily available to them my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

This record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. It collects in one place information which otherwise can be found only by studying thousands of pages of the RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills are for identification purposes only and I have not attempted to describe them in detail or to dwell upon the issues involved.

They do not, therefore, always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. I shall, however, be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, the issues involved, and the reasons for my vote, upon request. The footnotes at the end of this record will indicate the reasons for any absences.

Voting and Attendance Record, Representative STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, 2d District, New York, 84th Cong., 1st Sess.

Roll-call No.	Date	Subject and action taken	Vote
	1955		
1	Jan. 5	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 5	Election of Speaker (Rayburn 228, Martin 198)	MARTIN.
3	Jan. 25	H. J. Res. 159, authorizing President to employ Armed Forces of United States for protecting Formosa, etc. (Passed 410 to 3.)	Yes.
4	Jan. 27	H. R. 587, to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. (Passed 366 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
5	Feb. 8	H. R. 3005, to extend Universal Military Training and Service Act and Dependents' Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. (Passed 394 to 4.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 16	H. R. 3828, to adjust salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress. (Passed 283 to 118.)	Yes.
7	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
8	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142, motion to end debate on question of a closed rule on H. R. 1. (Defeated 207 to 178.)	Yes.
9	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142, to permit 5 hours of debate and amendments from the floor on H. R. 1. (Defeated 193 to 191.)	No.
10	Feb. 17	H. Res. 142, closed rule on H. R. 1 to prohibit amendments from floor. (Passed 193 to 192.)	Yes.
11	Feb. 18	H. R. 1, motion to recommit to committee with instructions to amend to require President to comply with recommendations of Tariff Commission except when national security is involved. (Defeated 206 to 199.)	No.
12	Feb. 18	H. R. 1, to extend for 3 years authority of the President to enter into trade agreements, final passage. (Passed 295 to 110.)	Yes.
13	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[2]
14	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
15	Feb. 25	H. R. 4259, motion to recommit to Committee on Ways and Means in order to delete provision calling for $20 credit against individual income tax for each personal exemption in tax year 1955. (Defeated 210 to 205.)	Yes.
16	Feb. 25	H. R. 4259, to provide 1 year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and to provide a $20 tax credit against individual income tax for each personal exemption. (Passed 242 to 175.)	No.
17	Mar. 1	H. R. 3828, conference report on bill to adjust salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress. (Passed 223 to 113.)	Yes.
18	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
19	Mar. 10	H. R. 4720, to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Yes.
20	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
21	Mar. 18	H. R. 4903, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1955, for an additional $4 million for United States contributions to United Nations program of technical assistance. (Passed 175 to 107.)	Not voting.[3]
22	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
23	Mar. 21	H. R. 4644, to increase postal employees' salaries an average of 7.5 percent. Suspension of the Rules. (Defeated 302 to 120.)	No.
24	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 21	H. R. 4951, directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for 1955–56. (Defeated 260 to 152.)	No.
26	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 22	H. Res. 170, to disapprove of the disposal of some of the Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants. (Defeated 283 to 132.)	No.
28	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
29	Mar. 23	H. Res. 171, to disapprove of disposal of some of the Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants, as recommended by Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission report. (Defeated 276 to 137.)	No.
30	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 30	H. R. 4259, conference report extending corporate and excise taxes for 1 year and deleting the $20 income tax credit for each taxpayer and his dependents. (Passed 387 to 8.)	Yes.
34	Mar. 30	H. R. 5240, amendment to restore a provision limiting to $1 per month the fee to educational institutions for reports on veterans. (Defeated 227 to 154.)	Yes.
35	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
37	Apr. 20	H. R. 4644, amendment to the postal pay raise which would increase the annual rate for certain classes of employees and raise the overall increase from 7.5 to 8.2 percent. (Passed 224 to 189.)	No.
38	Apr. 20	H. R. 4644, motion to recommit to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Defeated 287 to 125.)	Yes.
39	Apr. 20	H. R. 4644, on final passage of the bill as amended to grant a postal pay raise of 8.2 percent. (Passed 324 to 85.)	No.
40	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
41	Apr. 21	H. R. 4393, to provide for construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels. (Passed 373 to 3.)	Yes.
42	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
46	May 5	H. R. 12, amendment to remove peanuts as one of the basic commodities in the farm price-support program. (Defeated 215 to 193.)	Yes.
47	May 5	H. R. 12 to recommit to Committee on Agriculture. (Defeated 212 to 199.)	Yes.
48	May 5	H. R. 12, to restore the 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities. (Passed 206 to 201.)	No.
49	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 9	S. 1, to recommit conference report on the postal pay raise bills to conference committee. (Defeated 275 to 118.)	Yes.
51	May 9	S. 1, on final passage of conference report on postal pay raise bills. (Passed 328 to 66.)	No.
52	May 9	H. Res. 223, to authorize consideration of the bill to permit statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. (Passed 323 to 66.)	No.
53	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 10	H. R. 2535, to recommit to committee the bill authorizing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. (Passed 218 to 170.)	Yes.
58	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
59	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
61	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
62	May 12	H. R. 6042, appropriations for the Department of Defense, amendment deleting language requiring approval of congressional committee prior to disposal or transfer of work traditionally performed by civilian employees of Department of Defense. (Defeated 202 to 184.)	Yes.
63	May 12	H. R. 6042, papropriations for the Department of Defense, final passage. (Passed 384 to 0.)	Yes.
64	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
68	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 23	S. 727, to increase the salaries of judges for the District of Columbia. (Passed 283 to 33.)	Yes.
70	May 25	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
71	May 25	H. Res. 244, to create a select committee to investigate the White County, Ind., Bridge Commission. (Passed 205 to 166.)	Not voting.[4]
72	May 25	H. R. 2851, to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to needy persons in areas of acute distress. (Passed 344 to 1.)	Not voting.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
74	May 26	S. 727, to recommit to conference committee a bill which would raise salaries of District of Columbia judges to an amount greater than previously voted by the House. (Passed 170 to 165.)	Not voting.[4]
75	May 26	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
76	May 26	H. R. 5881, to recommit to committee the bill which provides for Federal compensation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal reclamation projects in order to limit the scope of the bill to 17 Western States instead of all 48 States. (Defeated 229 to 62.)	Not voting.[4]
77	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
78	June 1	H. R. 3990, to recommit to committee the bill which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to investigate projects for conservation, development, utilization of the water resources of Alaska. (Defeated 278 to 79.)	No.
79	June 7	S. 2061, to increase salaries in the postal service by an average of 8 percent and to provide for reclassification. (Passed 410 to 1.)	Yes.
80	June 8	H. R. 5923, to authorize an appropriation to complete the Inter-American Highway. (Passed 353 to 13.)	Yes.
81	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.

Footnotes at end of tables.

Voting and Attendance Record, Representative STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, 2d District, New York, 84th Cong., 1st Sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Subject and action taken	Vote
83	June 14	H. R. 1, acceptance of conference report on the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. (Passed 347 to 54.)	Yes.
84	June 14	H. R. 6227, to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies. (Passed 371 to 24.)	No.
85	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 15	H. Res. 210, to authorize an investigation of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board. (Defeated 214 to 178.)	No.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
88	June 20	S. 67, to increase salaries of civil service employees by about 7.5 percent. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Yes.
89	June 20	H. Con. Res. 109, authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference. (Passed 337 to 31.)	Yes.
90	June 20	H. R. 6205, to raise the per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses for Federal employees from $9 to $13. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Yes.
91	June 21	H. R. 4663, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, and to authorize an appropriation of $225 million therefor. (Passed 230 to 153.)	No.
92	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 22	H. R. 6040, to recommit to committee the customs simplification bill with instructions to strike out sec. 2, which would make export value the primary basis for assessing ad valorem duties. (Defeated 232 to 143.)	No.
94	June 23	H. Con. Res. 149, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yes.
95	June 27	H. R. 6992, to extend for 1 year the existing temporary ceiling on the public debt of $281 billion. (Passed 267 to 56.)	Yes.
96	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 27	H. R. 6829, to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations. (Passed 316 to 2.)	Yes.
98	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 28	H. R. 3005, to recommit the conference report to committee. (Defeated 221 to 171.)	No.
100	June 28	H. R. 3005, to extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years and to extend the Doctors-Dentists Draft Act for 2 years. (Passed 389 to 5.)	Yes.
101	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
103	June 29	S. 727, to recommit the conference report on the bill which adjusts the salaries of the judges of the courts of the District of Columbia. (Defeated 226 to 158.)	No.
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
105	June 30	S. 2000, to authorize appropriations for and carry forward the mutual security program. (Passed 273 to 128.)	Yes.
106	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
109	July 6	H. R. 3210, to recommit the bill which would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. (Defeated 316 to 74.)	Yes.
110	July 7	S. 2090, to adopt conference report authorizing appropriations for the mutual security program. (Passed 262 to 120.)	Yes.
111	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 11	H. R. 7224, to authorize appropriations for mutual security during fiscal year 1956. (Passed 251 to 123.)	Yes.
113	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 13	H. R. 6766, to adopt conference report authorizing appropriations for the AEC, TVA, and certain agencies of the Departments of the Interior and the Army, including a reduction in funds available to the Atomic Energy Commission and an additional 107 unbudgeted projects for which engineering studies were uncompleted. (Passed 316 to 92.)	No.
115	July 13	H. Res. 295, to provide for consideration of H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. (Passed 376 to 24.)	Yes.
116	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
118	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
119	July 18	H. R. 7225, to amend the Social Security Act to extend coverage to certain disabled persons who are at least 50 years of age, to women at 62 years of age, to certain disabled children over 18 years of age, and to certain occupational groups. (Passed 372 to 31.)	Yes.
120	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
121	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
123	July 19	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
124	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
125	July 20	H. R. 7214, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective Mar. 1, 1956. (Passed 362 to 54.)	Yes.
126	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
127	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
129	July 25	H. R. 7000, to agree to the conference report on the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. (Passed 315 to 78.)	Yes.
130	July 26	H. Res. 314, to provide for 3 hours' debate on H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill. (Passed 274 to 129.)	Yes.
131	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 27	H. R. 7474, to recommit this highway bill to committee and to substitute therefor the administration bond financing proposal for highway construction. (Defeated 221 to 193.)	Yes.
133	July 27	H. R. 7474, final passage on the highway construction bill, which included the increasing of certain taxes. (Defeated 202 to 123.)	No.
134	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
135	July 28	H. Res. 317, to provide for 3 hours of general debate on H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. (Passed 273 to 135.)	Yes.
136	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
137	July 28	H. R. 6645, to recommit to committee the amendment to the Natural Gas Act. (Defeated 210 to 203.)	Yes.
138	July 28	H. R. 6645, on final passage of bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, to remove from control of the Federal Power Commission natural gas producers and gatherers. (Passed 209 to 203.)	No.
139	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 29	S. 2126, to adopt Wolcott amendment to the Housing Act of 1955, which struck authorization of 135,000 public housing units. (Passed 217 to 188.)	Yes.
141	July 29	S. 2126, on final passage of the Housing Act of 1955. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Yes.
142	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
143	Aug. 1	H. Res. 299, to grant to the Small Business Committee on additional $35,000 for operating expenses. (Passed 231 to 134.)	No.
144	Aug. 1	S. 2576, to repeal franchise of Capital Transit Co., operating in District of Columbia, providing public operation, with District of Columbia obligated to make up deficits. (Defeated 215 to 150, a ⅔ majority being required to suspend rules.)	No.
145	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
147	Aug. 2	S. 2126, to adopt conference report on Housing Act of 1955. (Passed 187 to 168.)	No.

[1] On this day, Mrs. Derounian and I greeted the arrival of a new son, Steven Blake.
[2] In Nassau County on official, congressional matters.
[3] At Army Ordnance Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Md., on official business.
[4] Leave of absence granted on account of the death of my father.
[5] Attending a meeting with the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity the report contains parliamentary and legislative terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

First. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

Second. Recommittal: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

Third. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate by an S. There are four main types:

1. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which, when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

2. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally

used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

3. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

4. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

Fourth. Rule: Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House resolution (H. Res.), is granted covering the time allowed for debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

Fifth. Suspension of the rules: This action limits debate and does not permit the right of amendment.

Sixth. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

Seventh. Ordering the previous question: A motion to order the previous question, if adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

Eighth. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

1. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye" then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

2. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

3. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as teller, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a rollcall. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

4. Rollcalls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called and his vote recorded. Rollcalls constitute the official voting record of the House.

The outcome of various votes are indicated in parentheses in the record above. In the case of rollcall votes, the actual vote is shown.

Legislative Record of Hon. Irwin D. Davidson, of New York, 1st Session, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman, I should like the record to show that I am cognizant and deeply appreciative of, not alone the great honor but also the opportunity for public service which the people of my district have afforded me. I have worked hard to do the kind of job they had a right to expect of me. My efforts were in many fields of legislative activity. For their critical examination and the consideration of the House, I submit a compilation of the major bills which I have introduced this year. In some instances, it can be reported with pride, perhaps pardonable for a first-year Congressman, that I was successful. In others, it is my intention to continue to strive for favorable consideration next year.

I have introduced a fairly large number of bills and for convenience list them here in 12 major fields for legislative action.

1. CONSUMERS

House Resolution 220 introduced April 21, referred to the Committee on Rules: This resolution would authorize the establishment of a special congressional committee to study consumer problems such as false advertising, pricing practices, governmental activities for the protection of the consumer, including the desirability of establishing a consumers agency in the Federal Government or increasing the power and scope of the Federal Trade Commission. I have requested hearings before the Rules Committee and am hopeful that these may be held shortly after Congress reconvenes.

2. AUTOMATION

House Resolution 221, introduced April 21: This resolution would establish a congressional committee to study the effect of automation on the American economy, giving particular attention to the need for revision of social security, workmen's compensation and other laws. Following my introduction of this resolution, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report announced they would undertake such an investigation. Hearings will be held in October.

3. NARCOTICS

House Joint Resolution 225, introduced February 18, 1955: This resolution would completely revise our efforts to control narcotic importation, selling, and addiction. A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by a bipartisan group of over 40 Senators, including Senators LEHMAN, KEFAUVER, SALTONSTALL, and PAYNE. Under this resolution, the Federal Government would set up a chain of narcotic treatment clinics across the country, the FBI and Justice Department would take over enforcement of our narcotic laws and stronger penalties for violations would be imposed. The measure is pending in the Ways and Means Committee and I have exchanged correspondence with the chairman of that committee and believe that hearings will be held next year.

H. R. 7838, introduced August 2: This bill contains two major parts, one of which deals with narcotic addicts. We spent many months preparing this and several other bills along similar health-education lines. These are listed later on. Under H. R. 7838, $5 million is authorized to aid the States on a matching basis to build narcotic addict hospitals, treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities. This is an extension of the well-known Hill-Burton law, and I have high hopes that there will be favorable action on it.

4. SALK VACCINE

House Joint Resolution 278, introduced April 14: This resolution, authorized the coining of a special gold medal for Dr. Jonas E. Salk in recognition of his wonderful work in developing the polio vaccine. I am proud to say it was unanimously passed by the House and Senate and became law on August 9 when the President signed it. The medal will be prepared and presented to Dr. Salk by the Secretary of the Treasury. Bronze replicas of the medal may be sold to the public by the Treasury.

H. R. 5983, introduced May 3: The purpose of this bill was to authorize the President to control the distribution and price of the Salk vaccine. It is interesting to note that I introduced the medal resolution which passed just 2 days after the announcement of the development of the vaccine when everyone was elated at Dr. Salk's success. Three weeks later, due to the scandalous administrative handling of the vaccine and the press reports of favoritism and black marketeering I found it necessary to introduce control legislation. My bill would have given the President standby power to put the controls into force as he thought necessary.

5. CIVIL RIGHTS

I introduced a series of civil-rights bills on February 2. They were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and at my request hearings were held on July 13 and 14. I testified on July 14. No report has been filed as yet by the committee, and I will continue to press for some affirmative action. The bills which I introduced are as follows:

H. R. 3417, outlaw the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers.

H. R. 3418, reorganize the Department of Justice by establishing within it a division for the protection of civil rights.

H. R. 3419, prohibit intimidation or coercion of voters in national elections,

making such action criminal and providing penalties of $1,000 fine and/or 1 year in jail.

H. R. 3420, strengthen the laws relating to peonage, involuntary servitude, and slavery. This bill extends the prohibition against shanghaiing to all means of transportation instead of just to vessels.

H. R. 3421, prohibits activities such as Klu Klux Klan marauding on the public highways or on the private property of another.

H. R. 3422, establishes a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government.

H. R. 3423, an omnibus bill establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, a Civil Rights Commission, strengthening the laws protecting civil rights, and prohibiting discrimination in interstate transportation. The latter provision would extend the historic decision of the Supreme Court prohibiting so-called separate but equal school facilities to cover interstate transportation. It is high time this outrageous discriminatory, deceptive concept was eliminated entirely.

H. R. 3575, to protect the rights of all persons, including aliens, within the United States and to prohibit lynchings.

H. R. 3576, a separate bill containing the prohibition against discrimination in interstate transportation. This bill was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. By introducing several versions of the same bill, the chances of obtaining action is increased.

6. MINIMUM WAGE

H. R. 3424, introduced February 2: My bill to increase the minimum wage is the companion bill to that introduced by Senator LEHMAN. It provided for an increase in the national minimum to $1.25 per hour, and would establish minimums in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands of 80 cents the first year, and increase it there 5 cents per year for the next 5 years until it reached $1.05 an hour. I appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of my bill. While we were successful in obtaining passage of a bill to increase the mainland minimum to $1 an hour—10 cents more than the Republicans said they wanted—we were unable to obtain any real action on the Puerto Rican situation. I plan to introduce new legislation at the next session to cover this glaring need. The cost of living in Puerto Rico is higher than it is on the mainland, but the prevailing wages are much lower. This has a very adverse effect not only on the Puerto Rican standard of living, but on industry here in New York where more and more employers are leaving to open plants in the South and in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands. This tendency must be stopped.

7. HOUSING

H. R. 3926, introduced February 10: This was the first housing bill which I introduced and it provided for special low-rent housing for the aged.

H. R. 6745, introduced June 9: My bill provided for 150,000 units of public housing and a change in procedure in slum clearance financing. By the change contained in my bill, which has been passed by Congress, FHA will no longer be able to stall this program. My bill also closed a loophole in the slum-clearance law. Without my amendment, there could be vast windfalls. This provision of my bill was approved by the House committee, but due to the action of the Republican leadership was rejected and has not passed. I will introduce it again at the next session. In addition, I proposed that a study be undertaken to establish a system for insuring the equity which small-home owners have in their homes so that in the event of economic reversals beyond their control, they would not lose all the money which they put into the house. The committee reported on this suggestion and it will be studied by the housing subcommittee during the recess.

8. REFUGEE RELIEF AND IMMIGRATION

H. R. 4432, introduced February 25: This is the bill to amend the so-called McCarran-Walter Act. Senator LEHMAN and I introduced it the same day. It makes 10 major changes in the existing discriminatory immigration law including:

First. Elimination of the national origins quota system;

Second. Elimination of discrimination between naturalized and native-born citizens;

Third. Elimination of special immigration barriers against Negroes and orientals;

Fourth. Permission for immigration of up to 250,000 persons each year; and

Fifth. Establishment of statutory review and appeals procedures in case of deportation, exclusion, or denials of visas.

This bill, like my bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act has been referred to the Judiciary Subcommittee headed by Congressman WALTER. Senator LEHMAN and I and several other Congressmen are continuing our efforts to obtain consideration of these bills.

H. R. 6161 was introduced May 10 in conjunction with Senator LEHMAN. This bill is designed to completely revise the refugee-relief law. It provides for:

First. Appointment of a new Administrator of Refugee Relief;

Second. Sponsorship and assurances for refugees by recognized welfare agencies;

Third. Increasing the number of visas by 15,000.

Fourth. Extending the law to December 31, 1960;

Fifth. Broadening the definition of the word "refugee";

Sixth. Elimination of the 2-year documented history requirement;

Seventh. Elimination of necessity for certificates of readmission to country of departure;

Eighth. Elimination of the word "ethnic" from the law;

Ninth. Raising the age for orphans eligible for admission from 10 to 14;

Tenth. Broadening the provisions for adjustment of status of aliens presently in the United States; and

Eleventh. Repeal of the visa priority system.

9. BANKS

H. R. 5710, introduced April 20: This bill would require the national banks to comply with State laws relating to their branch-banking activities. It would remove the disadvantage at which the State banks are now placed. The companion bill has passed the Senate.

10. NIAGARA POWER

H. R. 5878, introduced April 27: Senator LEHMAN and I introduced this bill to permit the New York State Power Authority to develop hydroelectric facilities at the Niagara. It would also require the power authority to give preference in the distribution of such power to municipal and nonprofit cooperative electric companies. I testified before both the House and Senate Public Works Committees in support of the bill, but thus far the utility monopoly has been able to keep both bills bottled up in committee. The administration has vigorously opposed this bill and advocated another giant giveaway to the big-business combine. You may be sure that we will not let that happen. The Niagara belongs to all the people of New York, and will be developed by them and for them.

11. TAFT-HARTLEY

H. R. 6023, introduced May 4: This bill, if enacted, would repeal that portion of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits the States to pass the so-called right-to-work laws. These laws prevent legitimate union activities and have been condemned as reactionary antiunion measures throughout the Nation. The Republican leadership is fighting to prevent consideration of any revision of the Taft-Hartley law.

12. SCIENCE, HEALTH, AND EDUCATION

H. R. 7838, introduced August 2: This is the bill which I described in part under the "Narcotics" heading. In addition to those provisions, my bill would also provide $20 million for assistance to the States on a matching basis for the construction of psychiatric hospitals and psychiatric treatment and rehabilitation centers. There is at present a shortage of over 500,000 hospital beds throughout the country; the greatest single shortage exists in the field of mental illness. This bill seeks to overcome this great deficit.

H. R. 7839: This is the second bill which I introduced on August 2 as part of a program to stimulate science education and expanded health activities. The bill provides for 10 college scholarships per State each year for high school graduates who qualify in national mental examinations. The program would be similar to the GI bill and as long as the students make satisfactory progress they may remain enrolled under the plan. An additional group would enter each year, and certain students could continue under the scholarship into graduate schools. The purpose of this bill and H. R. 7840, is to increase the number of United States scientific personnel. Statistics show that we are rapidly and steadily falling behind Russia in the number of trained scientific people who graduate each year. At present there is a national shortage of doctors, nurses, dentists, engineers, laboratory

technicians, and many other scientists. New research is limited by this shortage. If we hope to continue the scientific advances we have been making, this shortage must be overcome.

H. R. 7840: This is the last bill which I introduced, and would provide $250,000 to finance the cost of preparation, publication, and distribution of science teaching text and laboratory manual supplements for use in public elementary and secondary schools. The manuals would be prepared by qualified private science teaching groups.

These last three bills were introduced on the final day of the session so that interested groups would have time to study them and so that reports could be obtained from the governmental agencies concerned before Congress meets in January. I have already requested these reports and have asked that public hearings be held as soon as possible next year.

The above constitutes a rather full report on my legislation. During the congressional recess we shall have hearings on automation, narcotics, housing, and the merchant marine.

"The Catholic Gift to the Public Schools": Editorial by the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, CSC, Archbishop of Philadelphia, Discusses How Catholics, in Addition to Their Federal, State, and Local Tax Payments, Contribute More than $1 Billion a Year in "Grants" to the Nation's Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread interest among Members of Congress in the problems of our schools, and in view of the fact that there is now pending on the calendar of the House a bill for Federal aid to education, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a very important discussion of this matter by a very distinguished constituent of mine, the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, CSC, Archbishop of Philadelphia.

From time to time Archbishop O'Hara has commented editorially in the Catholic Standard and Times of Philadelphia on some of the broad aspects of the problems of education. I was pleased and honored to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial of his which appeared in the Catholic Standard and Times earlier this year. I was gratified by the comments of so many of my colleagues in the House who expressed their appreciation to me for having placed this material in the RECORD.

The latest editorial by Archbishop O'Hara on this matter, entitled "The Catholic Gift to the Public Schools," appeared in the Catholic Standard and Times of Philadelphia on last Friday, July 29. It discussed in detail some facts which are not generally known in connection with what might be called the subsidy—or rather, subsidies—which Catholics in the United States, through the Catholic schools and otherwise, provide for public schools. In this editorial, Archbishop O'Hara places those facts on view in a clear and impressive manner.

CATHOLIC SUBSIDY OF $52 PER PUPIL IN NORTHEAST PUBLIC SCHOOLS

For instance, he shows that through the very operation of the Catholic schools, the States of the Northeast are able to spend $247 per year per pupil in the public schools. If there were no Catholic schools in those States, the same amount of public-school funds would provide only $195 per pupil. As the archbishop points out, this amounts to a Catholic subsidy of $52 per pupil per year in the public schools in the Northeast—the States from Maine to Pennsylvania.

For the North Central States—Ohio to Kansas—this subsidy is $29 per pupil per year. In the West—Rocky Mountains to the Pacific—it is $17 per pupil in the public schools per year. In the South—Delaware to Oklahoma—it is $6 per pupil. As the archbishop analyzes these figures, it comes to a total of $620,692,000 per year in this particular Catholic gift to the public schools.

Another Catholic gift to the public schools, the archbishop declares in this editorial, is in the $500 million of Catholic school construction per year. The other subsidy referred to school operating costs; this one refers to construction of buildings. If the $500 million of Catholic school construction were not put into place each year, the same amount would have to be spent out of public tax funds to provide public-school facilities for the children now going to Catholic schools. Added to the $620,692,000 previously referred to, that makes a total of $1,120,692,000 in annual Catholic grants, if you will, to the public-school system.

A TOTAL CATHOLIC SUBSIDY TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS EACH YEAR OF $1,120,692,000

These figures do not, of course, take into consideration the State and local taxes which Catholic citizens pay for the support of the public schools, or the Federal taxes which they pay which help to support any Federal program of aid to education, including the present program for aid to the so-called impacted areas. The total of $1,120,692,000 refers only to amounts which the public schools would have to spend each year in addition to present expenditures if the Catholic schools did not exist; that is, assuming the States would be making the same effort per pupil as they do now.

In legal terminology, this is a grant-in-aid.

The editorial declares.

Nothing is expected back. There are no bonds, there is no interest to pay. This grant for operating expenses frees other moneys for school construction. The total present grant for the public schools, then, is the annual expenditure of $500 million for Catholic-school construction, plus the $620,692,000 for operating expenses, or a grand total of $1,120,692,000.

The editorial also states this interesting fact:

Turning back to the table which shows the cost per pupil for current operations, we find that the South presents the acute problem. The small Catholic population in that section makes a magnificent gift—$56,466,000—to the public schools, and this is more than the total expenditure for operating public schools in 19 of the States of the Union. But it spreads thin over the almost 10 million pupils in that section.

If the Catholic-school population of the South were sufficient to provide for that section the bonus the Northeast enjoys ($52 per pupil) the expenditure in the South, with no additional taxation, could be $190 per pupil, or only $5 less than the expenditure in the Northeast and $4 more than the expenditure in the North Central States.

CATHOLIC GIFT TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS EXCEEDS PROPOSED FEDERAL AID

Mr. Speaker, I believe these facts shed needed light on an important problem, helping to bring understanding of the magnificent contribution to American education now being made by Catholics and the Catholic schools.

I should like to include the entire text of the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am informed, however, that it cannot appear as part of these remarks because arrangements have already been made for it to appear under a separate heading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix which in the temporary RECORD will carry tomorrow's date, that is, August 2. I urge all Members to give it their attention—page A5682.

Since there is to be, this November, a White House Conference on Education for which the Congress has appropriated funds, and since there is pending legislation to adopt a Federal aid program which would include $400 million a year of direct Federal grants, it is worth noting, as this editorial by Archbishop O'Hara points out, that:

The Catholics of this country, by the construction and operation of their own schools, are doing considerably more for the public schools than the Federal Government proposes to do.

H. R. 6887

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has added an amendment to this bill, H. R. 6887. Under present law, a deduction for the Federal estate tax is granted for bequests to charity. Under the Senate amendment, a deduction would also be granted for the amount of any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by a State upon the transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses as described in section 2055.

The deduction for charitable bequests allowed by section 2055 of the 1954 code for bequests to charity is measured by the amount the charity actually receives and not the amount of the bequest. For

example, if a State imposes a tax on the charitable bequest and the State tax must be paid from the charitable bequest, the Federal estate-tax deduction would be limited to the amount of the bequest less the State tax paid from the bequest, and the Federal estate tax would be increased by the corresponding increase in the taxable estate of the decedent. If the additional Federal estate tax thus arising must also be paid out of the charitable bequest, the charitable deduction will, in turn, be reduced and the estate tax correspondingly increased. By this pyramiding of tax on tax, the Federal estate tax can be increased by much more than the State tax on the bequest and the combination of these two taxes can result in the dissipation of a large part of the bequest that the testator intended to be used for a charitable purpose.

To prevent the charitable purpose of the testator from thus being frustrated and to carry out the national purpose of not subjecting charitable bequests to the estate tax, the Senate has added a provision that will grant a deduction for Federal estate-tax purposes for the amount of any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by a State upon a transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses as described in section 2055 of the 1954 code. Thus, the estate will receive the same deduction whether or not a State tax is imposed upon a bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer that is deductible under any paragraph of section 2055 (a) of the 1954 code.

The deduction will be disregarded in computing the credit for State death taxes under section 2011 of the 1954 code.

The amendment to section 2053 of the 1954 code will apply with respect to the estate of decedents in any case in which the last date prescribed by law for filing the Federal estate tax return is on or after April 1, 1955.

Speech Delivered by Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, at the 46th Annual Convention of B'Nai Zion at Monticello, N. Y., on June 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a guest speaker at the 46th annual convention of B'nai Zion on June 4, 1955, at Monticello, N. Y.

The 4-day convention began on June 3, 1955, and was attended by many distinguished leaders of Jewry including Yehuda Harry Levin, counselor of the Embassy of Israel, and the Honorable Bartley C. Crum, former member of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Palestine.

The speakers at the 4-day convention included Supreme Court Justice Arthur Markewich, president of B'nai Zion; Dr. Harris J. Levine, past president of B'nai Zion and president of the Jewish National Fund; Mendel N. Fisher, executive director of the Jewish National Fund; Benjamin E. Gordon, chairman of the B'nai Zion Foundation; Herman Z. Quittman, secretary of B'nai Zion. Among the many others who contributed to the success of the convention were Nathaniel S. Rothenberg, Hyman J. Fliegel, Norman G. Levine, Rudolph Edelson, Elias Epstein, Dr. Samuel Margoshes, Dr. Jacob I. Steinberg, Dorothy S. Levine, Hon. Harry A. Pine, Louis K. Bleecker, Benjamin Dantzker, Alazar Kushner, Joseph Kleiman, Dr. Sidney Marks, A. A. Redelheim, Herman Sperling, and Mike Funk.

I believe the text of my remarks on that occasion may be of interest to our colleagues. They are as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests upon the platform, fellow members and friends, I am in a somewhat difficult position. Our nassi (president) has already complimented the ladies. All of the compliments that can be thought of, together with our congratulations, have been extended to Herman and his good wife and to their son. You have been told the story about the silver and I understand the ladies have collected about all the silver that is available in exchange for the raffle tickets. Well, that sounds illegal. I mean, in exchange for a share in a diamond ring that somebody is going to take home.

I could talk about Jewish national fund, but Mendel Fisher didn't send me a letter. I could talk about the national lawyers committee of the Jewish National Fund Foundation, but I don't know whether I should because Abe Tuviem gave me his promise he would play customer's golf with me tomorrow, if I did. I am not sure that I want to play that kind of golf with him. Of course, as Judge Markewich told you, I did submit an advance copy of some of the things I intended to say tonight and part of them he has already used in his script. But I have learned from past experience that what you are going to send to the press as advance copy of your speech, don't send to any of the speakers that are going to precede you on the platform. So maybe I will fool him. Although you can't help but talk about some of the same general subjects at a meeting of this kind, I will try to put it in just a little different language than he has already used and try to save something also for those that are going to follow me on the platform at this convention. That may save you from the boredom of too much repetition.

Now I chose for the topic of my brief comments tonight not what the Jewish national fund has done during the years, not what B'nai Zion has done during the years, not what you are going to do in the years to come as you strengthen your membership by bringing new blood into the organization, not by talking about how you are the backbone of the Zionist movement and have been and will continue to be, nor about the fact that the Jewish national fund could hardly carry on without the aid of B'nai Zion.

I have chosen a topic which I am sure is uppermost in your minds as it must be in the minds of every Jew throughout the world and that is, "What is wrong with our American Government?"

Now there are a great many things that are right about our American Government, but there are 1 or 2 things that are wrong. Some of those things that are wrong touch you and me very closely. And you and I and our friends will have to do something about it.

Now within the meaning of the words "What is wrong with our American Government?" you can very easily take anyone of three topics.

You could take our immigration laws, and I touch upon that first so there will be no doubt in anybody's mind that I am not being political in my criticisms about government today because although I am a Democrat, I am very much ashamed of the fact that the immigration laws of this country bear the names of two Democrats and I think most highminded Democrats disown the principles of both the late Senator McCarran and my colleague, who still sits with me in the House of Representatives, Mr. WALTER, as written into the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I have said many times before, and I will say many times again, that act is a blot upon the history of our country and both parties are responsible for it. However, the leader of the Republican Party, the President of these United States, must bear the responsibility for that law not being corrected, and, to his everlasting shame, history will record that he made a deal, a political deal with the authors of that Immigration Act not to press for amendments of it, in exchange for a refugee act that is a fraud and a scandal. If the act has not been properly administered up to the present time, he must also bear the blame for that. In blaming him for that today let us recall that a certain Senator, whom I need not name, no longer holds a whip hand over the President or over his Secretary of State or over the Republican Party. If the McCarthy nominee in charge of that program is still there and in charge of it, our President, together with his Secretary of State, must bear the blame for it.

I refer to the Immigration Act because it indicates a lack of sympathy on the part of Americans in high official place, a lack of sympathy for the needs and for what must be done to help people outside of our country who can't otherwise be helped.

Now I come to the second of the things that I think is wrong with our Government. It is typified by the following quotation from a member of the President's Cabinet and if when she reads it, if she does read, in the newspapers anything that I have said here tonight and says that the quotation was taken out of context of the speech she made on Thursday, my answer is "Yes." Deliberately I have taken it out of context.

Let me read what Secretary Hobby said to a graduating class at the Presbyterian Medical Center on Thursday of this week and I quote: "Lacking your training, lacking your experience and your knowledge, we will at times seem remarkably inept." Those are the words used on Thursday of this week by Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the great Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of this country. That is the same lady who has not found time to attend before the congressional committees and explain why she was so inept in the handling of the Salk vaccine program in this country. She has time to make speeches and attend parties but on every day that she was supposed to attend before a congressional committee she claimed either illness or that she had to chase off to some place distant from Washington.

What she said typifies the ineptness of the administration in charge of the executive department of our American Government. That also typifies the lack of sympathy of those people in high Government place. I pointed out to you a moment ago their lack of sympathy for the foreigner. Now I am pointing out to you the lack of sympathy for our own children and for our own country's welfare. I am sure you will agree with me that the Canadians and the Canadian Government do not love their children any more than we do and their government does not have any more desire to protect their chil-

dren than our Government should have to protect ours. But the ineptness of the administration indicates its lack of sympathy with human problems. We provide free vaccines and toxins for our cattle without socializing the cows or the farmers. But to do as much for our children, Mrs. Hobby tells us will drive us into socialization of medicine.

Is it any wonder that we should be so concerned about the lack of sympathy of this same Government and these same high-placed Government officials with the problems that concern us so dearly and so closely as they involve the Middle East and particularly the new state of Israel for which you and I and our fathers and mothers labored so long and so hard, and for which we will continue to work hard.

It is hard to understand how we could have a President in these United States who voices his desire for worldwide peace and who talks about his interest in human beings, how liberal he is where the human element is involved and how conservative he is where property values are concerned, and yet takes so little interest in what his Secretary of State is doing.

I do not agree for one moment with any of those who attribute any anti-Semitism or any anti-Jewishness to our Secretary of State. At the same time I refuse to concede that there is a single Jew anywhere in these United States who is one bit less patriotic and less loyal to this country than is our Secretary of State. I refuse to believe that there is a single Jew anywhere in these United States who would not put the national security of this country ahead of even the national security of the new State of Israel. But none of us are called upon to do that. You need not put our national security ahead of the national security of any other people or any other country in order to work for and bring about a genuine peace in the world.

Sholom is the word that resounds through our Torah. Sholom is the word that is preached to us from the day we are old enough to understand. Sholom is the word and the principle and the concept that Jews have carried with them wherever they have gone from time immemorial and which we will always preach and practice. It would seem, however, that everybody except our State Department knows how to bring about peace in the Middle East. We are told on every side that the greatest accomplishment of this Republican administration in Washington is worldwide peace. I suppose we must concede that there is no worldwide war.

We might even further concede that there is no declared war. At the same time, unless we stifle our senses, we must know that there is no peace. The protestations of our State Department that it desires peace in the Middle East can be likened to a doctor treating a mental patient, afflicted with homicidal tendencies by telling him, "behave yourself" and while using expressions of good behavior to him, hands to this mental patient a loaded gun.

I have many times urged that peace in the Middle East can very quickly be established if our Government took the position that we would give no aid to the Arabs unless they consummated in good faith treaties of peace with the State of Israel. I have also many times urged that if we gave to the Arab States economic aid, we could divert the Arabs' attention from their military threats and desires to improving their standards of living. Everyone but our State Department seems to understand that you can't establish peace by encouraging violence. If you can't do it in the treatment of juvenile delinquency, how can you do it with adults? We know if you want to prevent crime you don't do it by teaching people how to use drugs or guns or weapons.

But our great Government can't understand that nations are groups or congregations of people and you must treat them as you would treat humans and you can't encourage peace by delivery of military armaments.

At the recent conference in Bandung a declaration on Palestine was adopted. Israel was not invited to attend. The Arab States were invited to and did attend. The declaration as there adopted referred to the existing tension in the Middle East and I quote, "of the danger of that tension to world peace." The declaration called for the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Palestine and, over the objections of the Arabs, the declaration included a call for, and I quote, "the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question." This is just one more resolution that the Arabs will ignore.

What right have we or anyone else to think the Arabs would pay any more attention to this resolution than to past resolutions which called upon them to renounce their belligerencies, to call off their blockades, to extend their armistice agreements to final peace settlements, and to integrate the Arab refugees into the Arab economies?

Every day that goes by without our Government making earnest efforts to establish peace in the Middle East and every utterance of the thought that armaments to the Arab states can establish peace is further proof of the Communists that our Government talks peace and acts war.

To those who say I am too critical of our Government, I say I am critical only when I can offer a solution. I don't pretend to be omniscient. I don't pretend to be infallible. But I have offered a solution. Maybe there is another solution or even a better one. If there is, then I call upon our Government to announce what that solution is and try to implement it.

As I see it, the solution is not military aid but a firm insistence upon suspension of hostilities and of all blockades and then move in with economic aid and teach these people to live as decent humans and to learn to love their neighbors as themselves. All a Jew ever asks anywhere is to be permitted to love his neighbor as himself and to be permitted to treat the stranger in his midst as one who belongs. That, my friends, is my brief message to you tonight. I do hope that in the year ahead you will continue the fine work you have been doing and that at the next convention we can get together and celebrate genuine world peace.

H. R. 257

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to H. R. 257 adds a new section to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is complementary to section 1341 of the code.

Section 1341 deals with the situation where a taxpayer mistakenly includes an item in his gross income of a prior year(s), and in a later year is required to restore the money or property which gave rise to the item of income in the prior year. Where the restored item amounts to $3,000, or more, section 1341 allows the taxpayer the option of: First, deducting the restored amount in the tax year it is restored to a third party; or, second, computing the tax for the restoration year without deducting the amount restored, and then lowering the tax of the taxable—restoration—year by the amount of decrease in tax caused by excluding the restored item(s) from the income of the earlier year(s) in which reported.

The Senate amendment simply extends a similar option to a taxpayer who, mistakenly believing that a third party had a claim of right to money on property, takes a deduction for the item or items in an earlier year or years. An amendment along this line has already been approved by the Committee on Ways and Means. The House should have no objection to the Senate amendment.

Foul Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a recent editorial in the Journal of the Iowa State Medical Society. It discusses aspects of recreation and juvenile delinquency, two subjects recently discussed at a conclave of champions hosted by the President at a White House luncheon. Mr. President, this editorial may express extreme opinions, perhaps the examples cited should by no means be considered typical. However, Mr. President, it merits wide reading and objective consideration. Questions raised in the editorial deserve considered answers—from the special committee of champions the Vice President heads to the school board in the most remote hamlet. I ask for unanimous consent, Mr. President, for its inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUL BALL

About 350 years ago, the aristocrats of London became tired, for the moment at least, of their customary amusements, among which were bearbaiting and cock fighting, and of the people who staged them. Casting about more or less at random, they hit upon the novel idea of organizing companies of children to replace adult actors in their theaters, and the innovation achieved immense popularity. The youngsters' ineptness proved highly entertaining, and if, as frequently happened, they obviously could not understand what they were required to speak, or if the situations and the lines were clearly inappropriate to their youth and innocence, the audiences were especially delighted. In those days no one thought that the exploitation of children was reprehensible, but if anyone had made such a suggestion, no doubt one of the originators of the scheme would have dreamed up the idea that it was a means of preventing juvenile delinquency.

The Little League system, in which 8- to 12-year-olds are being introduced to championship-competition baseball, is little more

than a repetition of what happened in the first Queen Elizabeth's time. Little boys are put under considerable pressure to work—rather than play—several hours a day at learning and exhibiting skills for which, in most cases, their stage of development does not equip them.

It is inevitable that the process of growing has sapped junior's strength, and his muscular coordination is by no means what it will be after 4 or 5 more years, but papa—and often mamma, too—have made it crystal clear to him that he must make the team, or stay on the team or not let the team down on penalty of losing their affection and esteem. Furthermore, since the practice sessions and games usually last through his family's dinner hour (the adult provocateurs cannot come to supervise and enjoy them at any other time), junior eats peanut-butter sandwiches by himself at 8 o'clock each night, instead of sharing in the well-balanced meal that his mother prepared for the rest of the family to eat at 6, and he misses out on the impromptu conclave incident to the family meal, at which he could have learned valuable lessons and bolstered his impression of his family's solidarity.

The idea that the Little Leagues prevent 8- to 12-year-olds from getting into mischief is no more than a rationalization. People merely have stumbled upon a new potential group of entertainers. In Iowa, at least, little boys infrequently get into serious mischief, for they are subject to relatively few temptations. Thus they have little need for the amount and intensity of outside-the-home activity that such programs force upon them. Rather, when adults preempt playing fields for the use of such little children, they force older boys—the potential delinquents—out of the parks and into the streets. Indeed, on one field that we know of, the grown-ups erected a fence across what used to be the middle of the outfield, with the result that grown boys and men are unable to play a game of baseball there at all.

Are those sorts of goings-on modern, or even sensible? Who, if anyone, will benefit, other than the type of man who buys his son a catcher's mitt and mask before his wife has been released from the maternity ward at the hospital?

In Des Moines, opprobrium has been heaped upon members of the board of education for refusing Little Leagues the right to use school diamonds on Sundays. In this instance we are fully in sympathy with the board. Though we have no statistics to support us, we are certain that a very considerable share of citizens regard games as a highly improper Sunday activity, and they are trying to get their sons and daughters to think so, too. Certainly it is not within the province of an elected board—as it likewise should not be the right of the Little Leagues' managers—to interfere with that sort of home training.

As regards some other phases of the athletic program for youngsters, however, we hold views at variance with those of most school boards in the State, for we think that the school officials have permitted an altogether disproportionate emphasis on competitive athletics and subsidiary activities in the high schools.

Football and boys' basketball in the larger schools, and basketball for both girls and boys in the smaller ones are being permitted to disrupt both academic work and family life. Practice sessions last from 3:30 to 6 or even 6:30, rather than from 3:30 until 5 or 5:30, with the result that boys and girls are prevented from getting home before dark and in time for dinner. There almost never is an opportunity for an athlete to consult his teachers after school hours, nor is there sufficient energy left him for any after-dinner school work or for the minor domestic chores, the chief benefit of which is the impression they give a child of his responsibility for helping maintain the home. Furthermore, so many interscholastic games are scheduled that some of them must be run off on school nights, with the result that both participants and student spectators are even prevented from getting to bed on time. Frequent pep fests are permitted during schooltime, some of them lasting more than an hour, and when a basketball team has been unusually successful, a series of tournaments deprives participants and nonparticipants alike of 1, 2, or 3 weeks of classroom work.

Our school boards should be reminded that they have been entrusted with educational plants and equipment worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, and are employing teachers at an average wage of about $2.50 per hour, each. The dollars-and-cents cost of closing school for an hour a week—not to mention a whole day or a whole week—and of sanctioning schedules that sap student's learning efficiency should give them serious concern.

Then, too, there is the very real danger that sports heroism will make boys and girls feel grown up prematurely. The tears into which girl basketball teams frequently dissolve when they have been eliminated from a touranment aren't symptomatic of anything good. Our sons distress us when they demonstrate the techniques of eye gouging, hip-throwing, and spiking by which their coaches have taught them to cripple their opponents. And we wonder what has happened to the high ideals of sportsmanship when they tell us the coach says a football player is no good unless he gets mad. But we are most worried when an overdose of adulation from his friends and his elders, and the acclaim given him by a sportswriter has made a son of ours feel so grownup and self-sufficient that he is no longer tolerant of the advice and restrictions that we want him to accept. Because we live in Des Moines, rather than in any of a couple of hundred smaller Iowa towns, our daughters haven't been subjected to that sort of head-turning, a circumstance for which we are deeply thankful.

We want our children to have physical training, and we want them to enjoy themselves by playing games, dancing, singing or engaging in any other sort of harmless recreation. But we don't think it is good for them to feel compelled always to win, and we want them to be treated as children and to think of themselves as children until they have attained emotional, intellectual, and physical maturity, together with as much of an education and of moral training as we and their teachers, unimpeded, can provide them.

Philadelphia Scientists Have Been Pioneering in the Field of Space Satellites and in Urging Official Attention to the Significance of Satellite Experiments

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the announcement on Friday, July 29, that the first artificial satellite project had been authorized was the herald of a new age—one which conjures up pictures of space travel, and interplanetary communication. We have every right in the world to feel proud of what our country is doing and to celebrate the fact that we live in a time when men have the courage and the vision to "set their hearts on the stars." Yet we should also remember that this new advance will bring new problems and new responsibilities.

Earlier this year, members of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society wrote to me to enlist my interest in this matter of artificial satellites, suggesting that the time had come for the United States seriously to consider work of this nature. Mr. Thomas Purdom, secretary of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society, asked my opinion on the subject and wanted to know if I thought work of this nature was practical. I replied that I thought it was a situation wherein the scientists should tell us what is involved and how practical or impractical it might be. I suggested that asking a Member of Congress whether the satellite projects were practical was a little like asking a Member in 1933 his views about the practical aspects of an atomic bomb.

THE LEVITT PROJECT: "MINNIE"

Subsequently, I was pleased to receive from Mr. Purdom a short description or outline of a satellite project proposed by Dr. I. M. Levitt, of the Franklin Institute at Philadelphia, one of a number of projects which had been capturing the interest of the scientific world. His project was given the nickname "Minnie." This is not the project finally decided upon by the Federal Government, but the work and thought which went into it are certainly worthy of note, and the members of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society have long felt that it is a very practical approach. I am including the outline of the Levitt project—"Minnie"—at the end of these remarks under unanimous consent of the House, since I think it will be of great interest to all Members, and particularly in view of the announcement of last Friday at the White House.

As to the significance of the satellite project we are undertaking, the scientists who have devoted so much study to this problem believe it is most important for us to understand what is involved.

For, as they point out, within 24 hours after the announcement, a controversy was developing over whether or not to share the satellite's data with the entire world. This is not the place to offer any opinions on that controversy, because as the scientists tell us, there are good arguments on both sides, but it is the place to point out that such a controversy exists and that there will be other and greater controversies in the years to come, as we reach farther and farther into space.

THE MOST AWESOME INSTRUMENT OF POWER EVER DEVISED

The secretary of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society, Mr. Purdom, wrote me that beyond this first unmanned satellite looms the first manned space station, an achievement which reputable scientists have said could be as close as 10 to 15 years away. When that station is established, barring unforeseen solutions to the tensions between nations,

we will be faced with the problems of controlling the most awesome instrument of power ever devised by man.

The manned satellite, we are told, would be the ideal launching platform for guided missiles with hydrogen bomb warheads. Its owners would be able to destroy any spot on the earth they chose, any time they wanted to. Its construction would mean nothing less than military domination of the earth.

All of this means, according to our scientists, that we will one day in the future be faced with the same problems the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb have brought us—the problem of controlling the new and frightful and unbelievably destructive instruments of power which the scientists are placing in our hands. They say that as of last Friday, July 29, this new problem we face is no longer academic. We are living in the dawn of the interplanetary age, and the problems that age will raise, our scientists tell us, will demand the fullest capacities of our minds and hearts. The consideration of these problems is the job of statesmen everywhere and of all politically aware citizens.

Science has now again impressed us with the fact that we are living in a larger world in a different time than we had realized a few years ago or a few days ago. To the scientists must go the credit and the thanks for giving us the powers to expand our horizons. Few of us will be so timid as to want to turn back and to hide from the advances which science makes possible. But as the secretary of the Philadelphia Astronautical Society put it:

We must now reach within ourselves and find that courage and wisdom which will give us the right to say we are large enough men to live in this vastly enlarged world.

Mr. Speaker, on that sobering note, I include here as part of my remarks a fascinating outline of an imaginative pioneering effort in the field of space satellites, a discussion of the project Minnie, proposed by Dr. I. M. Levitt, of the Franklin Institute, as follows:

THE LEVITT PROJECT: "MINNIE"

DESCRIPTION

Dr. Levitt's proposed satellite project, nicknamed 'Minnie," consists of a four-stage liquid-fuel rocket. The bottom stage will be the improved version of the V–2 and the upper three stages will be smaller rockets of types which already exist. Stage four would contain a balloon covered with aluminum foil and weighing about 10 pounds. When the last stage had taken up orbit about 200 miles above the earth, the balloon would be released and inflated to a diameter of 15 feet by a small CO2 cartridge. Then it would circle the earth like a new moon, balancing the centrifugal force caused by its terrific speed against the pull of earth's gravity.

COST OF THE PROJECT

Minnie will cost less than $10 million. This is less than the cost of a B–52 bomber. It is also less than 1 percent of the entire 1953 guided missile program. And in many ways Minnie will be one of the most important single missiles in our entire development program. She will pay for herself in money saved.

SIGNIFICANCE TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Minnie will fit into the defense picture in several ways:

1. By using the moving satellite to triangulate the entire earth and parts of it, more accurate maps will be made at less expense (the ultimate savings will be several times the cost of the satellite). In this way the problems of accurately guiding missiles over intercontinental distances will be simplified and the accuracy of such missiles will be increased.

2. By similar techniques, the satellite will be used to determine the average value of the gravitational constant of the earth. This seemingly abstract value is of great use in the search for oil. Many field surveys into fruitless areas could be eliminated and many untapped fields opened if we knew the value of this constant. Once again the money saved will be several times the cost of the project.

3. As a propaganda device. Visible as a bright new star every evening, racing across the sky in a few minutes, the satellite would be a symbol of our strength and a warning to aggressors of what we are capable of developing.

DETERMINING THE ORBIT

Calculating the satellite's exact orbit will be as easy (to the astronomers) as calculating the orbit of a new comet. The satellite will be photographed against a background of stars and these photographs will show us its position in terms of what the astronomer calls right ascension and declination. This information will uniquely determine the path of the satellite's orbit around the earth. The hard part of the job will be tracking the beacon—it will cross from horizon to horizon like a plane 3 miles up moving at 225 miles per hour—but modern instruments in use at White Sands can do the job with only a few modifications.

TRIANGULATING

Since the observer will know the satellite's position at any time, three observations will allow him to determine his own position. Surveying nowadays, particularly in flat, featureless lands, often calls for expensive installations and highly paid crews. The satellite would not only save us a good deal of money but would increase the accuracy of our meaurements. The Atlantic Ocean, for instance, has been measured to within a thousand feet, using the moon and the same methods that would be used with the satellite. With Minnie lending a hand, the width of the Atlantic could be measured to within a hundred feet—which is particularly significant when firing guided missiles over intercontinental distances where an error of a thousand feet could mean much wasted time and money.

THE GRAVITATIONAL CONSTANT

With the aid of gravity meters, the modern geophysicist is able to explore the surface of the earth and map its gravitational field. Variations in this field are sometimes due to light deposits of oil under a salt dome. If the explorer knew the precise value of the average gravitational constant for the earth, he would be able to determine whether these variations are truly significant. Field surveys into doubtful areas could be eliminated and a part of the $5 million per year now spent on exploratory diggings in the United States could be saved. The effects of gravity on Minnie's orbit could be used to determine this important constant, which cannot be accurately measured by present methods.

SOME MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

What about meteors?

If the satellite is struck by a meteor, nothing of any importance will happen. The carbon dioxide will leak out but the satellite will not be deflated. In space there is no external pressure to force it out of the shape it has already attained.

What will Minnie lead to?

Though there are practical reasons for the project, and though it will pay for itself in a few years, Minnie is also important for the things to which she will lead. The knowledge of missile design gained will enable us to put instrumented rockets into space. These more complex satellites will not only have value to the military and to persons interested in weather forecasting, but will also give us information about conditions beyond the atmosphere. Such information, eventually, will lead to the establishment of a manned space station. And from there the future is wide open.

How much work is being done now?

We don't know, but there is as much reason to believe no project is underway as there is to believe one is. Despite the logical reasons for building an unmanned satellite, many rocket engineers seem to be hesitant about the idea, a reaction which is almost traditional when dealing with great technical developments. The position was best summed up by Dr. Levitt in his original paper on the satellite delivered before the International Astronautical Federation Congress at Innsbruck: "In time the [satellite] beacon could be a natural evolution of the guided-missile program but the time can be shortened if a directive is issued for the establishment of a beacon."

Revising Our Federal Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, when we resume our work next year we will once again face a recurrent responsibility—the task of revising our Federal laws relating to corruption in elections. This task has confronted Congress in virtually every session during the past 30 years, and it is one which we cannot afford to shirk any longer.

The latest attempt to effect revision of these laws has been embodied in the proposed Federal Elections Act of 1955, introduced in the Senate—S. 636—by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., and by myself in the House of Representatives—H. R. 3139. The Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, under the chairmanship of Senator HENNINGS, conducted extensive hearings on this measure, and an amended bill was favorably reported and is now an the calendar of that body. In the House, the Subcommittee on Elections, under the chairmanship of the able Representative from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], has also conducted hearings during the past few months. I would especially like to commend Mr. ASHMORE and his committee colleagues for the manner in which they conducted their hearings. I can personally testify to the nonpartisan consideration which they gave the bill, and to the serious and thoughtful nature of their hearings. Their task has not been an easy one, nor a thankful one, for they will receive little commendation for their labors.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for this bill, or one of a similar character. Existing laws are unques-

tionably inadequate, and they add fuel to an all too prevalent belief that political personalities are venal men. I am proud to be a Member of the Congress of the United States, and I know my colleagues all possess similar pride. And yet, because of the miserable laws concerning the use of money in elections, many of the American people regard us all with suspicion. To some we are knaves, to others we are worse. For many people believe that politics is necessarily a quasi-corrupt profession. As long as we are content to conduct our elections under such inadequate laws, this attitude will remain in the minds of many of our citizens.

Reform of Federal election laws is urgently needed, and such reform will eventually be realized. If Congress does not act next year, the elections of 1956 will clearly and dramatically illustrate once again the defects of our present laws. A recent Gallup poll revealed that over two-thirds of the public advocates stricter Federal election laws. I am convinced that this number will continue to grow, until eventually we will be forced to act. I hope that such action will be taken next year.

The intergrity of our Government is closely related to the nature of the election process. That process in turn depends on the laws which regulate it. The people will continue to demand better and more adequate election laws, until eventually Congress enacts them.

I do not believe, however, that enactment of this measure alone will produce the situation which is our objective. American politics cannot be truly representative until all of our people participate actively. To encourage such participation, Senator HENNINGS and I also introduced bills to make political contributions in modest amount tax exempt, in the belief that increased financial participation will in turn lead to participation of other kinds, and that political contributions will be placed on a plane of equality with other public-spirited contributions. I hope that this latter bill also will receive favorable consideration at an early date next year.

Resolutions Adopted by 53d Annual Convention of the Oregon State Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 53d Annual Convention of the Oregon State Federation of Labor was held July 25 through July 29, 1955, in Medford, Oreg. The federation passed a number of resolutions on issues of nationwide interest. Voicing as they do the thinking of thousands of laboring people in the State of Oregon, I believe, Mr. President, that it is important that we know their position on these issues; with that in mind I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas the 20 percent Federal amusement tax was imposed upon the entertainment industry as a wartime emergency measure; and

Whereas the reasons for its continuance no longer obtain; and

Whereas tens of thousands of workers in this industry are jobless because of this ruinous tax, among them musicians, waiters, cooks, bartenders, and other service employees; and

Whereas all comparable excise taxes imposed as wartime and emergency levies have either been repealed or substantially reduced while the amusement tax continues at its discriminatory level of 20 percent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in session assembled go on record as protesting the continuance of this ruinous amusement tax and urging its repeal by the Congress; and that the secretary be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the personal attention of our Senators, WAYNE MORSE, DICK NEUBERGER, and Representatives EDITH GREEN, NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH in Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas one of the most important sections of the Lloyd-La Follette antigag law guarantees the right of postal and Federal employees to join unions of their own choice, provided such unions do not impose an obligation to strike; but does not guarantee that the executive branch of the Government shall recognize and deal with such unions; and

Whereas collective bargaining and proper machinery to settle grievances are considered proper and essential in private industry, and certainly the same rule should apply equally to all employers and employees whether public or private; and

Whereas H. R. 697, a personnel management relations bill has been introduced in the Congress by the Honorable GEORGE M. RHODES of Pennsylvania, which would require by law that the executive branch of the Federal Government recognize and deal with employee unions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 1955 convention of the Oregon State Federation of Labor go on record as favoring H. R. 687, a personnel management relations bill by Congressman RHODES, which requires the executive branch of the Federal Government to recognize and deal with unions of postal and Federal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary-treasurer of the Oregon State Federation of Labor notify the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress of this action and request their active support of this legislation.

RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas working people who are nearing retirement age are prone to infirmities and often lose much time due to sickness in the last few years of their employment; and

Whereas unemployment is a more likely hazard in later earning years; and

Whereas the consequent lost time under the act as now written, causes the person who falls within the above conditions to have their social-security retirement benefits cut down; and

Whereas this does not show a true picture of the contribution made by the individual over his earning years: Therefore be it.

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Medford, Oreg., this July 25 to 29, 1955, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act for the purpose of basing social-security payments upon a worker's most productive years; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION NO. 14

Whereas workers today are having difficulty finding employment after reaching age 50; and

Whereas most union workers at age 60 have already worked 40 years or over: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Medford, Oreg., this July 25 to 29, 1955, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act for the purpose of lowering the age limit for old-age benefits from 65 to 60 years; and be it still further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION NO. 15

Whereas disabled workers are finding it impossible to keep up with the American standard of living during disability: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Medford, Oreg., this July 25 to 29, 1955, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act, so that benefits may be paid to workers who have been disabled; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION NO. 16

Whereas Japanese-made plywood is being imported into this country with little, if any, duty and due to the low wages paid Japanese labor, the product is being offered on the American market for much less than what American manufacturers would have to charge; and

Whereas the manufacture of plywood is a major industry in the State of Oregon with the livelihood of a great number of our workmen depending on the industry; and

Whereas this practice is a great threat to our American standard of living and working conditions and our national economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our legislators in the United States Congress be asked to work for amendments to the existing trade agreements which will protect our American workmen and American industries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to neighboring State federations of labor for concurrence.

RESOLUTION NO. 18

Whereas the social-security laws, as presently enacted, tend to work an economic hardship on women over the age of 60 years; and

Whereas women over the age of 60 years are offered only limited opportunities of employment; and

Whereas the retirement of women from employment at the age of 60 years would, if they were then entitled to social-security

benefits, afford a suitable income to their household; and

Whereas such retirement of women at the age of 60 would increase job opportunities for men of advanced years; and

Whereas the members of organized labor are aware of the hardships created by the present social-security law with regard to women 60 years of age and older; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the existing social-security law is partially inadequate and that the following changes and amendments are recommended and endorsed by the Oregon State Federation of Labor as essential to the economic well-being of our Nation:

1. That the social-security laws of the United States be changed to offer benefits to women retiring from work at the age of 60 years, instead of the present 65 years of age.

2. That the aforesaid benefits be made available by appropriate changes in the social-security laws at the earliest available opportunity: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives from Oregon, with the request that they give it their urgent consideration.

RESOLUTION NO. 20

Whereas Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, and Congressman JOHN DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, and Congressman RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, have introduced amendments to the National Labor Relations Act that would restore to employers and employees in industry their right to bargain, without fear of interference, on any lawful matter mutually affecting them in normal labor-management relations; and

Whereas these new bills are identical to the Murray-Dingell-Rhodes bill introduced in 1952 which was endorsed by the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association and cleared by the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the proposed amendments would eliminate to a considerable degree four evils in the Taft-Hartley Act which have been most damaging to trade unions; namely, abolition of the closed shop, outlawing all forms of secondary action, interference with collective bargaining as traditionally practiced in industry, and the injunction: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor at its annual convention at Medford, Oreg., go on record as endorsing the Murray-Dingell-Rhodes bill and urge our Senators and Congressmen to vote for its passage: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Oregon Senators and Representatives in Congress with the request that they give this resolution their most favorable consideration.

RESOLUTION NO. 21 FOR OBSERVANCE OF THE BIRTHDAY OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Whereas the Nation's Government at that time seemed unable to cope with the many urgent needs of the people; and

Whereas, on taking office, Franklin Delano Roosevelt by his own show of courage and faith reawakened the hope of a despairing American citizenry as evidenced by the 99-day session of the 73d Congress that witnessed the most daring Presidential leadership in American history; and

Whereas his program of social-economic legislation gave the common people of America the chance for security and self-respect; and

Whereas in the words of Hugo Ernst, recently deceased general president of the Hotel, Restaurant, and Bartender's International Union, "Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the symbol and patron of the most hopeful ideas that ordinary citizens in a democratic society could build together a productive peaceful way of life, marked by the four freedoms: freedom of speech, freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom of worship"; and

Whereas, when America was plunged into the worst war in her history, Franklin Delano Roosevelt led this country to victory and the world to peace; and

Whereas, on March 7, 1955, the Portland Central Labor Council concurred in Local 664's resolution for observance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday as a legal holiday; and

Whereas Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and Senator DICK NEUBERGER have indicated their support of proposals asking the President of the United States to proclaim Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday a legal national holiday; and

Whereas there have already been introduced into the United States Senate and into the House of Representatives, joint resolutions asking the President of the United States to proclaim Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday a legal national holiday: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor petition the Governor of the State of Oregon to proclaim January 30 of each year a legal holiday in Oregon in commemoration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Oregon delegation in Congress to support this recommendation with suitable legislation.

RESOLUTION NO. 34

Whereas the forces opposed to public ownership of power are endeavoring to foist upon the people a partnership plan where the Government will pay the major portion of the cost of building the dam but the private power people will receive the revenue accruing from the sale of power; and

Whereas this is another sample of the give-away program which has been inaugurated by the present administration in Washington; and

Whereas publicly owned power is the greatest asset that the Northwest has and is the best method of procuring jobs for the workers and prosperity for the region; and

Whereas the private power advocates have put their greatest effort on the construction of low-head dams on the Hells Canyon site for the benefit of the private power monopoly; and

Whereas the fight in Oregon for the Hells Canyon project has been led by Senators WAYNE MORSE, RICHARD NEUBERGER, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council, at its 35th semiannual convention, again reiterate its stand in favor of an all-purpose Government constructed high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Representative EDITH GREEN for their efforts on behalf of an all-purpose dam at Hells Canyon and publicly owned power generally; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Representative EDITH GREEN.

Adopted by the State building trades convention July 24, 1955, and referred to the Oregon State Federation of Labor convention July 25–29.

RESOLUTION NO. 38

Whereas the retirement pay of most Federal employees is inadequate to the point where only the bare necessities for existence can be acquired by such pay; and

Whereas large numbers of retired employees are forced into the labor market at part or full-time work in order to maintain a decent standard of living, and

Whereas Federal employees contribute 6 percent of their salary during their productive years toward retirement pay which amount is several times the amount contributed by donors to social security with no appreciable increase in benefits; and

Whereas there are hundreds of millions of dollars that have piled up in reserve over the past years due to the parsimonious hoarding of the Federal employees own moneys by the Government; and

Whereas the proposed liberalization of the retired employees' annuities would not cost the Government any additional money beyond its present obligations; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor convening in Medford, Oreg., July 25, 1955, go on record as favoring the Morrison bill, H. R. 3791, which provides for the liberalization of the Federal employee's annuity by basing the annuity on 2½ percent of the average wage multiplied by years of service with optional retirement at the age of 60; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary be directed to notify the Oregon delegation in Congress of this action with a request to work for the enactment of this legislation into law.

RESOLUTION NO. 60

Whereas the National Government is now planning a $10 billion or more Federal highway improvement construction program; and

Whereas the coast Highway 101 has not been designated to receive Federal aid in this projected program; and

Whereas Highway 101 being an important north and south link in the coast highway system; and

Whereas the Northwest area of the United States is classed as a critical military area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Oregon State Federation of Labor do go on record as urging the United States Bureau of Public Roads to designate Highway 101 to be included in the projected Federal aid highway improvement program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Bureau of Public Roads and to the congressional delegations of the States of Oregon, Washington, and California.

RESOLUTION NO. 61

Whereas the Columbia River at Astoria, Oreg., and Megler, Wash., being the last link on Highway 101 not connected by a bridge and much delay resulting in the use of a ferry system, etc.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor do go on record as urging the United States Bureau of Federal Roads to construct the trans-Columbia bridge at Astoria, Oreg., and Megler, Wash., with the use of Federal funds thus completing the last link in this much-traveled north and south highway; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Bureau of Public Roads system and the congressional delegations of the States of Oregon, Washington, and California and the Governors of Oregon, Washington, and California.

Remarks by Hon. Denis Healey of the United Kingdom Delegation at the NATO Parliamentary Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the six-man delegation which represented this body at the NATO Parliamentary Conference at Paris in mid-July. It was a valuable experience to sit in conference with members of the parliaments of the Western democracies and to learn their regard for NATO and hear their hopes for its future.

It seems to me that we in this country do not fully appreciate the growing success of both the military and nonmilitary work of NATO. This is perhaps inevitable as of necessity the principle activities and accomplishments of NATO have taken place in Western Europe.

On the thought that some of my colleagues would like to have a wider understanding of the present and future role of NATO as our fellow parliamentarians saw it at the conference, I am presenting below a penetrating speech made at one of the plenary sessions of the conference by Mr. Denis Healey, Member of Parliament, a member of the United Kingdom delegation. This was perhaps the most discerning presentation of the entire conference and summarizes very well, I think, the best thinking of our friends in the north Atlantic area as they contemplate the future of NATO, and, to use Mr. Healey's words, "the supreme value of maintaining the unity and strength on which negotiations with Russia have become possible."

The address follows:

I have been struck very often discussing NATO, Mr. President, with people in England and also at this conference, by the complaint that NATO is just a military organization, and I think it is worth emphasizing the importance of having a military organization. The word "just" does not do justification to its importance, because, after all, the job of NATO in the military field is to see that we and our children stay alive, and that surely is not a task whose importance should be underestimated. In the second place, the success of NATO in preventing war is one of the things which, as General Billotte said, has produced a readiness in the Soviet Union to enter into what we all hope will be a new phase of relations with the West in the cold war, and what I want to offer a few views about is this military side of NATO's work as it affects us as parliamentarians. The military aim of NATO is to prevent war by deterring aggression, and we hope to deter aggression by showing the potential aggressor that aggression would not pay, and, as was explained to us in a briefing recently, the deterrent takes two forms.

In the first place, we have to show the aggressor that if he launches the Red Army against us in Europe, we can halt the Red Army in its tracks, and, in the second place, we must show the potential aggressor that if he begins a war he will be defeated.

If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that, after 6 years' work and tremendous financial sacrifices, and sacrifices in manpower by all our 15 nations, we are still uncertain of achieving the first part of our deterrent, because it is not certain now that we could halt the Red army if it launched a full-scale attack on Western Europe, and therefore the effectiveness of the deterrent depends on our ability to defeat the potential aggressor by other means. In other words, to defeat the Soviet Union should it engage in war, by long-range atomic bombardment of its homeland. Now what I want to suggest is that the present situation in which the military value of NATO depends on the power to destroy Soviet cities by long-range atomic bombardment, is an extremely unsatisfactory situation for two reasons. In the first place, the power to bombard the Soviet Union with atomic weapons does not lie in the hands of NATO. The only Western power which at the moment has the ability to mount a major attack on the Soviet Union with nuclear weapons, is the United States through its Strategic Air Command, and the Strategic Air Command is not under NATO control. And though we in Britain have decided to try to produce our own nuclear striking force, that too will not be under the control of NATO, and I may say that it is a very long way at the moment from existing in Britain. The fact that NATO's whole military strategy depends on the use of an arm which is not under NATO control is, I suggest, an extremely dangerous fact. In the first place it tends to corrode the alliance in Europe, because the European members of NATO have no control over their main means of defense, and in the second place they cannot now be sure that, if there is a war, whether or not the Soviet cities are destroyed, their own territory will not be occupied by the Red army. The reliance on a deterrent which is the monopoly of a single country is dangerous to the political existence of the alliance.

And the second danger in the present strategic situation, I suggest, is that America's readiness to use her thermonuclear striking power against the Soviet Union, is bound to decline as Russia's power to retaliate in kind increases, especially when neither America nor any other member of the NATO alliance have so far, as has been explained to us, any plans to defend their own population in case of thermonuclear war.

I was very impressed by reports of a study which a previous supreme commander of NATO, General Ridgway, submitted to Mr. Wilson in the United States shortly before his retirement as United States Chief of Staff, because General Ridgway himself suggested that, as Russia's power to retaliate with atomic bombardment of the United States increased, a situation might well develop in which the use of nuclear weapons might be excluded, either by gentlemen's agreement between both sides, or even by a formal convention. I believe that we should take General Ridgway's warning very seriously. Even in the period when America was the only country in the world with atomic weapons, she did not use those weapons in order to avoid the possibility of defeat in Korea or to prevent the certainty of a Communist victory in Indochina. I believe she was right in that case.

It is already accepted that the atomic weapon is not going to be used by the West in cases of aggression in what some American writers now call the "gray" areas, the areas in which American strategic interests are not directly involved in a major way. What I want to suggest, Mr. President, is that the gray area to which the thermonuclear deterrent will not apply, is likely to extend westward as Russia's power to bombard America with H-bombs increases and, according to recent reports in the American press, many informed persons believe that Russia is already outproducing the United States in heavy jet bombers and is producing as many medium jet bombers as the United States, and of course we know that the Soviet Union has the power to produce the H-bomb and therefore to turn all her existing A-bombs into H-bombs.

In other words, the military factor on which the whole of NATO's defense concept now relies, may lose its importance as time develops. If its use in war involves the certain annihilation of American cities and, even more, if the eight scientists who signed the declaration recently published by Lord Russell in London, are right the use of H-bombs by both sides in a major war might lead to the annihilation of mankind as a whole.

I believe it is very dangerous indeed that NATO should continue to rely on a strategy which it does not itself control and which may not become available to it in a crisis in the future. The present situation is one in which the price of resisting aggression by use of thermonuclear weapons is out of all proportion to the value of territory which might be lost by surrendering to aggression.

This situation fortunately does not yet exist; no one knows when the so-called atomic stalemate will be complete. It may be in a year's time; it may not be for 5 years, and we have, therefore, some time left in which to build a less suicidal form of defense in NATO, and a form of defense which does not involve suicide, perhaps, for humanity as a whole. And this I think is where our own responsibility as politicians is directly involved. It has been made clear by NATO spokesmen, not only to us in the briefing period the last 2 days, but also in speeches on public occasions, that the effective defense of Western Europe against a major attack by the Red army is impossible without a German contribution, as Herr Kiesineer said, which may be available to us, and we all hope will be available to us, in a few years' time as a result of the ratification of the Paris treaties, and even with the German divisions, the halting of the Red army will require the use tactically of atomic weapons against enemy forces in Europe. And I believe that Senator FLANDERS was right when he suggested in the American Senate just over a week ago, that if the use of tactical atomic weapons against the Red army is not to lead to full-scale thermonuclear war and the end of the human race, it is very important that we should try to establish a distinction between military targets and civil populations, which it will be the advantage of both sides, in case of war, to maintain.

If we can, in the next few years before the atomic stalemate becomes absolute, achieve what is the main present aim of the NATO military staffs, a force on the Continent of Europe which is capable of halting the Red army in Europe and protecting the European members of NATO from Communist occupation, then I think the danger of any deliberate large-scale attack on the West will be eliminated. If we fail to do this, then I believe that the collapse of the thermonuclear deterrent will put us in a terribly dangerous position.

There is one other point I would like to make. There is a great deal of talk nowadays, particularly at the Geneva Conference, about the possibility of creating between West and East, some sort of mutual bloc, of which Germany should be a member. Now, if I am right, and General Ridgway is right, in saying that the thermonuclear deterrent is going to lose its value, the situation in which its value will disappear first is one in which the aggressor might hope, by a rapid blitzkreig, to make a limited gain before the other side could make up its mind whether or not to invoke the extreme sanction. And I believe that it is therefore essential that NATO should remain a united political organization covering the frontier of the Soviet empire. Because if we create a new vacuum between East and West the danger

of war will be immensely increased. You will then have the danger that the Communist side will try to nibble us to death, in the belief that no single advance it makes is worth the terrible price of thermonuclear annihilation for humanity. Now, if this general argument is correct, then the importance of NATO as a military organization is going to increase tremendously in the last few years, and we as parliamentarians will have the duty to explain to our own peoples that if they want peace—not under the shadow of the H-bomb, not as an alternative to total annihilation, but a peace whose price is a reasonable one to pay—they are going to have to build up still further the unity and the strength which it has been the main purpose of NATO to provide. I think as General Gruenther has often said, it is going to be very difficult to convince public opinion of this point so long as the Russians are smiling instead of scowling, and it is mainly the function of parliamentary leaders to take the initiative in this field, and I believe that if our visit as parliamentarians to NATO in the last few days has done something to convince us of the supreme value of maintaining the unity and strength on which negotiations with Russia have become possible, then not only will it have been worthwhile, but it will be very worthwhile repeating this experiment in future years. Thank you.

The Privileges and Duties of a Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an essay written by Miss Mary Louise Conway, of Baltimore, Md.

Miss Conway's essay on The Privileges and Duties of a Citizen won first prize in the Baltimore Civitan Club's contest, the Chesapeake district award, and the top Civitan International award. It was the first time a high-school senior from Maryland has won the top prize.

Miss Conway is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. William M. Conway, of 5511 Purdue Avenue, Baltimore. She was graduated from the high-school department of the College of Notre Dame of Maryland last June.

At a luncheon held in Miss Conway's honor by the Civitan Club of Baltimore and the Women of Civitan, David H. Wallace, of Annapolis, governor of the Chesapeake district of Civitan International, presented her with a citation and a $600 scholarship. Miss Conway plans to use the scholarship at Northwestern University in the study of journalism this fall.

The winning essay follows:

THE PRIVILEGES AND DUTIES OF A CITIZEN

(By Mary Louise Conway, 1955)

"The American Republic was born to assure you the dignity and rights of a human individual. If the dignity and rights of your fellow men guide your daily conduct of life, you will be a good American," maintained President Eisenhower recently in an open letter to American students.

The world citizen of our modern civilization faces problems of such decisive importance, that upon his shoulders rests the burden of tomorrow—and what of tomorrow? Will it hold the dream of peace and brotherhood toward which good citizens everywhere are striving, or are we verging upon an era of chaotic destruction at the hands of tyrants? The answer, of course, is in the hands and hearts of the people, for ours is a people's government, and the outlook is a bright one, for the American citizen is armed with the most splended weapon of all—a hope that is stronger than hate and more timeless than death and the evils of war. It is that same magnificent hope that claimed victory for the citizen-colonists in the dark days of the Revolution, the same hope that uplifted the American heart and the lone Stars and Stripes over the battle-scarred Iwo Jima.

But the pride and hopefulness of the American citizen is not enough. Good citizenship is a way of life, rather than a privilege to be taken for granted. To begin with, a citizen is a person, subject to the authority of a country, who enjoys certain rights and privileges by reason of that fact. However, there is a two-sided nature of citizenship; it has been said that every right carries with it a duty. Reason tells us then, that because of the privileges a citizen enjoys, he has also the corresponding responsibility of doing his share to keep his Nation great and strong.

Our rights here in the United States are many and varied, but these rights, as listed in our Constitution, are included under three general categories—private property, personal liberty, and personal security.

Our Government guarantees any citizen the right to own and use property of any type, as long as this use does not intrude upon the rights of others or upon the community.

As citizens of the United States, we are guaranteed personal liberty, or the opportunity to develop to the fullest degree one's talents and sometimes latent abilities.

A third guarantee which we expect from our Government concern personal security; that is, the right of every citizen to enjoy life, health, and a good reputation. If any unjust infringement on his rights is attempted, a citizen may demand the protection of the state. This right especially includes protection for those accused of crimes.

The corresponding duties of a good citizen are fundamental; generally speaking, they include obedience to lawful authority and service to the Government and fellow citizens. In this respect, a really good citizen is one who not only keeps the laws of his country, but does his best to help make those laws good ones.

With reference to voting, it can be said that it is both a duty and a privilege, for the state does not extend this right to everyone. Graft and corruption can be stamped out of our Government if an interested and well-informed host of citizens perform their duties at the polls. As Winston Churchill once jokingly commented, "The only thing worse than having elections is not having them."

A responsibility which we often abhor is jury duty. In many States men and women are chosen from the voting lists for service on a jury. Because we are proud to boast of the fact that every accused person has the privilege of an impartial trial by jury, we should be just as proud to serve on a jury if we should be asked to do so. Since juries must be composed of citizens of highest integrity and honesty, no one should refuse his services for jury duty unless there is an excellent reason for doing so.

Here in America, where we put into practice the democratic principles cherished by our forefathers, a citizen must learn to cooperate for the common good; for democracy, whether in government, in industry, or in school, works only as well as the people work together. Just as citizenship implies cooperation, it likewise demands leadership and service. Unless we understand and discharge these duties, we become parasites, enjoying all the benefits of our American democracy but doing nothing to deserve these privileges.

To consummate all that has been said or implied on the subject of truly good citizenship, one should scrutinize himself carefully and rate himself personally as to how he is measuring up to our practical and unselfish American ideals, for the first step toward improvement is clear understanding. If we, as citizens, can glean a knowledge of the truth with regard to our rights and duties, we can build a better world for the citizens of tomorrow.

Facts on Federal Subsidies to Commercial Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statements I received from Mr. J. Carroll Cone, assistant vice president of Pan American Airways, in reply to two columns written by Mr. Ray Tucker:

PAN AMERICAN
WORLD AIRWAYS SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1955.

Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEAMER: One of your colleagues caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix two items by a newspaper columnist purporting to deal with Federal subsidies to commercial airlines. We know that the sponsor of the insertions in the RECORD had no desire to be unfair to anyone but, unfortunately, it appears that his source of information took an unfair advantage by failing to make known the sequence of events which followed the remarks of Senator DOUGLAS which was the basis for the columnist's misleading attacks on this important subject.

In order to present the true factual situation for the RECORD, I would like you, Congressman BEAMER, to have copies of the following material:

1. Relevant portions of a letter addressed to Senator DOUGLAS on June 24, 1955.

2. The letter addressed to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt on July 1, 1955.

3. Pan American's memorandum analysis, and reply to the Ray Tucker column of June 30, 1955.

4. Pan American's letter to the McClure newspaper syndicate, together with pages 14 and 15 of the enclosure mentioned therein.

With respect to item 1 above, note should be taken of the fact that Senator DOUGLAS' charges, which were based upon erroneous information, have not been publicly repeated by him following his subsequent opportunity to check with official sources. Concerning item 2, Pan American thereafter received a courteous note from Mrs. Roosevelt to the effect that since Pan American had undertaken to inform Senator Douglas, that is all that is necessary.

From past events it appears reasonable to assume that the insertions in the RECORD have resulted from the activities of a single individual who, following an established pattern, has attempted to mislead others on this serious subject.

We appreciate your tremendous interest as a member of the Interstate and Foreign

Commerce Committee of the House in the affairs of transportation, both domestic and international, and we have turned to you because of your known fairness in dealing with the problems of the transportation industry.

In the absence of the author of the insertions from this country, we humbly request that a copy of this letter be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with as many of the enclosures as you may see fit to insert, so that the public may be accurately informed and anyone interested may easily ascertain and undertake an independent evaluation of the actual facts.

Thanking you in advance for your earnest and fair consideration of this matter, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

J. CARROLL CONE,
Assistant Vice President.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1955.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
Member of Congress,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: * * * The subject that I wish to discuss with you is in reference to your recent interest in the problem of airline subsidies.

* * * We most sincerely regret that you have seen fit to level attack (particularly against the Pan American Airways) without first having afforded us the opportunity to demonstrate the inaccuracies of information upon which you have relied. I respectfully beg to suggest that you have been misled, most unfortunately, into reliance upon the same grossly incorrect and misleading information which has previously been given credence and public circulation by a few others and which, also, has been thoroughly discredited.

It is with great disappointment and concern that I have recognized a familiar pattern which seeks to rely upon your good name, as it has upon a few others until they have undertaken an independent appraisal of the actual facts, to create governmental and public distrust of some of the essential principles of the Civil Aeronautics Act and the world leadership in international aviation which has been developed and achieved for the United States thereunder.

* * * I am sure that you do not wish to become identified with or rely upon sources whose interests and motives appear to be entirely of an intentionally destructive nature. It is for this reason that I respectfully suggest that a careful analysis of the material upon which your recent positions have been based, compared with available facts and official and public records, will demonstrate that you have been prevailed upon to give credence to obsolete, demonstrably incorrect and repeatedly disproven allegations concerning subsidies for international airline operations. Many of the matters reflected in your public statements first arose in the hearings on the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill for fiscal 1955. Some of them were repeated, despite showings and readily available evidence to the contrary, in connection with the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1955. Some are now continuing to be repeated in your name despite voluminous and convincing evidence to the contrary from the previous hearings, the records of the Civil Aeronautics Board and of the General Accounting Office.

In addition, certain of the allegations or statements advanced have been directly disproven by reference to the annual reports of air carriers and certified public audits of their transactions and affairs.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I suggest to you that you reexamine your position by ascertaining that the following are correct facts:

1. The CAB request of $63 million for fiscal 1956, cut by the House to $40 million, was restored in the Senate to $55 million. The Senate hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee at page 294 fully disclose that the CAB still had sought the full $63 million in the Senate. When pressed for a reasonable reduction, the CAB suggested that $55 million would be a figure still requiring a supplemental appropriation, but would approximate the total subsidy bill much more closely than would the $40 million. There is no lawful or record or other basis from which to assume that the lion's share of the proposed increase, or any other precisely determinable ratio, would be received by any particular airline.

2. Your attacks on Pan American's nonaviation subsidiaries and the alleged effect upon subsidy claims are diametrically at variance with the policies firmly employed by the CAB, with respect to such matters and further reflect a lack of appreciation of the advantages which the American taxpayer stands to gain, without risk, from airline investments in such companies. No subsidy appropriated by the Congress or administered by the CAB to maintain our international air-transport system, goes to support affiliated companies of Pan American, whether foreign-flag airline or domestic or foreign nonairline concerns in any way whatsoever. Pan American's investment in such companies, their expenses, and any losses which they may sustain or which Pan American may suffer from its interests in such companies all are totally excluded by the CAB for mail-rate purposes. In contrast, however, the mail-rate policy of the CAB claims, in full, any net income realized by Pan American from investment in any affiliated company—with consequent reduction in subsidy requirements. The entire effect is that Pan American and its stockholders (which number some 40,000 located throughout the country in every State of the Union) assume all the risk and burdens of loss from investments in these companies—while the American taxpayer receives all the benefits of profits by reduction in subsidy.

3. Official reports of Pan American, as well as the CAB disclose that from the beginning of its interest in the Intercontinental Hotels Corp., that company has been a wholly owned subsidiary of Pan American and that no part of the financing and development of that company's activities has been provided for in the form of airline subsidies. The development phase of that company, which owns only one hotel but operates and manages others, was concluded as of December 31, 1953, and the company is currently operating at a profit.

4. The Intercontinental Hotels Corp. was formed some years ago by Pan American to meet the need for adequate hotel accommodations abroad and for the purpose of assisting local groups in arranging, financing, and providing technical assistance in connection with the planning, construction, and management of new hotels where needed. It is my understanding that the Export-Import Bank has been interested in these projects and can attest to the soundness of the investment. Perhaps you do not recall the Government interest in encouraging international air transportation through such means, and particularly, House Report No. 1527 of the 82d Congress, 2d session, in which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, following a more comprehensive investigation into Latin American matters, stated at page 23:

"While travel by aircraft may mean more dollars to the countries involved in the supply of food, lodging, and ancillary services, it also means that before any substantial volume of air traffic may be maintained there must be adequate and acceptable accommodations to support it. In the past in most of Latin America, the aggregate hotel accommodations provided have been limited, as geographical location and lack of internal communication discouraged travel and water transportation, especially cruise ships, largely satisfied existing requirements. With the stimulus to air travel already manifest, let alone what may develop from the inducements now planned by coach service and reduced fare, it would appear the provision of sufficient hotel space presents an important problem in most of those countries which may seek to protect and increase their revenue from this traffic."

5. Perhaps you are not aware, also, that your statements concerning the payments of income taxes has been thoroughly controverted by testimony in previous Appropriations Committee hearings. The policies followed by the CAB in this matter are in accord with general public-utility practice. To simplify, in absence of subsidy a public utility which suffers a net loss from its commercial operations obviously would have no income tax to pay. However, the Bureau of Internal Revenue treats Government subsidies as a part of gross income in the same manner as income from commercial sources. When the total of commercial revenues and subsidy support therefore produces a net profit for the company's operations, income taxes are incurred. Statutory mandates to provide public utilities or other business enterprises, subsidy payments sufficient to provide a reasonable return on the company's investment, must therefore give full consideration to income taxes actually incurred in determining whatever amount is necessary to provide the fair return required by the statute. Upon full examination into this, I am confident you will find no mystery or impropriety in this and I am equally sure that the General Accounting Office would confirm to you that such are the facts.

6. Pan American receives no Government subsidy under existing CAB mail rate orders for the operation of any routes which are comparable to any unsubsidized routes operated by other United States flag carriers. In the recent past, it has received subsidy attributable to and identified with maintaining air service over certain thin-traffic national-interest routes, such as those to South Africa, to the door of the Iron Curtain at Finland, to Australasia and westwardly from Hong Kong. However, under new temporary mail rates now proposed by the CAB, even some of these would receive no subsidy support.

7. Your contentions regarding the effect of the Supreme Court decision in the so-called "Offset" case, according to readily available official information, has no relevancy to the CAB's subsidy appropriations request for fiscal 1956. However, the CAB is currently processing the offset question in relation to Pan American. The net result of this, together with final adjudications in the mail-rate cases, will serve to determine whether for past periods there is a balance owing from the Government to Pan American or from Pan American to the Government. If it were assumed that the minimum admitted by the Government to be owed to Pan American for past periods and the maximum claimed by the Government for offset purposes were to be sustained, the difference would be an obligation in favor of the Government in the sum of $198,000. Accordingly, it would appear most likely that the effect of the offset decision when compared with amounts owed to Pan American for past periods, can be expected even to result in a balance in favor of Pan American owed by the Government. But whatever the final outcome, all or virtually all of any balance due the Government would be for the account of the Post Office Department and all or virtually all of any balance due Pan American would be paid by the Post Office Department. The offset

question, therefore, is of relatively little significance even in connection with subsidy appropriations for periods prior to fiscal 1956. As record explanation of this subject I refer you to hearings before the Senate committee on the second supplemental appropriation bill, particularly the testimony at page 238.

8. The frequently repeated concern with the extent to which Pan American's books and records have been audited in recent years was promptly disproven when made in hearings before the House subcommittee on the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1955. At that time, the CAB supplied its auditing statistics showing that over 10,000 man-hours had been spent during the previous year completing audits of Pan American, including the system general offices and all operating divisions. An additional 597 man-hours were devoted to the International Hotels Corp. The CAB has requested additional appropriations to cover the employment of additional auditors so that the frequency of such audits can be made an annual activity. Pan American will welcome this procedure. Moreover, foreign corporations in which Pan American has an investment, as you know, are not subject to the jurisdiction of United States Government auditors, but every transaction between any of those companies and Pan American is under the complete scrutiny of the CAB and is ascertainable and reviewed in the audits of Pan American's own books and records. This has been explained upon at least four occasions in recent months in the hearings before committees of both the Senate and the House.

In view of the foregoing, I am sure that you may find that the positions which you have been advocating on these subjects justify careful reexamination. We trust, therefore, that your subsequent conclusions, in fairness and equity to Pan American and consistent with the national interest in American-flag international air transportation, will provide occasion for your undertaking in an appropriate manner to correct the public record. In the meantime, may we respectfully request of you that this letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as relevant to the subjects to which your previous remarks have been addressed.

If there should be any additional information that we can provide, or if you would like to question in your office any of our officials, comptroller, treasurer, employees of our bookkeeping department, I assure you that they will be glad to answer any and all questions that might be troubling you.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

J. CARROLL CONE,
Assistant Vice President.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1955.

Mrs. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT,
Hyde Park, Dutchess County, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. ROOSEVELT: Senator BRIDGES has asked for our comments on a letter addressed to him in your name under date of June 25, 1955. Your letter refers to a letter received by you from Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and apparently accepts certain premises which we beg to assure you are based upon entirely misleading and incorrect information.

Since we do not have the benefit of whatever letter you may have received, it is somewhat difficult to ascertain precisely what information is needed. We are aware, however, of certain public comments and other correspondence recently attributed to Senator DOUGLAS and trust that the enclosed extracts from our letter directed to him on June 24, 1955, may be of assistance. I am confident that in your extensive public life you are aware of the manner in which destructive objectives are often sought to be accomplished at the instance of individuals, who may have become obsessed with either a self-appointed or sponsored cause. Their supplying incorrect, obsolete, and otherwise misleading information in a manner designed to cause its uninformed circulation by high personages is a familiar tactic. I know, of course, that you would never knowingly permit the use of your name or influence in a manner unfair to any person or company.

Please be assured that voluminous official and public records are readily available to demonstrate beyond question that:

1. All financial transactions between Pan American and other companies, affiliated or not, are subject to and under the continuing scrutiny and review of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board has testified fully on such matters, and the records are clear.

2. The entire operations of Pan American are being treated as an entity in accord with the Supreme Court decision having to do with the offset of earnings from one operating division against possible losses of other divisions. Pan American has and does fully agree with and supports the above decision.

Pan American enjoys no more favorable subsidy treatment than that afforded to any other United States air carrier. In several respects, quite the contrary is true, details concerning which we shall be pleased to supply and fully document if you so desire.

In order that you may continue your expressed interest in Pan American's mission of carrying the United States flag to most countries and colonies of the free world, we are pleased to enclose a company memorandum containing recent facts and figures which we believe you will find valuably informative. Should you have any further questions concerning Pan American's status and operations, we shall be pleased to serve your further request.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. CARROLL CONE,
Assistant Vice President.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS SYSTEM,
New York, N. Y., July 11, 1955.

As the attached analysis of Mr. Tucker's June 30 column shows, it is obvious that Mr. Tucker made no effort either to check or to accurately report the record.

His statements are utterly disproven by the official debate, CAB records, and testimony before the Appropriations Committees and from the records of the General Accounting Office.

MEMORANDUM

Tucker column

1. "It will decide whether Pan American World Airways shall continue to receive Federal subsidies which have totaled more than $1 billion since World War II."

Comment

No such decision was before the Appropriations Committees. Who gets how much subsidy is determined by a judicial proceeding before the Civil Aeronautics Board laid down by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Whether Pan Am should or should not get subsidy in 1956 was not an issue before the committee. The $1 billion figure is wildly exaggerated. A check with the proper Government office would have revealed the proper total as less than a fifth of this amount. The Government pays Pan American a subsidy for maintaining deficit air services essential to the foreign commerce, the post office, and the national defense.

Tucker column

2. "The White House and a House Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, from Brooklyn, cut the 1956 subsidy figure proposed by the CAB from $55 million to $40 million."

Comment

The White House had nothing to do with the proceeding. Not Representative ROONEY, of Brooklyn, but Representative PRESTON, of Georgia, is head of the subcommittee. CAB asked for $63 million. This was cut to $40 million in the House. Fifty-five million dollars was not mentioned by the House committee, but was the figure subsequently recommended by the Senate committee and which the CAB said was likely to require a supplemental appropriation later.

Tucker column

3. "The reduction is not so important as the purpose behind it, which was to force Pan Am to adopt economies that would make it self-sustaining."

Comment

Not a single line of the record of the proceedings supports this.

Tucker column

4. "Pan Am gets the lion's share of taxpayers' money allotted to airlines subsidies."

Comment

Not true. Local-service airlines and helicopter companies get lion's share.

Tucker column

5. "Its great overseas rival, Trans World Airlines, has just received a special citation from Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, congratulating it for operating without subsidies. Most other lines, foreign and domestic, pay their own way."

Comment

Pan American is also off subsidy for operations comparable to those of TWA. In the recent past, PAA has received subsidy to maintain air services over certain thin-traffic national-interest routes, such as those to South Africa, to the door of the Iron Curtain at Finland to Australasia and westwardly from Hong Kong. Incidentally, the Senate Appropriations Committee requested the CAB to clarify this distinction in the future. Foreign-flag airlines are heavily subsidized—many are government owned.

Tucker column

6. "In Senate debate on this question, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, developed these facts about Pan Am's finances and its relationship with the CAB, the Treasury and the General Accounting Office:"

Comment

Unsubstantiated charges were made by Senator DOUGLAS. The other side of the debate which fully answered Senator DOUGLAS with the record facts is completely ignored by Tucker.

Tucker column

7. "Pan Am receives between $8 million and $9 million a year from the Federal Treasury in order to pay its taxes to Uncle Sam. In some years, Pan American has received more than it owed in taxes, but it has simply pocketed the 'windfall'."

Comment

All of an airline's revenues, including Government subsidy and everything else, go into its bank accounts. It draws on these accounts to pay all of its expenses—wages of personnel, cost of fuel, and other supplies, rentals of facilities, interest on its debt, and income tax. It is no more accurate to say that the Government subsidy pays an airline's income tax than to say, for instance, that cargo shippers alone pay it.

Tucker's reference to a "windfall" refers to a CAB policy, changed many years ago, which applied to all airlines.

Tucker column

8. "Pan Am operates a chain of luxury hotels in Latin America, with fancy bars, golf courses, and swimming pools, on which it loses between $2 million and $3 million."

Comment

Pan Am's wholly owned subsidiary, Intercontinental Hotels Corp., operates a chain of hotels all but one of which are owned by others. They are an essential tool in the development of the tourist industry in Latin America. Tourist dollars spent at these hotels help provide Latin American countries with foreign exchange to buy goods produced by American workers. IHC operated at a profit last year and continues to do so this year.

Tucker column

9. "According to Senator DOUGLAS, this loss is financed by many taxpayers who cannot afford an air voyage to the luxurious hostelries."

Comment

Wrong. No subsidy money goes into the hotel company or ever has. On the other hand, under present subsidy policy, the CAB claims in full any net income realized by Pan American from investment in any affiliated company—with consequent reduction in subsidy requirements.

Tucker column

10. "According to Postmaster General Summerfield, Pan Am owes millions to the Government for past overpayments it has received for carrying the mail, which is another form of subsidy. But, despite Mr. Summerfield's urging, no suit to recover has been brought by the CAB or the Department of Justice."

Comment

This couldn't be more wrong. CAB judicial proceedings have been heard to determine whether Pan Am owes the Government or the Government owes Pan Am. Final decisions are not yet in, but upon the record, the CAB staff admits that the Government owes Pan Am, not vice versa. As in the past, the judicial proceedings protect the Government from overpayment and substantial amounts due have been withheld from PAA in the interim. Money received for carrying the mail is simple compensation for services rendered. Subsidy is separate. The Government made $7 million profit last year on the mail Pan American carried. This is the difference between the money it received from the sale of stamps less costs of handling the mail and the money it paid Pan American for the work of carrying the mail.

Tucker column

11. "Most amazingly, as several congressional investigations disclose, neither the CAB nor the Comptroller General have complied with legal requirements that they audit Pan Am's finances and operations."

Comment

This statement is plain astonishing. The CAB has testified that over 10,000 man-hours were spent in 1954 auditing PAA's books. An additional 597 man-hours were devoted to Pan Am's hotel subsidiary.

Tucker column

12. "Both agencies have failed to comply with a Supreme Court decision to that effect, a decision which revealed the jurists' annoyance over this untidy state of affairs."

Comment

This is a confused reference to a Supreme Court decision of February 1, 1954, in a test case against Chicago & Southern, not Pan American, which had nothing to do with auditing. In brief, the decision required that any excess earnings from one division of a company be applied to reduce subsidy in another division. Pan American has always believed that this makes sense and is on record as opposed to attempts by other airlines to change the Civil Aeronautics Act to upset the Supreme Court decision.

Tucker column

13. "Despite Senator DOUGLAS' scorching analysis, a Senate Commerce subcommittee headed by Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida, increased the subsidy total from the House allowance of $40 million to $55 million. Although HOLLAND failed to answer the Douglas indictment, the Senate voted for the larger amount by 51 to 25."

Comment

This just isn't true. Senator HOLLAND made a very full answer to the Douglas charges. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 16, 1955, page 7220 and following.

Mr. JOSEPH B. AGNELLI,
McClure Newspaper Syndicate,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. AGNELLI: This is in reply to your letter concerning Ray Tucker's column released June 30, 1955.

While we have regretted the necessity for preparing memorandum analyses replying to Ray Tucker's columns, we cannot believe that fairminded editors would presume to deny anyone opportunity to invite their attention to biased and prejudicial statements based upon inaccurate information supplied to a reporter or columnist by outside sources. We must again assure you that Pan American's memorandum covering Tucker's June 30 release not only sets forth the accurate situation, but is fully documented. Merely as examples:

1. The decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board of December 20, 1954, in the Trans-Atlantic Final Mail Rate case, Docket No. 1706, fully confirms that:

(a) Pan American is off subsidy for transatlantic operations comparable to those of TWA (p. 73).

(b) No investments in, advances to, or expenses of affiliated companies are in any way underwritten by Government subsidy for airline operations, but conversely, earnings realized by Pan American from any such investments are claimed by the CAB in reduction of subsidy (pp. 59–70).

(c) Pan American is being treated as an entity whereby any excessive earnings from one operating division are being offset against losses of another division as required by the Supreme Court decision in the Chicago and Southern case (p. 120). (See also the transcript of hearings in the Offset case, CAB, Docket No. 1706.)

2. As for the question concerning audits of Pan American's affairs and activities, the CAB supplied in Appropriations Committee hearings, when such questions were first raised, complete tabulations showing over 10,000 man-hours spent in 1954 completing audits of all Pan American divisions for the previous year, and 597 man-hours on the hotel subsidiary covering April 1946 to September 1954 (House hearings, second supplemental appropriations bill, 1955, p. 213, February 21, 1955), and a total of 41,990 man-hours commencing with the year 1946 (Senate hearings, second supplemental appropriations bill, 1955, p. 248, March 24, 1955).

3. As for Tucker's reporting only one side of a congressional debate, we respectfully refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, 1955, at page 7220 and following, particularly pages 7222–7223 and 7226, wherein the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, in exercise of his responsibilities as such, and after personally obtaining accurate information from official sources, answered, fully and effectively, Senator DOUGLAS' misinformed charges.

Please note that the citations referred to above are only a few of the sources among official Government records, CAB, GAO, and congressional, from which correct facts and figures were readily available long before June 30, 1955. In fact, reference alone to the information supplied by the CAB to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House, respectively, in hearings on the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1955 and the appropriations for fiscal 1956, will disclose the accurate facts with respect to most of the subject raised in the column in question.

As stated, the above are only a few of the examples of inaccuracies in the June 30 release. We assume that they will suffice for your purposes, and have no desire to burden you or your editors with further details. However, should you desire to make a further independent and complete evaluation of the points raised in Pan American's memorandum, we shall be pleased to provide documentation for whatever additional items you may wish.

We trust that you will recognize inherent in this matter a much broader perspective than that represented by a mere attack, or series of attacks, upon a single company by one who appears to have chosen to champion a cause against it. Our basic concern is not an argument between Tucker and Pan American, but one of essential relation to the national interest in assuring and maintaining a sound international air transport system, under private enterprise, carrying the United States flag to countries around the world in an intensely competitive international community. As an informative item for general reference, we commend to your careful consideration the enclosed booklet entitled "Uncle Sam's Best Buy," recently published by the Air Transport Association. You may find of particular interest the material contained on pages 14 and 15, including the nature and amounts of subsidies paid to various foreign-flag airlines by their governments.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE LYON,
Acting Public Relations Director
(In absence of John A. Creedy).

HOW FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS SUPPORT THEIR AIRLINES

The airlines of other countries are called foreign-flag airlines. Frequently, these foreign-flag lines are owned in whole or in part by foreign governments. Always, the foreign-flag airlines are heavily supported by their governments, because air service is essential to their commerce and defense.

There are many ways in which foreign governments aid their airlines. Sometimes, currency restrictions almost force people of other countries to fly under their own flag. Sometimes special travel regulations have the same effect. Tax laws may be used to help a foreign nation's airline.

Then, of course, payment of subsidy is a method of assistance used by all foreign countries. The accompanying table shows how representative countries, large and small, have assisted their airlines financially. The airlines of all the countries listed in the table compete with the airlines of the United States.

It should be remembered that a subsidy dollar spent for a foreign-flag airline goes much farther than the same dollar invested in American-flag air service, because foreign wages are so much lower than American wages.

Foreign flag subsidies, 1946–53

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct cash	Government stock ownership	Government loans	Provision of equipment, and so forth	Total
Great Britain	177	111	36.5	42	366.5
France	60	24	59.5	4.3	147.8
Netherlands	7	30.5	14	5.5	57
Belgium	2	3	7	1	13
Canada	10	25	1.5	2.8	39.3
Argintina	52	31	----------	----------	83
Scandinavia	6	9.6	23.8	----------	39.4
Switzerland	.720	.986	----------	3.5	5.206
Venezuela	6.6	----------	15.9	.584	23.084
Brazil	3.6	----------	----------	----------	3.6
Total	324.92	235.086	158.2	59.684	777.890

Address by William Podewitz, President of Fritz Reuter Altenheim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am happy to record a beautiful and patriotic event. Annually the Plattdeutsche Volksfest-Verein honor the old folks who live in the Fritz Reuter Altenheim in Hudson County, which institution is supported by these worthy people. The occasion was a happy one, replete with kindness, music, song, family reunion, and a sense of dedication to America. This year, I had the pleasure of presenting Old Glory to the home in honor of the devotion to America displayed by these good citizens. In the presence of His Excellency, Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey, I presented the flag to William Podewitz, president of Fritz Reuter Altenheim. Mr. Podewitz made an eloquent reply and to the singing of the National Anthem, the flag was raised, unfurling proudly as it arrived at the top of the flagpole. Thereafter, all present pledged anew our allegiance to Old Glory and our country. Mr. Podewitz's eloquent address on this memorable occasion follows:

Honorable Representative TUMULTY, your excellency Governor Meyner, honored guests, fellow members of the Plattdeutsche Volksfest-Verein and the Fritz Reuter Altenheim, ladies, and gentlemen: fate seems to decree that at least once in each of our lives, there is a very special momentous occasion which arises and surpasses all previous high points in our career. I feel that today is that very special occasion for me, in that I am privileged to be president of our Fritz Reuter Altenheim, and as such, be the recipient of the honor of having our very dear friend Representative TUMULTY, present to me this flag of the United States of America. When I say "the flag," this is not all, it is a very special flag, since it is a flag which flew over the Capitol of our great country at Washington, D. C. Our flag is without doubt the most beautiful flag in the world, and flies in glory and honor, unsullied and unscorned. I know I speak for all of you club members and friends here today, when I say we, who were born abroad, are proud of our German birth and are sincerely happy in the choice we have made to become citizens of a country we call our own, and that country is the United States of America. We are proud of its beautiful flag and all that it stands for. We are grateful to the land of our adoption for all the good things it affords us and we feel that we, the people of German descent and birth, have also with the other citizens of this great land of ours, contributed in full measure toward that greatness.

Thousands of Americans of German ancestry have fought side by side with other Americans in upholding our flag and have died for it.

I would be remiss if I did not mention such names as Schurz, Von Steuben, Weiser, Konrad, and in later years such names as Senator Wagner and General Krueger. Today we Americans of German origin are proud of our Governor of the State of New Jersey the Honorable Robert B. Meyner, and the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, and last but not least the President of this great land of ours Dwight D. Eisenhower.

If only the peoples of the earth would take a lesson from the happy people of this great land of ours and see that it is possible for all men to live together in peace, harmony, and happiness, with respect for each others rights and feelings, then truly we would have peace on earth. Representative TUMULTY, today it is my very special privilege to accept this flag on behalf of the Fritz Reuter Altenheim and to express our thanks to you, honorable sir, for considering the Fritz Reuter Altenheim for this signal honor.

We pledge that this flag, which graced the Capitol at Washington, will fly at our home in dignity and honor, with no acts on our part to mar its fair stars and stripes.

As president of the Fritz Reuter Altenheim, I now order this flag to be raised during the 3 days of festivities in the park and thereafter shall go to our home next door. We hope that this flag will fly there for many years to come and that Old Glory will wave on forever. Thank you.

Relationship Between Industry Groups and Administrative Agencies of Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following remarks regarding the relationship between some industry groups and some of the administrative agencies of our Government.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the relationship between some industry groups and some of the administrative agencies of our Government which may yet require investigation by Congress.

In the case of the National Labor Relations Board this relationship finds expression in recent decisions by the Board narrowing the scope of collective bargaining by placing arbitrary limits on the size of companies whose employees may seek relief before the NLRB, and by narrowing the scope of existing and proposed collective-bargaining units.

Evidence of at least a friendly understanding between the Board and employers in the telephone industry, for example, is found in an NLRB decision only 8 months old which withdrew protection of the National Labor Relations Act from all employees of telephone companies doing less than $200,000 business annually. Apparently the Board felt it necessary to protect smaller employers from harassment by unions. This, however, left the employers free to harass their employees, which didn't seem to impress the NLRB at all.

The Board went so far as to hold that such companies are not covered by the act, even if they are subsidiaries of larger companies which are subject to the act, and even if the company doing less than $200,000 annual business is wholly owned by one of the companies which make up the Bell System.

The Board and these telephone companies have an additional approach to undercutting what is still held by the law of the land to be the legitimate right of workers to form labor organizations of their own choosing.

According to this by now well-developed technique, a telephone company, faced with a union representation demand, classifies as confidential, professional, or quasi-supervisory as many jobs as possible, thus removing them from the collective bargaining unit.

As a result of this chopping away at the collective bargaining units, the telephone industry has—with the help of the NLRB—steadily increased the proportion of its supervisory employees to its total employees.

A case in point is the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. In October 1946, 12.2 percent of the total number of employees were supervisory. Today, in that same company, 20.2 percent of the employees are called supervisory.

In the Pennsylvania Bell Telephone Co., there are 35,150 employees, of whom 4,433 (or 13 percent) are supervisors. Right now, the company is seeking to have an additional 1,100 workers—service assistants—excluded from the bargaining unit. This would raise to 16 percent the number of workers in this unit to whom union representation would be denied.

Judging by recent decisions of the National Labor Relations Board involving large independent telephone companies, the Board is likely to agree to the Pennsylvania company's request, and remove these 1,100 service assistants from the bargaining unit.

Since all these Bell companies are owned by the giant A. T. & T., success for the company in Pennsylvania would encourage identical action in other A. T. & T. units across the country. The union operating in this field, the Communications Workers of America, estimates that more than 30,000 Bell System workers across the country may in this way lose their right to be represented by a union.

It is often charged by the union that the Bell System companies have a well-devei-

oped program of strikebreaking, using employees exempted from bargaining units. During the recent 72-day strike of the communications workers union against Southern Bell, supervisory employees were brought into the area from other places; the union charges that the company imported as many as 9,000 strikebreakers and that these people came from as far away as Cleveland, Ohio.

This mammoth, overloaded supervisory force being created with the help of the NLRB may enable the Bell System to pursue antiunion policies, but it means added costs to the public for telephone service, the cost of which has already jumped in recent years.

A thoroughgoing investigation into the relations between the National Labor Relations Board and the giant corporations of the country may yet be necessary.

The relationship of the Board with the telephone system may well be the place to start.

Today's Opportunities, Tomorrow's Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "Today's Opportunities, Tomorrow's Achievement."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the cause of peace has been advanced these past several months. Overwhelming Senate—and congressional—cooperation with President Eisenhower in the advance of that cause in history will be forcefully marked as a noble achievement of American Government in 1955.

As an American, I take pride in my support of the President in the overwhelmingly important field of peace and foreign relations. The Eisenhower policies are aimed at the Eisenhower goal: security of the American people in a just and honorable peace. The great majority of our people—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—enthusiastically support those policies.

I am reassured, Mr. President, that during this session both Chambers have given repeated proof that in America politics stops at the water's edge. The capacity of Congress to subordinate political differences in order to inspire mankind and to demonstrate our devotion to democratic principles is obvious in the overwhelming passage of the resolution granting President Eisenhower's request for authority to prevent communism from subjugating Free China, Senate ratification of the Paris accords restoring West Germany to the family of peace-loving nations, the approval of the SEATO and China defense treaties, and the affirmation of this Nation's willingness to confer and consult with other great powers of the world in our quest for peace.

The actions of this Senate and of this Congress in dealing with matters affecting foreign relations and international affairs show that day in and day out the undeniable motive of the Members is to move forthrightly and uncompromisingly toward the goal set out by the President. Therefore, it is decidedly heartening to look back over the last several months and recall the cooperation that has been extended our President and the solidarity that has affirmed our Nation's leadership in the constant striving for peace and security.

In no spirit of rancor, I wish to suggest that our legislative record on the domestic scene is far from satisfactory. I shall not attempt here to assess the blame, but I do desire to say that politics—unfortunately—contributed to this unhappy record on our home front.

I am distressed, Mr. President, by the failure of this Congress to take constructive action on—indeed, even to consider President Eisenhower's recommendations for—legislation bolstering our educational facilities, providing health reinsurance to bring medical and hospital care within the reach of all, and revising the immigration and refugee relief laws. The Senate, regrettably, did not even face the questions of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. And our failure to enact sound legislation providing for modern American highways is tragic.

As a Senate Public Works Committee member, I have listened firsthand to irrefutable testimony on the appalling condition of America's roads and highways. We need, urgently and without further delay, an up-to-date system of interstate highways, 40,000 miles in length. No one can deny that need. America's defense requirements dictate it and our economy demands it. Beyond that, our frightful toll of highway casualties is, in great part, attributable to antiquated and delapidated highways.

The Federal Government has an unmistakable responsibility in this field. Politics must not interfere with our discharge of it. There ought not to be a dime's worth of partisanship in our consideration of Federal highway legislation. While I sincerely believe in President Eisenhower's recommendations—and voted for them earlier this year—I am ready to discuss any reasonable alternative recommendations. But I will decline to discuss any unreasonable alternative or any political one.

While politics stopped at the water's edge, it is a source of great regret that partisanship was the chief reason for inaction on many urgent matters of domestic importance. If we are to convince the remainder of the world that self-government is the soundest and most effective way of recognizing the dignity of mankind, there must be a greater spirit of give and take and a less selfish approach toward proposed solutions of problems which affect the health, economic security, safety, and general well-being of our people. Our record on the domestic front was not good.

As a Californian, I must say that the 84th Congress in its first session has been sympathetic and understanding toward the State which I have the honor in part to represent. The Senate in particular has responded generously to appeals from the 13 million people of California for aid and assistance in solving some of their intricate and perplexing problems. For this, I am deeply grateful and proud.

By and large, the 84th Congress enacted a number and variety of measures which will benefit the people of my State. That was due in many instances to the circumstance that the California delegation, the second largest in the Congress, recognized the fact that ours is a State with wide ranges of economic, social, and political interests, and that cooperation and mutual assistance are essential in advancing the welfare of our fellow citizens.

In reciting some of the more noteworthy legislative accomplishments of benefit to California, I wish to remark that one measure with which I was most intimately concerned has national significance. The Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Act, which now is Public Law 159, will bring into play the resources of the Federal Government in a concerted campaign to overcome a menace that is spreading over our Nation and becoming more serious to the health, happiness, and safety of a growing number of people.

I am deeply grateful this Congress thus climaxed my 2-year fight to obtain Federal assistance for the local and State governments, public and private scientific groups, civic bodies, and educational institutions which have been trying to isolate the sources and causes of smog and other atmospheric contaminants and to devise remedial and preventive measures for purifying the air that people, plants, and animals all require for their very existence.

The antismog law, authorizing a 5-year $25 million course of investigation and experimentation, should pay tremendous dividends to the entire Nation. I am intensely pleased that this Congress saw fit to make an initial $1,190,000 appropriation toward setting the program in motion. Added to the $412,500 item in the regular Public Health Service budget for air pollution studies by the Division of Sanitary Engineering, the first allotment under the $25 million authorization will finance a series of projects that should yield valuable knowledge toward cleansing the atmosphere in metropolitan and industrial areas.

For more than a quarter of a century, Congress has been told again and again that water—due to maldistribution and the breathtaking growth of our population—is California's most complex and urgent problem. The people of our State have endeavored for generations to remedy the deficiencies of nature. They have displayed ingenuity and resourcefulnes in utilizing the surplus supplies found in some sections for the benefit of other regions where serious deficits must be overcome. The assistance of the Federal Government has been an invaluable ingredient of the progress made toward solving California's water problem and in enjoying our wealth of precious natural resources.

Again this year Congress has shown appreciation for the seriousness and complexity of our California water problem. I feel certain that the law authorizing the Trinity division of the Central Valley project—the largest single multipurpose water-resource development enacted under the Eisenhower administration—will contribute to the ultimate benefit of the Nation, as well as help immeasurably in the orderly growth and development of my native State. I am proud to have been associated with my colleague, Senator KNOWLAND, and our distinguished fellow citizen, Representative CLAIR ENGLE in the House, in sponsoring this law which makes possible immediate commencement of work on this $225 million undertaking.

Let me thank the Senate for approving the other reclamation project bill which I sponsored this year. I refer to the $27 million authorization of the Ventura project, so necessary for the people of Ventura County in their earnest endeavor to obtain an adequate and dependable supply of water. My bill now awaits action in the House, which I very much hope will be both speedy and favorable.

I repeat that water remains the basic problem of California. We now are the second largest State in the Union, in population as well as in size. We need to conserve the water we have to insure an adequate supply, and to distribute it equitably. In the Senate, approval this year of both the Trinity project and the Ventura project, Members on both sides of the aisle, in great majority, have assented to necessary Federal assistance. For those actions, they have the unbounded thanks of California.

Two other pieces of water legislation that should materialy aid California also were enacted during the current session. These are the so-called distribution systems law,

which will extend Federal financial help to local irrigation districts and other bodies desiring to build works that will spplement Federal reclamation projects, and the statute expanding the program of research into methods of reclaiming ocean and other saline waters for industrial, municipal, and agricultural uses and for human consumption.

While the unwillingness of Congress to authorize a new highway program is an undeniable black mark on the record of this session, the needs of our transportation system in this atomic era received partial recognition which is gratifying to me. I refer to the new Federal Airport Act which, I believe, will prove a sound and far-sighted investment and I know will give particular impetus to my State which is so air-minded and dependent on time-saving air transportation.

The importance of the 4-year program envisioned by this law is obvious when it is noted that only 2 cities in California and 5 in other States have airports presently capable of handling fully loaded jet transports.

With jet-powered passenger and cargo aircraft expected to be available for transcontinental schedules in 3 to 5 years, the need for such Federal assistance is clear beyond question. This new Federal aid law should be particularly valuable to California, with so many widely separated centers of population, such a large number of privately-owned aircraft, and the terminus of many transcontinental and transpacific routes. The Federal allotment to California, approximately $10 million over the 4-year period, will enabe a number of communities to tackle their back-log of urgently required improvements, which early this year were estimated to involve outlays of more than $50 million.

Because of the geographical expanse of our State, together with its exposed location, California is the site of an immense number and variety of national defense installations. The protection of the western half of the Nation, and at the same time the welfare of armed services personnel, will be advanced by the public works program this Congress authorized for the Armed Forces. I am pleased that in the $108,600,000 worth of construction scheduled in 21 counties of our State under the defense public works law a number of critically needed housing units are contemplated. These, supplemented by new construction which should be encouraged by the Housing Act amendments, will raise morale of officers, men, and their families, many of whom are stationed at isolated points or near heavily populated centers where quarters are inadequate and difficult to locate.

As usual, this Congress faced the unenviable responsibility of reconciling requests for appropriations from the National Treasury with the monetary resources of our Government. Although the budget still is out of balance, progress has been made toward sound fiscal policy.

The people of California, who bear a weighty tax load, appreciate the consideration shown by the 84th Congress in enacting appropriation bills. The numerous money items which will be available for activities and projects particularly in our State are invariably of the wealth-producing and prosperity-promoting variety.

I share the gratitude of people in a large area of California and of my colleagues in the congressional delegation for the $1 million appropriation to complete advance planning for and start construction of the vital Trinity division of the Central Valley project. This initial installment on such an economically feasible multipurpose water development is a notable example of wise fiscal management.

The miscellaneous appropriation bills contained several unique sums for California which deserve mention. The 84th Congress agreed to provide funds for some projects which I earnestly advocated and helped push to enactment in the 83d Congress. Conspicuous in this category is the Cherry Valley Reservoir, for which $785,000 was approved. The legislation under which this expenditure is authorized was the first measure adopted by the Senate after I entered this body which bore my name as a sponsor, so naturally I have a paternal concern about carrying this development to completion, so necessary to the people of San Francisco in connection with their domestic water needs.

The session now closing made available the following amounts to finance planning or initiate construction on public works projects which I favored in the 83d Congress and were authorized in the 1954 omnibus law: Richmond Harbor, $500,000; the Santa Maria project, $1 million; Playa del Rey Harbor, $25,000; Port Hueneme Harbor, $70,000; and San Lorenzo Creek project, $25,000.

An initial $70,000 was voted to carry out the program of saving the grasslands which are nesting and feeding grounds for migratory game birds along the Pacific flyway. This effort, authorized by the bill I sponsored in the 1953 and 1954 sessions, should prove a boon to farmers and sportsmen and the expenditure represents far-sighted use of Federal resources for general public benefit.

The 1st session of the 84th Congress wisely, in my judgment, recognized the value of intensifying efforts to protect the Nation's natural resources in different directions. For these purposes, the Senate added $1 million and the Congress finally voted this amount to the fund for plant and animal disease and pest control, chiefly to help curb the menacing Mexican fruitfly and the khapra beetle. Increased funds for stepped-up fire protection in the national forests, for which $300,000 was specifically earmarked for southern California, will safeguard our treasured timber, widely enjoyed recreation areas, and vital watersheds. A similar commendable objective was recognized when the present session added to the budget $1,250,000 to initiate the building of flood-control works to protect strategic and thickly settled parts of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.

On behalf of the people of the thriving section of California for which our State capital is the hub of commerce and trade, this Congress agreed to revive the Sacramento deep-water channel project. The $500,000 allowed for this development will permit resumption of dredging which was well underway when the Korean war forced a halt to all public works. This is one more California port facility now accorded Federal recognition.

California traditionally has deep concern in maritime and merchant marine matters. Because the sea for so many generations was a principal artery of communication and transportation, our people understandably have a continuing dependence upon shipping. Water-borne commerce still is a leading line of economic activity. Therefore, California is thankful the 1st session of the 84th Congress decided to continue Federal financial support for the 4 State nautical schools, 1 of which is California's Maritime Academy. Our far-flung trade interests likewise were reassured when this Senate preserved the 50–50 Cargo Preference Act which is essential to the continued existence of the Nation's overseas commerce and shipping industry.

Another great economic enterprise in California is agriculture. Cotton is our State's most valuable crop. Accordingly, I wish to thank the Senate for refusing to disturb the acreage allocation formula which is vital to the continued cultivation of cotton. I regret that the sugar bill was left hanging in the Senate and trust that next year this legislation—which recognizes the right of American farmers in California and other States to a just and fair share of the domestic market—will receive the approval of this body and become law.

Substantial progress was made toward translating into reality other ideas and suggestions which would further promote the prosperity of California.

Unfortunately, a variety of factors made it impossible to proceed this year as rapidly and as far as I had hoped with one piece of legislation that has national application, is universally acknowledged to be sorely needed, and would relieve literally scores of local governments in California and hundreds across the Nation from the squeezing pressures of rising costs and declining revenues occasioned by expanded property holdings by the Federal Government. I was gratified when in the closing days of this session committee consideration was given to several bills, including one of which I am cosponsor, to authorize the Federal Government to make payments in lieu of taxes to municipalities, school districts, counties, and other agencies dependent upon tax revenues to finance functions of local government. Enactment of general legislation for this purpose is entitled to high priority on the agenda for the 1956 session.

The legislative accomplishments of this first session did include approval of an assortment of bills primarily of local significance. Many California communities and citizens benefited by the passage of measures such as those authorizing California and Nevada to work out a compact for utilizing the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers and Lake Tahoe, carrying out the Federal obligation to reimburse the city of Los Angeles for expenditures to improve facilities of that municipality's great harbor, giving the city of Richmond jurisdiction over public utilities which are an integral part of the muncipally administered housing project, and equalizing burdens of the people of Merced County in the building and operation of protective levees on the San Joaquin River.

Mr. President, America has been summoned to a high responsibility never envisioned by the authors of the Declaration of Independence and the framers of the Constitution. Similarly, each year supplies new reminders that our frontiers of pioneer days have long been gone and western America is on its way toward overtaking the rest of the Nation both in people and production.

What an imposing panorama of opportunities stands before us. The initiative of our people has brought us to the highest level of productive employment in our history. People of good will all around the globe are knit more strongly together in their defenses against aggression and in the cause of peace. God grant that the United States, our people, and their Government may have the courage and the vision and the leadership to take today's opportunities and fashion them into the achievements of tomorrow.

American Taxpayers and Their Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the countless thousands who annually visit Washington, as pilgrims coming to the shrine of their country, are impressed by the marvelous beauty of the Capital City of their Government. I think they

would be interested in knowing something of the contribution that they as taxpayers make to maintaining the District of Columbia, hence I am extending my remarks to include a summary of Public Law 131, the Appropriations Act for the District of Columbia, as follows:

Public Law 131, 84th Cong.

(District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1956)

OPERATING EXPENSES

Executive Office	$308,000
Department of General Administration	3,081,850
Office of Corporation Counsel	442,900
Compensation and retirement fund expenses	10,036,000
Regulatory agencies	967,000
Department of Occupations and Professions	248,500
Public schools	28,130,000
Public library	1,639,300
Recreation Department	1,688,500
Metropolitan Police	12,808,000
Fire Department	6,257,900
Veterans' Service Center	92,200
Office of Civil Defense	75,000
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation	140,000
Courts	3,369,674
Department of Public Health	23,592,000
Department of Corrections	4,526,820
Department of Public Welfare	9,600,000
Department of Buildings and Grounds	1,687,000
Office of Surveyor	153,920
Department of Licenses and Inspections	1,546,276
Department of Highways	5,967,000
Department of Vehicles and Traffic	1,107,000
Motor Vehicle Parking Agency	350,000
Department of Sanitary Engineering	10,285,000
Washington aqueduct	2,120,000
National Guard	119,800
National Capital Parks	2,389,000
National Zoological Park	669,300
Total operating expenses	133,397,940

CAPITAL OUTLAY

District debt service	443,800
Public building construction	7,544,400
Miscellaneous capital outlay	1,260,300
Department of Highways	13,535,000
Department of Sanitary Engineering	9,662,000
Washington aqueduct	3,000,000
Total, capital outlay	35,445,500
Grand total	168,843,440

GENERAL PROVISIONS

First. Continues antistrike provisions.

Second. Authorizes use of funds for automobile allowances.

Third. Authorizes use of funds for attendance at meetings.

Fourth. Authorizes investment in United States securities of funds not needed to meet current expenses.

Fifth. Authorizes the employment of experts.

Sixth. Authorizes advances of money to officials herein specified.

Seventh. Prohibits the use of appropriations for certain activities of the Public Utilities Commission pertaining to taxicabs.

Eighth. Restricts amount to be paid for electric street lighting.

Ninth. Places motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles under the direction and control of the District of Columbia Commissioners.

Tenth. Authorizes use of appropriations for snow- and ice-control work.

Eleventh. Authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to establish a working fund without fiscal-year limitation for the purpose of printing, duplicating, and photographing.

My Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 1st session of the 84th Congress is now history. In some respects we have accomplished much, in others we have been derelict.

I regard it incumbent upon each Member to review his actions here and to recapitulate his voting record.

Representing as I do a great district, the 20th Congressional District of New York, I want my constituents and all the people of our blessed United States to know in what manner I have attempted to carry out their mandate to me.

The following is my voting record on each and every major legislative issue which came before the House of Representatives for its consideration:

Roll No. 3. Voted "yea." House Joint Resolution 159, a joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area. On passage, January 25, 1955, yeas 410, nays 3.

Roll No. 4. Voted "yea." H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to earn educational and other benefits under the GI bill until discharged. This bill was necessary to reverse the unfair action of the President which would have terminated educational and other benefits as of January 31, 1955, for all GI's. On passage, January 27, 1955, yeas 366, nays 0.

Roll No. 6. Voted "yea." H. R. 3828, a bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes. On passage, February 16, 1955, yeas 283, nays 118.

Roll No. 12. Voted "yea." H. R. 1, a bill to extend the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements under the Tariff Act for 3 years. On passage, February 18, 1955, yeas 295, nays 110.

Roll No. 16. Voted "yea." H. R. 4259, a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. On passage, February 25, 1955, yeas 242, nays 175. The $20 tax credit, of principal benefit for the small taxpayer was, unfortunately, eliminated in the conference between the Senate and House, primarily because of the President's opposition.

Roll No. 19. Voted "yea." H. R. 4720, a bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances. On passage, March 10, 1955, yeas 399, nays 1.

Roll No. 27. Voted "yea." House Resolution 170, a resolution to declare that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to the Congress on January 24, 1955. On agreeing to resolution, March 22, 1955, failed, yeas 132, nays 283. This resolution, had it been adopted, would have prevented another giveaway advocated by the Republican leadership.

Roll No. 29. Voted "yea." House Resolution 171, a resolution to disapprove proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic rubber facilities as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission report. On agreeing to the resolution, March 23, 1955, failed, yeas 137, nays 276. This is another giveaway advocated by the Republican leaders for big business which could not be prevented after this resolution was defeated.

Roll No. 37. Voted "yea." H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes. On Moss amendment No. 2 (8.2 percent increase), April 20, 1955, yeas 224, nays 189.

Roll No. 39. Voted "yea." H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes. On passage, April 20, 1955, yeas 324, nays 85. This was the 8.2 percent increase bill which the President vetoed.

Roll No. 57. Voted "nay." H. R. 2535, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. On motion to recommit, May 10, 1955, yeas 218, nays 170, "present" 3. This bill would have granted statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. They deserve it, but the Republican leadership succeeded in obtaining sufficient reactionary support to recommit the bill to the committee and thus killed it. My vote was against recommittal. If we had been successful, then a vote on passage would have been necessary, and I would, of course, have voted for it.

Roll No. 72. Voted "yea." H. R. 2851, a bill to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress. On passage, May 25, 1955, yeas 344, nays 1, "present" 3. This bill allows the disposal of some of our surplus agricultural products to American distress areas.

Roll No. 79. Voted "yea." S. 2061. This was the bill to increase the pay of the postal employees after the veto. It provided an increase of from 6 to 8 percent. June 7, 1955, yeas 410, nays 1.

Roll No. 80. Voted "yea." H. R. 5923, a bill to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway. On passage, June 8, 1955, yeas 353, nays 13.

Roll No. 83. Voted "yea." H. R. 1. Final passage of the bill to extend the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements under the Tariff Act. June 14, 1955, yeas 347, nays 54.

Roll No. 84. Voted "yea." H. R. 6227, a bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes. On passage, June 14, 1955, yeas 371, nays 24, "present" 2. This was an important bill on which we spent a great deal of time in the Committee on Banking and Currency. It reduces the power of certain giant monopolistic banking firms.

Roll No. 94. Voted "yea." House Concurrent Resolution 149, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism. On passage, June 23, 1955, yeas 367, nays 0. This important resolution is the one which the President said he had not heard of when asked about it at his press conference. He said he was probably out fishing.

Roll No. 100. Voted "yea." H. R. 3005, a bill to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. Conference report, on adoption, June 28, 1955, yeas 389, nays 5, "present" 1. This bill extended the draft.

Roll No. 105. Voted "yea." S. 2090, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes. On passage, June 30, 1955, yeas 273, nays 128. This bill provided for further United States defense and technical development assistance to our foreign friends and allies.

Roll No. 110. Voted "yea." This is another vote on the mutual security bill and approves the bill reported by the Senate and House conferees.

Roll No. 119. Voted "yea." H. R. 7225, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass—two-thirds required—July 18, 1955, yeas 372, nays 31, "present" 2. This bill provides for some much needed improvements in the social security law. I would have liked some additional improvements but this measure is a good step in the right direction. Perhaps we will be able to improve upon it at the next session after the Senate acts upon it.

Roll No. 125. Voted "yea." H. R. 7214, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956. On passage, July 20, 1955, yeas 362, nays 54, "present" 2. My own bill provided for an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and established a minimum of 75 cents in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Roll No. 129. Voted "yea." H. R. 7000, a bill to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption, July 25, 1955, yeas 315, nays 78, "present" 1.

Roll No. 133. Voted "yea." H. R. 7474, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. On passage, July 27, 1955, failed, yeas 123, nays 292. This bill would have provided Federal assistance in construction of the Nation's highways. The trucking industry combined with the oil, gas, and rubber companies to lobby against it and defeat this much-needed legislation. I hope we will have better success at the next session.

Roll No. 135. Voted "nay." House Resolution 317, a resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. On agreeing to resolution, July 28, 1955, yeas 273, nays 135. I voted against this resolution in an attempt to prevent House consideration of the bill to gouge the consumers and eliminate Federal control of the producers of natural gas. As the next two votes indicate, we were not able to defeat the bill in the House, but the Senate refused to consider the bill at all, so control remains in force.

Roll No. 137. Voted "yea." H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. On motion to recommit, July 28, 1955, failed, yeas 203, nays 210, "present" 1.

Roll No. 138. Voted "nay." H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. On passage, July 28, 1955, yeas 209, nays 203, "present" 2.

Roll No. 140. Voted "nay." S. 2126, an act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes. On the amendment—Wolcott substitute—July 29, 1955, yeas 217, nays 188, "present" 2. This was the vote to substitute the Wolcott bill which contained no public housing. I voted against it.

Roll No. 141. Voted "yea." S. 2126. Having failed to obtain House approval of our committee bill, I voted for the Wolcott substitute only so that we could hold a conference with the Senate which had previously approved 135,000 units of public housing. In the conference, we hoped to obtain some assistance for our slum dwellers. My own bill, part of which was adopted, provided for 150,000 units of public housing. The final rollcall was on the conference housing bill and as we had hoped provided for public housing, although for only 45,000 units. This is 10,000 more than the President's meager request and 45,000 more than the Republican leadership wanted. On passage, July 29, 1955, yeas 396, nays 3, "present" 4.

Roll No. 147. Voted "yea." S. 2126. Passage of the conference housing bill. Contains 45,000 units of public housing and provision for educational housing. July 29, 1955, yeas 396, nays 3.

Hobgoblins and Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, before the start of our legislative session, the President had great misgivings about the coming months. He reprimanded the voters of the Nation because they chose to send Democrats to Congress, while the administration was of the opposing political faith. He forecast that a Republican administration would not have the support of a Democratic Congress. During the 1954 congressional campaign, he even foresaw the possibility of a cold war within Government which could destroy the Nation's unity at this crucial time.

The same kind of talk from a Democratic President would have been labeled in the one-party press either as intended to scare our people or as an insult to our intelligence. Coming from the leader of the Republican Party, that same part of our American press repeated the reckless charge as though it were unimpeachable gospel.

How disappointing it must be to them to find that the hobgoblins and the gremlins disappeared into thin air even before the 84th Congress opened.

Now that the first session of this Congress has closed, the American people are entitled to the full story.

Even though an ardent Democrat, I will not pretend that none of my Democratic colleagues made any mistakes, nor that there was no occasion when some of my Republican colleagues did vote right. I do proclaim, however, as loudly as I can, that my Democratic colleagues voted right more frequently than my Republican colleagues and conversely, that the Republicans voted wrong more frequently than the Democrats—too frequently for the good of our country.

Let us now proceed to analyze the record.

The President greatly underestimated the caliber and character of the Democratic majority. He now admits that the political responsibility of the Democratic-controlled Congress made the successes of this session possible. The proof of Democratic leadership and sup-

port—the willingness to lay aside political antagonism and jealousies—is a part of the record.

It is with great pleasure that I review these accomplishments. In doing so, we must have in mind that what is right or wrong is not determined by who sponsors a proposal, nor by which party supports it. The determination must be based on the sole test of what is best for the greatest number of our people.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS: UNITY AND STRENGTH

Nowhere is the story of cooperation and responsibility better illustrated than in the areas of foreign policy and national defense. The world situation threatens to remain a precarious one for many years to come. Although the great ideological conflicts between East and West show some indication of being eased, few are shortsighted enough to believe that the aims of international communism have changed so completely in so short a time. If these differences between East and West cannot be settled or at least compromised, the alternative is a global atomic war from which no side could emerge victorious. While urging thorough exploration of every path that might lead to world peace, the Democratic Party stood as one man in favor of keeping our guard up and our defenses strong enough to withstand a sneak attack. In our system of Government the President and his State Department must assume the leadership in the realm of international affairs. Congress responded by supporting them completely on every major issue. The President was authorized to use United States military forces in defending Formosa and the nearby Pescadores Islands. Executive agreements were ratified establishing a mutual-defense treaty with Nationalist China and a NATO-type defense alliance for southeast Asia.

Despite overwhelming sentiment in the Congress for it, the executive branch of our Government took no firm or realistic step toward establishing permanent peace in the Near East.

The occupation of Germany was ended so that she could be armed and brought into the European defense system. Austria was reestablished as an independent and democratic state.

To carry out our foreign policy aims, Congress authorized $3.2 billion for economic and military aid to foreign countries.

To encourage the benefits of international trade, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended for 3 years so that the President has the full authority to continue his efforts to promote our foreign affairs. A bill simplifying our complicated and outmoded system of customs definition, classification, and rate structure was passed by the House of Representatives and awaits Senate approval in the next session of Congress.

A manpower reserve program was put into effect which provides for a trained military reserve of 3,900,000 men by 1959. Such a program, the President told us, will avoid the cost and inconvenience of a large standing army, while at the same time providing for the national defense. It was necessary, nevertheless, to extend the selective service law for 4 more years, including the draft of doctors and dentists for 2 more years. I am far from satisfied with either of these laws, but believe they are the best compromise we could get at this time.

Atomic energy projects were authorized to the extent of $237 million for research facilities and actual production of atomic peacetime projects, as well as atomic weapons. Funds were also authorized for the expansion of existing aeronautical research, for construction of foreign military bases and housing, and for a billion-dollar Navy ship-building program.

The only issue on which Congress and the administration clashed was the relatively minor one involving Marine Corps manpower. Congress refused to bow to the Republican demand for a 22,000-man cut in this important military unit.

All in all, the Democratic Congress was happy to follow a foreign-policy program whose principles were enunciated by President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, several years ago. The result has been a satisfying one. American prestige has grown abroad, the cold war tensions have lessened, if only temporarily, and a period of diplomatic negotiation has been vigorously begun. Democratic support, far from being absent, has been consistently greater than the support of the President's own party. Because of this support, the United States has been able to demonstrate its strength and unity.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION: FOR THE MANY AND NOT THE FEW

In domestic matters, of course, there was no comparable need for unanimity of thinking. The Democratic majority acted according to its political and economic principles and clashed with the administration where there was substantial difference. Once again, however, Mr. Eisenhower's forecast of a cold war was completely unfounded. The Democratic opposition to administration policies was as intelligent and high-minded as it was determined. There was no opposition merely for opposition's sake.

In the area of social legislation, several of the administration's proposals were extensions of earlier New Deal and Fair Deal ideas. These found enthusiastic Democratic support as far as they went—but often they did not go nearly far enough. Increased railroad retirement benefits, better FHA mortgage insurance coverage, and improved surplus property disposal to schools and hospitals were implementations of the Democratic program. Other parts of the administration program, however, proved quite inadequate.

A minimum wage proposal of $0.90 per hour, unreal at a time of high prices and general prosperity, was changed to a $1 minimum. This increase over the old $0.75 minimum will help keep industries from "running away" to the South and West where labor is so much cheaper, as well as preserve a decent wage for all American workers. More important, it raises the standard of living of all our citizens, nationally and not sectionally.

The administration's housing bill asked for only 35,000 public-housing units and made them well-nigh impossible of construction by improper restrictions. Congress increased the low-rent provisions by 10,000 additional units and eased the requirements to enable more extensive and better-balanced housing projects. Such liberalization of the law is necessitated by the acute housing shortage and the slum clearance needs of our urban centers.

To cure the unfortunate polio vaccine mixup, Congress authorized $2 million more than was asked by the President. In addition, all necessary funds are to be made available to the States to purchase enough vaccine for one-third of all the unvaccinated children, plus all expectant mothers. A more extensive and a better program was opposed by the administration as unnecessary and a step toward socialized medicine. The threat of a veto of the entire program effectually prevented the enactment of control legislation. Obviously, this administration is willing to risk black markets which may destroy the health of our people.

In appropriations for general matters of health, education, and social welfare, the Congress added more than $17 million to the Eisenhower program. The Congress felt that these were matters in which false economy was extremely dangerous. We were not willing to bear the responsibility of holding back research programs on cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and mental health so that the Federal budget might be a fraction of 1 percent lower. This, too, points up a basic difference of philosophy. The Democrats believe in being liberal with money to conserve the health of our people.

So too, an attempt to liberalize the social security laws and make the program more adequate to meet today's problems was stoutly opposed by the Republican administration. The Democratic majority in the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a bill to lower retirement age for women from 65 to 62, to allow disability benefits to 250,000 workers aged 50 or more, to continue disability benefits for children after age 18, and to extend coverage to the professions. Administration opposition in the Senate defeated this program there, although the need for such legislation has become more and more apparent in recent years.

Throughout the consideration of these matters, the Republicans consistently showed themselves for what they are—a party dedicated to the few rather than the many; a party which is more interested in budgetary figures than human needs; a party seeking to carry out a minimal social program at a minimal expense. Plenty of lip service, but no votes.

BUSINESS AND TAXATION: THE LITTLE FISH IN A BIG POND

The Eisenhower administration has time and again denied that it is an administration of, by, and for big business. And yet the record clearly shows that almost all of the major economic policies which seek to help the small-business man have originated among the Democratic Members of Congress

and have been opposed by the Republican administration.

The Small Business Administration, an agency dedicated to the plight of small business, was extended for 2 years. The administration opposed any increase in its authorized funds. The amount of any individual loan was increased to $250,000. These loans are intended for those deserving small-business men who cannot get help from regular bank sources. The disaster loan program and the small business participation in Government procurement were strengthened. The lending function together with the help given to small business in getting a fair share of Government procurement contracts makes SBA one of the most important agencies to have been started in recent years.

This is one of the few domestic policies, which in principle, has been consistently supported by both parties.

Bills were passed to halt the growing monopolistic practices in business. The antitrust penalty for violation of the Sherman Act was raised from $5,000 to $50,000. It was evident that $5,000 to a large corporation is merely a petty-cash transaction which was no deterrent to such a potential violator. In addition, the House passed a bill to curb the influence of bank holding companies by requiring Federal approval of new bank acquisitions by holding companies and requiring those companies to divest themselves of their nonbanking interests. This bill is designed to preserve the small independent bank as the banking unit best able to serve the interests of the small-business men. In the area of taxes, most of the existing income, corporate and excess-profits taxes were extended for another year. The only important proposal for tax relief came from the Democratic side of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Although this concerned a mere $20 cut in personal income taxes for each taxpayer and each dependent—relief aimed at the lowest-income bracket, yet equally fair to all income brackets—the Republican administration forecfully rejected the idea and caused its defeat in the Senate after the House had given its approval.

ARMED SERVICES AND VETERANS: SOMETHING FOR SOMETHING

Thanks to Democratic support, the serviceman and veteran were not forgotten during the past few months. Those who were in the service as of January 31, 1955, were allowed to go on building up GI schooling benefits until discharged from the service. The Veterans' Administration direct-loan program was extended for another 2 years and was broadened to include home improvements as well as home purchases. Disabled veterans, including those who fought in Korea, were given the privilege of starting purchase of a special automobile before October 1956.

To help the buildup of a strong backbone of career servicemen—an essential supplement to the new military Reserve program—Congress raised the pay and created greater benefits for servicemen as an incentive to a military career. Finally, Congress decided to continue regular pay to the dependents and relatives of missing or captured men who had fought in Korea.

The feeling was strong in the Congress that our Government should do as much as it could for the men who defend our country and are called upon to make great sacrifices. This program was both an expression of gratitude of the American citizen and a means of compensation for their sacrifices.

TRANSPORTATION: BUT NOT AT ANY COST

The pressing need to bring the Nation's transportation system up to date was apparent to the leaders of both parties. Airport construction was encouraged to the extent of $252 million in grants-in-aid to the States for 4 years.

In advocating a nationwide highway-construction program, the Eisenhower administration asked that the 10-year program be financed with special high-rate bonds. This would have involved at least $2.7 billion in unnecessary interest payments to bankers and other bondholders. The administration proposal was another unfortunate example of special-interest legislation which the Democratic majority has refused to stomach. The Democratic majority almost unanimously rejected this. They proposed in its place a system of user taxes on gasoline and tires, a plan by which those who benefited by the construction of the highways would pay their cost. Opposition to this proposal arose from many sources and the House defeated the bill even though the Senate had given its approval. The Republican opposition was almost unanimous.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: MORE OF THE SAME

With regard to the pay of Federal employees, the administration insisted it would approve only a straight 5 percent increase, while conceding the employees were entitled to more. The Democrats once again felt this to be bad business and false economy, having in mind how much Government workers' pay had lagged behind the cost-of-living increases and comparable wage increases among other workers throughout the country. We prevailed, though not to the full extent. Increased pay bills for more than the administration recommended were passed and approved.

THE GIVEAWAYS: BIGGER AND MORE

The minks are now sables. The 5-percenters are 10-percenters. Teapot Dome was a drop in a bucket compared to Dixon-Yates. First they gave away our oil lands. Now they are trying to give away all the rest of our natural resources.

The projects in which big business would not risk its stockholders' money are now beginning to pay back the taxpayer his investment. So the administration will now get the Government out of business by giving to big business the taxpayers' property.

To help do this our Government now uses w. o. c.'s That is the old dollar-a-year man. He now works for us "without compensation." Big business pays him and lends him to the Government for nothing. For nothing to the taxpayer, but not for nothing to his private employer. He merely steers the Government business to his employer. He sits in on all the high-level policymaking conferences, either as the head of the department or as his consultant. Maybe he does not give his private employer any advance information. Maybe he does not write the specifications that only his private employer can bid on. Maybe I am speculating. Then why did Secretary of Commerce Weeks refuse to tell a congressional committee what his big business advisers do? Why was it necessary to employ as a top executive in the Container Division of that Department, the Washington "special representative," on the payroll as such, of the country's largest container corporation? The testimony showed this man knew nothing about the business.

The full story is being developed now and promises to be the biggest scandal of our history.

THE FARMER AND THE CONSUMER: THEY NEED EACH OTHER

I have supported the Democratic farm program because I am convinced that neither farmer nor consumer can prosper alone. They live and prosper together, or not at all.

The Eisenhower farm program will destroy our country.

Our warehouses are bursting at the seams. Some because they are overloaded. Others because this administration bought and paid for defective storage facilities.

In various parts of the country there is unemployment so serious that our people are starving while surplus commodities in Government warehouses are rotting away.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration, the farm program sustained losses of $1 billion. In less than 2½ years of Republican administration the farm program lost $2½ billion.

In 20 years under the Democrats, the maximum authorization for the program was $6¾ billion. In 2½ years under the Republicans, the Eisenhower administration increased it to $12 billion.

If you do not think cheese smells, ask Secretary Benson to explain about the millions of dollars he just handed to—no not the farmers—to the big cheese processors.

FISCAL POLICY: I HOPE YOU CAN ADD

Candidate Eisenhower promised to balance the budget. Of course, you know he was fooling. President Eisenhower, thinking you took Candidate Eisenhower seriously, has hastened to explain that he did not say when.

But he did promise as President, that if we increased the national debt limit in 1954 to $281 billion, he would cut back the increase in 1955. In the last days of this session, he sent word to your Congress that he could not keep his promise and that we must give him another year in which to do what he said needed only 1 year to do.

Let us not be too hard on him. I think that you, too, would have trouble with that much money. I know that I would.

MY OWN PROJECTS: SOMETHING FOR THE FUTURE

Every Congressman has his own particular interests that he hopes to see

enacted. Throughout the years I have been able to gain the approval of many proposals while others still await congressional approval. Without attempting to set them forth in the order of their importance, some of the proposals I hope to see enacted in the near future are: low-income housing for the aged; a complete civil-rights program; revision of the refugee relief and immigration laws; no discrimination or segregation in National Guard units; measures to keep racist and defamatory literature out of the mail; power to the President to act in health matters in case of a national emergency; strengthening of our antitrust laws to help keep the small-business man as the backbone of our free-enterprise system; income-tax deductions for all educational expenses of dependents and exemptions for servicemen serving overseas; prevention of the giveaway programs of Government rights and property; free postage to and from members of the Armed Forces; a review of all disapproved veterans' claims by the United States Court of Claims; a sound and just security program that will weed out the disloyal, without destroying the loyal; a system of standby economic controls for the prevention of inflation; a system of allocations and priorities of fuel for emergencies; a Department of Civil Defense within the Department of Defense, with strengthened authority; greater consideration of consumer problems by establishing a congressional committee therefor, as well as an executive department to protect the consumer; better pay for Federal employees; equal pay for equal work by women; and a code of ethics in Government for Government officials which, among other things, will prevent big business from acquiring our birthright.

CONCLUSION: RESPONSIBILITY AND INTELLIGENCE

The record of the Congress this year has been a mixed one. And this is far from a complete record. It is merely a brief summary. Some of the more important legislation that might have been carried out this year has been left until next year.

The accomplishments, nevertheless, have been solid ones—the very opposite of what the Republican leaders told the American people to expect.

The moral of this story may be simply stated; the opposition to the administration by the Democratic majority has been intelligent and responsible. Where differences have existed between administration and Congress, there has been a give-and-take and compromise worthy of democratic institutions. The people of this country were not neglected by their Government in favor of partisan politics and petty jealousies. The Democrats of this country have a right to be proud of that record.

RECESS BUT NOT RESPITE

Although Congress is about to recess until Janauary 1956, your Congressman will continue to serve you. His office—your office—is room 1305, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. It will remain open and fully staffed throughout the year. If visiting Washington, feel free to come in. If you have a problem that you think your Congressman can help you solve, write him a note to that address. He may not be able to help you, but you may be sure he will try.

CAB Ruling on Airlines Stuns Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am taking this occasion to call to the attention of this body a series of articles published recently in the Bakersfield Californian, a daily newspaper which is published in Kern County, Calif., in my congressional district. The stories relate to a recent decision by the Civil Aeronautics Board denying applications by Southwest Airways Co. and Bonanza Airlines, Inc., for a temporary exemption which would have permitted new daily passenger flights into Bakersfield. In my opinion, the articles very ably point out the justice of the case as far as the needs for additional passenger air service for Bakersfield are concerned.

I also am taking the liberty of inserting immediately after the newspaper articles a copy of a letter from one of my constituents directed to the Civil Aeronautics Administration with respect to the same matter.

[From the Bakersfield Californian of July 7, 1955]

CAB RULING ON AIRLINES STUNS COUNTY—FEEDER LINE PROPONENTS REPORT UNITED GIVES KERN POOR SERVICE

The long fight of Southwest Airways Co. and Bonanza Air Lines to improve air travel in Kern County has been dealt another stunning blow by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

United Air Lines, critics say, has a virtual monopoly on commercial use of the air in Kern County. United, they go on, has been so absorbed in its fight to prevent feeder lines from getting a toehold, that it has failed to improve its own service as much as the public would like.

The county has grown and improved tremendously in recent years, but United has jogged along in its same old way. United began running air service into Bakersfield in September 1926. That's nearly 29 years ago. Today it runs 10 planes through Bakersfield—5 each way.

EARLY FLIGHT

One of the Los Angeles-bound planes stops at the Bakersfield Airport at 3 in the morning. It carries very few passengers and critics of United say that's a heck of a time to fly a plane on the valley route. United spokesmen have countered with the excuse that the plane is kept on that schedule because it carries mail.

Nobody knows for certain whether announcements by United of greatly improved service to Bakersfield are timed to coincide with efforts of Southwest and Bonanza to win approval of their feeder line proposals, but it is considered odd that United has obtained much favorable publicity on each occasion.

PLANES WITHDRAWN

It is known only that upon several occasions United has announced that Bakersfield would receive greatly improved service. The new planes would begin flying on schedule and then—very quietly, and without a single drumbeat—would be withdrawn.

Bakersfield and other Kern County communities are growing at a great rate. It is shown by statistics that America's airlines are doing more business, dollarwise, than any other transportation medium, but these facts appear to have been unnoticed—and United's legion of attorneys continues to appear before the CAB to block any effort by a feeder line not only to improve air passenger service but actually to help United by funneling hordes of new air travelers into its planes.

While fighting doggedly to keep others from entering the field, United has consistently refused major improvements in its service between Bakersfield and Los Angeles. One sore point, particularly with folks of Pasadena, Burbank, and a large part of the Los Angeles area is that United refuses to land at the Lockheed air terminal at Burbank. This means that residents of some of these areas must travel as much as 25 miles by car in order to board or meet a United plane at International Airport at Inglewood.

A frequently voiced complaint is that United schedules make for "poor connections" in Los Angeles with other planes.

HOURS OF WAITING

Commenting on United's 3 a. m. plane, one air traveler said: "That plane is a dead duck so far as passenger service is concerned. If I want to go to Phoenix and take that plane out of Bakersfield, I have to wait 4 hours at Los Angeles before I can board the Phoenix plane."

Another resident who likes to fly had this comment:

"It pays to fly, if the service is good. But, we can't sell Bakersfield to other communities because of the poor service we get from United." This seems to be a common complaint.

Cecil Meadows, county airports superintendent, who has made frequent trips to Washington and other cities in the interest of improved air service, said:

There is no question in my mind that the companies now seeking permission to come into Bakersfield would provide better connections with planes to eastern points—and I believe that either of these lines, by giving better service, would get more passenger business out of Bakersfield than United is now getting."

CAR FASTER

Another critic of United said: "You can get from here to Sacramento quicker by car than by commercial airline. That is one reason the board of supervisors bought its own plane—so county officials can get to and from the State capital within a few hours."

Fresno, one man pointed out has better service than Bakersfield because it is served by two commercial lines—TWA and United.

Latest setback received by Southwest and Bonanza in their 10-year battle to establish feeder service was the denial yesterday by the CAB of their applications to establish temporary service between Las Vegas, Bakersfield, Inyokern, Lancaster-Palmdale, and coastal points.

The companies had sought to establish service while the CAB completes its studies—studies that were started about 10 years ago. It is understood that permission, if granted, will be given to only 1 of the 2 applicants.

Fight of the feeder-line companies has been supported for many years by the Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, the board of supervisors, the Bakersfield city council, and the Kern County board of trade.

[From the Bakersfield Californian of July 11, 1955]

AIRLINE SERVICE IS BAD

The successful opposition effected by United Air Lines to the addition of air transportation here is not accompanied by the prospect of any improvement in the service being provided here by the company itself and as articles now appearing in the Californian show, and air travelers know well, this service can hardly be described as satisfactory.

In fact, it would require a considerable amount of ingenuity to contrive schedules that would be more inconvenient than the ones that United offers out of Bakersfield at present. Yet the company consistently blocks any effort by the community to better itself.

The service that it offers the community is undependable and irregular, and it is difficult to understand how the Civil Aeronautics Board allows such irresponsibility to proceed unnoticed and unpunished, and to allow it to have weight against the proposal to permit Bakersfield to be provided with additional service.

Schedules are dropped without notice, types of equipment are altered and substituted contrary to advertisement, station conveniences and accommodations for passengers at the local terminal correspond only to those provided in the earliest period of stagecoach travel, and the entire air service situation reminds experienced travelers not of that enjoyed by a modern American city but that with which a remote Latin-American village is favored by accident.

Many times the citizens of Kern County, through their delegated representatives, have called in a united demand, for better air service, either through the improvement of the present facility or through the addition of a competitive line. Other cities have reported very satisfactory service when the field is shared by two or more lines. Each time, Bakersfield has been denied this, and United has been allowed to proceed without taking into consideration any of the defects that render the service so unpalatable.

The community is directed, by implication, to regard the air service here in the light of the famous aphorism of Dr. Samuel Johnson concerning a dog walking on its hind legs: It is not done well but you are surprised to find it done at all.

The novelty of airliners sailing majestically overhead has long since worn thin, and the fact that Bakersfield is included among the stops made by an airline has been tarnished by the regrettable result that these stops are made at times that could scarcely be less useful.

The patience of the citizens here is growing thin, and they are determined to have better air service here or turn entirely to other methods of transportation which offer better schedules and more accessibility to transfer points. The present facility can provide it, or in all fairness, step aside and allow others to do it. The present service borders on the intolerable, and enters completely into the category of the impractical.

We are informed that there are at least two companies which have offered substantial proof of their ability to provide additional air service, better and more opportune service than is being presently provided. The lines that seek to serve Bakesfield have established excellent records of dependability and safety, with the assurance of additional schedules of greater convenience and opportunity.

The Civil Aeronautics Board should consider these applications and allow at least one of them to establish the much-needed service here, taking into consideration the wishes of the community and the traveling public instead of the intricate arguments of attorneys representing the concern that has so long spurned the needs and wishes of the people it professes to serve.

It is hoped that Bakesfield and Kern County will in the near future have a fresh opportunity to demand better service and above all to get it.

[From the Bakersfield Californian of July 11, 1955]

FEEDER AIRLINE COULD SPUR UNITED TO IMPROVE SERVICE

All profit and loss considerations aside—if approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board of a feeder airline service did nothing more than spur United Air Lines into providing better service it would accomplish a worthwhile objective in the opinion of dissatisfied Kern air travelers.

Criticized service given here by United was brought into the spotlight a few days ago when the CAB denied applications filed by Southwest Airways and Bonanza Air Lines to establish temporary feeder service between Bakersfield, Lancaster-Palmdale, Las Vegas, and other points which do not now have direct air service to this city.

People who like to travel by air are not particularly concerned with the problems of profit or loss. They do want better service, and an air link with towns that do not now have such connections. Taft, to cite but one town now without airline service, has many potential airline travelers. Inyokern, Mojave, Lancaster—are others. Yet, the CAB says they can't have connecting air service with United—because United doesn't like the idea.

Southwest Airways and Bonanza have tried for the past 8 or 10 years to get CAB approval of feeder service in the county and direct connections with Las Vegas, Reno, and coastal points. And for 8 or 10 years the CAB has said "No."

While the CAB has turned a deaf ear to applications of Southwest and Bonanza, service offered out of Bakersfield by United has been under frequent criticism.

A few days ago the Californian was told that United Air Lines serves Bakersfield with 10 flights daily. That was incorrect. One flight has been quietly dropped, and now there are nine.

Much of the criticism leveled at United concerns the poor connections made by valley planes with trunkline planes at Los Angeles. Let's have a look at the schedules:

If you like to stay up all night or just happen to be a real early bird, you might catch the 3:30 a. m. plane out of here. You would arrive at International Airport at 4:25 a. m. Then, if you want to catch a first-class United plane for the East, you'll have to doze at the airport until 8 a. m.

That one too early? Well, there's another plane leaving Bakersfield Airport at 9:25 a. m.—one of only two daylight flights from Bakersfield to Los Angeles. The next southbound plane leaves here about 8 hours later—at 5:55 p. m.

There's one more Los Angeles-bound plane out of Bakersfield. That one leaves at 8:50 p. m.

People who travel by air say there's a connection layover of 1 to 3 hours at the Los Angeles International Airport if you take either of the two daylight flights out of Bakersfield.

CANCELLATION IN APRIL

There you have it—only 4 southbound flights out of Bakersfield every 24 hours. There was a fifth but it was dropped April 24.

United schedules from Bakersfield to Los Angeles International Airport are so unsatisfactory that, according to one regular air traveler, about 60 percent of Kern County air travelers drive to Los Angeles and catch a plane there. Many sleep at a nearby motel until plane time, and park or store their car until their return to Los Angeles.

The schedule situation from Los Angeles to Bakersfield isn't much better, according to people who do much of their traveling by air.

"If you come from the East on a night flight, you usually have to stay over in Los Angeles for about 6 hours," one traveler said. If an air passenger gets into Los Angeles from the East later than 5:30 a. m., he must wait until 1:05 p. m. to catch a plane for Bakersfield.

Northbound flights stop at the Kern County Airport at 2:15 a. m., 7 a. m., 1:55 p. m., 5:50 p. m., and 7:30 p. m.

United has 16 flights in and out of the Fresno Airport, compared to 9 at Bakersfield. At Fresno, it was pointed out, United must compete with TWA.

Establishment of a feeder line to serve Bakersfield would not only give this city closer connections with communities which do not now have air service, but might inspire United to improve its schedules between the valley and Los Angeles, it was said.

Air travel by Southwestern to Las Vegas via Inyokern would be cheaper than the present United schedule which compels travelers to go first to Los Angeles, it has been pointed out.

[From the Bakersfield Californian of July 25, 1955]

ATTORNEY DENIES UNITED'S CLAIM OF ADEQUATE BAKERSFIELD AIR SERVICE

(The following letter by Bakersfield attorney Henry C. Mack, an extensive air traveler, is reprinted in its entirety. It is a detailed analysis of the service provided Bakersfield by United Air Lines.—EDITOR'S NOTE.)

EDITOR, THE CALIFORNIAN:

Many people in Bakersfield, including the writer, have been following the arguments pro and con as to the efficiency and adequacy of the air service provided by United Air Lines to and from Bakersfield. As a fairly consistent user of air transportation, I have felt that a thorough analysis of United's timetable would help to solve the question. After all, the purpose of using air transportation, which, at least for local hops, is far more expensive than any other form, is to arrive at one's destination in a reasonable time, without undue delay at transfer points, and at a time convenient to the purpose of the journey. For businessmen this means arrival early in the morning before business houses, courts, and so on, have commenced the day's activities.

The writer has scanned United's timetables for some years for trips in and out of Bakersfield. Until April 24, 1955, service to Sacramento was practically impossible; since then, a flight from here leaving at 7 a. m. gets there at 10:15 a. m. Still no good for lawyers making a court appearance at 10 a. m. (judges are sometimes stuffy about 15 or 20 minutes), but better than it was. This change was pointed out in United's recent comment on the question carried by your paper.

The excellent connections to Albuquerque were also cited, together with a plaintive comment that practically nobody ever went to Albuquerque from Bakersfield. Exactly. Bakersfieldians want to go to San Francisco, Seattle, Los Angeles, San Diego, or New York and points on the east coast. It is submitted that an analysis of the service to those points will quickly show that bald assertions that the service out of Bakersfield is good are just that, and entirely unsupported by the timetables themselves.

Let's scan the United's timetable effective April 24, 1955. There is a later one (they do something to the timetable every 2 or 3 months, but nothing much to change the connections I want to discuss. Besides, the April timetable was in effect during the time the application of another airline was being considered).

Suppose we want to go to Seattle. We can take flight 191 to San Francisco, leaving Bakersfield at 7 a. m., arriving in San Francisco at 9:25 a. m. By sitting around the airport there for 2 hours and 20 minutes, we can get an aircoach flight (No. 465) which finally rumbles into Seattle at 3:50 p. m. Pacific standard time, or 4:50 p. m. daylight time, or practically 10 hours after leaving home.

By sitting around San Francisco airport until 12:05 p. m., we can get a first-class flight and arrive at 1:55 p. m. Pacific standard time, or 8 hours after leaving Bakersfield. (Cost, first class one way, $59.40 plus tax.) If we lived in Los Angeles, we could take flight 671 at 7 a. m. and be in Seattle at 10:55 a. m. Pacific standard time. (Cost, first class, $64.55 plus tax.)

Similar connections are made with flight 369, leaving Bakersfield at 1:55 p. m., arriving in San Francisco at 4:05 p. m. First Seattle connection, flight 683 at 7:30 p. m. There is one fair connection, flight 365, from Bakersfield at 4:50 p. m. with only a 50-minute wait in San Francisco for flight 683 to Seattle. Of course, if your business requires you to be in Seattle anywhere before 2 p. m., you can either go up the day before and stay in a hotel (not at United's expense), or you can get up at midnight in Bakersfield, catch the 2:15 a. m. flight 177, arrive at San Francisco at 4:45 a. m. and catch flight 671 at 9:05 a. m., which will get you in Seattle at 10:55 a. m.

If you are going to Seattle on any deal where you want to be sure and make no foolish concession to your adversary, this is the flight I recommend. After you've made it, you wouldn't be a soft touch for your own mother.

We often have to go to San Diego for a court appearance at 10 o'clock a. m. For years this schedule has been a nightmare of frustration. Every Bakersfield flight, except one, arrives in Los Angeles just in time to miss the San Diego connection. Flight 352, which leaves here at 5:55 p. m., arrives Los Angeles 6:45 p. m., leaves there as flight 650 at 8:10 p. m. and lands in San Diego at 8:55 p. m. You can always get a hotel room in San Diego if you know a few days in advance that you will be there.

Look at the rest of the schedule: Flight 356 leaves here at 9:25 a. m., arrives Los Angeles at 10:15 a. m. (Flight 670 left Los Angeles for San Diego at 9:10 a. m., so you can wait in Los Angeles until 11:05 a. m. and be in San Diego at 12:10 p. m.) If you take flight 152 out of here at 11:25 a. m., you will get to Los Angeles at 12:20 p. m. (Yep, flight 380 left for San Diego just 35 minutes ago.) Then comes flight 352, which gets you down there in pretty good time just as everything is closing up for the night.

Flight 164 leaves here at 8:50 p. m., arrives Los Angeles at 9:45 p. m. If it isn't Sunday, you can get flight 364 to San Diego at midnight; Sundays at 12:20, arrive 1:05 a. m.

Now comes United's answer to the businessman who wants to be in San Diego bright and early—or at least early. You can catch old 162 out of here at 3:30 a. m. and, after waiting in the airport at Los Angeles from 4:25 until 7:05 a. m., you can get on 652 for San Diego. Your appearance before the three judges of the appellate court at 10 a. m., after this flight is bound to attract their attention.

Now, let's take off for New York. Remember that we land in Los Angeles on the first morning flight (except the 3:30 a. m. one) at 10:15 a. m. Well, we've missed flight 708, nonstop to New York, which left at 9 a. m.; 732, which left earlier; 540 (aircoach), which left at 7:30 a. m.; 518 (aircoach) which left at 8:30 a. m.; 718, a DC7, which left at 10 a. m. (boy, that was a close one, just 15 minutes too soon for us to get aboard).

If we want an aircoach, though, flight 516 leaves at 11 a. m., and there is a first-class flight (No. 616, the first one since we arrived in Los Angeles at 10:15 a. m.) which leaves for New York at 7:25 p. m. Of course, you have to change planes in Denver and you don't get to New York until 8:30 the next morning if you take this one. Might as well wait for 724, which is the first first-class flight to leave for New York since we arrived at 10:15 a. m. This leaves at 9 p. m. and gets us to New York at 8:30 a. m. next day.

There is no use multiplying these examples. Just for fun, take United's schedule and figure out how long you'll have to wait in Los Angeles coming home from San Diego, or from New York, for that matter.

The total number of seats furnished per capita of population doesn't mean a thing when one stops to think that at least 44 of these seats go through Bakersfield at an hour no one wants to start out on any kind of a journey, and many of the rest will take you to some place where you have to wait and wait for connections that never seem to arrive.

As much as I am sold on air transportation, I have long since decided to drive my car to Los Angeles on most trips. There, there are available several airlines, and I have my choice of lines running all over the United States.

Yours truly,

HENRY C. MACK.

[From the Bakersfield Californian of July 26, 1955]

TRAVELER COMPLAINS—AIR PASSENGER HITS UA FLIGHT SCHEDULE

(The following, unsolicited letter by Miss Pauline M. Colahan, regional director for the Association of Desk & Derrick Clubs of North America and an employee of a local oil company, to S. P. Martin, assistant to the president of United Air Lines, is reprinted here in its entirety. It is her report on travel service provided Bakersfield by United Air Lines.—EDITOR'S NOTE.)

"I have been following with great hope the efforts of the Bakersfield Californian to improve airline service out of Bakersfield because I have had occasion to make several trips by air within the last year and have found your service far from adequate.

"Last September, I needed to be in Vancouver, British Columbia, to leave there at 8:30 p. m. In order to do so, I had to leave Bakersfield on your flight around 2 a. m., arriving in Vancouver about 2 p. m. There was no later flight leaving Bakersfield which arrived in time.

"In February I had to go to Tulsa. There was not one single daytime flight that I could make. I took the train.

"In May I had to go to Sacramento to arrive there for an evening meeting. There was one flight—the one you mentioned in the Californian that would have arrived in time—leaving Bakersfield at 7 a. m. and arriving around 10:30 in the morning. Slightly early for an evening meeting. I drove my car.

"Later that same month I went to Portland and Seattle. I had to leave Bakersfield at 7 a. m., arriving in Portland at 11:30 a. m. Again slightly early for an evening meeting that I went to attend.

"Now I need to go to New York City. There is not one single blessed first class daytime flight available. (Either via Los-Angeles or San Francisco.) Not one. There is one—just one—tourist flight which I can take.

"May I suggest that you reevaluate your schedule out of Bakersfield and see if better service wouldn't result; in better patronage.

"Very truly yours,

"PAULINE M. COLAHAN.

"P. S.—I must mention that you do have a very convenient schedule and return from San Diego. That trip I truly enjoyed."

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *July 14, 1955.*

ADMINISTRATOR, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with dismay that residents of the city of Bakersfield have read of the Civil Aeronautics Administration's decision not to allow Southwest Airlines and Bonanza Airlines to establish franchises into Bakersfield; thereby giving Bakersfield much-needed and improved air service than it has today. It is amazing to me the extent to which United Airlines can prohibit competition in an area. At present, United Airlines has 4 flights a day to Los Angeles and 4 flights to the north. None of these flights connect either at San Francisco or Los Angeles with any of the eastbound flights. An example of United's poor service is United flight No. 356 which arrives in Bakersfield at 9:25 in the morning to Los Angeles and the next flight south out of Bakersfield is United flight No. 352 at 5:55 p. m., which means a gap of approximately 8 hours during the working day. We who work in the oil industry have continuously asked United for service to and from Sacramento. Fresno has such service, and actually for people going from Bakersfield to Sacramento this means a trip to San Francisco and a change which normally takes longer than driving or rail.

People who know the excellent service that Southwest and Bonanza Airlines give the coastal cities have wished for some time that such similar service could be afforded Bakersfield. As a growing community, Bakersfield can certainly use airline service of more than one line. We certainly need United, but we feel that the inclusion of Southwest and Bonanza Airlines would give competition, which would result in better all-around air service. It would be, I believe, a benefit to the Civil Aeronautics Administration if they would listen to the demands of the taxpayers and not the prerequisite of major airlines such as United.

Very truly yours,

T. W. CAMERON.

(Copies to Hon. HARLAN HAGEN, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.)

The Limits of Law in Housing and Social Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 29, the Honorable Charles Abrams, rent administrator of the State of New York, delivered a very thoughtful and thought-provoking speech at the 12th annual institute of Race Relations, held at Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn. The title of Mr. Abrams' speech was "The Limits of Law in Housing and Social Action."

Mr. Abrams is widely acknowledged as one of the foremost thinkers, writers, and administrators in the field of housing in the United States. He is adviser on housing to the United Nations, and has written a number of authoritative books on the subject. And, of course, he is rent administrator of New York State.

I ask unanimous consent that this most cogent speech on the subject of housing and its relationship to minority

group rights and action be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIMITS OF LAW IN HOUSING AND SOCIAL ACTION

(By Charles Abrams, New York State Rent Administrator, at 12th Annual Institute of Race Relations, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., June 29, 1955)

The cases before the United States Supreme Court directing equal educational facilities and the recent dispute over civil-rights riders have renewed discussion on the long unsettled issue of whether law can create the moral climate in which racial and social equality can be achieved. On one side stand those who say that law cannot and they cite the prohibition amendment as an example of how a law defying the public consensus must be unenforceable. On the other side stand those who cite fair employment statutes as examples of how laws have succeeded in winning greater equality. Among these are also the extreme optimists who look to law as the main weapon which cannot only eliminate group discrimination but modify human behavior, codify ideals, and put the States' influence on the side of the minority. "Laws," they say, "can be enacted in response to the demands of a small minority or without the knowledge of the majority."[1] The nonsegregation order in the American Army is cited as proof of how civil rights can be won by edict, irrespective of how the majority felt in the first place.

In between those groups is a third which says sometimes it can and sometimes it can't. Two authorities, for example, in a recent article in the New York Times[2] say that if only 15 percent of the people in a community oppose a civil-rights regulation, public acceptance is easy except where the 15 percent is the dominant group politically. They conclude that, "* * * the majesty of the law, when supported by the collective conscience of a people and the healing power of the social situation, in the long run will not only enforce morality but create it." All of whcih begs the question for if the collective conscience of the people is for it and the healing power is actually healing, other devices than law might be just as effective.

The wide range between theories reflects the almost complete lack of any authentic analysis of the issue. Conclusions have been drawn on the most inadequate evidence and major policies have been adopted in the most critical areas of civil rights with nothing more to base them on than pronouncements ex-cathedra.

The cities where the Supreme Court decisions will be put into effect will provide a partial laboratory for studying the effects of law upon public opinion. Research projects should be set up in these areas to chart the movement of such opinion. Simultaneously, public action groups should be functioning in as many areas as possible to help reinforce the Supreme Court's mandate and thereby help veer public opinion in the right direction. But entirely too much reliance has been placed upon the courts and too little on the collateral forces essential to ease their task.

As little thought has been given to the effect of civil-rights riders, though here, too, the stakes are large and the risks critical. In March of 1949 the issue of civil-rights riders was presented in sharp focus when Senators Cain and BRICKER, who were notoriously opposed to public housing, introduced a rider to the public-housing bill which would have outlawed racial segregation in public-housing projects. The rider threatened to end the tenuous southern support for public housing, a program which has made dramatic demonstrations in racial integration, often in face of local opposition and even violence. In June 1953, 268 projects containing more than 33,000 dwellings were occupied by Negroes in projects where neighbors usually dwelt next door or across the hall. Considering the novelty of the approach and the complexities inherent in any effort to reshape a living pattern founded upon long-existing and stubborn prejudices the public-housing experience has been one of the most revealing and constructive in the history of the race-relations enigma.

Yet the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People favored the rider and liberal legislators, like Senators DOUGLAS and HUMPHREY, who viewed the amendment as designed to defeat the public-housing appropriation, were faced with political reprisals. I opposed the rider at the time in articles in the New York Post and, indeed, a number of Negro organizations and leaders took the same position, including the National Council of Negro Women. Curiously, the hearings before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities now reveal that the antidiscrimination rider was conceived as a ruse by the real-estate lobby deliberately designed to alienate the support of southern Congressmen.

Today, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has again resolved to attach a similar civil rights rider to the public-housing bill as well as to other measures. I don't for a moment disagree with the intent or good motives of the association or of Congressman POWELL and others supporting this amendment.

But will not such a rider again play directly into the hands of the real-estate lobby and make the civil-rights fight the tool of reaction instead of the bannerhead of liberalism? It is still hard to say for no one yet knows how or when the rider will be attached. If it is attached to the first title of the bill and will apply to all housing, the public-housing appropriation may escape all trouble. But if the opponents of public housing succeed in having the present bill withdrawn and substitute a separate measure, then the public-housing bill with a rider might fail.

I plead, therefore, for a more thorough analysis of the strategy in the use of riders as well as in civil-rights legislation.

The fight for civil rights in a democracy is not confined to a particular weapon. It may be public education, the ballot box, courts, the administrative agencies or all of these. It may also be civil-rights legislation and civil-rights riders, but none of these alone are panaceas. Neither the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, nor the 14th amendment, nor the constitutions of the States, nor the civil-rights laws of 1866 won equal rights for Negroes when other forces were simultaneously lacking to reinforce them. They became forceful when the climate of opinion after World War II had changed to favor the transition from equivalence to equality.

The Russian constitution grants few of the civil liberties it espouses on paper. The United Nations professions of equality hardly apply to South Africa. Our own 14th amendment failed until recently, to protect the Negro. Civil-rights laws are important and often indispensable, but they must be supported by demonstrations of their validity, by implementation and above all by a sympathetic public opinion. A civil-rights statute may state a principle and thereby pave the way for educational processes to operate. The mere statement of principle, however, does not itself assure the libertarian gain. The fight must be made on many fronts if it is to prove effective. Yet, in choosing the front in which the battle is to be waged, there is no compulsion to accept that front which suits the enemy of social legislation or which plays into its hands.

To lose the public-housing measure means the end of a great experiment and the acceleration of the Jim Crow pattern in most of the housing in the country. There is no rule which says that the fight for equality must be fought with a flagrant disregard of consequences. It calls instead for a concentration of efforts and forces where they can be deployed most effectively. The battle should be fought at a time and place at which the gains already made by minorities will not be threatened and when the factors and forces which bring us closer to equality will not be endangered.

In such a context, civil rights riders and civil rights legislation may have a place—not by their indiscriminate introduction but by their careful use at particular times and places. For example, public housing funds are dispensed by public agencies. Since the rulings in the education cases, it should be clear that segregation in neighborhoods by a public agency would be struck down by the courts as a violation of the 14th amendment. No statute or rider is needed to guarantee this, for the salvation of civil and political rights when threatened by public agencies emanates not from the will of the majority or from statute but from the basic charter whether it be called the Bill of Rights, the inalienable rights, or the public policy. To abandon the position that the basic rights are supreme and that the right to equality must be reestablished through the painful and laborious if not impossible process of antidiscriminatory statutes would amount to fatal surrender of the principal supports that fortify the American scheme.

I do not say that the court test on public housing should be made immediately, for considerable headway has already been made through the administrative agency in advancing nondiscriminatory policy. If this policy changes for the worse, then the test should, of course, be made. If resort to the courts fails and if resort to administrative pressures likewise fails, then resort to the Congress is indicated. But why test in the Congress a principle already working administratively?

I am not opposed unconditionally to riders and there may be strategic considerations favoring a rider attached to the military Reserve program. Such a rider may perhaps serve to dramatize the civil rights issue and force a more positive attitude and policy from the executive and administrative agencies than they have shown to date.

Such a rider to the education bill should awaken the Executive to a long overdue assumption of the responsibility to implement the Supreme Court decision through his administrative agencies. For the enforcement of the Court's decision through the courts alone must be a difficult and arduous task. The district courts cannot take independent action to enforce the High Court's decree, but may enforce it only on complaint of a litigant. The litigant, in turn, must provide proof of discrimination which is often a costly if not impossible task. When the Executive has shown no disposition to back up the Court and, in fact, completely ignores his responsibility to support its decree, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People can hardly be blamed for resorting to statute as a means of stimulating and dramatizing such implementation.

A similar situation governs the FHA authorization. FHA today can influence the flow of private housing where needed as well as the racial patterns of American neighborhoods, and the agency has a duty to do

[1] Morroe Berger, Equality by Statute, Columbia University Press, 1952, p. 3.

[2] John P. Roche and Milton M. Gordon, Can Morality Be Legislated?, the New York Times Magazine, Sunday, May 22, 1955, p. 47.

precisely that. It is more than a private company concerned only with its stockholders or a working tool for private builders. FHA's duty to regulate methods of operation implies that such methods of operation should not be permitted to extend to racial discrimination. The FHA Administrator may take shares of stock as part of transactions, and its plain duty as a stockholder with a public trust is to see that its benefits are dispensed without bias. Its statutory obligation to protect families with children applies with no less force to Negro children than to white. FHA is indeed a creature of the public with an affirmative duty to protect the public interest. The full faith and credit of the United States remain behind every mortgage insurance contract. FHA has been accorded the same priorities in bankruptcy proceedings as are given to the United States, its administrator is appointed by the President and it is answerable to the people—all the people, not merely a preferred class of citizens.

The same logic applies to the Veterans' Administration in the insurance of its mortgages, to the Home Loan Bank System and to the Federal National Mortgage Association, all of which are Federal agencies operating under formulas which place the primary risk on the Federal Government.

Yet these agencies have openly discriminated in the dispensation of their benefits from the time of their formation. The discriminatory policies of FHA were actually written into manuals and read like paragraphs culled from the Nuremberg Laws. In 1950, the objectionable paragraphs were withdrawn, but there is still no indication that FHA or its sister agencies in the private housing complex intend to condition their aid upon nondiscrimination by their beneficiaries. While a court proceeding has been commenced by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to enjoin exclusion of Negroes from Levittown, Pa., it is impossible to judge at this time whether the Supreme Court will hold that insurance of mortgages to a private developer bars the lender and builder beneficiaries from discriminating.

Irrespective of how the Court rules, however, the Executive and the administrative agencies can themselves set a nondiscriminatory policy without having to wait upon the Court's decision. The protection of civil rights is tripartite and not peculiar to any one of the governmental arms. Since the vast majority of the Congress are for FHA authorizations, though not for nondiscrimination, the rider may serve to dramatize an issue which should long ago have been dramatized, i. e., the open and arbitrary discrimination by Federal housing agencies aiding private enterprise.

It is significant that New York State recently enacted the Metcalf-Baker bill which barred racial discrimination or segregation in FHA-aided projects. This represents the first occasion where a State has enjoined discrimination against the Federal Government. Up to now, it has been the Federal Government which has enjoined the States from discriminating. It indicates how far the Federal Government has strayed from the purpose sought to be achieved by the 14th amendment and justifies the use of riders in these areas.

We now come to the question of urban redevelopment. This program ostensibly devised to clear slums and provide housing on slum sites or vacant land has been perverted largely into a device for ousting minorities from their homes. In July 1952 there were 70 urban redevelopment projects, not a single one of which was on open land. Of 45,450 families to be displaced, more than two-thirds were listed as nonwhite.

No corrective action has been taken administratively or by legislation and no court action has succeeded in remedying these oppressions. In fact, the Stuyvesant Town case (*Dorsey* v. *Stuyvesant Town Corp.*, 229 N. Y. 512, cert. denied, 339 U. S. 98) holds that discrimination may be freely practiced. A law has been passed in New York and other States barring such discrimination, but the rule is not applicable nationally. Here, therefore, the need for a national civil-rights statute is indicated.

But the careful selection of legislation to which civil-rights riders should be attached is a far cry from the reckless use of such riders. The former serves to highlight the grievance and seeks its correction; the latter only serves to confuse the civil-rights issue. It tends to reduce the battle for civil rights to a game, loses support for the issue in quarters from which support might have been won, gives opponents of civil rights an opportunity to divert the issue to one of riders instead of rights. Simultaneously it enables opponents of social legislation to vote for such riders where such support might help defeat the legislation while voting against such riders where the interests of lobbies can best be served. Since the issue of riders was raised, the gains won by the Supreme Courts recent decisions have been sought to be diluted by insinuation of the old claim that only education will solve the problem of equality.

There is room, therefore, for a new look at the tactics and strategy of race relations not only by the minority groups, but by the Executive. The minority groups must effect a strategy which can weigh the desirability of court tests, Executive pressures, local statutes, and congressional riders. The Executive, instead of directing the issue to the propriety of riders, should assume his responsibility to bind all the Federal agencies to comply with Supreme Court decisions and with the Constitution. The President should be rising above the tactical battle of riders by exploring ways and means for implementing the Supreme Court's decisions and carrying its edict into education and other fields. Simultaneously research and education should be organized on a series of fronts. There should be:

1. Expansion of research in the causes of neighborhood discrimination and prejudices.

2. Education of builders in the need for building homes for minorities in integrated neighborhoods.

3. Education of experts and public officials in the various aspects of race and group frictions.

4. Education of the press and other media of communication in their role and responsibilities.

5. Education of employers who employ minority labor and labor unions.

6. Education of minorities in their rights and responsibilities and greater encouragement of local leadership among them.

7. Education of citizen groups in the nature and causes of tensions and in the creation of democratic environments.

8. Education of public agencies, local, State, and national, in the problems of discrimination and segregation.

Such education must be simultaneously reinforced by the organization of groups of citizens alerted to the moral principles laid down by the Supreme Court's decisions. This is the most effective medium, yet one of the most neglected. Advances will not come from local and State office holders who have been traditionally chary of taking a stand on civil rights unless pressed and unless assured that policy has the backing of influential groups. Although the whole movement for public education in the United States stemmed from the feeling that loyalty to republican ideas and democratic equality could be advanced only through the general system of education at public expense, that responsibility will not be assumed unless such citizen associations insist upon it. Here are the frontiers—before us lie the devices for piercing them. The principles which we seek will not be won by reckless resort to one device to the exclusion of another or by the indiscriminate use of devices to achieve nondiscrimination. Strategy is part of the fight for principle and the fight will not be won without assessing it at every point and directing the battle toward the most strategic areas and with the most effective devices.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column entitled "Keenotes," which follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

What is the "ideal" retirement age? Is it the same for all?

In many Government and teaching positions, retirement is compulsory at 70. The accumulated years of wisdom and of experience which make some individuals so outstanding in their jobs suddenly become not assets any longer but liabilities when the "must" retirement age is reached.

Since the advent of social security just 20 years ago this month, 65 has become a common retirement age for workers covered by this program. Under a bill which the House passed this year and which is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, women would be eligible for social-security benefits at 62 instead of 65.

Many people will tell you that they look forward with great anticipation to retirement, when they can drop the daily cares of earning a living and concentrate on the relaxed enjoyment of life. But how often does that anticipation give way to disillusionment? Some people find they have to keep on working in order to enjoy a full life and escape boredom.

The reason doctors have never been brought under social security is that their spokesmen insist doctors never do get a chance to retire, hence would not really benefit from coverage. (But so many doctors die young—literally working themselves to death in service to the community.)

In any event, this problem of retirement and the ideal age for it is one that each person faces individually. One eminent American—a great public servant who died last week—faced that problem and solved it in a novel way. "Retired" as Librarian of the Library of Congress 16 years ago, Herbert Putnam was named by Congress to a specially created post of Librarian Emeritus. He worked at the job every day, except during the summer when he went to New England for his favorite sport of sailing small boats up and down the Maine coast.

He was 77 when he "retired." When he died last week—still in harness—he was 93.

Appointed as Librarian of the Library of Congress by President McKinley in 1899, Herbert Putnam served for 40 years as the active director of that remarkable institution, singlehandedly, almost, raising it in stature to the greatest storehouse of knowledge in the world. The Library had about 1 million poorly cataloged books when he took over; when he "retired" in 1939, it had five and a half times as many books and a cataloging system which has become standard throughout the country. Just about

every library in the Nation depends upon the Library of Congress for its cataloging.

Dr. Putnam, whose name has been synonymous with scholarship, culture, knowledge in the field of books, considered himself an administrator rather than a scholar. He once told a reporter:

"I am not a profuse reader. I read romantic stuff, travel tales, westerns, and detective stories and stirring romances with a happy ending."

Whether he was pulling the reporter's leg or not, putting himself on the lowbrow level in his reading habits, he certainly did more for scholarship than almost any other American. And, fortunately, he never did retire. Some people just aren't meant to retire.

Patronage Politics or Racial Discrimination in Public Housing Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at various times during this session of Congress I have had occasion to call attention to the fact that the Eisenhower administration was engaged in the worst kind of patronage politics. In recent days, one more example of this type of maneuver has come to the attention of the Nation. On July 25, 1955, the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Albert M. Cole, advised Dr. Frank S. Horne that he was being dropped from his position in that Agency because of what he called a necessary reduction in force. According to Cole, this was brought about because of budgetary considerations.

Never have I seen a more flagrant example of patronage politics in action. What possible budgetary considerations could be involved when actually the budget for this agency had been increased from $2,868,500 to $5 million? Furthermore, Dr. Horne is a status employee within the civil-service ranks and he is entitled to veterans' preference. He, therefore, according to civil-service rules and regulations, is entitled to bump any other employee of equal or lesser status who does not have veterans' preference. Now, as it happens, Dr. Horne is qualified and, under the civil-service rules, is eligible for at least seven other jobs within the Agency. In spite of this fact, Mr. Cole, in his letter to Dr. Horne, says that Dr. Horne has been "considered for all possible reduction-in-force placements but no other continuous position in the Office of the Administrator for which you are qualified was found to be held by an employee with lower subgroup standing."

Nor is this the end of the story. Upon receipt of the letter from Mr. Cole. Dr. Horne objected to his abrupt dismissal and pointed out that he was well qualified to fill other positions within the agency. He then received a letter from Douglas Chaffin, the Director of Personnel within the Housing Agency, which stated that his case had been reconsidered and he was offered a new job at the same salary but with quite different duties. This was most certainly a new job, for none like it had ever existed up to that time. It was a job for which Dr. Horne was not nearly so well trained as he is for his old position and it quite obviously overlaps the duties of other members of the staff of the Agency. What happened to the budgetary considerations when they offered Dr. Horne this job? Where was this position when Mr. Cole first informed Dr. Horne of his dismissal?

Dr. Horne refused this new job and said he would appeal his case directly to the Civil Service Commission. I wish him luck with his appeal but I seriously doubt that it will do him much good for his case is but one in a pattern. There is a difference, however; Dr. Horne is today recognized as a leading expert in the field of interracial housing. During his 17 years service with the Government he has done much to make possible the success of such programs and the prestige of the United States has grown accordingly. This is the second time he has had great trouble with his agency head since the Eisenhower administration took office. He was given the position from which he has just been fired in 1953 in order to make room for a political appointee in the Housing Agency. He protested that action at the time, but finally took what was an entirely new position because he felt he would still be able to do his job and aid the interracial housing program. He now sees that he was mistaken. The new job was not nearly so satisfactory because he was removed from the mainstream of agency activity in the field of his specialty and relegated to the sidelines. Now even this job has been taken from him. And this at a time when President Eisenhower has been urging increased activity in the public-housing field. Is this another case of the right hand not knowing what the left is doing? I felt deep concern for the public-housing program when Mr. Cole was originally appointed for he was known to have been an outspoken opponent of the whole idea of public housing. This idea has been newly reenforced because of this decision to drop Dr. Horne from the staff of the Agency.

There is one other aspect of this whole matter which disturbs me greatly. That is the possibility that racial discrimination may be involved. The United States Government has gradually been building an excellent record in the field of interracial public housing. It is a record of which all Americans may well be proud. But—and it is a very large but—this may not continue to be the case for long. As Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt pointed out in a recent newspaper column, "Mr. Cole advised the Judiciary Committee of the House to go slow in considering racial segregation bans involving Government housing and in Government housing insurance." That advice, taken in conjunction with the attempt to remove Dr. Horne, a specialist in interracial housing, from his position, seems to indicate that the Administrator of the Housing Agency really does not believe in such ideas or projects.

Thus, whether Dr. Horne's dismissal results from patronage politics, from a general disbelief in public housing, or antagonism to the idea of interracial housing, it is a miserable situation and one that well merits the attention of the Congress. It is my hope that when Congress reconvenes or perhaps even before that time, the appropriate committee or committees will make a full investigation of this whole affair. Only in this way can we be sure that justice will be maintained.

For the information of my colleagues I would like to include as a part of my remarks, the text of the letter from Albert M. Cole to Dr. Horne, a letter from Dr. Horne to Douglas Chaffin, an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, and some letters to the editor which were carried in that newspaper.

The matters follow:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1955.

Mr. FRANK S. HORNE,
Assistant to the Administrator, Immediate Office of the Administrator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORNE: Budgetary considerations have made a reduction in force in the Office of the Administrator necessary. As a result the position which you occupy will be eliminated.

In accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, you have been considered for all possible reduction-in-force placements, but no other continuous position in the Office of the Administrator for which you are qualified was found to be held by an employee with lower subgroup standing.

Accordingly, I regret to inform you that you will be separated effective midnight August 25, 1955.

The procedure followed in effecting this reduction is in accord with the civil-service rules and regulations. If you believe that the regulations have not been carried out in your case, you should make a specific written appeal to the Director of Personnel within 10 days of the receipt of this notice. If, within 10 days after receipt of an answer by the Director of Personnel or the receipt of a supplementary notice, you so desire, you may further appeal the action to the appropriate office of the Civil Service Commission. Your written appeal to the Commission must also give specific reasons for your appeal.

There is a supplemental sheet attached which indicates where you may inspect the retention register, the Commission's regulations, and other pertinent records and which contains additional information of importance to you at this time.

You are eligible for listing on the reemployment priority list.

The Agency is appreciative of the contribution you have made to its programs.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

REDUCTION-IN-FORCE NOTICE, ISSUED JULY 25, 1955

DOUGLAS E. CHAFFIN,
Director of Personnel, Office of Administrator:

On July 25, 1955, I received reduction-in-force notice from Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, eliminating the position I now occupy (Assistant to the Administrator—GS–101–15) as the result of budgetary considerations. I

hereby appeal this action on the ground that the procedure followed in effecting this reduction is not in accord with the Civil Service Rules and Regulations applicable to a classified civil service employee with veteran's status.

There is no evidence, to my knowledge, that a general reduction in force has been ordered that would achieve any significant budget savings. I am informed by the personnel office that as of today only two separation notices have been issued for alleged budgetary consideration, one to me and one to my assistant. The only conclusion that I can reach is that such summary action, in violation of statutory employment rights, was deemed necessary to dispense with my services.

The Agency has made no placement offer based on retention registers and individual qualifications, although I am a status employee with 17 years of varied experience in Government housing agencies and veterans' preference. Although my RIF notice states that I "have been considered for all possible reduction-in-force placements but no other continuous position in the Office of the Administrator for which you are qualified was found to be held by an employee with lower subgroup standing." I have examined a list of grade GS–15 and GS–14 positions in the Office of the Administrator and find that a number of continuous positions for which I am clearly qualified are now held by nonveterans. These positions include the following as examples:

NONVETERANS—GS–15

301. Director, Operations Analysis Staff.
301. Director, Urban Renewal Services Branch.
301. Chief, Project Procedure and Review.

NONVETERANS—GS–14

101. Racial Relations Adviser.
301. Relocation Rehousing Adviser.
301. Assistant Area Supervisor.
301. Assistant Director, Demonstration Program Branch.

I claim that there can be little question that I have the basic education and experience, and such special skills and aptitudes as are necessary to take over any of the above positions, as well as others at grades GS–15 and GS–14 in the Office of the Administrator, in a reduction in force and render satisfactory service without undue interruption to the work program. Further, in any instances in which there could be a shadow of doubt as to my qualification, that doubt would supposedly be resolved in favor of a veteran.

Second, under section 14 of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended, and part 22 of the Civil Service Regulations, I challenge the validity of the reduction in force action and claim it to be a device to preclude the proper recognition and exercise of my statutory rights as a classified civil-service employee with veteran's status and thus to displace me from the Agency as part of the original improper process involved in my removal in October 1953 from my original position (Assistant to the Administrator (Racial Relations)—GS–101–15) and reassignment under pressure to a newly created position (Assistant to the Administrator—GS–101–15). The alternatives indicated as open to me by the Agency in October 1953 at the time of my reassignment were either to resign or accept the newly created position, with no indication or recognition of my rights actually due me as a classified civil service employee with veteran's status either in my original job or to any other. In fact, the job sheet created for the new job evolved out of a series of discussions between the Assistant Administrator for Administration and me after I had indicated that I would not resign but would resist displacement from the Agency as the result of clearly identifiable political action. I introduced the word "rank" into the discussions and, while it was never acknowledged as a job right, concessions were made in obvious efforts to parallel the rank of the job from which I was being displaced (Assistant to the Administrator (Racial Relations)—GS–101–15). Finally, I accepted the job in good faith at the request of the Administrator as indicated in his public announcement of October 1, 1953.

At the time of the reassignment action, I had and was given no information regarding my retention rights in my original position. The Roth case had not been decided and, even now, there are doubts as to the implications of this case and Civil Service Commission Departmental Circular No. 789. It appeared to me, however, that the moment I was reassigned to the newly created position, I suffered loss of rank.

As evidence of this fact, there was a diminishing of my prestige within the Agency and among professional organizations in the field of housing and racial relations who had come to regard me as one of the outstanding authorities in these fields. Although listed as an Assistant to the Administrator, I was excluded from the Administrator's primary staff meetings which I had previously attended; specific assignments were not made to me by the Administrator nor by other members of his immediate staff; my studies and recommendations were almost completely ignored; I ceased to have any primary effect upon policy or procedure; I ceased to be able to speak for the Administrator or the Agency in any effective way; while formerly it was my responsibility to write and sign correspondence related to policy questions, I was confined to routine responses in a restricted area; in my original position, delegations and individuals seeking consultation regarding policy and procedural questions involving the public impact of Agency policies and operations, such contacts were now precluded; while previously, on behalf of the Administrator, I gave general supervision and direction to extensive operations throughout OA and the constituents, and had come to be regarded as a keystone in an area recognized to be of considerable significance both within and outside the Agency, my position, rank, and prestige all suffered from restriction to narrower concerns.

When I recognized this loss of rank and in an effort to bolster the position to which I had been reassigned, I presented, during November and December of 1954 and in January 1955, a redefinition of my function for consideration by the Administrator which would have enhanced the role of my office in such matters as review of workable programs and relocation plans in order to be placed in the stream of Agency operations and to place at the disposal of the Agency and the Administrator my accumulated experience and skills. While originally considered sound by the Administrator, it was never accepted nor put into operation. Finally, it had become evident that there was clearly no intention to maintain the rank of my position as Assistant to the Administrator nor to allow me to preserve the high prestige formerly recognized by professional groups and organizations.

After discovering, by accident, in April 1955, the existence of Civil Service Commission Departmental Circular No. 789, originally issued January 24, 1955, I filed a written request with the Assistant Administrator for Administration on April 15, 1955 (within the 90-day period indicated in the circular), as to the implications of CSC Departmental Circular No. 789 "for my own present and former position." Three months elapsed during which I received no response whatsoever. Finally, on July 28, 1955, after I had received the reduction-in-force notice, I filed another formal memorandum requesting response to my original request of April 15, 1955. You will note that the response to my second request, finally received on July 29, 1955, is not pertinent to my original request regarding the possibility of improper action in my removal in October 1953 from my original position as Assistant to the Administrator (Racial Relations)—GS–101–15.

I now, therefore, claim that the removal and reassignment action of 1953, made under pressure, was improper, that the position offered was not of the same rank and that the current reduction-in-force action is a device to absolve the Agency from meeting my legitimate and statutory rights as a classified employee with veteran's preference in and to my original position (Assistant to the Administrator (Racial Relations)—GS–101–15). My appeal to you, therefore, is for withdrawal of the reduction-in-force notice and restoration to my original position (Assistant to the Administrator (Racial Relations)—GS–101–15) from which I was improperly moved.

FRANK S. HORNE,
Assistant to the Administrator.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

PATRONAGE HANGOVER

Repercussions from a patronage move nearly 2 years ago are causing a stir in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. At that time the HHFA ousted Dr. Frank S. Horne, the able and experienced director of its Racial Relations Service, and named Joseph R. Ray, Sr., a Republican leader of Louisville, as his successor. When the ousting of Dr. Horne, a Democrat, provoked a series of protests because of his good work in the delicate field of racial relations in housing, HHFA Administrator Cole decided to keep Dr. Horne on as a special assistant to the administrator. In reviewing his budget situation recently, however, Mr. Cole decided that he could not afford the luxury of two units working on racial relations and decided to abolish the jobs held by Dr. Horne and an assistant.

Apparently there was no dissatisfaction with Dr. Horne's work. Recognizing Dr. Horne's civil-service rights, Mr. Cole said that efforts would be made to find another job for him. It is to be hoped that some means will be found for continuation of the good work he has done in housing, but there seems to be little chance of finding the kind of job—other than the one he previously held—that will utilize his special talents. The public has an interest, of course, in not maintaining duplicate services in the HHFA or any other governmental agencies. The real mischief was done 2 years ago when Dr. Horne was displaced from the post for which he had been specially trained, merely to meet the demands for patronage.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

"PATRONAGE HANGOVER"

May we congratulate the Washington Post and Times Herald for its splendid editorial entitled "Patronage Hangover"? You have placed the issue of the dismissal of Dr. Frank Horne as assistant to the administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in its proper framework—politics.

For more than 19 years, Dr. Horne has been an outstanding public servant in the field of race relations and 17 of those years have been in the field of housing. We who sign this letter have had occasion throughout the years to consult frequently with Dr. Horne. We have watched him grow with his job. He built his staff as director of the racial relations service with consideration only as to the skill of the persons recruited for Government service.

Never have we detected a partisan approach in his operations or his policy recommendations. Much of the credit for improved racial relationships in housing within this country throughout the last two decades

rightfully belongs to the skill of the operations directed by Dr. Horne.

When Dr. Horne was removed as head of the racial relations service 2 years ago to make room for a political appointee, we protested. When a compromise was reached establishing a new position as assistant to the administrator to advise on broad racial policies, some of us urged Dr. Horne to accept it. We believed that the position was established in good faith, although some who have signed this letter warned then that it could be a delaying action. Those who held that reservation were apparently correct.

Throughout the last 22 months, Dr. Horne's vast experience and tested judgment were seldom drawn upon. Racial policies have not progressed with the times and strong leadership has been lost.

The fact that Dr. Horne's dismissal was based on a reduction in force for alleged budgetary reasons which cannot be defended is incidental to the issue. The fact that proper consideration was not initially given to his rights as a civil servant with veterans' preference, while indicative of a breakdown in the whole structure of public service, is not the basic cause for the expression of alarm that has been raised by this action throughout the Nation.

We protest this effort to destroy the foundation on which sound racial relations in the housing field have been built. We assert that the abandonment of forward-looking policies executed by highly skilled technicians and the substitution of political determinations in one of the most critical phases of American life, weakens our country both at home and abroad.

We are grateful for your public service in pointing up this issue.

Kenneth M. Birkhead, Wallace J. Campbell, Lee F. Johnson, Mrs. Winthrop D. Lane, John D. Lange, Mrs. W. T. Mason, Mrs. Olya Margolin, Clarence Mitchell, Philip Schiff, Bert Seidman, George L. P. Weaver, Bernard Weitzer.

WASHINGTON.

As a practicing attorney and one interested and active in civic affairs, I wish to congratulate you on your splendid editorial relating to the ouster of Dr. Frank S. Horne. I think your point is very well taken that the demands for patronage should not cause the dismissal of highly qualified, trained, and skilled employees, and you are to be commended on bringing it to the attention of the public.

There are many capable public servants who now hold and should be permitted to continue to hold top-level Government jobs without regard to the fact that they are not members of the party which now happens to be in power.

I realize that patronage is an integral part of the American political process; it is equally true, however, that the experience accumulated by many men like Dr. Horne through long years of Government service should not be discarded lightly. Appointive authorities at all levels of Government service should remain alert to the balance which must be struck between rewarding party loyalty and giving the best government possible to the American people.

CHARLES T. DUNCAN.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"PATRONAGE HANGOVER"

Your editorial entitled "Patronage Hangover" relating to the dismissal of Dr. Frank S. Horne and his assistant, Mrs. Corienne Morrow, is a commentary which calls for high praise. To those who recognize that making democracy work is a difficult problem it is also a challenge to express themselves in support of two exceptionally devoted and competent public servants.

Working in a field requiring unusual talent, both Dr. Horne and Mrs. Morrow have made a record worth examining thoroughly. In playing a leading part in opening a much needed supply of modern housing to minority groups throughout the Nation, and in stimulating initiative on the part of private enterprise in doing this, Dr. Horne has become an outstanding person.

I have known Mrs. Morrow for more years than Dr. Horne. In those years I have seen her display unusual sagacity in handling some extremely difficult problems in human relations. She has revealed an uncanny understanding of Negro psychology, and used that knowledge in the public interest. As a well-integrated personality her efforts in handling tough assignments have been outstanding.

It is people of such caliber to whom public service should be made especially attractive, no matter of what race. When, through carelessness or prejudice life is made difficult for them a blow against democratic institutions is being delivered.

I believe we are entering a period in which we must employ all of the ingenuity and inventiveness which Americans boast, and which has brought enormous progress in science and technology, in the field of human relations. It is in this area that progress has lagged dangerously. If we are to be successful in this field, especially in bringing into public service the ablest and most self-effacing men and women, those who see this need must come to the support of the kind of folk who care more about serving others than themselves.

You have done this editorially in bringing to public attention the cases of Dr. Horne and Mrs. Morrow.

BARROW LYONS.

WASHINGTON.

Activity of the Committee on the District of Columbia During the 84th Congress, 1st Session

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to take this opportunity to make a statement as to the activity of our committee in the first session of this Congress. As you know, under the Federal Constitution the Congress of the United States is charged with the responsibility of exercising exclusive jurisdiction in all matters whatsoever concerning the District of Columbia. Under the rules of the House of Representatives the House District Committee has jurisdiction of all measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefore, including adulteration of foods and drugs, incorporation and organization of societies, insurance, executors, administrators, wills and divorce, municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws, municipal and juvenile courts, public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations, regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors, and taxes and tax sales.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress the members of the House District Committee have worked diligently on measures before this committee and have spent many hours of their time in hearing bills before this committee affecting matters in the District of Columbia. I would like at this time to take the opportunity to thank each of the members of this committee, both on the majority and on the minority side, for the fine cooperation which they have given to me during this 1st session of the 84th Congress, and to thank each of these members for their time spent considering measures pertaining to the District of Columbia. Without the assistance of these members the record of this committee could not have been achieved.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress a total of 127 bills were introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Of the House bills introduced, 29 were referred to either a subcommittee or the full committee and separate hearings held on these measures. Of the 29 bills considered, 20 bills were reported by the full committee. Seventeen bills passed the House either as reported by the committee or in an amended form. Six of the original House bills passed the Senate. Also during the 1st session of the 84th Congress 19 bills which passed the Senate were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Of the 19 bills, 9 were acted on either by a subcommittee or the full committee and reported in the House of Representatives. Twelve bills which were acted on by the Senate were also passed by the House of Representatives. Of the total bills passed by the House and Senate, 17 bills became public law and 1 private bill became private law. None of the bills were vetoed by the President.

I believe that the record of this committee speaks for itself, and I take great pride in making it available to the Members of this body.

A Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the conclusion of the 1st session of the 84th Congress is a good time to pause and reflect upon the legislative record accomplished, and particularly my own efforts in serving the needs of the people of my district. In this way I hope to keep my constituents better informed as to my record and my views on major issues.

I represent the Eighth Congressional District of New York, which is located in Brooklyn and includes the sections

known as Greenpoint, parts of Williamsburgh, Bushwick, the Navy Yard area, and so forth. It is strictly an urban district of working-class, low-income families, people of various national origins and religious faiths, but all devoted and loyal American citizens. I am proud to represent them in the Congress of the United States and am grateful to them for choosing me as their Representative.

THE SEARCH FOR WORLD PEACE

The quest for world peace is today uppermost in the minds of people everywhere. Of late there has been somewhat of a relaxation of international tensions, but it is still a long way from mankind's cherished goal of attaining a real and lasting peace. There is great doubt in the minds of many people whether the Communists are earnest in their current policies or whether they are stalling for time; consequently, we must at all times be on the alert.

When I came to Congress in January of this year I had pledged to myself to do all in my power to further the cause of peace and the abolition of war. I have given this matter a great deal of thought and have taken several noteworthy steps to fulfill my pledge. In April I delivered a major address in Congress on "The Search for Peace," in which I developed the thought for a people-to-people approach to the problem of international peace and I suggested three proposals to Congress: First, adoption of a resolution expressing the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes; second, revision of the United Nations Charter by extending the authority of the U. N. to halt aggressions, facilitate universal disarmament, enforce international law, et cetera; third, set up a "Mission for Peace" to be comprised of elder statesmen who would conduct discussions leading toward peace. A few weeks later I introduced three resolutions incorporating these proposals, which were then referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for consideration.

In July I was honored by Speaker SAM RAYBURN by being appointed a member of the United States congressional delegation to the NATO parliamentary conference, which took place in Paris July 18–22. This was a meeting of representatives of the 15 countries which are associated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to plan the maintenance of peace and security of these nations, as well as to obtain closer economic, social and cultural relations between the peoples of the Atlantic community.

Shortly before leaving for the conference I had prepared a lengthy study on the international situation in which I proposed the idea that the United States should invite the principal powers of the world to join with us in a declaration establishing a moratorium on war for a period of 10 years. I indicated the benefits which mankind would derive and I stressed the need for certain safeguards. At the NATO conference I discussed the plan with many statesmen from other countries, who responded very favorably to the idea. I also submitted a copy of my plan to Secretary of State Dulles, who was then at the summit conference in Geneva.

In other matters of international affairs, I supported the extension of our trade agreements program for 3 years and simplification of our customs procedure to increase our international trade with the rest of the world. I voted for the resolution expressing United States opposition to colonialism and imperialism. I also supported continuation of our mutual security program to provide military, economic, and technical assistance to our allies.

I want to emphasize at this point that in our search for peace we must never, while there still remains tension in the world, let down our guard for one single moment. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, a successor to General Eisenhower as Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, told me while the summit conference was going on in Geneva that what inspired that conference more than anything else was the existence of NATO. Without NATO, Russia would have already moved over all of Europe and she would have had no desire for talks. Now more than ever, we must keep in mind that the dissolution of NATO still remains the No. 1 objective of the Soviet Union. The moment we let down our guard, the moment we weaken our defenses in Europe or anywhere else in the world, Russia will not have to talk to us.

Following my experience in World War II as an intelligence officer with OSS, I was against scrapping of our huge war surpluses and other means of defense. I warned then—1945—that our friends today might be our enemies tomorrow. The political information I had on Russia convinced me then that she was only a convenient ally. I am now firmly of the opinion that had we had a NATO organization in 1914 and also in 1939 in Europe, World War I and World War II would have been averted. We cannot afford to gamble on the future again.

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROGRAM

The problem of immigration is of vital interest to me. Immediately after my election to Congress I began to work on a bill to revise the discriminatory McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. My very first deed after the oath as Congressman on January 5 was to introduce my bill, H. R. 501, a document of over 200 pages, calling for a complete revision and liberalization of our present immigration laws. In it I advocate the elimination of the national origins quota system, the establishment of an annual quota of 220,000 immigrants based on the 1940 census, the distribution of unused quotas among countries with small quota allotments, no discrimination against immigrants because of race, religion, or national origin, the elimination of all distinctions between native-born and naturalized United States citizens, and many other liberal features.

Several months passed and nothing was done. The House Judiciary Committee, to whom the bill was referred, did not schedule hearings on this measure. Finally, I decided to intiate a discharge petition on my bill in an effort to bring it out on the floor of Congress for debate and a vote. In order to accomplish this the petition must be signed by a majority of the Members of the House—218. Although a large number have already signed the petition we are still far from the necessary 218. During the first weeks of the 1956 session I plan to undertake an intensive campaign to obtain the required number of signatures in the hope of giving Congress a chance to vote on the measure.

Meanwhile, I also introduced a bill suggesting five amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. This is the act which provides for the admission of 214,000 refugees over a 3-year period ending December 31, 1956. Less than a year and a half remains of this time limit, but until now only about 30,000 people were admitted under the program. In order to save the program from being a failure and to step up the flow of immigration, I proposed as follows: to raise the age limit of orphans from 10 to 14 so that 4,000 orphans can be admitted; to eliminate the need for housing and employment assurances; to abolish the requirement for readmission guaranties; to take the program out of the hands of the State Department and administer it under a special commission; and to extend the act for another year until the end of 1957. Also in this respect nothing was done and I shall, therefore, continue my efforts to obtain action early in the new session.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The House approved a bill to extend social-security benefits in several ways: by including self-employed professionals except doctors, reducing the retirement age for women to 62, and providing certain disability benefits. The bill was sent to the Senate but final action was delayed until the next session. I was in favor of these improvements but I felt that they do not go far enough. Back in March I introduced a bill which I consider more adequate and which would provide greater security for our older people.

My bill contains four major proposals: to raise the monthly minimum benefits from $30 to $40; to allow outside earnings up to $125 per month instead of the present $100; to lower the retirement age from 65 to 60 for both men and women; and to extend coverage to professional groups, including doctors. I regard my amendments as more practical and will continue to work for their adoption in the future.

I also introduced a special bill known as Insurance Against Blindness Act, which provides that those who become blind shall be entitled to receive social-security benefits from the time they are afflicted with blindness, instead of waiting until they reach 65. This proposal has been endorsed by organizations working for the blind.

LABOR AND MINIMUM WAGE

Unfortunately, very little was done by Congress this year in the field of labor legislation, with the sole exception of increasing the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour. I had hoped that the minimum wage would be set at $1.25, but President Eisenhower proposed only 90 cents, so we compromised at $1. I

felt that these were substandard wages which we should not tolerate in the United States and I so told my colleagues in Congress. The higher minimum wage will benefit about 10 million low-paid workers and their families.

Nothing was done to repeal or amend the Taft-Hartley labor law, and I frankly doubt whether it will ever be repealed under a Republican administration. Every other attempt to aid labor was frustrated. I made at least two attempts but they were both defeated. When the Sugar Act came up I introduced an amendment which provided that sugar workers, who are among the most exploited in this country, should receive the minimum wage as prescribed by law and that they be permitted to join unions. In another instance, when the Mexican farm-labor bill came up in the House, I submitted an amendment which required that American employers who are bringing in Mexican contract labor should offer the same terms and conditions to domestic farmworkers as those given to Mexicans, including transportation, housing, guaranties of wages, and so forth. This is necessary for the protection of American labor. Both of my amendments had the support of the big labor organizations in the United States, but both were defeated in Congress.

FARM PRICES AND THE COST OF LIVING

When I came to Congress in January, the leadership suggested that I become a member of the Committee on Agriculture. Although I do not have a single farmer in my district in Brooklyn, the idea appealed to me for this reason: As a member of the committee I would represent the standpoint of the consumer in the big city who is struggling with the high cost of living and I would be in a position to plead the cause of the city people. This I have been doing since then at every opportunity.

Unfortunately, the cost of living which has such a telling effect on our pocketbooks continues to remain high. The present administration is making no attempt to bring it down a little. In my own way I have tried to do everything possible. I introduced a bill for the improvement and construction of modern marketing facilities for handling perishable food products in urban areas, which would not only be more sanitary but more economical. It would result in lower prices for fruits, vegetables, meats, eggs, dairy products, and so forth. Just before the session ended, the Agriculture Committee approved the bill and it will come up in the House early next year.

In view of the huge surpluses of food in this country, such as wheat, butter, and other commodities, which are rotting and spoiling in warehouses, I introduced a bill to authorize the sale of some of these surpluses to foreign nations on credit. This is to be done particularly in areas where there is hunger. In this way we shall be able to help relieve starvation and also dispose of some of our surplus foods in this country. Of course, I also voted for the bill authorizing the Government to donate substantial quantities of food for use by institutions for the poor and the aged and for other needy people.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

I have always taken the position that our country should take the lead in practicing toleration toward minority groups and that discrimination against any group on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin should be eliminated. For this reason, I am a strong believer in civil rights and the protection of our civil liberties to which all American citizens are entitled under the Constitution.

I regret to report that in its 1st session the 84th Congress has done nothing in this field. Although many civil rights bills were introduced, not a single one was brought to the floor of either House for consideration and approval. In April, I introduced a bill calling for the observance of civil rights in the United States. In it, I proposed four steps: First, the President should set up a Civil Rights Commission to conduct a study of the policies, practices, and the enforcement program of the Government with respect to civil rights, and the progress made throughout the Nation in observance of these rights; second, abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting; third, outlaw lynching and mob violence; fourth, set up a fair employment practices commission—FEPC—to eliminate discrimination in employment.

CRIME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The sharp increase in crime and juvenile delinquency in recent years is most deplorable. It is my view that in order to check its growth Congress should lead a crusade against crime on a national scale, instead of leaving it to the local communities. As a former judge and voluntary social worker, I have always been deeply interested in this problem, particularly the great menace it constitutes for our youth.

Since coming to Congress, I have spoken on the subject several times in the House of Representatives. I introduced several bills to deal with this problem. One bill calls for the creation of a congressional committee of five to study the causes of crime and to seek methods for preventing crime. Another bill recommends that a Bureau of Crime Prevention be created in the Department of Justice to deal with crime and juvenile delinquency, and to cooperate with State and local authorities in crime-prevention programs. In a third bill, I suggested that the United States establish a port patrol and border patrol in the Customs Bureau of the Treasury Department to deal more effectively with the smuggling of narcotics into this country.

In February the large New York newspaper Daily Mirror asked me to write a special article on teen-age crime and how to deal with it. My article was published in the Mirror on Sunday, February 13. In my own district I organized a group of public-spirited citizens to help me fight crime. We purchased an old police station which we are planning to remodel and to open it in the near future as a youth center to provide a variety of wholesome activities for young people.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

During my first term in Congress in 1951–52, I served on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. There I became fully acquainted with the problems of our postal workers and Federal employees, their struggles and their plight in maintaining a decent standard of living on a limited income. Their salaries had not been raised for several years. One of my first acts when I returned to Congress was to introduce a bill to increase the salaries of all postal and Federal workers by $1,000 per annum. I feel that they have worked for many years on inadequate salaries and deserve this compensation.

In 1954 President Eisenhower had vetoed a 5-percent increase for these people. It was therefore clear that a $1,000 increase would never be approved by the administration, so I began to work very actively for the adoption of a bill which would provide at least a 10-percent increase. After many months, when at times it looked like a forlorn cause, we succeeded in compromising on an 8.1-percent raise for postal workers and 7.5 percent for Federal employees. While I am happy over the results, I still feel that it is not sufficient.

VETERANS LEGISLATION

Another group which always finds a warm response in my heart are the veterans of this country who have sacrificed so much for the defense of the United States in two world wars and the Korean war. In the first session of the 84th Congress we passed several measures to benefit war veterans which I was glad to support.

Among these measures are the following: A bill which provides that all those serving in our Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to earn educational benefits until their discharge up to 36 months of entitlement. This would give them a chance to continue their education, just as other servicemen had done after World War II. Other bills extended an increase in military salaries, continuation of assistance to dependents of those in the service, improvement of survivors' benefits, special privileges to disabled veterans, and extension of the Veterans' Administration program for home loans to veterans.

MISCELLANEOUS LEGISLATION

Many other bills and issues came up during the course of the session on which I expressed my views. Following are some of the more important issues:

Prior to the 10th anniversary meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco in June, I delivered an address in Congress on the need for early admission of Italy to the United Nations. I pointed out that Italy is a major nation on the European Continent, it is peaceful and democratic, it is an ally of the United States and a member of NATO. I cited how on five different occasions the U. N. was ready to admit Italy as a member, but in each instance Soviet Russia vetoed her application. I pleaded with the United States to take the lead in bringing Italy into the U. N.

When religious persecution spread in Argentina against Catholics and the Catholic church, I protested in Congress against the Peron regime and I urged our Government to stop its financial assistance to that regime which seeks to destroy religion and religious freedom. I also wrote to President Eisenhower and

suggested that the United States protest to Argentina against this persecution.

In the case of the Arab-Israel conflict in the Middle East, I protested to our Government for sending arms to the Arab countries. I proposed that either we extend the same or proportionate military assistance to Israel as to the Arab States, or else that we cease giving such aid to the Arabs. I also proposed that the United States conclude a mutual defense pact with Israel whereby the security of that country and its people would be guaranteed and the integrity of its borders respected by the Arab countries. I am convinced that if the United States would pursue a policy along the lines I proposed, tension in the Middle East would be ended quickly and peace between Israel and the Arab States would be attained. Needless to add, I was happy to support the economic aid program under which Israel will receive about $30 million during the coming year, although I felt she should have received as much as in previous years.

On several occasions during the session I took the floor in the House to extend greetings to various nationality groups whose homelands are now under the yoke of Communist imperialism. I refer to Poland, the Ukraine, Lithuania and the other Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, and others. In each such instance I assured these people that we, as Americans realize their great plight, that we support their aspirations for national independence and freedom, and that we shall at all times be ready to help them in every way possible. Theirs is a just and righteous cause which deserves our support.

I have also introduced a bill to designate December 15 of each year as Bill of Rights Day, in honor of the first 10 amendments to the United States Constitution establishing the basic freedoms and fundamental rights of the American people. Another one of my bills recommends that deputy United States marshal jobs be placed under the civil-service classified system.

At the beginning of the session, the Democrats proposed that the exemption for income tax be increased so that low-income families be aided. Later a compromise was reached whereby a $20-per-person tax reduction was recommended. I was glad to vote for this reduction, but unfortunately the Republican administration forces killed it in the Senate. I hope that tax relief for low-income groups can be attained in the next session.

Other measures which I supported are an adequate public-housing program, increased penalties for violation of antimonopoly laws, a highway program financed on a practical basis, Federal aid for school construction, elimination of excess profits on Government contracts, aid for mental-health research, and many others. Some of these are not yet enacted.

CONCLUSION

This is by no means the full story of my activities in Congress. Due to limitations of space I am stressing only those matters which are of greater and more general interest. A chapter in itself is the service performed for many constituents who seek my help and advice in personal matters. Some require intervention in immigration matters, others need help in housing problems, servicemen's hardship cases, veterans' pensions, social-security payments, postal-service matters, information and literature about the Government, and numerous other inquiries. These are handled both in my Washington and New York offices courteously and efficinetly. I regard it a privilege to be helpful to all those who seek my help, and nothing pleases me more than when my efforts in behalf of my constituents prove successful.

I am proud to present this record of my achievements during the current session. It is an account of my stewardship of office which, I trust, will be read carefully by the constituent. I leave it to his good judgment to evaluate this record. Even if we may not see eye to eye on all issues, I have no fear that the intelligent and informed citizen will realize that the welfare of the American people as a whole stands uppermost in my mind and my actions. The whole world looks to the American people for guidance and leadership. We must stand united in our efforts toward human freedom, peace, and the dignity of man.

May I take this occasion to wish to all my constituents and my friends in and out of Congress a peaceful and a prosperous 1956.

Senate Committee Version of Bank Holding Company Bill Would Give Go-Ahead To Chain Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial reprinted from the July 28, 1955, issue of the American Banker, which expresses a position with which I am in general accord.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMASCULATED—SENATE COMMITTEE VERSION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANY BILL WOULD GIVE GO-AHEAD TO CHAIN BANKERS

Rather worse than nothing at all is the Senate Banking Committee's version of the bank holding company bill which drops the House-passed provisions against further acquisition of banks in other States.

This takes the guts out of the Spence bill as approved by the House of Repreesntatives. It flies into the face of all those banking interests in the United States which believe that since branch banking across State lines is unlawful, its equivalent extension through the holding company device should be equally taboo. The Spence bill was drawn to bring group banking operations definitely into the same legal restrictions that apply to branch banking. Why has the Senate Committee spayed this provision?

The Senate version would be grasped by the active holding company interests as a go-ahead signal for attempting to spread their form of branch banking into every State in which they can get a foothold.

The Senate version would still require Federal Reserve Board approval for acquisitions of additional banks by holding companies. In other words, the law would authorize holding-company expansion, legalize it, and State lines would be no barrier, if the Reserve Board favored crossing them. Congress, having considered and rejected the proposed ban against crossing State lines, could be interpreted as having recognized and legalized interstate branch banking as admissible by the back door.

The one purported safeguard, a requirement for hearings by the Reserve Board if anyone protests a proposed acquisition, would work out only as the Reserve Board desired it to work. Hearings might be held. But by that time options, or agreements virtually sealing the fate of the bank in question would be in their final stages, and whether opposition by State banking department authorities, or local banking groups could upset well-laid plans of a local bank to sell out to the holding company is extremely doubtful.

We are sure a lot of Senators and Congressmen will hear from their banker constituents in both big and small towns.

Do the bankers and legislatures of non-branch-banking States want to see the door left open for chain banking systems in other States to own and operate satellite banks within their borders?

Do independent bankers who have worked so hard to obtain passage of a real bank holding company control bill relish the prospect that the Senate version would be a holding company expansion authorizing measure?

Do the Members of the Senate, and its committee which emasculated the State-rights powers from the Spence bill text, realize that they are opening their States to out-of-State controlled branch banking?

Do Members of Congress want to have put over on them interstate branch banking by indirection in the guise of group and chain banking when they most certainly would not accept any bill to authorize interstate branch banking?

Do the people in Denver, in St. Louis, in Kansas—in almost any city or State that you might name—look benignly upon the probability that ambitious men in the group banking field, with access to vast and powerful city capital funds, would be invited to engage in a competition for chain-bank expansion—an expansion that can only end when their local banking systems succumb to regional chains, and regional chains are absorbed into national systems?

Do the big New York City and Chicago banks contemplate with pleasure the probability that they will have to engage in this competition for branch operations within and beyond their States' lines?

All this, while branch banking is strictly limited to State control by State and Federal law.

It is a simple and accepted provision of law that if something is illegal and against public policy, it is equally illegal and against public policy to do it by subterfuge or indirection.

We have no assurance that the Federal Reserve Board (which at times historically has had little sympathy for the small-town bank and its community needs and also at times has been strongly in favor of branch banking) will stand between the Nation and the sort of chain-branch banking which we envision in the questions above. If there is to be a real bar, the ban must be written into the Federal statutes at their source, in the Halls of the House and the Senate.

Group bankers are too shrewd to be in open jubilation over the emasculation of the bank holding company bill in the Senate. They have won a great battle in the Senate committee's revision of the Spence bill text.

Whether they will be able to consolidate that achievement into a victory that will give them the sort of bank holding company bill that they want, or kill it altogether, depends upon the solidity of the proponents of real holding-company control in the House of Representatives and among the Senate membership.

If ever there was a time for loyal action by the Independent Bankers of America—the American Bankers Association has been no help in this struggle to restrict holding companies to the same limits as branch banks—that time is now.

Echo Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter dated July 29, 1955, in which Mr. Howard Zahniser, Washington representative for the Council of Conservationists, comments on the significance of our resistance, in this 1st session of the 84th Congress, to the threatened invasion of the National Park System at Echo Park. I am particularly pleased to be able to place this letter in the RECORD, not because it refers to what I have personally done to help insure protection of this natural area but more because I am happy to have taken part in a forthright stand protecting this American heritage. The conservationists have won their battle thus far. Through their efforts they have convinced many of my contemporaries how unwise an invasion of Echo Park would be. The conservationists have had nothing to gain but the satisfaction of knowing that their efforts will be lauded by future generations. They are a vigilant and influential group. They are also reasonable, and I am sure that when a reasonable solution to the upper Colorado problem is presented they will be among the first to welcome it.

The letter follows:

COUNCIL OF CONSERVATIONISTS,
New York, N. Y., July 29, 1955.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: In the national public interest it is certainly a most fortunate thing that the 84th Congress's first session has refused to tolerate the threat to the national park system that has been posed by the Colorado River storage project, and you are to be congratulated for your leadership in national park protection.

This conservation achievement in resisting the authorization of the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument is deeply significant.

Objections to the Echo Park Dam arise, primarily, from the fact that it would be built in one of the superbly beautiful and wondrous natural areas of our earth—in an area that it would be a shame to use for a dam site. But the objections go beyond this because they involve the protection of all such areas of beauty and wildness.

OUR NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Because this area is of such an outstanding character, it has become a part of our national park system. By a firm policy arising from the genius of the American people and their regard for the unspoiled America that they love and find so inspiring—a policy established in law by Congress nearly 40 years ago and since reaffirmed—this national park system has become a world-famous means for preserivng some of our American wilderness, a few of its best, pristine areas. We have placed the Dinosaur National Monument wtihin this system in order to apply the preservation principles of the system to the scenic wild canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

To permit the construction of this proposed Echo Park Dam would thus not only destroy the natural scenic splendor which we seek to preserve there. It would also, in this instance, render ineffective the national park system as a means for safeguarding such splendors.

Never since the establishment of the national park system by Congress in 1916 has there been such a dam authorized in any unit of this national park system—though there have been, and are, many such structures proposed by their would-be builders, in more than a dozen national parks and monuments.

Thus broad national policy has been deeply involved in this controversy, because the Echo Park Dam is a threat to the national park system.

PRESERVING NATURAL AREAS

But our concern is even greater than this, because a threat to the national park system is a threat to any hope we have of preserving any of our land in its natural, unspoiled beauty. It is a threat to our wildlife refuges, a threat to all our State and city parks, a threat to our wilderness areas, our national forests, and to all the areas that we have sought to set aside for special preservation purposes by the device of land classification. It is a threat to all these because it endangers what has been deemed to be the safest of all such systems of land classification, the national park system.

If the national parks and monuments scarcely be saved, how can we hope to protect these other areas?

It would be a tragic thing, indeed, to weaken our public policy for preserving some of our land in its natural condition.

THE NEED FOR WILDERNESS

We deeply need our areas of wildness.

We need our unspoiled parks for recreation, for the kind of recreation that can be found only in natural areas. As Henry Thoreau said in his famous book Walden, "We need the tonic of wildness." It is not only for enjoyment but also for much-needed relief from the stress and strain of our civilized living that we go to the areas that are protected and assured of preservation only because they are dedicated to this purpose.

We civilized people have tended to remove ourselves from contact with the rest of the natural world of which we really are a part. Our mechanized civilization threatens to change for human exploitation every last area on the earth. Were these tendencies to continue, were these threats to prevail, future generations would be entirely deprived of access to natural areas. They would even gradually lose the sense of the importance of such natural areas. We who know the value to us of these unspoiled national parks know that it would be fundamentally tragic to lose them and to lose our sense of values that preserve them.

OUR ONLY HOPE

Our only hope, however, for preserving any such areas, in the face of our increasing population and our growing civilization, is through our governmental policy of setting aside areas specifically for preservation. That policy is what has been at stake here. That is why it is so important that this Colorado project be redesigned by its makers so that it does not, in their own opinion, depend on any proposed dam in our national park system .

Our American policy for preserving some of our wilderness which we are here defending, is based on two understandings.

1. We are confident that our land and water resources are great and varied enough that we can have a system of national parks without sacrificing other advantages.

2. On the other hand, our preservation program is based on the understanding that our civilization is such that no lands will persist unexploited except those that are deliberately set aside and faithfully protected.

For this policy to succeed we must respect our dedications. Otherwise those areas will disappear 1 by 1, whenever it is profitable to exploit them. We cannot merely set aside an area until we get to it with some kind of exploitation project without defrauding both our own and future generations.

ECHO PARK'S SIGNIFICANCE

To tolerate the possibility of building the Echo Park Dam would certainly jeopardize this public policy of national park preservation.

So, turning back this threatened invasion has been a reaffirmation of the sanctity of all the areas which the Nation has dedicated for preservation. It has helped to make sure that our whole system of parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas will be safeguarded more firmly than ever.

All who have shared in this reaffirmation can well have a deep sense of satisfaction.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Washington Representative.

The Stakes Are High—The Fight Over Western Rights Is Underway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I take this opportunity to call attention to a problem of tremendous importance to the people of the West. For nearly a century it has been the settled rule that western water rights are dependent on and determined by State law. That's precisely what the Congress intended down through the years, yet a small but determined group continue to carry on the fight for the control of our western waters. It is true that we have lost a legal skirmish or two but the stakes are high and now the people of the West are alarmed and they are ready to fight. Let no one be so fooled as to

believe that the people of the western empire will under any circumstances surrender their water rights to the Federal Government. We are prepared to battle to the bitter end to preserve and protect our western water rights.

The economy of thriving communities all over the West depend almost entirely on the crops produced from the 27 million acres under irrigation. Water has been applied to 75 percent of that acreage as a result of substantial local investments over a period of many years. The stability and security of western water law provided the incentive for these large investments of private capital. These unwarranted attacks on our water rights strike directly at the foundation of the economy of the Western States. Freedom to divert water and apply it to beneficial uses long distances from the point of diversion is essential to the growth, development and prosperity of our public land States.

To my way of thinking the time has come for the Congress to reaffirm, restate, and reinforce that long list of Federal laws enacted for the express purpose of preserving the integrity of State water law. If we fail to do so I am very fearful there will be a continuing trend toward Federal encroachment on this traditional field of State jurisdiction. Strange as it may seem, this movement could constitute a serious threat to water rights long since acquired and put to beneficial use in the Western States.

Many Members of the Senate and the House from the Western States have been greatly concerned with this problem and appropriate bills have been introduced seeking a solution of this problem. In the last session of Congress I introduced S. 863 for myself and for Senators MALONE, BIBLE, DWORSHAK, ALLOTT, GOLDWATER, WELKER, and CURTIS. Many other Senators indicated their desire to be associated with legislation along the lines of my bill. Earlier this year H. R. 741, H. R. 3404, and H. R. 6147, all being similar in purpose and effect, were introduced in the House. The position of the National Reclamation Association on the objectives of legislation of this general character is plain and evident from resolution No. 2, adopted at its 1954 annual convention, which reads as follows:

"Whereas the authority to regulate and control the appropriation, distribution, and use of the waters of streams arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian is properly the exclusive sovereign function of the States; and

"Whereas existing laws have not resulted in clear and uniform practice in accordance with said principles by all Federal agencies and officers having to do with use or development of water resources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, reaffirming and amplifying its policy developed during past years by appropriate resolutions,* That the association urges the enactment of a Federal law clearly and unequivocally recognizing the title of the States to waters therein, and requiring all Federal agencies and officers to proceed in conformity with State water laws in all matters having to do with appropriation, adjudication, use, ownership, and distribution of water and water rights in such States; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the association strongly urges the cooperation of the executive branch of the Government in the attainment of the above objectives."

In my judgment the decision of the Supreme Court rendered on June 6 last in the case of the *Federal Power Commission* v. *The State of Oregon* has made the need for this type of legislation more urgent than ever. In a sincere effort to find proper and adequate language to clearly define and restate the Federal law in this field, I have sought the aid and assistance of a number of highly qualified and interested persons in revising the language of S. 863 and also in preparing this statement. It seems to me that some of the safeguards afforded Federal interests in the revised bill are unnecessary, but we have incorporated them in the new draft to meet some of the objections which have been raised to S. 863 at various times.

I have forwarded the redraft to the staff of our Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and I have been assured that a committee print of the new draft will be made available in the nature of a proposed amendment to my bill S. 863. The revised language submitted is as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act may be cited as the 'Water Rights Settlement Act of 1956.'

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. In the arid and semiarid regions west of the 98th meridian rights to the use of water are property rights which are fundamental to the economic life and well-being of the American people. In view of the fact that the needs for water do not coincide with the location or the natural flow of the available sources of supply, it is recognized that rights to impound and divert water and to apply it to beneficial purposes, frequently at places substantial distances from the points of diversion or storage, are matters of paramount importance. To promote the beneficial application of the available water supplies in these regions it is and has been necessary that public and nonpublic entities be encouraged to make investments in water resource developments. Security of right to the use of water for beneficial purposes is essential to such encouragement, and regulating the acquisition of water rights must be orderly and with full regard to the need for stability of such rights if public and private investments in water-resource development are to continue on a sound basis. Neither the proprietorship functions of the United States derived from the ownership of the public lands nor the exercise of its powers relating to interstate commerce and the general welfare should be permitted unduly to interfere with prior rights to the use of water or the orderly acquisition of such rights in the future. For more than 90 years this policy has been recognized by the Congress and the acquisition of such rights under State law has been encouraged and repeatedly protected by Federal legislation. Under this policy these States have been able to make their proper contribution to the strength of the Union, and 27 million acres of arid and semiarid land have been brought under irrigation, of which only one-fourth are a result of federally assisted projects. It has not been and is not the intention of the Congress that Federal agencies, in pursuing their programs for water resources development in these arid and semiarid areas, shall have any prerogative to preempt the field or to cast clouds on the security of prior rights under State law acquired for beneficial purposes. Because of the fact that previous acts of Congress have been and may be interpreted with respect to these States so as to cast clouds on such prior rights and to interfere with the future orderly development of water resources in accordance with the foregoing declaration, it is the purpose of this act: (1) to remove any such clouds; (2) to provide for the future acquisition of unappropriated waters, navigable and nonnavigable, in compliance with State laws; and (3) to provide adequate protections of the Federal interests to the end that the Federal Government may perform its functions in a manner consistent with the foregoing purposes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

"(a) 'Federal agency' means the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States, and corporations primarily acting as instrumentalities or agencies of the United States;

"(b) 'Employee of the Government' includes officers or employees of any Federal agency, members of the military or naval forces of the United States, and persons acting on behalf of any Federal agency in an official capacity, whether temporarily or otherwise.

"APPLICABILITY

"SEC. 4. This act shall apply only to States lying wholly or in part west of the 98th meridian.

"FEDERAL INTERFERENCE WITH WATER RIGHTS PREVIOUSLY ACQUIRED UNDER STATE LAW

"SEC. 5. In the use of water for any purpose in connection with Federal programs, projects, or activities no Federal agency or employee of the Government shall interfere with the exercise of any right to the use of water for beneficial purposes heretofore acquired under and recognized by State custom or law except when expressly authorized by law and upon payment of just compensation therefor: *Provided,* That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to preclude, when authorized by Federal law, the acquisition by the United States of such rights by purchase, exchange, gift, or condemnation.

"FUTURE ACQUISITION OF WATER RIGHTS

"SEC. 6. Subject to existing rights under State law, all navigable and nonnavigable waters are hereby reserved for appropriation and use of the public pursuant to State law, and rights to the use of such waters for beneficial purposes shall be acquired under State laws relating to the appropriation, control, use, and distribution of such waters. Federal agencies and permittees, licensees, and employees of the Government, in the use of water for any purpose in connection with Federal programs, projects, activities, licenses, or permits, shall, as a condition precedent to the use of any such water, acquire rights to the use thereof in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of such water: *Provided,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to preclude the storage and release of water by the United States solely for the prevention of floods: *Provided further,* That the United States may acquire such rights, when authorized under Federal law, by purchase, exchange, gift, or condemnation: *Provided further,* That no right acquired under State law shall be enforceable against the United States if such right would be enforceable against the United States only because of a State law or custom which discriminates against the United States or denies the United States the opportunity to acquire such rights on terms and conditions at least as favorable as those under which any other entity or person may acquire such rights: *And provided further,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to permit any person or entity to acquire the right to store or divert waters in any national park or monument unless otherwise authorized by act of Congress.

"WAIVER OF IMMUNITY TO SUIT

"SEC. 7. (a) Consent is hereby given to join the United States as a defendant in any suit relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water which is to be used for beneficial purposes when (1) the United States is or claims to be the owner of any right to the use of such water or is in the process of acquiring any right to the use thereof by appropriation under State law or otherwise, and (2) the United States is a necessary party to such suit. The United States, when a party to any such suit, (1) shall be deemed to have waived any right to plead that said State laws are inapplicable or that the United States is not amenable thereto by reason of its sovereignty, and (2) shall be subject to the judgments, orders,

and decrees of the court having jurisdiction of any such suit in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances: *Provided*, That judgment for costs shall not be entered against the United States in any such suit.

"(b) Summons or other process in any such suit may be served on the Attorney General of the United States or his designated representative, or on the United States attorney for the district in which the court having jurisdiction of any such suit is situated.

"(c) In the absence of the service of summons or other process in any such suit, the Attorney General of the United States or his designated representative is authorized, either in person or by writing, to make an appearance or file pleadings in any such suit on behalf of the United States and thereby to subject the United States to the jurisdiction of any such court.

"(d) On petition of the United States any such suit may be removed pursuant to title 28 of the United States Code from a State court to the district court of the United States for the district and division within which such action is pending.

"INTERSTATE LITIGATION

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the joinder of the United States in any suit or controversy in the Supreme Court of the United States relating to the rights of States to the use of the water of any interstate stream.

"EQUITABLE APPORTIONMENT AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with the rights of any State to waters apportioned under any interstate compact or judicial decree, or to permit appropriations of water under State law which interfere with the fulfillment of treaty obligations of the United States."

Congress has repeatedly endeavored to express its intention that Federal programs should not interfere with State law relating to the ownership, control, appropriation, distribution, and use of water. The Congress defined its policy as early as 1866 when it encouraged State control by permitting the acquisition of water rights first on nonnavigable streams and bodies of water, on the public lands of the 3 Western States and 8 Territories and later when it subordinated navigation west of the 98th meridian to appropriative rights and by subjecting flood-control projects to the policy of protecting present and future beneficial consumptive uses and recently by providing for adjudication of water rights, other than on interstate streams, in State courts. Down through the years the Congress has reaffirmed its position time and again that Western water laws are to be observed and followed by the Federal Government. Let me cite these provisions of law:

1. The act of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 253);
2. The act of July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 218);
3. The Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377);
4. Section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 390);
5. Sections 9 (b) and 27 of the Federal Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1077);
6. Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1269);
7. The Great Plains Water Conservation and Utilization Projects Act of October 14, 1920 (54 Stat. 1119);
8. The Water Conservation Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1419);
9. Section 1 of the Flood Control Act of February 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887);
10. The National Parks Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 885);
11. Section 208 of the act of July 10, 1952, authorizing suits against the United States in State courts for the adjudication of water rights;
12. Subsection 3 (e) of the Submerged Lands Act of May 22, 1953 (67 Stat. 31); and finally,
13. The act of July 23, 1955 (being section 4 (b) of Public Law 167—84th Cong.), the act providing for multiple use of the surface of tracts of public land.

Until very recently it was generally believed that the Desert Land Act of 1877 effectively severed the usufructuary rights to water from the Federal ownership of all public lands so as to render the water subject to appropriation under State law. *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.* (295 U. S. 142): see *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U. S. 589, 611 et seq). The sweeping opinion in the former case seemed to provide ample justification for such a belief. The Supreme Court said in the case *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.* (295 U. S., at 162–163):

"As the owner of the public domain, the Government possessed the power to dispose of land and water thereon together, or to dispose of them separately * * *. The fair construction of the provision now under review is that Congress intended to establish the rule that for the future the land should be patented separately; and all nonnavigable waters thereon should be reserved for the use of the public under the laws of the States and Territories named. The words that the water of all sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable 'shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public' are not susceptible of any other construction. The only exception made is that in favor of existing rights; and the only rule spoken of is that of appropriation. * * *. What we hold is that following the act of 1877, if not before, all nonnavigable waters then a part of the public domain became publici juris, subject to the plenary control of the designated States."

In the case of *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon* (Docket 367), decided on June 6 last, the Supreme Court injected great doubt and uncertainty into the validity of many water law principles accepted generally in the public land States. The applicant in that case did not acquire water rights for power generation under the laws of Oregon, notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 (b) and 27 of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, as amended. The proposed dam would abut an Indian reservation created in 1855 on one side and a power site reserve, established in 1909, on the other. The Court sustained the granting of the license, notwithstanding the failure to comply with State law, on the ground, among others, that the Desert Land Act of 1877 does not apply "to the use of waters on reservations of the United States." It appears clear that the court used the term "reservations" to include all public lands withdrawn or reserved from sale or disposition under the public land laws, such as national forests.

Justice Douglas, in a dissenting opinion filed on June 6, 1955, in the case of *F. P. C.* v. *Oregon* above referred to, said:

"The argument pressed on us by the United States is akin to the one urged in *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U. S. 589, 611 et seq.). In that case, the United States struggled to be rid of the rule of law that made its water rights on nonnavigable streams of the West dependent on State law. It claimed that it owned all the unappropriated water in the basin of the North Platte River. The argument was made not only under the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 388), but also under the Desert Land Act of 1877 (19 Stat. 377), the act involved here. We reserved decision as to whether under some circumstances the United States might be the owner of unappropriated water rights. But we held that under those acts the United States took its water rights like other landowners, viz, pursuant to State law governing appropriation.

"Unless we are to depart from that ruling, we must accept Oregon's claim here."

Justice Douglas cited two cases supporting his position, *Power Company* v. *Cement Company* above mentioned and also the case of *Ickes* v. *Fox* (300 U. S. 82), arising in the State of Washington, in which case the Secretary of the Interior contended that because the Government diverted, stored, and distributed the water it thereby acquired ownership of that water. The Supreme Court rejected this contention. Appropriations, under the Reclamation Act, it said, were made not for the Government but for the use of the landowners, and by the terms of that law, as well as Washington law and of the contract, the water rights became the property of the landowners, wholly distinct from the property of the Government in the irrigation works.

Justice Douglas concluded his opinion with this powerful and impelling statement:

"The Desert Land Act applies to 'public land'; and the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063, as amended, 16 U. S. C. 791a et seq.), grants the Commission authority to issue licenses for power development 'upon any part of the public lands and reservations of the United States.' * * * The definition of those terms in the act says nothing about water rights. And, as I have pointed out, it has been the long-term policy of Congress to separate western land from water rights.

"The final resort of the Commission is to the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847), providing:

" 'That the President may, at any time in his discretion, temporarily withdraw from settlement, location, sale, or entry any of the public lands of the United States, including the district of Alaska and reserve the same for water-power sites, irrigation, classification of lands, or other public purposes to be specified in the orders of withdrawals, and such withdrawals or reservations shall remain in force until revoked by him or by an act of Congress.'

"It was under this act that some of the lands here involved were reserved for a power site. But the act of June 25, 1910, by its very terms, did no more than withdraw these public lands 'from settlement, location, sale, or entry.' The act did not purport to touch or change in any way the provision of the Desert Land Act that pertains to water rights. If the words of the 1910 act are to control, water rights remained undisturbed. The lands remained 'public lands,' save only that settlers could not locate on them. I assume that the United States could have recalled its grant of jurisdiction over water rights, saving, of course, all vested rights. But the United States has not expressly done so; and we should not construe any law as achieving that result unless the purpose of Congress is clear.

"The reason is that the rule adopted by the Court profoundly affects the economy of many States, 10 of whom are here in protest. In the West, the United States owns a vast amount of land, in some States over 50 percent of all the land. If by mere Executive action the Federal lands may be reserved and all the water rights appurtenant to them returned to the United States, vast dislocations in the economies of the Western States may follow. For the right of withdrawal of public lands granted by the 1910 act is not only for 'waterpower sites' but for a host of public projects—'irrigation, classifications of lands, or other public purposes.' Federal officials have long sought that authority. It has been consistently denied them. We should deny it again. Certainly the United States could not appropriate the water rights in defiance of Oregon law, if it built the dam. It should have no greater authority when it makes a grant to a private power group."

The possible ramifications of this new decision are practically unlimited. Millions

of acres of public lands have been withdrawn or reserved since 1877. Many of these are prime watershed areas. A good many questions arise as a result of the confusion created by the recent Supreme Court decision in the Oregon case.

(a) Are State law appropriations made on such lands since their withdrawal totally invalid? Or only invalid against Federal uses on such lands?

(b) Are the Federal rights riparian in character and limited to the watershed of the stream? Or are they applicable to any beneficial use on Federal lands? Cf. *Winters* v. *U. S.* (207 U. S. 564).

(c) Are such Federal rights subject to the doctrine of equitable apportionment among States? Or are they a first charge against the stream capable of destroying appropriative rights acquired under State law? Cf. *Hinderlider* v. *La Plata* (304 U. S. 92). See *Petition of Intervention of the United States, Arizona* v. *California*, pending in the Supreme Court.

(d) Are rights of the United States to use water for irrigation on reclamation projects carved from Federal reservations or withdrawals superior to those for use on privately owned lands? Or does section 8 of the 1902 Reclamation Act constitute a specific modification of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Desert Land Act?

(e) Are Federal rights to use water for the generation of power on Federal reservations as a part of the reclamation project valid without reference to the doctrine of priority?

(f) Are nonirrigation uses on reclamation projects carved from Federal withdrawals superior to irrigation uses since section 8 of the 1902 act refers specifically to State laws relating to "water used in irrigation"?

These questions are not intended to exhaust the possibilities. They merely illustrate the confusion and uncertainty which could result if Congress does not act to clarify the appropriability of water under State law.

It could take 30 years of litigation to know the full import of this decision. Only Congress can prevent such a cloud on the future development of the West.

Back of this bitter struggle over western water rights, as I have pointed out, is a long history of efforts by Congress to protect western water laws and prevent administrative supersedures of those laws. This history commences with the discovery of gold in California. The public lands on which it was found were unsurveyed and not open by Federal law to occupation and settlement. Miners and settlers nevertheless rushed into these areas and, lacking regulatory Federal laws, they framed in every district rules of government whereby peace and order were reasonably well maintained. These rules, customs or laws of the miners as they have been variously called, recognized that discovery and appropriation should be the foundation of a possessor's mineral and water rights. They secured to all persons, with practicable limitations, an absolute equality of right and privilege.

Gold mining, in most cases, could not be undertaken without water, so it was necessary to bring water from streams and lakes to the mining localities. Under the rules of the miners, the first appropriator of water, to be conveyed to these localities for mining or other beneficial purposes, was recognized as having, to the extent of actual beneficial use, a prior or better right. So-called common-law doctrines respecting the rights of riparian owners could not be applied. Nature and necessity dictated otherwise.

For 18 years, from 1848 to 1866, these local regulations and customs as enforced and molded by the State courts and implemented by State legislation, constituted the law governing all property in minerals and water on the public lands. The system was basically good and Congress recognized that fact. Its recognition in legislative form became the act of July 26, 1866, declaring that mineral lands of the public domain were free and open to exploration and occupation, and providing that water rights which had vested and accrued by priority of possession under local customs, laws and decisions should be federally recognized and protected. Mr. Justice Field correctly construed the intention of Congress in enacting this law, holding that it was to secure existing and future possessory rights by a patent from the Federal Government. *Jennison* v. *Kirk* (98 U. S. 453, 459).

The possessory rights vested by the 1866 act were further extended and protected by Congress in the act of July 9, 1870. Mr. Justice Sutherland stated that the effect of these two acts was not limited to rights acquired before 1866. "They reach into the future as well," he said, "and approve and confirm the policy of appropriation for a beneficial use, as recognized by local rules and customs, and the legislation and judicial decisions of the arid-land States, as the test and measure of private rights in and to the nonnavigable waters of the public domain." (See sec. 17, 16 Stat. 217.) *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.* (295 U. S. 142).

In the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, which was applicable to 11 States and potential States, Congress specified that all surplus nonnavigable waters, over and above bona fide prior appropriations, should remain free for the appropriation and use of the public for irrigation, mining, and manufacturing purposes. Mr. Justice Sutherland said that if the language of this act was to be given its natural meaning, and the Supreme Court at that time saw no reason why it should not be given that meaning, it effected a severance of all nonnavigable waters upon the public domain, not theretofore appropriated, from the land itself, and made such waters available for appropriation under State laws. *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.* (supra, p. 158).

Do not get the impression, however, that the Supreme Court went along willingly in all instances with congressional intent. Navigability in law does not always mean navigability in fact. This presents a problem which can send the Court off on unforeseen tangents. Some of these excursions continue to be matters of great concern to the reclamation States. The first such excursion, of importance here, was the result of a complaint filed by the Attorney General in 1897 against the Rio Grande Irrigation Co. to restrain it from constructing a dam across the Rio Grande River at Elephant Butte, New Mex. The Attorney General persuaded the Supreme Court that the contemplated construction would seriously impair the navigable capacity of the river. The Rio Grande, within the boundaries of New Mexico, obviously was not a river which in its ordinary condition carried trade and travel, and the Supreme Court acknowledged that fact. Nevertheless, on the theory that depletion of flow might affect navigable capacity elsewhere, it said the 1866 law, as amended, formed no basis for inferring that Congress intended to release its control over the upper Rio Grande River. Further, it said that section 10 of the act of September 19, 1890, prohibited obstructions to navigable capacity "not affirmatively authorized by law." This decision impelled Justice Sutherland to say at a later date that, subject to the technicality noted, the Supreme Court still recognized and assented to the appropriation of water, under the congressional acts of 1866 and 1877, in contravention of the riparian law rule. If these acts of Congress did not constitute an entire abandonment of the common law rule of running waters insofar as the public lands, and subsequent grantees thereof, were concerned, they foreshadowed, according to Justice Sutherland, the more positive declarations of the Desert Land Act of 1877. I have already noted his statement that he saw no reason why that act did not effect a severance of all nonnavigable waters upon the public domain, not theretofore appropriated, from the land itself. However, the act did not, according to Justice Sutherland, bind or purport to bind the States to any particular policy. "It simply recognizes and gives sanction," he said, "insofar as the United States and its future grantees are concerned, to the State and local doctrine of appropriation, and seeks to remove what otherwise might be an impediment to its full and successful operation." *Power Co.* v. *Cement Co.*, (supra, pp. 158–159); *U. S.* v. *Rio Grande Irrigation Co.* (174 U. S. 690, 703).

As I have pointed out, when a Secretary of the Interior wrongfully sought to diminish water rights which had vested under a doctrine of prior appropriation, Justice Sutherland said that mere ownership of the irrigation works and diversion, storage and distribution of water did not divest prior acquired water rights. Indeed, even appropriations under the Federal reclamation acts are not made for the United States Government but for the landowners and by that law, as well as applicable State law, the later water rights also become the property of the landowners, wholly distinct from the property of the United States in the irrigation works (*Ickes* v. *Fox* (300 U. S. 82)). A similar attempt to claim water rights, by reason of ownership of the project works, was brushed aside by the Supreme Court in *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* in line with the earlier pronouncements of Justice Sutherland. However, while the line was held there against administrative attrition, it has been seriously weakened by other decisions involving questions of navigability and Federal Power Commission licenses for hydroelectric power developments.

The Federal Power Act is another, but related, story which need not be recounted here. Of importance to the reclamation States are the provisions of section 27 of that act in which Congress specifically stated that nothing therein should be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way interfere with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein. As a result of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the First Iowa Co-op case and *Oregon* v. *Federal Power Commission*, this provision should be strengthened to effectuate the original intent of Congress that the issuance of licenses must be consonant with State laws on water rights.

Congress continuously has sought since 1866 to protect western water laws and water rights. The 1944 Flood Control Act had the effect of releasing navigable waters for appropriation. The Submerged Lands Act specifically provided that the control, appropriation, use and distribution of ground and surface waters in States lying wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian "shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States."

Congress should continue to give special attention to water problems in the West. The customs and laws which it has sought since 1866 to protect and strengthen are vital to the economy and the welfare of the Western States. The early landmark principles enunciated by the Supreme Court in decisions written by westerners, such as Justice Field and Justice Sutherland, which are in the process of being nullified by decisions such as the New River case, the Red River case, the First Iowa Co-op case and the Oregon case, must be restated and strengthened. This attrition must be stopped by Federal legislation if recognized and ac-

cepted principles of western water law are to survive.

The problem outlined in this statement constitutes a serious threat to the people of my section of the country. The issue is one of paramount importance to the Nation. I have discussed the issue in great detail and I have printed the proposed revision of my bill in the hope that Western lawyers and other interested citizens will take the time to study the problem and to give me their candid views and suggestions on the proposed legislation before the Congress convenes next January. I am confident that the Congress will follow its long and consistent policy of protecting State water laws, once the issue is clearly and forcefully presented. In this fight the sovereign States of the West can enlist the support of all those people who believe that water rights should be administered under State law.

A Target for the Future—Tribute to Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we were all saddened during the closing days of the session by the absence of our respected leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Fortunately all of the reports on his condition have been encouraging and we have every reason to hope and expect that he will be back with us in January in the leadership role.

During the early days of his illness, the CBS commentator Charles S. von Fremd delivered a tribute to LYNDON B. JOHNSON which is deeply moving. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. von Fremd's broadcast be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many questions were asked of President Eisenhower at his news conference today, but not a single one concerned the recent heart attack of the Senate's majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. This surprised both the Chief Executive and his White House staff, who were prepared for such a question, not only as it dealt with Senator JOHNSON in particular, but also as this taxing of health affects all public servants holding high office.

Mr. Eisenhower intended to pay lavish praise to Senator JOHNSON'S efforts up on Capitol Hill. Despite the fact these two men represent different parties with varying political beliefs, each holds high admiration for the other. They clashed openly last week, just before JOHNSON was stricken, over the accomplishments of the 84th Congress, but the President today intended to give the ailing Senator his just credit for the tremendous leadership he demonstrated during recent months.

Mr. Eisenhower was also expecting an allied question: Did he believe that candidates for the Presidency, or other high offices, should have complete medical checkups prior to the campaign and election day, so that the voters would know the physical fitness of the men for whom they voted? This matter is almost an obsession with Mr. Eisenhower. He feels the American people should know full well the condition of their high public officials.

As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower insists that his own top aids receive complete physical examinations every 6 months. The so-called White House palace guard must visit Walter Reed or Bethesda Naval Hospital semiannually for such checkups; Mr. Eisenhower himself, of course, is examined with far greater regularity and frequency.

The White House family, and high officials in the executive branch of this administration, are given physical examinations often, at the personal direction of the President, and it would seem that this practice might be well applied to all arms of the Federal Government, with the leaders in the executive, legislative, and judicial fields receiving such medical exams, for their own good and for the good of the country.

It's within the realm of possibility that Senator JOHNSON'S attack last Friday may eventually cost him the Nation's highest office. A fairly substantial presidential boom was building up about him recently, and at the age of 46, he could have missed next year's nomination and election and still be young enough for the 1960 or even 1964 presidential years. But it would require the strongest assurances from the leading heart specialists now to convince the majority of voters that he could stand up under the strain of the White House.

But even if the voters, nationwide, might not accept the talented and respected Democratic Senator from Texas as top man on his party's ticket because of his ailment, his colleagues on both sides of the aisle pray for his return to the upper House.

For Senator JOHNSON in his short period as majority leader exhibited abilities seldom found and greatly needed in this critical age in which we live. In his quiet, unspectacular way JOHNSON compiled a record that will stand as a target for other majority leaders to aim at in the future. It's too bad that it took his affliction to dramatize for the people of the country the great contributions he has made.

Is There a Paper Curtain in Washington?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in government of the people, the full flow of information gives the electorate, as the American Society of Newspaper Editors put it, the "foundation of truth upon which to judge their government." Do the people have that solid foundation to formulate their opinions and intelligently exercise their franchise? Do Government agencies clearly and frankly tell the people what is being done by Government servants, giving them the essential background? Or have the agencies become citadels of silence, manipulating information to give the people only facts that are favorable to those who, as Mark Twain said, "are clothed in a little brief authority?"

As the Government has grown larger in recent years, there have been charges that less and less reliable information is being released about activities of the Federal Government. These charges have come from the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Sigma Delta Chi journalistic fraternity, various news organizations, independent newspapers, Washington correspondents, and reporters all over the country who have the difficult job of digging out the day-to-day facts on Government activities.

This warning that a paper curtain is cloaking the operation of our Government is not a new development. The paper curtain may be an end-product of an increasing trend toward secrecy in government. It results from the bureaucratic theory that it is up to each agency to decide what information the people should have.

During the 80th Congress, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments looked into the information policies of the previous administration. The committee was concerned because Congress, itself, was finding it more and more difficult to ferret out information which the public is entitled to know and which is necessary in legislating and appropriating. In a report on their investigation, Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan, as committee chairman, stated:

> Action on the part of the Executive or the head of some department, challenging the right of the Congress to specified information has never been confined to the representative or representatives of either political party. It has been a policy followed by the Executive who at the moment was in power.
>
> Nor is the propose legislation aimed at the acts of the present Executive and his subordinates, for he and they are but following in a greater or a lesser degree a position taken by the Executive of all parties. It is aimed at a practice or policy.
>
> The issue is one between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, regardless of political affiliations.

We are pleased to have Mr. HOFFMAN as a member of the House Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Government Information, of which I am the chairman. Hon. DANTE FASCELL, of Florida, is the other member of the Government Information Subcommittee which was directed to look into this most important problem by Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, chairman of the House Government Operations Committee.

The Government Information Subcommittee in this Congress will not be conducting an investigation but, rather, will be studying a vital problem. The job will be done in a nonpartisan spirit, since the protection of our American democracy and the development of good government know no party lines. As Congressman DAWSON stated in chartering the Government Information Subcommittee:

> An informed public makes the difference between mob rule and democratic government. If the pertinent and necessary information on governmental activities is denied the public, the result is a weakening of the democratic process and the ultimate atrophy of our form of government.

An American public, told that there is no major danger from atomic fall-out, for instance, may be complacent about the need for a civil defense program

based on immediate evacuation of metropolitan areas. The people, inadequately informed, could support any demagogue who sells them the idea of complacency or cheap victory. Given the full information on what can be expected to happen in atomic or hydrogen bomb warfare, the American public will not be stampeded but will prepare intelligently for the worst while continuing to work for the best.

The American people—call them taxpayers, voters or what you will—hold the final authority in our democratic system. They are the ones to decide, for instance, whether our civilian defense program and our military offensive strength are adequate to protect the free world in these times of tension and potential disaster. As taxpayers, the American people have the right to know what their tax dollars are being spent for; as voters, the American people will cast their ballots for those representatives who will spend the tax dollars to support the program the people want.

But can the American people vote for representatives advocating the wisest use of their tax dollars if they do not have enough information to make intelligent decisions? Of course not. And it is with full realization of this fact that the dictatorial bureaucrat refuses to expose governmental activities to the light of public opinion. An uninformed public acts from fear, or ignorance, not good judgment based on fact.

When Government agencies arrogate unto themselves the unrestricted power to decide what information the American people should have, the agencies sometimes reach conclusions that are absurd and laughable. One agency, for instance, refused to tell how much peanut butter the armed services were buying. The agency decided, in all seriousness, that putting out such vital information would allow a clever enemy agent to deduce the number of men in our Armed Forces. Yet another agency, located not far away in Washington—unworried about the connection between guns and peanut butter—reported regularly on the number of men supported by tax dollars in the armed services. If this kind of thinking is carried to a logical conclusion, we may some day find a slap-happy bureaucrat has classified the weather report on the grounds that it might give vital information to a potential enemy.

Not only do some Government agencies refuse to tell the public how they are handling the public's business, but they also refuse to tell the Congress of their activities. The American taxpayers and voters hold the power of government; their chosen representatives in Congress have the duty, under oath, of legislating the wishes of the American electorate. It is just as absurd to expect an uninformed Congress to carry out its duties wisely as it is to expect uninformed voters to cast their ballots intelligently. Big government, as we know it today, need not be secret government.

Speaking to this general point, James S. Pope, of the Louisville Courier-Journal—for 3 years chairman of the freedom of information committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, observed in a letter:

> The fact is that all of us—Congress and the press alike—need to reexamine our approach to information about government, and consider whether our tools and our manpower have not become dangerously inefficient. There is such a vast quantity of news. If you look at the increase in Federal business and employees in the past 100 years, it becomes obvious that even good will on the part of all concerned leaves enormous areas of ignorance, both in Congress and in the country. We hardly see as much of it as a big iceberg shows above the surface.

It has been said that government has become distant and removed from the people. The Federal Government used to be at least a kissing cousin. But it has become so large and so aloof that it is now only a distant relative.

There have been an increasing number of comments about the remoteness of government and the brown-out of information from the Government.

In a Senate speech, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY criticized Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson for having slapped a "confidential" stamp on the parting report of the former Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew Ridgway. It so happened that the report eventually was published in the press. As Senator HUMPHREY pointed out, Secretary Wilson said he had stamped the report "confidential" because he did not wish to add in any way to the problems of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles at the Geneva conference.

> It is a most extraordinarily frank example of this administration—and especially the Department of Defense—classifying matters which are neither secret nor should they be—

Said Senator HUMPHREY.

> It is a use of secrecy to keep from the American people information which they have every right to know and which they must have if they are to be the informed electorate that is necessary for the proper functioning of a democracy.

Senator HUMPHREY and our House Government Information Subcommittee have been receiving mounting complaints, as the Senator phrased it, "from responsible members of the working press here in Washington that they are finding it increasingly difficult to get the facts from this administration—that the public relations, Madison Avenue treatment is more and more standing between them and the information—in no way secret—that should be public knowledge."

The repression of information seems to take various forms. According to complaints which this subcommittee is studying, the information may be withheld by misusing the security stamp in order to avoid embarrassment or unpleasantness. In other instances, agencies apparently have discontinued publishing information of a nonsecret nature on the pretext of economy. Much of this information is of a scientific or technical nature and is information which the Government should disseminate to interested citizens or organizations. In other instances, there have been complaints that officials have been instructed not to talk with, or even associate socially with, responsible writers. In at least one case, the subcommittee has received a complaint that indicates intimidation and investigation of reporters who publish stories not considered favorable to the agency.

The Government Information Subcommittee, with the cooperation of the executive agencies, the press, public affairs organizations, and interested individuals, will take a long, hard look at this entire problem. As a first step, the subcommittee has sent to every executive department and independent agency of the Federal Government a questionnaire to try to find out what are the information policies of these agencies and how they are construed in actual practice. The subcommittee not only wants to find out how the Government agencies are carrying out their duty of informing the public and the Congress, but also hopes to recommend any improvements necessary to build a foundation of truth.

Editor and Publisher describes the questionnaire as a "blunt approach." We have framed the questions frankly and forthrightly, and we expect to receive frank and forthright replies. The replies will be duly published and will provide a rich mine of information for further inquiry, if necessary. The subcommittee has tried to make the questions simple and direct. It is hoped that the replies will be equally simple and direct.

The subcommittee's study has aroused a great deal of interest. The consensus is that such a study is long overdue. The Kinston (N. C.) Daily Free Press calls the subcommittee's work "one of the most worthwhile inquiries which has been initiated in Congress in recent years." The New York Daily News editorialized:

> We hope Representative Moss' committee can smoke out numerous bureaucrats who cover their mistakes by classifying them as secret, and can do something toward making them open up.

The Topeka State Journal editorialized as follows:

> A NEW HARD EYE ON NEWS SMOTHERING
>
> The tables have turned, and the worm, too. The people may get to listen in on their own affairs yet.
>
> Or at least if they aren't told all, they may soon have a better idea of how much they aren't being told.
>
> Just the other day we referred in this space to the wallops laid by Mr. Hoover and his Commission upon the back of the bureaucracy. We learned how much money and time he found could be saved by pruning drastically in the "wilderness" of Government forms and questionnaires, some 4,700 of them.
>
> Now there is one more questionnaire but it is one that everybody should cheer. The Government is sending the Government a questionnaire. Or rather, we should say a committee of Congress is sending a questionnaire to every department, agency and nest of bureaucracy within the wide-flung borders of big government. Congress is really not a part of the bureaucracy, which is an executive growth. But Congress did spawn, and does tolerate bureaucracy.
>
> Anyway this questionnaire, of which we have received a copy, is 5½ pages of blunt queries and calls for full information. The questioner is a House information subcommittee headed by California's JOHN MOSS. The information demanded of the Government is how available to the people, who

own the Government, is Government information?

Completing the satisfaction of citizen questionnaire answerers in this table-turning is the timing. The questionnaire was sent to all Government bureaus on Wednesday of this week with instructions to file complete answers to the 80 questions by September 15. In other words, no fooling around about it. (And while we hate ourself when we think things like this, we hope the requirement is laid on for every question to be answered in octuplicate.)

Secrecy is regarded by Washington's top newsmen as the No. 1 headache of the newsgathering profession. It has grown like cancer in some agencies, where the hushup technique has been perfected to a fine degree, with newsmen being sent from pillar to post to get the simplest fact. One Washington newsman related not long ago that he has to wait 3 days for a mimeographed biographical sketch of a Marine colonel to go through channels and receive the proper stamp approving it as what Defense Secretary Wilson calls "constructive."

The great trouble, the great threat to free minds is that the defense need of security in a few military matters is played into a huge, sacrosanct closet where officials may hide their failures and misdeeds.

And by the way, while we're rooting for the new House probe of information channels, who's going to investigate the fact that 41 percent of the 3,002 congressional committee sessions in the last Congress were "executive," a three-bit word for keep out, scram, and this means you?

As a further step, aside from the questionnaire, the subcommittee is assembling and checking reports of specific instances of refusal by executive agencies to make available their public papers to both the public and the Congress. The subcommittee has specifically asked each agency to justify its authority for withholding information. These replies will be analyzed carefully. The first series of hearings will be held this fall.

It is not the temper of the public to be left in the dark about decisions of the Government. As of now, one gets the impression that the public is being treated as if it could not be trusted with certain information to which it is rightfully entitled. The theory in some quarters within the Federal Government seems to be: What the people do not know will not hurt them.

It is not the temper of the press to be kept at arm's length when it makes legitimate inquiries of Federal agencies. Newspapermen are impatient with double talk, soft soap, the run-around, and the bum steer.

Nor is it the temper of the Congress to be denied information vital to legislating, appropriating and even orating. Congress has the right to know, under its mandate spelled out in the Constitution. I am sure the Congress has no intention to abdicate in this field.

Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the following column written by Philip W. Porter, which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer titled "Porter on Hoover Unit":

PORTER ON HOOVER UNIT—COMMISSION IS BIPARTISAN—STATURE OF MEMBERS REQUIRES REPORTS BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY

(By Philip W. Porter)

If you're a normal citizen, you probably are bored with the details of government (and don't even read pieces like this). But since you won't hear as much about government in the next few months, now that Congress and the Legislature have both folded, I'm going to toss out a few more observations about the Hoover Commission.

Chances are you don't have the slightest idea who constitutes the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; probably you think it consisted only of old Herb and some research men. Not so. The Commission is a bipartisan one, with both branches of Congress, the administration and the public all represented. It consists of 5 Democrats and 7 Republicans: Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and Director of Defense Mobilization Arthur S. Flemming; Senators Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, and John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Representatives Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio, and Chet Holifield, California; former Postmaster General (and Democratic national chairman) James A. Farley; former Ambassador to Great Britain Joseph P. Kennedy; Sidney A. Mitchell, executive director of the first Hoover Commission; Robert G. Storey, dean of the Southern Methodist Law School; and Solomon C. Hollister, dean of the Cornell College of Engineering.

CAN'T BE BRUSHED OFF

That's a sharp list of people, well-balanced and imaginative. But no higher in caliber, actually, than the men who were chairmen of the various task forces, such big wheels as Gen. Mark W. Clark, President Harold W. Dodds of Princeton University, Gen. Robert E. Wood, a top official of Sears Roebuck & Co.; Charles R. Hook of Middletown, Ohio, chairman of the board of the Armco Steel Corp., and Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

The stature and unquestioned public spirit of these guys is one reason why the administration and Congress will have to take the report seriously and try to put into effect the recommendations (implement them, as the eggheads, say). They can't be brushed off, despite pressure groups. Nor should they be, for if adopted, Herbert Hoover says, they can eliminate the budget deficit next year and recapture for the Government in the long run about $15 billion which could be used to reduce the national debt.

COMPETITION TARGET

One of the principal recommendations of the Hoover Commission was that the Government should get out of enterprises it is running in competition to private business.

The Government has been manufacturing fertilizer, chain, sleeping bags, false teeth, spectacles, ice cream, maps, flags, paint, ammunition, clothing, magnesium, furniture, and ships. It provides rail, air, and marine transportation, trucking, blueprinting, insurance, and warehouses. It operates hotels, and moving picture studios, processes scrap, retreads tires, roasts coffee, washes windows, and repairs furniture and typewriters.

That's utterly absurd, you may say; there are plenty of industries doing all this already, and they should take the risk, not the taxpayers. How right you are. That's the point of the Hoover reports: get the Government out of activities it has no business in.

NEWS HEARTENING

Most of these unnecessary activities are in the Defense Department, so it was heartening last week to read that a half dozen businesses it has been running are going to be discontinued.

Such items are often unnoticed unless you search for them, for they don't warrant the bigger headlines. Among them was one 2 months ago about how the Government had finally sold almost all its wartime synthetic rubber plants to private industry and—believe it or not—had sold them for $10 million more than they cost originally.

There was also the recent announcement that the Goodrich-Gulf Co. which was organized to buy synthetic rubber plants, is considering putting up a $12 to $15 million facility somewhere around Avon Lake. This will be easy to understand: private industry buys factory, wants to expand, decides to locate new one near Cleveland, obviously will provide new employment for several thousand workers.

Hon. Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio, Awarded Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws in Political Sciences by the Free Ukrainian University, Munich, Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on May 29 one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws in political sciences from the Free Ukrainian University located in Munich, Germany. The Members of this House are keenly aware of the tireless efforts of our colleague in behalf of the cause of peace and human freedom and the many contributions he has made to a better understanding of the real menace of communism and its threat to the very existence of our entire civilization.

It is significant to note that the Free Ukrainian University was founded in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in 1921, by the invitation of Thomas G. Masaryk, the first President of Czechoslovakia. Under the protection of Thomas G. Masaryk this university served as a rallying point for Ukrainian intellectuals who fled their homeland after the Communists destroyed the independent government and up until World War II it was known as an intellectual center advocating those political principles essential to any democratic form of government. When Czechoslovakia was occupied by the Communists, this free university was transferred to Munich, Germany, and there received the support of the American occupation forces and later the official approval of the Federal Republic of Germany.

A significant tribute was paid to our colleague, Congressman FEIGHAN, on the occasion of his receiving this honorary degree of doctor of laws. Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include that well-deserved tribute made by the

board of governors of the Free Ukrainian University:

The Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, distinguished American lawyer and legislator, has been warning the free world against the danger of imperialist Russian Communist aggression, a process pursued by the same group of ruthless enslavers for a period of 37 years. His great devotion to the task undertaken, uncompromising adherence to principle, and keenly penetrating mind, have brought him to the foreground of western civilization's fighters against the forces of darkness.

Often daring to tread upon untrodden ground, he finally broke many prejudices theretofore existing among those who were loath to even admit that neither Russia as such, nor the Soviet Union in particular, was not a political and national monolith.

A true leader in the cause of liberation of nations and peoples forcibly kept in bondage by Russian communism, he has gained the undying gratitude of all the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union as a protagonist of American democratic ideals in all sectors of life: the religious, political, cultural, and academic. Thereby MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN fully merits the degree of doctor of laws in political sciences, honoris causa.

Where's the Discrimination?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where's the Discrimination?" which appeared in the July 29, 1955, issue of the Denton Journal, Denton, Md. This excellent editorial deals with the matter of cargo preference for American-flag vessels, and it reflects the growing conviction that the American merchant marine is "vital both to the national security and to the economy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE'S THE DISCRIMINATION?

Some of our friends in foreign maritime nations have been critical of what they term "United States flag discrimination." Their principal target is a measure passed last year by Congress, known as the 50–50 law.

This law provides that half of the overseas cargo which is paid for or guaranteed as to payment by the United States Government, such as surplus commodities sold abroad, must travel in American-flag vessels. It is limited by a provision that these vessels must be available, and must offer the service at reasonable rates.

It's pretty hard to find any discrimination there. While foreign-flag vessels have been given the right to half of the cargo, in actual practice they have been doing much better, during 1954 over 80 percent of our tramp-borne cargoes moved in foreign bottoms, for the reason that there weren't enough American tramp ships available to do the job. In the overall picture we have been going downhill. According to an article in the New York Journal of Commerce, in 1946 American ships handled 60.9 percent of our dry cargo export and 56.3 percent of the imports. In a recent month the figures were 24.4 and 29.1 percent, respectively.

Other maritime nations have in effect legal restrictions far more sweeping than ours, in order to protect their merchant fleets. By comparison, American policy is truly liberal.

Basically, of course, the 50–50 law is designed to help keep the American merchant flag on the high seas. That is vital both to the national security and to the economy. The criticisms coming from abroad should be given small notice here.

The Record of the 84th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the first Democratic-controlled Congress to face a Republican President in 75 years has completed its first session. Inevitably, its record will be compared with that of the Republican 83d Congress—the first in 20 years to work with a representative of its own party in the White House.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, the 83d Congress, in its first session, met on 117 legislative days, approved 288 public laws, acted favorably on 32 of the administration's 44 proposals, rejected 3, took partial action on 3 and no action on 6.

By the same standard, the 84th Congress met on 112 legislative days, passed 390 public laws, approved 96 of the administration's 207 specific requests, finally rejected 14, had 16 passed by one House and pending in the other; gave committee consideration to 35; and left 44 for possible action in the second session.

But it is not by such statistical comparisons that the American people will sit in judgment upon the records of these two Congresses. The ultimate verdict will rest, not upon the quantity, but with the quality of the performance which each has rendered in the public interest. The 84th Congress will not suffer by such comparison.

In retrospect, the first session of the 83d Congress seems almost wholly barren of fruitful or constructive action. But with the turning over of the reins of government to a Republican administration after 20 years of Democratic control, this is to a large extent understandable.

Nevertheless, it seems unfortunate that the 83d Congress, in its first session seemed chiefly interested in initiating changes and that, for the most part, it was preoccupied with reorganizing government departments and agencies; with creating innumerable high-salaried positions for political appointees outside the Federal civil-service system; and with setting up study groups, commissions and committees for additional overhaulings of existing government services. Ten percent of all legislative action was directed toward these ends, while almost 20 percent was limited merely to extending existing laws.

Indeed its principal claim to fame would appear to depend upon the dubious distinction of having given away one of the Nation's richest national resources—its offshore oil reserves.

Further development of our natural resources for the common benefit of all the people was brought to a standstill; social-security legislation gained the questionable advantage of an especially appointed, but none to sympathetic study group; the shaky position of the Nation's farmers was bolstered only to the extent of emergency loans restricted to drought-disaster areas. Neither the veteran nor the Federal employee acquired any benefits of substantial nature. The small-business man received a sop in the form of a renamed Small Defense Plants Administration—the Small Business Administration—which was hemmed in with restricting limitations. Even big business suffered a surprising rebuff with the prolongation of the excess-profits tax beyond the date of its scheduled expiration. The national defense was weakened by curtailment of the Air Force buildup program; and our international relations were boosted principally by expressions of sympathy for minority groups and satellites behind the Iron Curtain and a Refugee Relief Act that kept out more freedom-seeking immigrants than it admitted.

In contrast to this negative record, the accomplishments in the 1st session of the 84th Congress are genuinely outstanding.

The defense and security of the Nation have been strengthened by insistence upon an increased air wing goal; by the authorization of an additional $356 million for the increased production of B–52 jet bombers; by a 4-year extension of the regular draft, a 2-year extension of the doctors and dentists draft, and passage of legislation to achieve a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 trained men by 1960.

The natural resources of the country are assured of continued development by the addition of 107 projects, not requested by the administration, for which funds have been included in the public works appropriations bill. The farmer has been aided by a law lowering the interest rate on disaster loans—which the administration had increased to 5 percent—to a maximum of not more than 3 percent; by providing special help in low-income areas; by a new modernized system for dividing up REA loan funds among the States; and by repealing a restriction of ACP payments enacted by the last Congress and which committed such payments to be made only to farmers who had fully complied with all of the acreage restrictions and marketing quotas in effect on basic farm commodities.

For low-income families the 84th Congress reversed its predecessor to assure continuation of slum clearance and the construction of 45,000 public-housing units in the current fiscal year. Small business has been helped by a law providing permanent, instead of temporary,

permits for the small "feeder" airlines serving smaller communities; by increased penalties for violation of the antitrust laws; by increases in the Small Business Administration's revolving funds for making loans; and by the closing of loopholes in the tax laws which permitted a billion-dollar-windfall principally to the advantage of big corporations.

For veterans, benefits under the GI on-farm training program have been increased; the same VA home-loan program has been extended to include farm homes as well as city dwellings; and home improvements as well as home purchases have been included in the direct loan program. Veterans in service as of January 31, 1955, can go on building up GI school benefits as long as they are in service; and survivors' benefit improvements have already passed the House and will, without doubt, pass the Senate in the next session.

The average citizen has been benefited by an increase in the minimum wage; by the appropriation of $30 million, plus additional sums as may be necessary, to provide grants to States for free polio vaccine. Unemployed workers have been assured of wheat flour and corn in the distribution of surplus food to needy families. Employees of the Federal Government, both postal and classified workers, have received long-overdue cost of living pay increases; and last, but not least, a social-security bill has already passed the House which will extend coverage and provide additional benefits for women and disabled workers.

This is only a partial listing of the major legislative action of the 84th Congress. It represents a sound record of achievement in the interests of all the American people and a return to that atmosphere of dignity and sanity in Government which the American people have a right to expect in the conduct of their Nation's affairs.

The Coal Industry and Its Importance to America's Economy and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the commercial application of atomic energy is destined to occupy an increasingly predominant position in America's fuel picture. Because of the enthusiasm for the development of this new source of power, there may be a tendency to overemphasize the possibilities of nuclear fission to the neglect of our traditionally basic fuels. I am thinking particularly of coal, which has been used most prominently as a source of camparison—pricewise at least—in news stories about the theoretical economies of atomic energy.

The most heralded projects at the present time are electric powerplants that will be fueled by the atom. Scientists and engineers foresee universal construction of electric generating plants in which reactors will provide power both for domestic and industrial consumption. But regardless of the increasing application of atomic energy to electric utilities, there will still be a need for more and more coal throughout our vast utilities systems. Fuel experts predict that, no matter how much power is to be generated by the new method, the electric utilities industry will by 1975 require at least three times more coal than is currently being consumed. This is strong argument that our coal industry will continue to be the fundamental source of energy for a long time.

From 1800 through the first half of the present century, coal was responsible for 46.1 percent of the heat and mechanical energy produced in the United States. To heat our homes and power our industries in peace and war—and to fill the fuel deficits in friendly nations—more than 28 billion tons of anthracite and bituminous coal have come from our mines.

Ohio, which through the years has been America's fifth leading coal producer, mined more than 1 billion tons of bituminous coal in the last 100 years. Records show that in 1806, the first mining in the State took place at Coalport, now in Pomeroy, Meigs County, which is in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. In the northern part of the State, the first mine was opened in 1810 in Summit County. In those days, besides being used for heating purposes, coal served in forges and in salt furnaces. As consumption increased and further utility value was discovered, production gradually moved upward. Shortly after the middle of the last century, Ohio's mines were producing more than a million tons a year; by 1900, the figure was in the vicinity of 20 million tons. In 1920, a record output of 45,878,000 tons was reached; in 1948 the output was nearly 39 million tons. There has been a steady decline in the past several years. In 1954, the production was 22 percent below the 1948 figure.

Federal and State Governments owe it to the general public, as well as to the mine owners and mine workers, to rectify any unfair competitive conditions that have come about. The Federal administration took the first such steps on February 26 of this year with the issuance of the report by the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. One of the recommendations is the provision stating in effect that oil imports should be prevented from continuing their wholesale raids on United States domestic fuel markets. I have, for years past, supported legislative proposals to prevent excessive quantities of foreign goods from taking over the markets that are the rightful customers of American products. The principle of protecting American industry and labor from goods made in countries whose wage scales and standards of living are far below ours has been disputed by the so-called free trade group over the years. In no case, however, can anyone justify the disemployment of large numbers of American workers, particularly in industries which are vital to the national security.

Foreign oil has been coming into the United States at sharply increased rates since shortly after the end of World War II. In April 1955 R. L. Ireland, chairman of the executive commtitee, Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., with headquarters in Cleveland, appeared before a Senate subcommittee and stated:

> In many cases, loss of markets for Ohio-produced coal can be attributed directly to the chain reaction that has resulted from the displacement of coal, in east coast markets, by imported residual fuel oil. Some of the coal displaced in the eastern markets has successfully sought other outlets among customers who ordinarily would burn Ohio-produced coal. The result is that because of certain market conditions, restrictive transportation rates and other factors, Ohio coal is stymied in many instances in its efforts to recoup these lost sales.

Much of Ohio's coal is used in generation of electricity. A number of Ohio's public utility companies are expanding their present capacity. When these expansion programs are completed, considerably more coal will be required for the generation of electricity. The Federal Government is constantly increasing its fuel consumption. The Tennessee Valley Authority, for instance, will soon be generating as much electricity from coal as from water power, with consumption by this agency scheduled to exceed 13 million tons annually beginning in 1956. It is estimated that the Government's atomic energy plants now under construction will use about 23 million tons of coal per year when they are completed. As you know, one of these facilities is located in southern Ohio and will depend upon our State's mines for much of the fuel to generate the vast amounts of electricity which will be required.

The coal mining industry is going to have to expand to meet these and the many other demands that will be made upon it. For some time, many mining companies have been forced to sell their product at a price below actual cost—a condition that could imperil the entire industry structure. Our coal industry must be ready for the great undertaking that lies ahead, and it cannot be prepared for this job if it is forced to operate at a loss in the interim period. The President's Material Policy Commission, which 3 years ago completed a study of the Nation's future energy requirements, estimated that within a quarter of a century coal consumption will rise from its present level to more than 800 million tons a year, with a far greater amount needed in the event of world hostilities. As I have mentioned, electric utilities will be using increased tonnage as will also the coke and steel industries. Those markets alone will then be consuming much more than the entire Nation is using at the present time. To these must be added the estimated demands of manufacturing industries, the railroads, the chemicals industries, and the retail and export markets.

The industry's job is cut out for it. I have confidence in mine management and in the great laboring force in our coal communities. I am disturbed because of the fact that depressed conditions in the coal industry have brought

vast unemployment to our people. In some cases the family breadwinner has been laid off for months at a time. In other cases, he must struggle on an income that comes with 1 or 2 or 3 days work per week. Unless greater opportunities are open to him, it is only natural that he will think about leaving his native locality to seek employment elsewhere. In this event, there could very well be a shortage of miners at a time when America needs them most.

Whatever unnecessary obstacles that are burdening this vital industry should be removed. Coal has always been an essential element in America's progress. It will continue to be so for many generations to come.

New Jersey Strongly Supports Plan for Observing the Golden Anniversary of the Conservation Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey this year is observing the 50th anniversary of the conservation movement. New Jersey passed its act for the establishment of State forest-park reservations in 1905 and acquired two tracts within the year. One of these in Bass River Township, Burlington County, became the nucleus of our present Bass River State Forest.

It was our good fortune, shortly before 1900, to have Gifford Pinchot, our country's greatest pioneer conservationist, as the consulting botanist for a survey and study of the forests of southern New Jersey. An administrative report of the period called Mr. Pinchot's study "refreshing as well as forceful in suggestion." Many of his recommendations were promptly adopted.

It is with this background in mind that I joined with Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, in developing a joint resolution providing for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching in the United States of the conservation movement for the wise and efficient use and preservation of our country's priceless resources.

The year 1957 marks the golden anniversary of the first conference of State governors ever held in the history of the United States. The conference, called by President Theodore Roosevelt to consider the problem of conservation was addressed by the President who said among other things that—

> So vital is this question of conservation, that for the first time in our history the chief executive officers of the States separately, and of the States together forming the Nation, have met to consider it. It is the chief material question that confronts us, second only—and second always—to the great fundamental question of morality.

A bipartisan group of 28 House Members and 29 Senators joined in introducing the joint resolution.

The House Members introducing the measure were the gentlewoman from New York, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE; the gentleman from California, B. F. SISK; the gentleman from Delaware, HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR.; the gentleman from Michigan, THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ; the gentleman from California, CECIL R. KING; the gentleman from New Jersey, T. JAMES TUMULTY; the gentleman from Ohio, THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY; the gentleman from New Jersey; WILLIAM B. WIDNALL; the gentleman from New Jersey, HUGH J. ADDONIZIO; the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER W. RODINO, JR.; the gentleman from Arizona, STEWART L. UDALL; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; the gentleman from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.; the gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL; the gentleman from California, CHET HOLIFIELD; the gentleman from California, JAMES ROOSEVELT; the gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN A. BLATNIK; the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANK M. CLARK; the gentleman from Oklahoma, ED EDMONDSON; the gentleman from Wisconsin, LESTER R. JOHNSON; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOHN P. SAYLOR; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT; the gentleman from Minnesota, ROY W. WIER; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, LEON H. GAVIN; the gentleman from Michigan, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.; the gentleman from Wisconsin, HENRY S. REUSS; and myself.

The text of the joint resolution follows:

> Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States
>
> Whereas the year 1957 marks the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors ever held in the history of the United States; and
>
> Whereas President Theodore Roosevelt, who called the conference in his opening address on May 14, 1907, said in part:
>
> "So vital is this question of conservation, that for the first time in our history the chief executive officers of the States separately, and of the States together forming the Nation, have met to consider it. It is the chief material question that confronts us, second only—and second always—to the great fundamental question of morality.
>
> "The occasion for the meeting lies in the fact that the natural resources of our country are in danger of exhaustion if we permit the old wasteful methods of exploiting them longer to continue. In the development, the use, and therefore the exhaustion of certain of the natural resources, the progress has been more rapid in the past century and a quarter than during all preceding time of history since the days of primitive man.
>
> "All these various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as part of one coherent plan and not in haphazard and piecemeal fashion"; and
>
> Whereas this first conference of governors, in complete agreement with the thinking of President Theodore Roosevelt, adopted unanimously a series of resolutions calling for a national policy and programs that would preserve and protect the forests, the water and streams, the soil and the range, the minerals, fuels, and all other natural resources; and
>
> Whereas this action by the State governors, assembled together for the first time in history, gave formal birth to the conservation movement in the United States; and
>
> Whereas the problems involving the protection of our natural resources are as great today, if not greater than ever before, as pointed out by President Dwight D. Eisenhower at the Mid-Century Conference on Resources for the Future held in Washington, D. C., in December 1953; and
>
> Whereas it has been emphasized repeatedly by both Democratic and Republican Presidents of the United States since Theodore Roosevelt that conservation of our natural resources is a bipartisan, continuing, and never-ending struggle that should have the interest and support of all citizens; and
>
> Whereas the conservation of natural resources is the key to the future because the very existence of our Nation depends on conserving the resources which are the foundations of its life; and
>
> Whereas it is vital for the continued welfare and prosperity of our citizens that conservation policies be followed in the future for the protection of our natural resources which will make certain that the purpose of "conservation is the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time"; and
>
> Whereas the most effective way of maintaining such conservation policies is for the greatest possible number of citizens to maintain a continuing interest in the problem of conserving our natural resources; and
>
> Whereas this interest of all citizens will be aroused, renewed, and stimulated through the proper observance of the golden anniversary of the birth of the conservation movement in the United States: Therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the National Conservation Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to in this joint resolution as the "Commission").
>
> (b) The Commission shall be composed of the following members: The President of the United States, who shall be honorary chairman; the President of the Senate and four Members of the Senate appointed by him; the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 4 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by him. The Commission members shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number. The Chairman may, with the advice of the Commission, expand its membership to include 15 representatives of national nonprofit organizations dedicated to conservation of various natural resources and 10 citizens at large from private life.
>
> SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the birth of the conservation movement in the United States and generally promote among all citizens a realization of the importance of protecting the natural resources of the United States. In the preparation of such plan, the Commission shall have the cooperation and assistance of all departments and agencies of the Federal Government. It shall also cooperate with the governors of the individual States in order that there may be proper coordination and correlation of plans for such observance.
>
> SEC. 3. (a) The Commission is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of such employees as are necessary in the execution of its duties and functions.
>
> (b) There is hereby authorized the appropriation of $100,000 to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by the members and employees

of the Commission. All expenditures of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist not later than 1 year after the date of the observance of the golden anniversary of the birth of the conservation movement in the United States.

I include here some of the letters which I have received regarding this joint resolution:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Trenton, N. J.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I am very much interested in your plan to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the national conservation movement. I shall be pleased to serve as one of the cosponsors.

Perhaps you know that here in New Jersey we are having such a 50th anniversary this year. Our State passed its act for the establishment of State forest-park reservations in 1905 and acquired two tracts within the year. One of these in Bass River Township, Burlington County, became the nucleus of our present Bass River State Forest.

It was also our good fortune, shortly before 1900, to have Gifford Pinchot the consulting botanist for a survey and study of the forests of southern New Jetrsey. An administrative report of the period called Mr. Pinchot's information "refreshing as well as forceful in suggestion." It appears that some of his recommendations promptly took root and grew.

Although the prevention of forest fires seems to have been a primary consideration in much of our early conservation work, there was also a recognition of the need for outdoor recreation areas, demonstration woodlots, and other practices leading toward our present emphasis on multiple land use of all public properties.

If our department can be of help to you in carrying out your plans for the observance of the national conservation anniversary, we hope you will call upon us.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH E. MCLEAN,
Commissioner.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N. Y., July 28, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much for your letter of July 23 regarding your plan to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement in the United States.

I think the effort you and Senator MURRAY are planning is a very worthy one and that it can be especially effective in focusing public attention on the problems and possible courses of action if its general scope is as clearly fixed as possible at the outset. This would be desirable, I think, because of the differing definitions there may be of conservation, itself; and also because of possible differing views as to the relation of overseas sources to our domestic resource policy.

If, as I hope, the effort you and Senator MURRAY are proposing would be of the broadest possible scope (and would therefore embrace the wise or efficient use concept of conservation as well as the idea of preservation, and would also embrace a consideration of our materials position in terms of overseas as well as domestic sources), I would view your your undertaking most favorably.

Perhaps you would permit me to defer a definite reply until your plans have developed to the point that you are assured of the bipartisan support you are trying to achieve in the Congress and of the broadest possible approach to the subject of conservation.

I look forward to hearing further from you on this.

The only suggestions I would offer on the proposed joint resolution have to do with expanding the idea of preservation to include the wise or efficient use of natural resources. Also, in the third paragraph from the bottom of the first page, the date of the Mid-Century Conference should be 1953.

With appreciation of your writing to me, and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM S. PALEY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. WILLIAM S. PALEY,
Chairman of the Board,
Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PALEY: I appreciate very much having your comments on the joint resolution Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and I have been working on to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States. You will be interested in the fact that though the resolution was developed in the closing days of the first session still 21 Democrats and 7 Republican Senators were able to join with Senator MURRAY in sponsoring his measure; and 23 Democrats and 4 Republican Members of the House joined me in introducing the resolution in the House.

You are, of course, completely correct when you say that the commemoration of the golden anniversary of the conservation movement can be especially effective in focusing public attention on the problems and possible courses of action before us in this field. The wise and efficient use of natural resources, I feel, is inherent in the concept of conservation but it would undoubtedly improve the resolution to have language spelling this out included in the text. I only wish that your letter containing this suggestion had been received in time to have done this before the joint resolution was presented. This can be done, however, early in the next session of the Congress or at the time the resolution is being considered.

Copies of the resolutions presented in the Senate by Senator MURRAY and by me in the House are enclosed for your consideration.

I hope that you will be able to arrange your schedule so that you can appear and testify when hearings are held next year. In the meantime, it is my hope that there will be wide public discussion of the plan to commemorate the 50th anniversary. I have been informed by C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the Natural Resources Council of America, that this will be one of the subjects to be on the agenda of the forthcoming annual meeting of the council. The wise and efficient use of our natural resources and their conservation and preservation for the future is of the broadest public concern. I know this was made evident to everyone who participated in the Midcentury Conference on Resources for the Future which you chaired so brilliantly and effectively in Washington in December 1953. Any assistance which you can give in publicizing the plan for commemorating the anniversary will be most helpful and will be greatly appreciated by the congressional sponsors of this joint resolution.

With kindest regards.

Cordially,
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 31, 1955.*

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Very many thanks for your letter telling me of the joint resolution re conservation sponsored by yourself and Senator MURRAY. I am certainly interested in this—and pleased that 13 Members have joined you in sponsoring the measure.

Since bipartisan sponsorship in both the Senate and House is sought, have you thought of asking GAVIN and SAYLOR, both Congressmen from Pennsylvania, who have expressed to me their strong interest in conservation policies?

I think the resolution is excellent—but I have one suggestion to make if possible. Would it not help to strengthen the position of the resolution if something were said from the antimonopoly angle, which as you know was so much a factor in the thinking of both Gifford Pinchot and T. R. Roosevelt and is quite if not even more important today. You remember the former said:

"The conservation policy has three great purposes:

"First, wisely to use, protect, preserve, and renew the natural resources of the earth.

"Second, to control the use of the natural resources and their products in the common interest, and to secure their distribution to the people at fair and reasonable charges for goods and services.

"Third, to see to it that the rights of the people to govern themselves shall not be controlled by great monopolies through their power over natural resources.

"Conservation is the application of commonsense to the common problems for the common good. Since its objective is the ownership, control, development, processing, distribution, and use of the natural resources for the benefit of the people, it is by its very nature the antithesis of monopoly."

Sincerely yours,
CORNELIA BRYCE PINCHOT.

That the preservation and protection of our natural resources today is an even greater problem than it was 50 years ago is pointed up by the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission. This Commission, headed by William S. Paley, chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System, made an exhaustive study of every phase of the Nation's resources and materials. The report, entitled "Resources for Freedom," was submitted to the President and the Congress in 1952. At one place the report says:

The full report of the President's Materials Policy Commission, Resources for Freedom, has as its central task an examination of the adequacy of materials to meet the needs of the free world in the years ahead. Even a casual assessment of these years shows many causes for concern. In area after area we encounter soaring demands, shrinking resources, the consequent pressure toward rising real costs, the risk of wartime shortages, the strong possibility of an arrest or decline in the standard of living we cherish and hope to share. As a Nation, we are threatened, but not alert. The materials problem now demands that we give new and deep consideration to the fundamental upon which all employment, all daily activity, eventually rests: The contents of the earth and its physical environment.

None of us in the United States, whether in civilian or military life, is easily accustomed to the idea that raw materials can be a problem. Indeed, America's problem today is precisely the reverse of the problem to which all our tradition has accustomed us. A hundred years ago resources seemed limitless and the struggle upward from meager

conditions of life was the struggle to create the means and methods of getting these materials into use. In this struggle we have by now succeeded all too well. So efficiently have we built our high-output factories and opened the lines of distribution to our remotest consumers that our sources are faltering under the constantly increasing strain of demand. As a nation, we have always been more interested in sawmills than seedlings; we have put much more engineering thought into the layout of factories to cut up metals than into mining processes to produce them. We think about raw materials last, not first.

THE CONVERGING FORCES

Today, throughout the industrial world, but centering inevitably in the heavily industrialized United States, the resulting materials problem bears down with considerable severity. The nature of the problem can perhaps be successfully oversimplified by saying that the consumption of almost all materials is expanding at compound rates and is thus pressing harder and harder against resources which, whatever else they may be doing, are not similarly expanding. This materials problem is thus not the sort of "shortage" problem, local and transient, which in the past has found its solution in price changes which have brought supply and demand back into balance. The terms of the materials problem we face today are larger and more pervasive.

Powerful historical streams have converged to make the problem uniquely intense today.

Mr. Speaker, the President's Materials Policy Commission submitted many excellent recommendations for preserving our resources and materials and for their wise and efficient use. One of the greatest services that the proposed National Conservation Memorial Commission could render the Nation would be to arouse a continuing interest on the part of our citizens in the problems of protecting our natural resources. Whatever can be done to encourage the people to familiarize themselves with these problems and thus arouse public sentiment toward a program of action will benefit our country and its citizens for generations to come.

The Cheese Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, much ado has been made about the Department of Agriculture's purchase and sale of cheese in connection with its administration of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and its efforts to assist the dairy farmer under the price-support program.

I have had occasion to look into this whole matter. There has been a great deal of both misunderstanding and misrepresentation with respect to it. I think that we should try to keep the record straight as to just what is involved.

The Comptroller General recently concluded that transactions in supporting cheese prices by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to announcement of DA-112 did not constitute a purchase within the meaning of the Agricultural Act of 1949. He also stated that he does not in any way question the sincerity of purpose or infer that there was intentional wrongdoing on the part of any officer concerned. What are the facts and the implications inherent in this decision?

The Agricultural Act of 1949 directs that the price of milk, butterfat, and the products thereof be supported through loans on or purchases of the products of milk and butterfat. This necessarily requires that the price support be provided by transactions with manufacturers, processors, cooperatives, and other handlers of dairy products, particularly butter, Cheddar cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids.

The Department, since 1947, has consistently under the law extended this price support to producers by offering to purchase dairy products meeting required specifications at announced purchase prices from all manufacturers, processors, cooperatives, and other handlers without discrimination. Thus, farmers are able to market their milk production at price-support levels through their regular trade outlets, since such outlets have the assurance of this Department that the products of such production can be sold to the Department at the guaranteed purchase price for the product.

The effective operation of the dairy price-support program depends upon the full play of competition which exists between handlers and manufacturers and their willingness to pay support prices in a competitive market for milk in reliance upon the assurance which this Department gives of a market for the dairy products at guaranteed prices.

This Department has also consistently, since 1950, offered to sell to any person dairy products which the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired under the price-support program at a specified markup—2 cents per pound in the case of cheese—above the price-support level prevailing at the time it sold such products.

The transactions under announcement DA-112 in which the Commodity Credit Corporation contracted for the purchase of dairy products in March at regular purchase prices under the support level of 90 percent of parity then in effect and simultaneously contracted for the sale thereof in April at regular sales prices based on the new support level of 75 percent of parity, beginning April 1, 1954, plus markup, were in keeping with these long-established policies.

At least three successive solicitors and general counsels of the United States Department of Agriculture, along with the legal staff of the Department have construed such transactions as authorized under the law.

The action taken by the Department was an integral part of the overall price-support efforts to bring stability to the dairy industry and was instituted solely in the interest of the American dairy farmers.

The transactions stabilized the price for American dairymen during the period of price-support adjustment by halting a downward trend in the farm price of milk in March 1954.

The procedure by which such purchase and sales were consummated, as set forth in Announcement DA-112, effected an efficient, businesslike operation, saved the Government the cost of at least 1 month's storage plus the cost of moving into and out of storage on all of the commodities involved.

It assured consumers a continuing supply during the time when the market was undergoing a transition between the old and new price-support levels.

It should be noted that every action taken by the Department represented a transaction to provide farmers with the announced support price throughout the entire period and maintain a movement of cheese through the established outlets. Some of the basic questions which should be considered in appraising the effect of the Fountain committee report are—will this report be detrimental to farmers and future farm programs? Newspaper headlines and cartoonists have used this report as a vehicle for attacking the entire farm program. The costs and difficulties involved in dairy price-support programs have been spotlighted to the disadvantage of the dairy producers. Will this report make future administrators less aggressive in trying to protect the interests of farmers? I am sure that Congressman FOUNTAIN did not intend these unfortunate effects on agriculture.

A further effect of these hearings and the unfortunate publicity may be less aggressive efforts on the part of future governmental administrators to try to save money for taxpayers. In the past there has been too much attitude in Government of "take the most protected courses of action—why risk a congressional investigation."

The Department of Agriculture should not be deterred from trying to protect the interests of farmers, taxpayers, and the public generally. I am sure that the approach of the Department, in checking with its General Counsel to determine the legal aspect of any proposed action and then moving forward to administer the law in accordance with the overall objective of protecting the interest of producers, will meet with the approval of the dairy farmer and those Members of Congress serving dairy districts.

Retirement of Orme Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, according to a news release from the Department of the Interior, Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis will leave the Department on September 15, 1955, to return to his law practice in Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. Lewis in the past 30 months has served as Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, and in this capacity

has directed the activities of five agencies within the Department having responsibilities of vital importance to the West and to the Nation—the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Office of Territories.

During his period of service as Assistant Secretary, I served in the 83d Republican Congress as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and during the present Democratic Congress have served as chairman of that committee, whose functions deal almost exclusively with matters involving the Interior Department.

In my committee role—and as a Member of Congress representing a district where natural resources development and utilization forms a principal economic base—I have had frequent contact with public land management matters and with Orme Lewis.

While I have on occasion disagreed with him in political philosophy, I have greatly respected his ability to master comprehension of the varied and frequently technical subjects upon which he has testified before the committee. I have differed in several instances with the policy recommendations of the Department in matters under his jurisdiction, but at the same time have found him outstandingly qualified to articulate that policy and to defend his reasons for supporting it.

As a westerner, Mr. Lewis used an open mind and broad-view approach to problems; as a trained and practicing lawyer he has demonstrated that he has equipped himself to logically and precisely define the issues involved and then state his case. He was unusually conscientious and dedicated in purpose.

Mr. Lewis was able to bring to Washington in his work with the Department a broad knowledge of the natural and human resource problems of the West, and his experience here should serve him well when he returns to Arizona.

I join with his many good friends in Washington and the Congress in wishing him every good success for the future in the knowledge that he has made a lasting public service contribution to the cause he served.

Backstage in Rubber Plants Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under the title "Backstage in Rubber Plants Case" in his column the Washington Merry-Go-Round, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 22, 1955, Mr. Drew Pearson reported on the inside story behind the sale of the Government-owned synthetic rubber factories.

This question was voted on, on two occasions, in the House of Representatives during this session of Congress; first, on March 22 on House Resolution 170 and again on March 23, on House Resolution 171. In both instances I voted to disapprove the sale of the Government-owned rubber factories. It was pointed out during the debate on these bills that rubber prices would rise after the sales were completed. This has proved true for only a few weeks ago a substantial increase in the price of automobile tires was announced. A further objectionable feature of the sale was that the Government rubber properties, having a potential value of $584,651,170, were authorized to be sold for about $289 million.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Pearson's column, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—BACKSTAGE IN RUBBER PLANTS CASE

(By Drew Pearson)

Here is more of the inside story showing why some Congressmen are worried over the monopolistic sale of the Government-owned synthetic rubber factories. Their disposal comes up for a vote in the House of Representatives today.

Toward the end of the Truman administration the Federal Trade Commission started probing a monopolistic scheme by which the Big Four rubber companies purchased synthetic rubber from the big oil companies, then turned around and sold their tires through the filling stations of those same oil companies.

Thus Shell Oil had a contract with Firestone and Goodyear to sell their tires through Shell filling stations and not sell the tires of any other manufacturer. Any Shell filling station operator who sold an independent brand of tires lost his Shell agency. In return, Shell got an overriding commission or rebate of 10 percent from Firestone and Goodyear.

This practice, of course, made it extremely tough for a manufacturer outside the big four to sell tires; so the Federal Trade Commission started to investigate. At that time briefs were filed on behalf of Firestone by its attorneys, Edward Howrey and S. Chesterfield Oppenheim.

PROBE HUSHED UP

Months passed. The Eisenhower administration came into office. The son-in-law of Harvey Firestone, Charley Willis, joined the White House staff, became right-hand man to Assistant President Sherman Adams. Harvey, himself a big Ike booster, was a visitor at the White House, attended Ike's famous stag dinners.

Simultaneously, the following interesting things happened: Firestone was appointed Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

2. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, other attorney for Firestone before the FTC, was appointed cochairman of the Justice Department committee to rewrite the antitrust laws.

3. The FTC investigation of Firestone and the other big rubber manufacturers got lost in the FTC shuffle. It just evaporated, disappeared; nobody heard any more about it. It is now dead.

Ed Howrey, FTC Chairman, promised the Senate he would keep hands off matters pertaining to his old client, Firestone, and doubtless he has. But Charley Willis has been reaching into the FTC, putting in new staff personnel, easing out old trustbusters, just as he has reached into the Federal Communications Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

So with the FTC probe of the big four rubber companies and their oil company hookups dropped, let's see how the sale of the Government rubber factories affects their hookups.

"NAKED" MONOPOLY

Congressman YATES, of Illinois, testified eloquently on this. He showed how the sale nails down the monopoly tighter than ever—how the independent rubber companies now won't be able to buy synthetic rubber for there is frequently a shortage of synthetic rubber, and production will now be controlled by the Big Four and their oil company partners, not rationed by the Government as is the case today.

"The most naked combination between the oil distribution and the tire manufacturers," testified Yates, "is found in the proposed purchases of the Government plant at Port Neches, Tex., by Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals and Texas-United States Chemicals. Goodrich and Gulf Oil together will manufacture synthetic rubber. The synthetic rubber will then be 'sold' to Goodrich to manufacture tires.

"Gulf will then distribute the tires for Goodrich at Gulf's service stations. Gulf will, of course, allow its dealers to handle only tires approved by Gulf. The vicious price squeeze and discriminatory practices which have already been mentioned in connection with the integration of Shell through Firestone and Goodyear are already apparent.

"The Commission's disposal program," continued Yates, referring to President Eisenhower's commission to sell the rubber factories, "also allows United States Rubber and the Texas Oil Co. to combine as purchaser of the copolymer plant at Port Neches, Tex.

"United States Rubber is owned and controlled, together with General Motors, by the du Pont Corp.," testified the Congressman from Illinois. "The du Pont Corp. owns the Ethyl Corp. in equal shares with Standard Oil of New Jersey. In the past, Standard and Du Pont, through the Ethyl Corp., maintained a nationwide system of price fixing of retail gasoline until stopped by the United States Government.

"But the United States Rubber Co. also sells its tires to all Standard companies and filling stations through Atlas. When you go to a Standard Oil filling station you can only buy Atlas tires.

"Finally and almost unbelievably," concluded Yates, "the Eisenhower plan allows Goodrich, Gulf, the Texas Co., and United States Rubber to combine together to purchase and operate the largest and most efficient Government butadiene plant.

"With these sales the Government is turning over an entire industry to a few select companies. With such interlocking and integrated patterns, it is silly to taly about free competition.

Cooperation of Many Individuals Results in House Interior Committee Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the House Comittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, during the session of the 84th Congress just ended, has again established what I

believe to be an outstanding record of performance of its legislative responsibilities.

There is published elsewhere in the Appendix for the information of Members a summary of the major measures acted upon by this standing committee which I serve as chairman. Here, I wish to comment briefly on a few of the aspects of our committee's functions which made that performance possible.

Notwithstanding the large number of bills reported from the committee, we have received prompt attention and fair consideration by the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas; by the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; and by the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, in the scheduling of bills for floor action. In this matter, the majority has fully consulted with, and has received the cooperation of the minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts. The patience and persistence of the majority whip, Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma, and the minority whip, Mr. ARENDS, of Indiana, has assured advance notice of the legislative program in a manner which has resulted in full attendance of Members.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STAFF

The committee has broad responsibilities in the field of natural resources and the public domain, including administration and development of our national parks system, and with respect to the administration and welfare of our Indians, Indian tribes, and our other fellow citizens in the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Reflecting recognition of the breadth of our assignment, the committee roster of 32 members shows representation from 19 States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. A substantial portion of our legislation deals with matters directly affecting the development and economy of the West and our offshore areas, which perhaps accounts for representation from 14 of the States west of the Mississippi River—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington—and 5 east of the Mississippi—Florida, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

This geographic distribution of the membership results, I believe, in a balanced legislative approach in the national interest, and at the same time retain the regional know-how which permits full understanding of the matters considered. For example, this distribution means that—

Members come from States, Territories, or possessions embracing approximately three-fourths of the land areas—continental and offshore—of the United States.

Of the 17 States of the reclamation West, 13 have Members serving on the committee.

Of the 11 mining States of the West, 9 have representatives on the committee.

More than 320,000 of the approximately 405,000 Indians of the United States and Alaska have a direct voice by reason of the areas represented.

The achievements of the session just ended—and I wish particularly to emphasize this—were made possible only through the cooperation and diligence of all of the 32 members of our committee.

Members on both sides have worked closely together and have given freely of their time to subcommittee and committee sessions averaging well over one per working day throughout the 1st session, a total of 191 meetings. To help advance measures reported, committee members have given many hours from their crowded schedules in appearances before the Committee on Rules, in debate on the floor, and in our several conference committees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

But for the energy and leadership of our subcommittee chairman—Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado, Irrigation and Reclamation; Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York, Territories and Insular Affairs; Mr. ROGERS, of Texas, Mines and Mining; Mrs. PFOST, of Idaho, Public Lands; and Mr. HALEY, of Florida, Indian Affairs—and the continuing cooperation and work output of the ranking minority Member, Dr. MILLER, of Nebraska, and his colleagues, we would have been unable to perform our mission.

I am particularly pleased, too, with the work of the committee staff: our committee clerk, clerical and stenographic staff of four, and professional staff—reclamation engineer-consultant, mining engineer-consultant, Territories and ethnic consultant, and legal counsel—have met a high standard of performance in committee activities and in their service to Members.

LEGISLATIVE WORKLOAD AND PERFORMANCE

With 486 House and Senate bills, resolutions, and concurrent resolutions referred to the committee, a total of 279 were disposed of through reporting out, tabling, or as duplicates.

Of 103 bills reported to the House, 56 became public law, 13 private law, 10 were pending in the House, and 21 in the Senate at adjournment, and there were single bills in each of 3 other classifications—1 in Senate-House conference committee, 1 recommitted, 1 disapproved by the President.

The fact that 56 of the 390 public laws of the 1st session of the 84th Congress—better than 1 of every 7—came from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs helps to support the assertion that committee members and staff were kept busy.

Congress convened on January 5, 1955, and adjourned sine die on August 2, 1955, a total of 210 calendar days. If Members of Congress are entitled and obligated to take notice of the 5-day workweek enjoyed by most employees throughout the Nation, this means that, there were 150 working days during the first session, that is, Mondays through Fridays. The committee performance, statistically, means this:

During those 210 calendar days, 150 working days, or 112 legislative days, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House convened a total of 191 separate meetings—157 subcommittee meetings, and 34 sessions of the full committee. I believe these figures speak for themselves.

Finally, a word of praise of some people sometimes overlooked in discussions of the activities of the Congress.

DEPARTMENTAL, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE, AND COORDINATOR'S CONTRIBUTION

As a natural result of our committee legislative responsibility, the bulk of our initial requests for reports on pending legislation are directed to the Department of the Interior. Interior received from our committee alone in the session just ended request for reports on 236 pending bills, a number of them after July 1. As of adjournment, we had received 163 reports, a performance record representing a substantial improvement over the comparable period, the 1st session of the 83d Congress. Then, our committee requested reports on 233 bills, and Interior submitted reports on 90 of them as of adjournment.

The Department is to be commended for this improvement, and particular credit is due the personnel of the Legislative Division, responsible for preparing and expediting reports.

Again this session, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has produced on numerous occasions—and frequently on short notice—statistics, information, legal briefs, legislative history reports, general reference, and related materials so essential to full and orderly development of a base for consideration of matters within the committee jurisdiction. I believe that its staff of experts and research specialists make available to the Congress an indispensable service.

Similarly, the Office of the Coordinator of Information of the House in the past session has proven the depository of factual and statistical material and information regarding the legislative, executive, and administrative functions in our Federal system—all on a current basis.

Committee output, Mr. Speaker, does not just happen. It takes the energy, leadership, initiative, and cooperation of many individuals to fulfill the congressional mission; the session of Congress just ended has demonstrated how successfully that mission can be fulfilled.

One Hundred Thousand Dollars of Taxpayers' Money Wasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers' Home Administration has done an outstanding job in helping to establish and maintain the family-size farm. The following article from the Washington Merry-Go-Round shows what has been happening to this fine agency of the Department of Agriculture under the Eisenhower administration:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

BENSON'S BOYS REHIRED

Agriculture Secretary Benson has been been keeping it very hush-hush but he's been forced to rehire six top Agriculture Department executives previously fired, and pay them back salaries of about $100,000.

Benson's reversal came as a result of his purge of the Farmers' Home Administration, which has the job of aiding small farmers.

Among others, he downgraded, transferred or fired most of the State directors of the Farmers' Home Administration. He did this by first changing their status to non-civil-service schedule A, which the Supreme Court later ruled was illegal. So Benson has had to make new jobs for the State directors whom he fired.

After the Supreme Court decision forced Benson's hand, Departmental Order 75 was published in the Federal Register stating that if employees terminated under rule 6 did not appeal in 90 days they could not get their jobs back.

THE PURGE ROLLCALL

The Federal Register is an official Government publication magazine read by a very small fraction of the 160 million people in the United States. And some former employees of the Agriculture Department, now scattered all over the United States, did not see this notice, therefore did not appeal until it was too late. Even so, Benson will have to pay around $100,000 in back salaries to the following men who have either been reinstated or offered reinstatement:

Clarence Gehrig, former State director for Ohio, fired April 1954, reinstated this year, but later resigned to work with National Council of Cooperatives in Ohio.

Julian Brown, Alabama, fired June 1954, reinstated this summer, but refused to accept new job under Benson.

Carson Mertz, Pennsylvania, fired April 1954, restored last month, but resigned to become director of farm safety for Pennsylvania State.

Odum Stewart, Tennessee, fired April 1954, restored June 1955, given post in Washington. His place was taken in Tennessee by Allen T. Murray, whose lifelong experience had been with an insurance company, a construction company, and a retail grocery firm.

E. M. Newton, Maryland-Delaware, fired June 1954, reinstated this spring, now special assistant to Farmers Loan Administration in Washington.

Floyd Higbee, Colorado, fired January 1954, restored June 1955, now special assistant in St. Louis office. His place in Colorado was taken by Homer Cogdell, long-time employee of International Harvester.

FREEZING FARM LOANS

Tragedy of the Farmers' Home Administration, however, is not so much the upsetting of people's jobs and the extra $100,000 to be paid by the taxpayer, but the complete demoralization of an agency set up to help small farmers. Benson, a friend of the big farmer and the big co-op, who has even indicated that small farms might have to fall by the wayside, would just as soon abolish the Farmers' Home Administration. But whenever he tries to cut its budget, Congress rebuffs him.

So Benson has put the Farmers' Home Administration in the hands of men not particularly sympathetic to small farmers. Robert McLeaish, its head, is a McAllen, Tex., citrus waste plant operator, who acts as if small farmers were enemies, not friends. One of the first things McLeaish did was to recommend a 1-percent hike in interest to farmers, though local banks whom he consulted were opposed.

The New Small Business Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I issued recently regarding the newly amended Small Business Act:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT, DISPOSAL, AND LOAN ACTIVITIES, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, today stated that "the newly amended Small Business Act will enable the Small Business Administration to play a far more dynamic and effective role than ever before in encouraging the growth of small business in this country."

Congressman MULTER, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which had legislative jurisdiction over the bill, is chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Disposal, and Loan Activities of the House Select Committee on Small Business, of which Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, and Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Republican, of New York, are members.

The Small Business Act recently signed by the President and enacted into law extends the life of the Small Business Administration to June 30, 1957, and considerably increases the scope of its activities. Under the original 1953 law, the Small Business Administration had three major functions:

1. The granting of loans to deserving small-business concerns who could not obtain loans through regular banking channels.

2. The rendering of expert technical advice on business matters whenever small business seeks such advice.

3. The securing for small business of a fair and equitable share of Government defense contracts.

"The new law," Mr. MULTER stated, "increases the effectiveness of these major functions." The amount of any individual loan by the Small Business Administration has been increased to $250,000. The interest rate for such business loans shall be the prevailing rate in the area where the loan is to be used but shall not exceed 6 percent per annum.

The disaster loans were extended to be applicable to drought areas, and all disaster loans are limited to an interest rate of 3 percent per annum.

Mr. MULTER stated that another new feature of the law will permit loans to small-business concerns who pool their assets in order to establish a corporation producing and securing raw materials or supplies. The limit of any loan extended under this pooling provision shall be $250,000 multiplied by the number of small-business concerns participating in the formation and capitalization of such corporations.

The act now provides for the issuance of a certificate, when requested to do so, which will certify an individual concern as a "small-business concern." Such certification by the Small Business Administration shall be conclusive proof that a firm is a small business. The act provides that "officers of the Government having procurement or lending powers, or engaging in the disposal of Federal property or allocating materials or supplies, or promulgating regulations affecting the distribution of materials or supplies shall accept as conclusive the administration's determinations as to which enterprises are to be designated 'small-business concerns'."

New provisions have clarified the definition of small business, and the old arbitrary formula of 500 employees or less, may not be used as the sole standard. The criteria for defining a small business is set forth in the act as follows:

"A small-business concern shall be deemed to be small business when it is independently owned and operated, not dominant in its field of operation. In addition to the foregoing criteria the number of employees and dollar volume of business may be used by the Small Business Administration to determine whether a firm is or is not small business."

This definition binds all governmental agencies and particularly requires the Defense Department to abandon its arbitrary numerical definition in all procurements.

The act, as amended, indicates congressional intent to eliminate duplication of work pertaining to small business among Government agencies. The new law states that "the Administration shall not duplicate the work or activity of any other department or agency of the Federal Government and nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any such duplication unless such work or activity is expressly provided for in this act."

In the executive branch of the Federal Government it is now the exclusive jurisdiction of the Small Business Administration to protect and encourage the growth of small-business concerns. The duty of the Small Business Administration is to aid, counsel, assist and protect insofar as possible the interest of small-business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total Government purchases and contracts for supplies and services be placed with small business, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

Accomplishments of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs During the 1st Session, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to summarize for Members the major accomplishments of the standing committee which I have been honored to serve as chairman during the 84th Congress, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I am elsewhere commenting briefly on the statistical aspects of our committee's functions during the session just ended and here comment on the legislative activity of the committee so as to assemble in one place a ready reference to the legislation processed.

For our committee the session just ended has seen several landmark accomplishments in carrying out the prime responsibility of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That respon-

sibility involves considering, reporting, and helping to secure enactment of legislative measures providing for the maximum development, utilization, management, and conservation of the natural resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; legislative matters involving the Government and administration of our Territories and possessions; and all legislation, except appropriations, affecting the Indians, Indian tribes, trust lands, and claims of Indians of the United States and Alaska.

The summary is presented under five major headings, reflecting the basic jurisdiction of our standing subcommittees: Irrigation and Reclamation, Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; Mines and Mining, Chairman WALTER ROGERS, Texas; Public Lands, Chairman GRACIE PFOST, Idaho; Territories and Insular Affairs, Chairman LEO W. O'BRIEN, New York; and Indian Affairs, Chairman JAMES A. HALEY, Florida.

After designation of the public law and/or bill numbers the author—or authors—is indicated, with the first name shown that of the author of the bill reported, considered by the House, or enacted into law, those which follow the authors of bills having the same or a similar purpose.

The summary follows:

I. WATER RESOURCE UTILIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT

TRINITY RECLAMATION PROJECT

In reporting and securing enactment of Public Law 386 (H. R. 4463, ENGLE), authorizing construction of the Trinity division, Central Valley project, California, the committee was responsible for having approved the largest single reclamation project unit authorized by Congress in history.

This $225 million project will make available nearly 1.2 million acre-feet of vitally needed additional water for lands in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, in addition to assuring more than 1 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually to meet the ever-increasing needs in central and northern California. Time did not permit disposition of several other irrigation and reclamation measures providing for project construction.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

H. R. 3383 (ASPINALL, DAWSON of Utah, FERNANDEZ, and ROGERS of Colorado), upon which a rule was granted in the closing days of the session, would authorize the Colorado River storage project in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Anticipating a $760 million development, the 3 storage reservoirs and 11 participating projects would effectively harness the water and hydropower resources of one of our great remaining undeveloped areas, would provide irrigation water for approximately 133,000 acres of new land and supplemental water for an additional 234,000 acres, and assure billions of kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually from facilities having an installed capacity of 933,000 kilowatts. The Echo Park Dam and Reservoir proposed for construction in the Dinosaur National Monument was deleted from the bill.

WASHITA BASIN PROJECT

Favorably reported, but with a rule denied for this session on the eve of adjournment, S. 180 (H. R. 310, WICKERSHAM) would authorize construction of the Washita River Basin project, Oklahoma. This $40.6 million project would provide irrigation, flood control, municipal water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits in an area plagued with serious adverse affects on agricultural production brought on by drought, floods, and erratic distribution of annual rainfall.

HELLS CANYON, AINSWORTH

Two additional project measures were pending in full committee at adjournment—H. R. 4719 (PFOST, GREEN of Oregon, METCALF, MAGNUSON), the authorizing legislation for the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River, Idaho-Oreg., and H. R. 5749 (MILLER of Nebraska), providing for construction of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska.

FRYINGPAN, VENTURA, TUOLUMNE

Considered and still pending in subcommittee was legislation proposing authorization of three other projects: H. R. 412 (CHENOWETH), the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in southeastern Colorado; H. R. 3427 (ENGLE; TEAGUE of California), the Ventura project, California; and H. R. 2388 (ENGLE), to authorize certain additional power development on the Tuolumne River, Calif.

Other committee-sponsored measures acted on reflect congressional recognition of the absolute need for insurance of full water resource utilization throughout the Nation to meet our present and future needs.

RECLAMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

Public Law 130 (H. R. 103, ENGLE), authorizes Federal loans to local districts for construction of distribution systems on reclamation projects authorized for Federal construction, and through this substitution of local for Federal construction, will make possible substantial reduction of costs to water users.

SMALL PROJECTS BILL

Premised on the same Federal-local cooperation approach as Public Law 130, H. R. 5881 (ENGLE; MILLER of Nebraska; YOUNG), the small projects bill, providing loans for construction locally of small reclamation projects in the West, was reported by the committee and passed by the House. It was amended in the House to include the 31 nonreclamation States, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The House-passed version differed from that of the Senate; the latter expanded the scope of the legislation to include for the nonreclamation States—in addition to traditional reclamation purposes—drainage, water storage, and saline water intrusion control projects. On those differences a House-Senate conference committee was unable to agree prior to adjournment. It was agreed that during the adjournment, the administration's views on these varying approaches would be requested to assist the conference committee in its deliberations when Congress convenes.

TOSTON (MONTANA) AND ARCH HURLEY (NEW MEXICO) IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Two measures enacted into law affect individual irrigation districts. Senate Joint Resolution 82 (H. J. Res. 353, METCALF), which became Public Law 374, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Toston Irrigation District, Montana, to furnish water on a temporary basis for not more than 10 years, provides for repayment of costs, and anticipates ultimate negotiation of a long-term contract. Public Law 277 (S. 1965; H. R. 5169, DEMPSEY), pertains to the Arch Hurley Irrigation District, New Mexico, and repeals a provision included in a 1938 act as an antispeculation measure which had served its purpose and had since acted only to work hardships on parties involved in normal land transactions.

YUMA MESA DISTRICT, ARIZONA

H. R. 5806 (UDALL), pending in the House at adjournment, authorizes execution of a repayment contract by Interior with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District of the Gila project, Arizona, paving the way for businesslike and orderly operation of this district serving nearly 20,000 acres.

SALINE WATER RESEARCH PROGRAM

Public Law 111 (H. R. 2126, ENGLE, BOW) extended the saline water research program through fiscal 1963, and increased the amount authorized to be appropriated from $2 million to $10 million. The program involved may well serve to trigger scientific solution to the problem of making available to our coastal cities—and some inland areas—virtually inexhaustible quantities of saline water converted to a quality usable for domestic and industrial purposes. Accomplishments to date are encouraging and may well result in revising our present concept of available supplies of this one indispensable natural resource.

INTERSTATE WATER COMPACTS

Finally, in the field of major water-resource legislation, the committee reported and Congress aproved Public Law 346 (S. 2260; House bills, BROOKS of Louisiana, ALBERT, HARRIS, PATMAN), granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the waters of the Red River and its tributaries.

Public Law 353 (S. 1391) paves the way for compact negotiations between the States of California and Nevada with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and their tributaries.

Public Law 316 (H. R. 3587, ENGLE, COON) provides for negotiation of a compact between the States of Oregon and California relating to the waters of the Klamath River.

Pending in the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, after a counterpart bill passed the Senate, H. R. 5804 (THOMPSON of Wyoming, HOPE) would authorize negotiation of a Missouri River Basin compact between the States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri.

II. MINERAL RESOURCES LEGISLATION

The session of Congress just ended saw enacted into law several landmark measures in the field of Federal legislation governing the development, utilization, management, and conservation of the minerals and materials resources of the United States.

MATERIALS ACT AMENDMENT; MINING LAW AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR MULTIPLE SURFACE USE

Public Law 167 (H. R. 5891, ROGERS of Texas; DAWSON of Utah, FJARÉ, YOUNG, ELLSWORTH, COOLEY, HOPE, UDALL, BUDGE, ENGLE), known as the Multiple Surface Use Act, represents the most significant change in the mining laws of the United States in more than 80 years—since 1872—and is the end-product of almost continual study and debate by industry associations, by advisory groups to Federal agencies and commissions, and by Members of Congress over the past 15 years.

H. R. 5891 was considered and passed by the Congress in recognition of the needs and demands of a fast-growing population and an expanding economy for greater and more effective utilization and management of the surface and surface resources of the public lands of the United States.

Public Law 167, without limiting or interfering with bona fide mining or prospecting, achieves the following objectives:

1. Amends the Materials Act of 1947—by barring future locations under the mining laws for certain materials commonly occurring throughout the United States; by extending the act's operations to national forest lands; and by giving to the Secretary of Agriculture responsibility for administering the act with respect to lands under his jurisdiction.

2. Amends the general mining laws—by limiting and defining the rights of locators to surface resources prior to patent for locations hereafter made; by providing for

the utilization and management of the surface and surface resources (which would include but not be limited to forestry products, forage crops, grazing, water, fish and wildlife, recreational areas, camping grounds, scenic values, and access to adjacent lands) on mining locations hereafter made, or on existing claims placed in the status of locations hereafter made in accordance with well-defined procedures; and by permitting quieting of title to surface resources on locations made prior to the effective date of the act through procedures established in the act.

MINERAL ENTRY ON POWER WITHDRAWALS

Public Law 359 (H. R. 100, ENGLE), called the Mining Claims Restoration Act of 1955, is another measure aimed at making compatible competing surface and subsurface resource development on a large area of the public domain closed to general mineral entry for many years. This bill was passed by the 84th Congress after expiring in four previous Congresses at some stage of the legislative process.

Approximately 7 million acres of public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development—95 percent of them closed to mineral entry since about 1910—are open by Public Law 359 to entry under the mining laws, subject to carefully drawn provisions preserving existing and future power development rights, and establishing procedures for permitting placer mining operations in such manner as to minimize interference with other land values.

SOURCE MATERIAL ENTRY ON COAL LANDS

Public Law 357 (H. R. 6994, BERRY) was designed by the committee to provide statutory authority required for the mining and removal of uranium-bearing lignite coal found in the public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal. Found necessary to clear title complications inherent in a large number of mining claim located in good faith on public lands in the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana, Public Law 357 will also further exploration and development of uranium-bearing lignite coal deposits considered by the Atomic Energy Commission as an important potential source of uranium.

DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM EXTENSION

Passed by the Congress but disapproved by the President, H. R. 6373 (ENGLE, MILLS, HARRISON of Virginia, ABBITT, HARRIS, METCALF, BLATNIK, YOUNG, PFOST, RHODES of Arizona) had as its purpose amending the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 to increase the quantities of domestically producted tungsten, manganese, chromite, asbestos, mica, beryl, and columbium-tantalum to be purchased by the United States.

Principal aim of the committee in urging its enactment was to prevent disintegration of important segments of the domestic mining industry and thereby to maintain a newly won mobilization base composed of hundreds of producing mines until a comprehensive, long-range domestic minerals program might be formulated through promised recommendations of the recently established Office of Minerals Mobilization.

I interpret the memorandum of disapproval accompanying H. R. 6373, unsigned, to the House, as containing implicit assurance that such a long-range program will shortly be recommended to the Congress, and that in the meantime the going domestic industry in these essential minerals and materials will not be permitted to wither and die. I believe with many of my colleagues that the President—as his memorandum of disapproval makes clear—has a right to expect early performance in this respect by the responsible executive and administrative agencies.

CONSERVATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

In recognition of the ever-increasing danger of loss of the vast reserves of anthracite coal by flooding of coal formations and underground workings, the committee secured enactment of Public Law 162 (H. R. 7066, FLOOD, FENTON, CARRIGG, WALTER, SAYLOR).

This measure will provide $8.5 million of Federal funds—to be matched in an equal amount by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—for the purpose of establishing a program for the control and drainage of water in anthracite-coal formations so as to conserve vital national resources, promote national security, prevent injuries and loss of life, and to protect and preserve public and private property. The saving of our valuable anthracite-fuel reserves, amounting to approximately 5 billion tons and comprising an area of 480 square miles in the anthracite region of northeastern Pennsylvania, is a matter of national concern. Public Law 162 will also serve to a degree to stabilize the economy of that area, dependent to an appreciable extent on the anthracite industry.

TIMBER AND STONE LAW REPEAL

Public Law 206 (H. R. 4894, ROGERS of Texas) repeals the outmoded timber and stone law of 1878, which is inconsistent with more recent statutes permitting the sale of timber alone without including the land, and laws which facilitate sustained-yield management of timbered public lands.

III. PUBLIC LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Looking to the future, and guided by past experiences, the committee considered and acted on several important measures relating to the regulation, utilization, and development of our public lands and our national park system. Without exception, this legislation has one common aim: fuller development and utilization of the timber, forage, recreational, scenic, historic, and related values of our public domain.

TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

In obtaining enactment of Public Law 171 (H. R. 4664, ENGLE; S. 1464), the committee and Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire rights-of-way and existing connecting roads adjacent to public lands when needed to provide access to timber on public lands under his jurisdiction.

This act will facilitate the perpetual, sustained yield forest management program of Interior on 2 million acres of highly valuable forest lands in western Oregon, and a similar but less intensive forestry program on approximately 4.5 million acres of scattered public domain lands elsewhere in the 11 Western States.

DESERT LAND ENTRY

More than 10 million acres of arid and semiarid public lands have been entered and settled under privately managed irrigation development since Congress passed the Desert Land Entry Act of 1877. As amended, the 1877 Act established a maximum allowable acreage of 320 acres to any one person, and was limited to entry on nonmineral lands. Subsequent legislation provided for entry on mineral lands but limited the acreage allowable on such lands to 160 acres.

Public Law 76 (H. R. 1844, THOMSON of Wyoming; S. 265) is designed to bring uniformity into the laws governing desert land entry by permitting maximum mineral land entry of up to 320 acres, the maximum allowable on nonmineral lands. It recognizes the necessity of making available a true economic base in consonance with the historic policy of Congress of encouraging agricultural homestead entry, thus fuller development and use of land, water, and human resources.

FEDERAL IN-LIEU PAYMENTS

With 11 bills pending on the subject of Federal reimbursement to States and local government by reason of Federal ownership of tax-exempt real property, the committee initiated hearings on this major public lands policy legislation.

Concurrent with the report to the President by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of recommendations with respect to this matter, the Subcommittee on Public Lands held preliminary hearings on H. R. 4884 (ENGLE) and related bills by Representatives MCDONOUGH, LANE, KEATING, LIPSCOMB, WHITTEN, MULTER, HYDE, PHILBIN, WILSON of California, directed the launching of a recess research program, and laid the base for a determination of the position of the administration and executive agencies so that this far-reaching legislation might be advanced during the second session.

"MISSION 66" AND THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

During the first session the committee heard, and discussed with, the Director and staff members of the National Park Service the subject of a legislative approach which would effect a comprehensive, long-range program for full development of the 180 units of the park system under the Department of the Interior.

For some months, the Park Service has devoted many man-hours to what is labeled "Mission 66," which calls for legislative initiation of a program for funding and administration, concentrating on such matters as campground development; employee housing; bringing of existing roads and trails up to standard and construction of badly needed new ones; reexamination of the concessions program within the system; park facilities construction and development; and installation and improvement of water, sewage, and sanitation facilities.

In addition, it is hoped that plans for "mission 66" will include recommendations for land acquisition to provide for acquiring title to non-Federal lands within the exterior boundaries of units of the existing system, and for accompany boundary adjustments.

Anticipating an approximately 10-year program, this ambitious project is aimed at completion in time for the 50th anniversary of the National Park Service in 1966. It recognizes these basic facts:

1. Park system visitations have increased 129 percent since 1946;

2. More than 48 million people visited the park system areas in 1954;

3. Present development of land, water, and facilities within the 22 million acres of the system are such as to properly accommodate about 21 million day-visitors; and

4. Current usage-rate increases indicate that by 1966 the park system will have to accommodate annually 75 million day-visitors.

"Mission 66" legislation, when developed and enacted, may well represent revitalizing of the entire national park system program, minimize the piecemeal "emergency" approach of the past, and constitute a base for full utilization of the priceless recreational, scenic, and historic resources of our public domain.

PARK MUSEUM PROPERTIES

By its enactment of Public Law 127 (H. R. 5597, ENGLE; S. 1747), Congress has provided authority in Interior for increasing the benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of various museum properties within the system.

Public Law 127 is designed to provide additional authority in the operation of museums and the acquisition and disposition of museum properties within the park system by permitting the Secretary to—accept donations of money and personal property; purchase, exchange, make and accept loans of museum objects and collections. With little if any, additional cost to the Government, this bill serves a desirable public purpose, and will enable more efficient public service.

BOSTON, NEW YORK HISTORIC PROPERTIES

In its continuing effort to establish coordinated programs for the preservation of the Nation's historic properties, the committee reported, and Congress enacted, two measures in this legislative area.

Public Law 75 (H. J. Res. 207, McCORMACK; S. J. Res. 6) establishes a commission to investigate the feasibility of a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in Boston and vicinity for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings of that area. Their existence is inextricably associated with the colonial and revolutionary periods of American history; a program for their preservation will be of incalculable value to the Nation as an inspirational and cultural resource.

Similarly, Public Law 341 (H. R. 3120, KLEIN; S. 732) authorizes establishment of a commission for the purpose of advising the Secretary, and furthering public participation in the rehabilitation and preservation of three of the Nation's most important and significant historic shrines in the New York City area: Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and the Statue of Liberty National Monument.

Recommendations of both the Boston and New York Commissions would, upon completion, be forwarded to the Congress for appropriate action.

BROOKLYN MONUMENT

Public Law 214 (H. R. 473, ROONEY; MILLER of Maryland) authorizes an investigation and report to Congress regarding the advisability of establishing a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y., in honor of 256 Maryland soldiers killed in the Battle of Brooklyn on August 27, 1776.

DEVILS TOWER, WYOMING

Public Law 287 (S. 2049; House bill, THOMSON of Wyoming) provides recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower Monument, Wyoming, the first national monument—established in 1906—and authorizes the addition of certain lands to the monument for use as additional campgrounds, parking areas, and other facilities.

SITTING BULL, NORTH DAKOTA

Enactment of Public Law 261 (H. R. 7284, KRUEGER; S. 535) conveying certain land of the United States and the Standing Rock Tribe of Indians, North and South Dakota, to the State of North Dakota, will make possible establishment of a State historic site. The land conveyed contains the original burial site of the legendary Chief Sitting Bull; creation of the proposed historic site will serve to commemorate one of the principal figures of the Sioux Nation, the most numerous and powerful of the Plains Indians.

COLONIAL PARK, VIRGINIA

Having passed the House, H. R. 5280 (ROBESON, Virginia), if enacted, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange on a land-for-land basis certain Federal lands for other non-Federal lands within the exterior boundaries of Colonial Historical Park, Virginia, thus permitting more orderly administration and development of this outstanding area.

GENERAL GRANT TREE, CRAZY HORSE MEMORIAL

Two other measures were reported from committee, and were pending in the House at adjournment: House Joint Resolution 194 (SISK), which would designate the General Grant Tree in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine; and House Joint Resolution 303 (BERRY), which would establish the Crazy Horse Memorial Commission to provide for the construction of a permanent national memorial to the North American Indians.

OKLAHOMA LAND CONVEYANCE

Public Law 215 (H. R. 4001, ENGLE), provides legislative authority, now lacking, for the management and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of the interest of the United States in the surface rights to approximately 20,000 acres of reconveyed Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian lands in the State of Oklahoma. Its enactment quiets title to numerous small tracts scattered throughout an area 100 miles long and 60 miles wide in eastern Oklahoma, will permit proper management and maximum utilization of the lands, and will also make possible a higher dollar return to the United States for the amount spent in purchasing these lands from the Indians.

MILES CITY, MONT., LANDS

Public Law 191 (H. R. 6296, FJARE; S. 1878) extends for a 5-year period the provisions of a 1950 act which authorized conveyance by the Secretary of certain public lands in Miles City, Mont., to the city on a term-purchase project. Its enactment will make possible the development of further proposals by the city's industrial planning board for industrial uses of the land.

CHANDLER, OKLA., LANDS

H. R. 4747 (STEED), which became Public Law 241, permits the Secretary to quitclaim to the city of Chandler, Okla., the interest of the Federal Government in approximately 154 acres of land given to the city in 1923. The provisions of the original conveyance, limiting city use to public park, military, and aviation purposes, have proven unduly restrictive, and this conveyance will permit the city to obtain a clear title to the lands and to proceed with plans for civic benefit.

RECORDATION OF SCRIP

After predecessor legislation having the same purpose passed the House in both the 82d and 83d Congresses, but expired each time before final action by both bodies, H. R. 2972 (ENGLE) became Public Law 247, to provide authority for determining how much Federal "paper" in the form of scrip, lieu selection and similar rights is outstanding. Issued under more than 40 acts of Congress between 1815 and 1922, this "paper" constitutes an outstanding claim by the holders of lands of the United States. Enactment of Public Law 247, with its recording requirements, will enable the Department of the Interior to determine the amounts outstanding under formulated procedure for satisfying them.

INDIAN RIVER LANDS, FLORIDA

Public Law 258 (H. R. 6101, HERLONG; S. 464) is another measure made necessary by reason of erroneous private surveys of Federal lands under congressional policy in effect prior to 1910. In this instance, the act constitutes authority for issuance of patents to some 586 acres of land bordering on the Indian River in Florida; patentees would be individuals who have for many years occupied and used these lands with accompanying indicia of real-property ownership, including, in most instances, payment of taxes thereon. Its enactment will effectively settle substantial title uncertainties presently existing in the area.

ARIZONA FOREST LANDS

Public Law 39 (H. R. 2679, UDALL) amends existing law providing for supervision of mining locations in certain Arizona national forest lands by extending present statutory authority to include approximately 80,000 acres of national forest land in the Sedona-Oak Creek area within the Coconino National Forest. Its enactment will assure bona fide mineral development and will help to preserve public recreation and timber values, without blocking development of mineral resources.

IV. TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The 1st session of the 84th Congress recorded substantial progress in disposing of legislation referred to the committee dealing with the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

HAWAII-ALASKA STATEHOOD

While perhaps the most important single piece of legislation involving our Territories and possessions, H. R. 2535 (ENGLE; SAYLOR), the joint Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, was not approved during the first session, the record made in committee and on the floor will prove valuable, I believe, in future consideration of this key legislation.

In addition to extensive deliberation in committee, and more than 12 hours of presentation before the Committee on Rules in support of a rule, H. R. 2535 was ordered recommitted by the House only after 7 hours of floor debate.

Bills for Alaska statehood only were introduced by Delegate BARTLETT, Congressmen SAYLOR, and MACK of Washington; and for Hawaii statehood by Delegate FARRINGTON, Congressmen SAYLOR, ENGLE, and MACK of Washington.

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH

Ordered reported by the committee, and ready for early consideration in the second session in the House is H. R. 6376 (GREEN of Oregon; O'BRIEN of New York, BARTLETT), the Alaska mental health bill.

This measure, if enacted, will remedy an historic deficiency in Alaska's ability to perform one of its basic governmental responsibilities, will completely write off the statute books the archaic commitment procedures presently in effect, and will make possible initiation of a long-range comprehensive program for construction of adequate mental health facilities in the Territory.

GENERAL TERRITORIES LEGISLATION

In recognition of its responsibility for legislation aimed at securing orderly administration, securing full development of resources, and encouraging establishment of sound economic bases in the Territories, the committee acted on several important measures.

ALASKA, HAWAII WATER RESOURCES

Two measures acted on will complement H. R. 5881, the small reclamation projects bill referred to above, in promoting water-resource development in the Territories. Public Law 322 (H. R. 3990, BARTLETT) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to further utilize Bureau of Reclamation facilities in Alaska to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources in Alaska. H. R. 6461 (FARRINGTON) passed the House and delegates authority to the Territory of Hawaii which will promote sound economic development of irrigation projects by the Hawaii Irrigation Authority.

CITY OF REFUGE, HAWAII

H. R. 5300 (FARRINGTON), which became Public Law 177, provides for establishment of the City Refuge National Historical Park on the Island of Hawaii and assures preservation of an area both unique and of great historic significance.

WAIKIKI BEACH DEVELOPMENT

Another measure is tailored to meet the ever-increasing demands for recreational facilities, and will make for fuller utilization of the Waikiki Beach area. Public Law 199 (H. R. 6331, FARRINGTON) authorizes officials to acquire from abutting property owners littoral rights to certain tidelands adjacent to Waikiki, which acquisition will make possible transactions assuring construction of a new public recreational area and tourist attraction to be known as Crescent Beach.

HAWAII LAND CLAIMS

H. R. 7186 (FARRINGTON) passed the House, and if enacted, will establish a procedure permitting a number of eleemosynary organizations of Hawaii composed of persons of Japanese ancestry to file claims for lands conveyed by them to the Territory during World War II.

HAWAII LAND USE

Three measures which passed the House prior to adjournment reflect a continuing congressional willingness to delegate authority to territorial officials with a common objective of broadening the land-utilization base.

H. R. 6463 (FARRINGTON), ratifies and confirms an act of the territorial legislature providing, among other things, a practical method of disposition of small remnants of public lands resulting from eminent domain proceedings and from the abandonment of all or portions of existing but unused public roads, streets, or other rights of way.

H. R. 6807 (FARRINGTON) would vest authority in the Territory to amend certain patents by removing restrictive covenants on their use for residents for eleemosynary purposes whenever changes in surrounding land use justify restriction removal.

H. R. 6808 (FARRINGTON) deals with existing provisions of law governing the sale of public lands for residential purposes in Hawaii and, if enacted, would modify the present procedure so as to eliminate a requirement for readvertisement of sale where lands had been once offered for sale and not sold.

ALASKA DEVELOPMENT MEASURES

Consonant with its desire to accelerate resource and economic development of Alaska, the committee secured enactment of several measures designed to achieve that purpose:

Public Law 158 (H. R. 245, BARTLETT), authorizing road-building activities on through highways within the boundaries of Alaska municipal corporations; Private Law 163 (H. R. 4853, BARTLETT), authorizing the sale of a tract of public land in Alaska to permit construction of a $3 million sawmill and plywood plant; Public Law 232 (H. R. 3338, BARTLETT), to promote industrial development on trackside property of the Alaska railroad by permitting term leases designed to encourage national bank loans; Public Law 56 (S. 1650; H. R. 5462, BARTLETT), correcting a technical situation so that Alaska will be able to obtain full benefits of the Employment Security Administration Financing Act of 1954; Public Law 213 (H. H. 605, BARTLETT), opening to sale and entry—subject to certain limitations protecting the Federal interest—reserved spaces between claims on shore water areas of Alaska; and Public Law 154 (S. 1633; H. R. 5166, BARTLETT), relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska.

HOUSE PASSED MEASURES

Three additional measures involving Alaska development passed the House: H. R. 4047 (BARTLETT), authorizing Federal construction and maintenance of public recreational facilities in Alaska for a 5-year period; H. R. 603 (BARTLETT), granting additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska, by amending existing law to permit the selection of both mineralized and unsurveyed lands (presently prohibited) and to give meaning to a 1929 act granting 100,000 acres to Alaska for use of its university but limiting selections to vacant non-mineral, surveyed, reserved public lands; H. R. 607 (BARTLETT), promoting fuller development of Alaska school lands by lessees through permitting leases of sufficient length to attract mortgage investment loans; and H. R. 4096 (O'BRIEN), permitting supervised disposal by the Secretary of the Interior of lands closed to entry and sales because withdrawn for highways, telephone, and pipeline purposes.

H. R. 604 (BARTLETT), to provide port of entry and related facilities on the Alaska Highway at the Alaska-Canadian border, was favorably reported and pending in the House at adjournment.

V. LEGISLATION RELATING TO INDIANS

Another of the prime areas of legislative responsibility of the committee is that involving relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes of the United States and Alaska. With more than 100 measures proposing Indian legislation referred, the committee made considerable progress in its continuing effort to effectively aid in management and conservation of Indian resources and funds, to assist in bettering individual and tribal economic conditions, and to help resolve difficulties arising from claims against the United States.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION LEGISLATION

H. R. 5566 (HALEY, METCALF), which passed the House, and S. 1746, which passed the Senate, have as their common purpose amending the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 so as to extend the Commission termination date only to such time as will permit complete, but expeditious, disposition of a backlog of 750 pending claims. Since only 102 of 852 claims filed under the act have been disposed of, the committee concluded an extension beyond the present April 10, 1957, termination date is necessary to assure proper hearings on the remaining claims.

LAND UTILIZATION MEASURES

Public Law 255 (H. R. 7157, UDALL, METCALF; S. 34), permitting Indian owners of restricted lands to lease all or part of their holdings for a period of up to 25 years for specified purposes will, it is believed, add substantially to income received from use of these lands. It will also encourage investment in permanent improvements on them, attract improvement, livestock, and agricultural loans because of the longer lease period permitted, and make possible more effective management, utilization and conservation as full development goes forward.

MOHAVE-CHIMEHUEVI LANDS

Public Law 390 (H. R. 6418, UDALL; S. 2039) has long-term lease provisions identical to those of Public Law 255, but applies only to unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona, authorizes leases by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the Mohave and Chimehuevi Indians, and permits exercise of such authority only during a 2-year period following enactment.

INDIAN LAND LOANS

In the same general purpose area, the committee secured House passage of H. R. 4802 (HALEY, BERRY), authorizing—subject to Secretarial approval—execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land, thus permitting competent individual Indians to use their real property resources for obtaining capital necessary to development of true economic units. No final Senate action was taken on this measure prior to adjournment.

PAPAGO MINERALS BILL

Public Law 47 (H. R. 2682, UDALL), withdraws from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under the mining laws some 2.7 million acres of lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz., and provides that minerals underlying the reservation are made a part of it, to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian Tribe. Existing mineral rights of non-Indians are safeguarded, with this act blocking further loss of surface utilization brought on by accelerated uranium prospecting and location. Existing provisions make possible continued mining operations through tribal leasing, thus providing increased income to the Papagos and retention of surface title, without locking up needed mineral resources.

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES RESTRICTIONS

Public Law 348 (H. R. 7218, STEED, ALBERT, EDMONDSON; S. 2198) extends the period of restrictions against alienation or encumbrance of lands belonging to the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, in order to guard against injudicious business transactions leading to complete loss of such lands. The act does provide authority, however, for the Secretary of the Interior to issue an order removing restrictions under the act's carefully drawn provisions, and provides appeal procedure in the State courts.

INDIVIDUAL TRIBAL LAND MEASURES

Other measures acted on involving Indian lands include these: Public Law 188 (H. R. 1801, HOLMES) authorizes the Yakima tribe to purchase and sell trust lands now in heirship status on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Washington, and to make exchanges of lands, thus providing for blocking-up and consolidation of lands for greater economic utilization and improved management.

Public Law 263 (H. R. 7248, DAWSON of Utah; S. 878) authorizes the State of Utah to exchange State-owned mineral lands lying within the exterior boundaries of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation for mineral-bearing public domain lands outside the reservation boundaries, to the mutual advantage of both the Indians and the State, through resulting consolidation.

Public Law 252 (H. R. 727, SCUDDER) authorizes conveyance of certain land in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation, California, from the United States and the Hoopa Indians for use as a school site.

Public Law 276 (S. 1906) authorizes the Pueblo Indians of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navajo Indians, making available funds to the former for improving their economic status, permitting the latter to consolidate lands for more efficient administration; and Public Law 187 (H. R. 1802, HOLMES) authorizes the Yakima (Washington) tribe to lease the State some 200 acres of tribal land for development, maintenance, and preservation of historic Fort Simcoe.

UTILIZATION OF CREEK, KAW, AND SHOSHONE-ARAPAHO TRIBAL FUNDS

Three measures involving Indian tribal funds will permit direct individual financial assistance by providing for fund distribution. Public Law 202 (H. R. 4367, EDMONDSON) provides for distribution of all funds held by the United States in trust for the Creek Nation of Indians and certain members thereof. Public Law 281 (H. R. 6804, BELCHER; S. 2197) authorizes equal distribution of approximately $2.1 million to members, heirs, or devisees of the Kaw Tribe of Indians of moneys held in trust by the United States, and as is the case in Public Law 202 reflects current congressional policy of making Indian moneys available to those Indians regarded as competent to wisely utilize it.

Similarly, Public Law 278 (H. R. 6945, THOMSON of Wyoming; S. 2087), amends a law providing for semiannual per capita payments from tribal funds to members of the Shoshone and the Arapaho Tribe, of Wyoming, so as to permit quarterly payments, thus encouraging more judicious expenditure of payments received as periodic needs arise.

MONTANA LANDLESS INDIANS

H. R. 7433 (METCALF), directing the Secretary of the Interior to provide immediate relief and welfare services to Indians residing on Hill 57, at Great Falls, Mont., was reported by the committee and was pending before the House at the time of adjournment. Its counterpart, S. 2556, passed the Senate.

SIOUX REHABILITATION LEGISLATION

Initial hearings were held on three measures authorizing Federal appropriations for damage resulting from, and rehabilitation partially necessitated by, construction of two mainstem dams on the Missouri River, Fort Randall Dam, and Oahe Dam.

Proposing substantial fund expenditures for comprehensive rehabilitation measures and as additional reimbursement by reason of damages, H. R. 3544 (BERRY), Lower Brule

Sioux, South Dakota; H. R. 3602 (LOVRE), Crow Creek Sioux, South Dakota; and H. R. 5608 (BERRY), Standing Rock Sioux of North Dakota and South Dakota, if enacted, may well be the keys to substantial strides forward in Sioux Indian Nation progress. Field hearings are planned at each reservation during the present recess.

COLVILLE INDIAN LANDS

Initial hearings were also held on H. R. 6154 (HORAN) and H. R. 7190 (MAGNUSON), providing for restoration to tribal ownership of more than 800,000 acres of land within the exterior boundaries of the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash. If enacted, this legislation would constitute a keystone in the economic base of the reservation.

Judicial Review of Veterans' Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly of the United States war veteran and simple justice. The problems of our citizens who have given of their time and ability in the armed services are well known to all. The veteran has rightfully been allowed a variety of pensions, benefits, loans, and services under our laws that date back many years, including special enactments following both World Wars and the Korean conflict. The Congress has tried to provide young men and women who were called upon to protect the rest of us, a fair, if not always adequate substitute for all they gave up.

Nevertheless, we have somehow erred in proceeding toward this goal. The present laws under which veterans' benefits are administered give complete and decisive authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Once a proceeding has been considered and decided by this office, the matter is settled—fully, finally, and without appeal. Is this the type of justice with which we should confront our veterans?

The Veterans' Administration had not made a record as a liberal Government agency. Yet, even if this were not so, commonsense and fairness would require a resort to a higher authority than the Board of Veterans' Appeals, an agency, wholly within and part of the Veterans' Administration. No man is infallible, and in the course of thousands of administrative proceedings a small number will inevitably be denied their just rewards. No matter how small the number, each statistic represents a man or a woman who has not been dealt with equitably by his Government. We should try to prevent such situations from arising and where they arise, they should be speedily remedied.

The remedy is encompassed in H. R. 2023, a bill which I introduced on January 11 of this year, and which was referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

The purpose of the bill is to confer upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim for a benefit or payment under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration, if such claim has been disallowed, in whole or in part, by a decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

All the judicial safeguards of a civil proceeding will be assured. In addition, such a resort to the Court of Claims will act as a spur to greater care within the Veterans' Administration. It also will be of considerable psychological value to the veteran. He will then know that the Veterans' Administration is not the sole agency to hear his case. All this will make for more efficiency and more certain justice.

The Veterans' Administration has issued an advisory report to the Committee on the Judiciary disapproving H. R. 2023. The opposition falls neatly into three categories: First, That making all denied claims eligible for judicial review would impose an unbearable burden on the Court of Claims; second, that the administrative expense of defending the Veterans' Administration's position in court would be excessive; third, that past legislation of the Congress and court opinions based on that legislation are in opposition to the proposed bill.

These objections arise from and are based on an underlying policy feeling that looks upon veterans' benefits and compensation as gifts of the Government, given, so to speak, out of the goodness of its—the Veterans' Administration's—heart. This is precisely what H. R. 2023 seeks to change.

I do not feel that the Government is guilty of giving handouts when it authorizes compensation for service-connected disabilities, pensions for nonservice-connected disabilities, vocational rehabilitation, education and training, subsistence allowance, readjustment allowance, guaranties or insurance of loans, out-patient medical treatment, artificial limbs, hospitalization, seeing-eye dogs, electronic and mechanical equipment for the blind, specially adapted housing for disabled veterans, reimbursement of burial expenses, and so on. On the contrary, these are not handouts given in exchange for nothing. They are payments only in part for what has been given up in its defense.

Whatever the present legislative policy in these matters, it is about time that we readjust our thinking in veterans' matters. These men and women should not be placed in the position of begging for compensation and benefits. The Government, as the agency of the people, is morally obligated to treat its veterans with the greatest possible care. All that H. R. 2023 attempts to do is to make this moral obligation a legal obligation as well.

Society, unfortunately, finds it difficult to enforce moral obligations, no matter how great they may be. We are lucky, however, to have an institutionalized procedure, in the form of our court system, to attempt to make justice keep pace with moral duty.

The strict legal argument that the United States Government is a sovereign and, therefore, may not be sued without its permission is a cold argumentative device that is persuasive only in the realm of political theory. It has nothing whatever to do with human affairs. Should we run our Government on the basis of past procedure and prevailing theory when individual sacrifices are being evaluated and compensated? Should we look upon the veteran's obligation to defend his country as a privilege, and his right to be compensated for his losses as an act of kindness?

H. R. 2023 answers "No." To do otherwise is to impose a double standard. If a citizen is obligated to fight for his country, the country must certainly be considered obligated to compensate him for all his losses. Surely there is no lack of justice or logic in that. As for the arguments as to the judicial burden and the expense of litigation, the former involves time and the latter involves money. Neither should be excessive and neither is comparable to the other values involved—human dignity and simple justice.

I urge the Committee on the Judiciary to consider this bill and report it as quickly as possible.

1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests To Be Held in Adams County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the untiring efforts of a small group of farmers and business and professional men of Adams County, Ohio, the 1957 world's exposition and plowing contests will be held in Adams County, Ohio.

Mr. Earl K. DeVore, a prominent farmer and businessman of Winchester, Ohio, has been the leader in bringing this outstanding international event to Adams County, Ohio.

The officials of the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, Inc., are Mr. Earl K. DeVore, Winchester, Ohio, general chairman; Mr. Robert C. Miller, farm program director, Radio–TV Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, cochairman; Mr. Ellis Dorton, Peebles, Ohio, vice chairman; Mr. Carey W. Richey, Peebles, Ohio, secretary-treasurer; and Mr. Paul Wilson, Peebles, Ohio, assistant secretary-treasurer.

THE AIMS OF THE WORLD PLOWING ORGANIZATION

The purpose that inspires the World Plowing Organization is twofold and may be defined as the material and moral betterment of society as a whole. Unquestionably the fundamental problem that faces the world today is that of growing enough food for all, and anything and everything that tends to the betterment of agriculture adds to the betterment of mankind. The plow, now as always, is the basic instrument of food production and improved plowing meth-

ods mean more food. The World Plowing Organization believes that by stimulating world interest in the most ancient of all human crafts and by raising the standard and dignity of the plowman, the world contests organized by it will, by their influence, increase the fertility and yield of the soil of every continent.

Every entrant for the world championship contest has won his place as a result of a series of elimination contests in his own country—local, provincial, and national—in which hundreds of plowmen have taken part and every single one of these contests has aroused considerable local interest in the plowman's craft. When the competitors for the championship enter the field their progress is followed with interest by many thousands of enthusiasts from all over the world.

As regards the moral betterment for which the World Plowing Organization strives, this must necessarily be brought about by the friendly association in a common and basic endeavor of so many men and women from so many different countries. Better living and happiness for mankind are to be found in the discovery of the innumerable ties that unite us rather than in emphasizing the relatively few and, for the most part, artificial barriers that separate us. Men of good will of all nations cannot but find community of interest and understanding in the development and improvement of an art that is as old as history and as widespread as the human race itself.

The World Plowing Organization has a governing board which at the present time consists of John A. Carroll, honorary president, Canada; J. D. Thomas, president, chairman, Canada; J. J. Bergin, vice president, Ireland; G. T. Weir, treasurer, England; Vaino K. Neuvonen, Finland; Arie C. Stehouwer, Holland; Alf. Larsen, United States of America; Bengt Svensson, Sweden; Tore Wiig, Norway; Paul-Bildsoe Hansen, Denmark; Walter Feuerlein, Germany; Stanley G. Powell, Great Britain.

This organization has as its objectives:

First. To foster and preserve the art and improve the skill of plowing the land.

Second. To promote world championship contests.

Third. To provide facilities for demonstration work and trade displays.

Fourth. To urge the development and adoption of improved techniques and aids to man in all branches of agriculture.

Fifth. To foster a vigorous spirit of cooperation and enterprise in producing food for an increasing world population.

Sixth. By these means to encourage fellowship and understanding amongst the peoples of all nations.

Seventh. To support and cooperate with other bodies or associations in the furtherance of these objectives.

The first world event was held at Toronto, Canada, in 1953.

The schedule of other world events is as follows:

1954: Ireland.

1955: Sweden, University College Farm Uppsala, October 8 and 9.

1956: England, Cambridge.

1957: United States, Peebles, Ohio, September 19 and 20.

1958: Germany.

The statement of Mr. J. D. Thomas, of Canada, president of the World Plowing Organization, follows:

This year over 1 million plowmen are getting ready to compete in organized plowing contests. Their ultimate goal is to be crowned the champion plowman of the world at the third annual world plowing matches to be held at Uppsala, Sweden, on October 8th and 9th.

Mr. Thomas said that 14 countries will be represented by contestants which include Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Northern Ireland, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, and the United States; also observers will be present from Australia, Austria, India, and South America.

He added:

In order that as many people as possible from the United States and Canada may attend this year's matches in Sweden, Thomas Cook & Son, travel agency, have been appointed to handle all travel arrangements. The first world champion was J. Eccles of Canada, last year in Ireland. Hugh Barr of Northern Ireland was proclaimed world champion.

The world match is scheduled to be held in England at Cambridge in 1956, and at Peebles, Ohio, in the United States in 1957.

INVITATION OF YOUR HOSTS IN 1957

The statement of invitation from the farmers providing the land for the event follows:

Inviting the world to our humble community to participate in and to view the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, we, the citizens of Adams County, Ohio, offer you this statement of our belief.

We believe that the fathers and mothers of every nation in this world desire in their hearts world peace that their children might enjoy freedom from the hell of wars. Yet world peace is too great a price for them to pay if their children are to face starvation, disease, and complete poverty. If war and conquering can offer any relief of these three destroyers of the desire to live, then parents are willing to use it and sacrifice peace in their day.

Wars are built upon starvation, disease, and poverty. The soil is the provider of the answer to these three wants. Ordinary citizens of America, people of the land, recognize the need for meeting the peoples of other lands on a common level, through the presentation of an event which fosters a frontal attack upon poverty, disease, and malnutrition. Here in America, Government is responsive to the will and the needs of the people. The governmental agencies of a Government springing directly from the people are tools designed and built for use by ordinary citizens. In preparing this gift of "get acquaintance" and of "know how" for the world, we will put to use as the tools they are these governmental servants. Extension specialists, soil conservationists, foresters, members of the United States State Department, and others are used just as a plow is used for the job for which it was designed—tilling the soil.

In America industry is of, by, and for the people; and thus it, too, knows that it must serve people to survive. Here in this great land the people have built industry by learning to till the soil properly. Agricultural advancements have destroyed hunger and the racking diseases of malnutrition, and they have released men's minds and bodies to build industries for the creation of higher standards of living.

Working the soils of the world will build the industries of the world. Working the soils of the world will build the peace fathers and mothers of every land so desperately want.

The fathers and mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers, of Adams County, Ohio, United States of America, offer this humble contribution of illustration (the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests) to the peoples of the world in our mutual struggle against poverty, disease, and malnutrition.

To assist in financing the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, I have introduced a bill H. R. 7815 authorizing an appropriation of $300,000, as follows:

A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in financing the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests to be held in Adams County, Ohio, in September 1957, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $300,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture, to remain available until expended, for the purpose of aiding in the defraying of certain expenses of the World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests of 1956, 1957, and 1958.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture may utilize the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in this act to make grants to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing necessary facilities for the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests to be held in Adams County, Ohio, in 1957, including water lines for fire protection, sanitary facilities, temporary power and light systems, temporary sewage disposal units including necessary plumbing fixtures, and the construction of roads, and such other facilities as may be considered necessary by the Adams County Soil Conservation District.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reimburse the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and Plowing Contests, Inc., a nonprofit organization of Peebles, Ohio, and the Adams County Soil Conservation District for necessary expenses incurred by them prior to the date the appropriation authorized by this act is made.

SEC. 4. Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in this act which are not needed for the purposes of section 2 may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to defray the expenses of the United States participants in the 1956 world's championship plowing contests in England in 1956 and the 1958 world's championship plowing contests in Germany in 1958.

I shall request a hearing on H. R. 7815 when Congress reconvenes in January. The subject is very meritorious and I believe merits favorable consideration by the Congress.

Gen. Peyton C. March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, last April when one of our greatest Americans died

I paid him a feeble tribute, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 19, 1955.

Since then I have come into possession of a letter from the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, addressed to Mrs. Peyton C. March, and also a telegram of April 14, 1955, addressed to Mrs. March from one of the most successful businessmen of our time, Thomas J. Watson.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from President Eisenhower and the telegram from Mr. Watson in the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 14, 1955.

Mrs. PEYTON C. MARCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. MARCH: It was with great regret that I learned yesterday evening of the death of your distinguished husband. To all Americans and to the military personnel in particular, his outstanding accomplishments during World War I have become almost legendary. Considering the difficulties we in World War II had in transporting men and material to Europe, what he did some 25 years earlier always stood out in my mind as a triumph of brilliance and ingenuity.

Mrs. Eisenhower joins me in deep sympathy to you and to the members of your family.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

NEW YORK, N. Y.,
April 14, 1955.

Mrs. PEYTON C. MARCH.

Mrs. Watson and I extend to you and your daughters deep sympathy in the passing of your distinguished husband. The contributions which General March made to his country and to the world, as a general, as a statesman, and particularly as Chief of Staff and head military adviser to President Wilson during World War I will forever remain as a lasting monument to his memory. To him the people of the world owe a great debt for his indefatigable service in helping to preserve for his fellowmen the democratic principles of freedom and justice. We know that you are receiving comfort from the one great Comforter who never fails us in our hour of need.

THOS. J. WATSON.

An Expression of Appreciation to the Honorable Jere Cooper, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress I would like to pay tribute to the beloved and esteemed chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. His leadership, wisdom, and counsel have made an important contribution to the outstanding accomplishments of our committee in this 1st session of the 84th Congress and to the impressive record of accomplishments of the House of Representatives.

Early in January of this year it was my privilege to nominate my friend and colleague from Tennessee to be chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. At that time I reviewed my long friendship with him and his record of distinguished service to his country as a lawyer, soldier, and statesman. It is significant to note that virtually every member of the committee joined in my expression of congratulations to Mr. COOPER and offered his own laudatory remarks.

Since that day in January, Chairman COOPER has not only proved that the plaudits of his committee colleagues were fully warranted but also that those remarks were perhaps inadequate to greet a man who has proved himself to be a great chairman of what I regard as the most important committee in the Congress of the United States. He has placed the national interest above every other consideration in his wise guidance of the committee in its work. Under his leadership the committee has prepared major legislation improving and strengthening our trade-agreements program, simplifying our customs laws, liberalizing our social-security program, and making our tax laws more equitable. To my recollection the only time that the committee has given consideration to every bill referred to the committee on which a Member has requested consideration was under the chairmanship of the Honorable JERE COOPER in this 1st session of the 84th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is by no accident that the gentleman from Tennessee has already achieved this distinguished record as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. At each step in his illustrious career, JERE COOPER has capably and conscientiously performed his responsibilities in preparation for the greater responsibilities that inevitably came to him. As a lawyer, city official, and as an officer in the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, JERE COOPER has done his job well.

Based on that record of accomplishment, it is not surprising that his neighbors in the community in which he was born should send the gentleman from Tennessee to Congress as their elected Representative in 1929 and that they should continue to do so ever since. JERE COOPER has rendered over 25 years of distinguished and outstanding service as a legislator to the people of his congressional district and to the citizens of the United States.

In the intervening years my beloved friend, JERE COOPER, has become dean of the Tennessee delegation; he has served longer on the Committee on Ways and Means than any living American; he has become a deserved leader in National and State affairs as well as a leader of his party.

Mr. Speaker, it was appropriate, therefore, that JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, should follow in the footsteps of those illustrious Tennesseans, the Honorable George W. Campbell and the Honorable James K. Polk, in becoming chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. It was inevitable that with his attributes of wisdom, experience, and integrity that JERE COOPER should do the job well.

His experience and ability have resulted in JERE COOPER being given a large number of positions of responsibility and influence. He is chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and a ranking member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. In addition, the gentleman from Tennessee is chairman of the Democratic committee on committees which has the important responsibility of designating the Democratic Members for membership on the other 18 standing committees of the House. As a veteran with a distinguished war record, JERE COOPER has found time to be active in veterans' affairs and to maintain a constant and beneficial interest in the welfare of our Nation's veterans.

I would like to commend my committee colleague and beloved chairman for the outstanding record he achieved in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. I know that I speak for everyone on the committee when I express appreciation for Chairman COOPER'S understanding leadership and his wise counsel. I am confident that his future years of service as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will be years of selfless service to the Nation with an unsurpassed record of achievement.

Developing Cultural Understanding Through Foreign Language Study: A Report of the Modern Language Association of America Interdisciplinary Seminar in Language and Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House the very excellent report of the Modern Language Association of America concerning the increasing need to develop linguists through our schools and colleges.

The failure of American education to encourage greater study of foreign tongues is a real handicap to the development of intercultural understanding in today's world. The Modern Language Association is to be commended for its thorough report on this matter which it is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report follows:

DEVELOPING CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDY: A REPORT OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA INTERDISCIPLINARY SEMINAR IN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

The study of foreign languages in the schools and colleges has in the past been justified in many different ways, and without question many reasons can be adduced to support their place in modern education. One argument in their favor which has been advanced more and more frequently is the assertion that foreign languages are not only useful but necessary for an understanding of other peoples and other cultures. This point of view is by no means limited to professional teachers of foreign languages but

is to be found among men in public life and in organizations deeply concerned with contemporary educational problems. Despite their variety of source, the statements which have been cited demonstrate a surprising unanimity of attitude in their insistence that a fundamental aim of foreign language instruction is the transmission of what, for lack of a better name, we may call cultural insights.

This immediately raises the question: At what point in our foreign language instruction may cultural insights best be developed? It seems clear that on the average no more than 10 percent of the students who begin the study of a language in college pursue it beyond the second year. Certainly considerably fewer high school students continue their studies through the fourth year, which is generally comparable to second-year proficiency in college. There are many reasons for this situation, but the fact remains that, to the extent that the educational aims which have been expressed are valid for a considerable portion of the high school and college population, they must be realized prior to the conclusion of the second college year of foreign language instruction, or its equivalent at other levels of education.

Although it is true that certain cultural insights are transmitted almost at the very outset of the student's contact with a foreign language, very often the first year of instruction is heavily preoccupied with giving him some degree of control of a modicum of vocabulary and a minimal set of language patterns. The second year, then, offers a somewhat greater opportunity for emphasis upon content and attitude rather than the sheer acquisition of a set of skills. Therefore, if the cultural objective is to be realized at all through foreign language instruction, we must think of it as especially pertinent to this intermediate stage of the student's foreign language experience.

There is some reason for believing that, as foreign languages are generally taught today, this cultural objective is not always obtained. In 1953, Dean Hollis Caswell, of Teachers College, Columbia University, though expressing himself as being firmly in favor of "greatly extending and deepening our understanding of other cultures and people," and convinced that the "study of foreign languages may be made to contribute to the understanding of other cultures," nevertheless felt compelled to conclude, "but in few schools is this achieved." The same doubt is echoed by others who have been in an equally favorable position to survey the language teaching situation.

To sum up, there is an impressive array of opinion to the effect that foreign language study should contribute to an understanding of other nations and that the present world situation makes this an urgent need. We are not wholly certain how effectively this is being accomplished. We are reasonably sure, however, that this aim must be achieved to a considerable extent before the advanced level of instruction.

The Modern Language Association is currently engaged in a study of the place of foreign languages in American life. Consequently, in view of the expressed purposes of the MLA foreign language program, it seemed that this whole matter demanded further exploration. A memorandum prepared by Albert H. Marckwardt of the University of Michigan and addressed to the executive council of the association on December 27, 1952, proposed that an interdisciplinary seminar be established, to study the ways in which these broader cultural purposes of foreign language study might more fully be accomplished. The general tenor of the proposal is indicated by the following excerpts from the memorandum:

"As one senses the present attitude of the Modern Language Association, a large share of its justification of the place of modern language study at all levels of the curriculum is based upon the value of such study in contributing to international understanding by giving the American student an insight into the content, the intellectual framework, and the behavior patterns characteristic of one or more foreign cultures.

"Nor are the teachers of modern languages in the United States alone in encountering difficulty with this problem. It is an equally serious one for those agencies of our Government who are preparing English-teaching materials for use abroad in our cultural centers and elsewhere, nor have they achieved any singular measure of successs in coping with it. It will also arise in connection with the preparation of reading materials in the program for oriental languages, which has recently been undertaken by the American Council of Learned Societies. We are brought face to face with it whenever, in the course of language instruction, we seek to use a newly acquired language as a tool in trying to acquire an insight into the lives and minds of the people who speak it. It is a problem which would seem to require a frontal attack. This leads us to the pertinent question of what the nature of this attack should be.

"In the elementary stages of language instruction, the most fruitful procedure has been to compare the language to be learned with the native language of the learner, in order to determine the points of difference and the areas of similarity.

"It is reasonable to assume that our approach to the construction of materials designed to produce a cultural orientation must proceed upon precisely the same basis, namely, a comparison of the two national cultures involved, a determination of the principal points of difference between them, and the selection of materials, literary or expository, which will set forth, illustrate, and perhaps account for, the cultural attitudes involved in those points of difference.

"At any rate, this matter is so basic to our whole program that we cannot escape making some direct attempt to solve it. * * * Moreover, since the systematic analysis of cultures lies within the province of the social sciences, it would seem eminently reasonable that literary and linguistic scholars look to the cultural anthropologist, the social psychologist, the historian, and the political scientist for collaboration and aid in such a project.

"In such a seminar, then, a number of leaders in various areas of modern language instruction and a number of social scientists would jointly address themselves to the problem of how to plan for and effect this insight into the culture of another people through the medium of language instruction."

The proposal was approved on January 31, 1953, by the steering committee for the foreign-language program of the Modern Language Association, and Professor Marckwardt was directed to organize such a seminar to be held at the University of Michigan during the summer of 1953. The present document constitutes the report of the group which was brought together pursuant to these instructions. The seminar began its sessions on June 29, 1953, and concluded them on July 24.

French, German, and Spanish, in addition to English, were selected as the languages to be represented in the seminar primarily because they reflect the greatest proportion of student enrollment in foreign languages; hence the problem of successfully effecting the transmission of cultural insights to students in our Nation's schools is more urgent in them than in some of the less frequently taught languages. There is no reason to suppose that the conclusions reached with respect to these would be greatly modified for Russian, Japanese, Portuguese, Norwegian, or any other modern language.

The group met regularly 3 hours a day, 5 days a week, during tthe period of the seminar, and supplementary meetings were held for committee work and special purposes. The first week was devoted to an examination of current textbooks, not only in French, German, and Spanish but for English as a foreign language as well, supplemented by further information concerning language instruction in the elementary and secondary schools. This constituted the introductory phase of the work.

The second and third weeks were primarily cross-educational. During this period the representatives of the social sciences discussed a number of concepts basic to a consideration of cultures and national characteristics, indicating the possibilities and methods of comparing two cultures for points of similarity and difference. The final week of the seminar was integrative and directed toward the practical applications of the principles which had previously been discussed.

This report stresses particularly the matters under discussion during the initial and final phases of the seminar. The concepts and attitudes resulting from the cross-educational or interdisciplinary feature of the sessions are implicit, however, in virtually every aspect of the presentation.

EXISTING TEXT MATERIALS

The widespread opinion that foreign language study should result in the modification of culture-bound attitudes toward foreign peoples and their ways of life, and the equally prevalent view that these changes in attitude do not now regularly occur as an outcome of such study combine to raise the following question: Do available text materials give evidence of having been planned to achieve this end? If they do give evidence of this kind of planning, any general failure to attain the desired goal must therefore spring largely from faulty classroom presentation. If they do not, a reasonable next step would be to consider the possibility of outlining a procedure whereby a set of aims designed to attain such a cultural orientation might be systematically reached.

Accordingly, the initial phase of the seminar was devoted to examining and analyzing the cultural content of a considerable number of textbooks. The collection thus examined, while in no sense complete, gave a comprehensive view of the types of books having a cultural aim, whether direct or incidental, in all the languages under consideration: French, German, Spanish, and English as a foreign language. Particular attention was given to the books designed for the second-year college courses, although the more advanced college texts as well as some of the most widely used high-school texts were also included. The seminar felt that the coverage was sufficiently broad to lend validity to the generalizations presented here in consequence of this analysis.

On the whole, the existing materials maintain a fairly uniform pattern throughout the various languages. From the point of view of subject matter and approach, there seems to be no appreciable difference between materials designed for use in high school or college. Although there appears to be no dearth either of informative or colorful material intended to illustrate the different foreign cultures, none of the existing texts attempts to present cultural insights in terms of linguistic structure. Very occasionally textbook writers do seek clues to cultural traits in certain language features or patterns, but in the absence of a generally accepted body of knowledge in this area, any such considerations must remain largely speculative.

Texts with some cultural emphasis may be classified according to four principal categories: (1) elementary texts containing auxiliary cultural materials; (2) cultural miscellanies; (3) comprehensive presentations of a total civilization; and (4) selections of literary material illustrating culture.

1. Auxiliary material in elementary texts and grammars: The primary aim of this type of selection is to provide practice in reading, composition, and conversation to reinforce the development of linguistic skills. While individual readings here and there throughout the books may be sound and attractive, they seldom reveal in their total effect a clear principle of organization with respect to cultural content. Particularly on the high school level, readings of this type tend to predominate, often overwhelming the student by a multiplicity of unrelated cultural facts.

2. Cultural miscellanies: General cultural readers, frequently of a descriptive nature, exist on various levels of language difficulty and serve as basic text material for a more or less concentrated treatment of the foreign culture, although in many cases they are actually keyed to linguistic skills rather than cultural objectives. In recent years the pictorial material in these works has assumed an ever-increasing importance. Many such texts are exceedingly attractive in format, lively in approach, and modern in their language, but they tend to draw in a hit-and-miss fashion upon history, literature, art, folklore, music, customs, politics, etc. Thus they appear to be altogether haphazard in their choice of subject matter and fail, beyond certain considerations of linguistic difficulty, to offer a clear-cut principle of selection. Use of the travelogue form is common, and inevitably this type of text concentrates upon the picturesque or upon insignificant oddities. Although the authors may often be sensitive to cultural differences, they do not attempt to present or develop these differences or contrasts in a systematic or relevant fashion.

3. Comprehensive presentations of a civilization: With few exceptions, texts of the "cours de civilisation" type have as their primary aim a panoramic and encyclopedic representation of the factual data of a given culture. Useful though this comprehensive array of facts may be, it can be doubted whether such texts provide sufficient motivation and develop in the student an awareness of significant features and values in the foreign culture. Moreover, these texts frequently reveal a tendency on the part of the compiler to present the data of the foreign culture in as attractive a light as possible and to display a certain evangelistic fervor which sometimes amounts to transparent propaganda. This type of text serves best as a supplementary reference work. Conceivably such material might be presented as effectively in English.

4. Culture through literature: The purpose of the literary text of this type is to illustrate the manifestations of a given culture through the writings of distinguished men of letters. The material may, of course, be used as well to enlarge the student's literary and artistic sensibilities, to cultivate his stylistic perception, and to acquaint him, incidentally, with the great figures of foreign literature. Yet purely literary works, selected essentially for their excellence as literature, need not necessarily be concerned with a significant factor of the contemporary culture. Moreover, as these texts confront teacher and student alike with complicated matters of literacy taste and criticism, they may lose some of their effectiveness for the immediate purpose of cultural elucidation. The selection in these readers naturally tends to be undertaken from a literary point of view and, as in the general cultural readers, a clearly reasoned definition of purpose seems to be lacking.

The various sorts of cultural text materials differ somewhat in their distribution in the languages represented in our examination. The comprehensive presentation of the civilization, for example, is perhaps more prevalent in the French textbooks. The travelog has been frequently adapted to the Spanish-speaking Latin American countries. German texts tend to dwell upon the established phases of the political and intellectual history of the country, to which literary specimens are subjoined. A few textbooks in English for foreigners attempt a synthesis of the American way of life, but seem inadequate as cultural carriers. Thus each language area may represent a peculiar and individual situation. But in general, whatever advantages the texts discussed above may have, they appear on the whole to lack a sufficiently clear focus upon the relevant aspects of the foreign culture as contrasted with the student's own experience and value systems.

GENERAL PERSPECTIVE

Up to the present the attempt to provide cultural insights in foreign language classes has been concentrated upon a single broad objective: an understanding of the culture of the foreign country or countries in which the language is spoken. The seminar focused its attention not only on this but on related types of insight.

Even beyond the immediate familiarity with the foreign culture, a heightened comprehension of American life and values should appear as an important derivative of the new perspectives gained about another people. Some teachers occasionally relate American characteristics to the foreign culture, but the acquisition of such an understanding is rarely an overt objective of foreign language courses. Moreover, it is doubtful that existing teaching materials are adequate for this purpose.

It may be questioned, likewise, whether an appreciation either of the foreign or of American culture can be achieved satisfactorily without an understanding of the nature of culture itself—in the general sense. This does not mean that "culture" as such need serve as a topic for classroom discussion. If methods for transmitting the particular insights are adequate, then a comprehension of culture generally should automatically follow.

No longer is the word "culture" limited in its meaning to that which is admirable, superior, or desirable. More often the term is now employed to indicate the whole range of customary activities of the members of a society. There is, indeed, no appreciable difference between this general application of the word and its somewhat more technical use by the social scientists, who may define it as "the learned (not inherited) and shared aspects of the behavior of members of a society." In either case, the material to be dealt with in a cultural description or analysis will not be limited to that which is felt to be great and timeless.

Anyone growing up in a society acquires habits which are shared by those around him. He also learns to avoid modes of behavior not approved by others. The applied set of preferences, of judgments as to what is good or bad, that an individual learns can be called the "values" of a culture. Not only are these learned, but a set of moral convictions about some of them is also acquired.

A person whose entire view of the world is determined by the value-perspectives he has gained through a single cultural environment—who thus cannot understand or accept the point of view of another individual whose values have been determined by a different culture—such a person may be considered culture-bound in his attitudes. He makes premature and inappropriate value judgments. He is limited in his understanding of the world. Consequently, the reduction of a culture-bound attitude becomes an important objective of our educational process.

The understanding of the culture of a specific country is not, in and by itself, all that the cultural aspect of language study should contribute to a general and a liberal education. To achieve the fullest possible contribution, three important ends must be borne in mind in selecting and presenting cultural material: (1) The student must gain an understanding of the nature of culture; (2) his culture-bondage must be reduced; (3) he must achieve a fuller understanding of his own cultural background.

Our collaborative effort has concentrated upon finding the best techniques for reaching these goals. It must be realized that there are no readymade materials, or even criteria for the selection of materials, that are specifically designed to accomplish the foregoing aims. To attain them will require considerable ingenuity in combining and devising techniques from various fields and disciplines.

POPULAR CONCEPTIONS OF NATIONALITY

Social psychology and sociology provide excellent methods for investigating the conceptions that the people of a nation have of themselves and of one another. A large literature indicates that, except in earliest childhood, the citizens of modern states always have such conceptions. The American, for instance, may describe the German as scientific-minded, industrious, and stolid. The German, in turn, will think of American as intelligent and materialistic. These conceptions change as we are forced, from time to time, to reevaluate our enemies and allies, but they always exist and with a considerable amount of agreement as to their content within a given society at a given time. They are often derived from hearsay, resting either upon pure imagination or loosely interpreted fact rather than from a direct contact, properly evaluated, with the nationality concerned. It is quite obvious from the study by Katz and Braly that many Americans who have never made the acquaintance of a Turk are certain that the Turk is cruel, dirty, and sensual.

In general, conceptions of nationality are couched in evaluative, culture-bound terms which would not be used by an objective student of society. To call the Chinese superstitious, for example, is to say that he holds a set of beliefs concerning the supernatural which we do not share. When we begin to recognize that the practicing Christian may in turn appear superstitious to the Chinese, we have acquired a certain degree, at least, of what may be called cultural sophistication.

Sources other than the researches and writings of social scientists may be employed as evidence of nationality conceptions. Popular dramatic presentations, particularly the moving pictures, caricatures, and current jokes, the treatment of foreigners in newspapers and other periodicals all constitute important information; they are also very difficult to interpret. With such materials, however, one must bear in mind the regional variations within a country and also the tendency of the public taste to demand that the mass mediums concentrate on the strange and adventurous. These mediums will not always convey accurately the overall nationality conception.

Other available sources would be quantitative data on book sales and public-library circulations representing the literature of the foreign country or books from whatever source dealing with the foreign country, the former category presumably to be limited to material translated into the language of the home country. In evaluating such information as an indication of the nationality conception, we should be aware, however, that selection for translation appears to be determined by a complex of factors not always fully understood and does not,

for that reason, represent an altogether free choice according to an independent public taste.

Descriptions of national characteristics are also to be found in the impressions of travelers and the epitomizations of untrained observers. Authors in this category will often profess to present the truth about a nationality. In many instances it will be apparent from the vocabulary used that the notions thus presented are provincial, sometimes even chauvinistic. The inadequacy of such impressionistic studies can be shown by comparing them with methodologically more advanced work. Nevertheless, they may, in turn, be reinterpreted as representing culture-bound impressions of foreign nationalities.

Using existing cultural conceptions as a starting point is not the only way of selecting from the unlimited storehouse of cultural materials those which are significant. Another approach, which can be used in conjunction with the first, is that of stressing those aspects of the foreign culture which the residents of that country feel to be important. For example, if the particular foreign people believe themselves to be romantic, or generous, or moral, or practical, and feel that this trait is commonly misunderstood, then possibly this self-conception should be taken into consideration.

Contemporary events suggest that popular nationality stereotypes, including national self-conceptions, are inadequate cognitive tools for meeting international responsibilities. The language teacher who undertakes to develop soundly based cultural sensitivity cannot be content merely to perpetuate the stereotypes. Some cross-cultural perspective is essential to the communication of cultural insights that are not simply nationalistic projections. Aware of the German's view of the American as well as the American's view of the German, we are compelled to look for ways of conceptualizing national differences which will be free from cultural bias. For this we must naturally turn to the more objective studies of culture. Nevertheless, it can be helpful to begin with existent nationality stereotypes because they spot areas of misunderstanding and possible contention, thus providing a principle of choice among cultural items that could be presented, even though they fail to supply acceptable terms for the interpretation of such items.

OBJECTIVE CRITERIA—METHODS AND RESULTS

An objective comparative analysis of the cultures of the two countries concerned gives us a reliable basis for arriving at similarities and differences. Such a comparison should reveal significant facts about the cultures beyond those discovered by other methods. Covert aspects of the cultures, for example, may be discoverable only through the use of carefully and subtly devised objective techniques.

Existing studies of American culture will naturally be of value in making comparisons with any foreign country. These studies are diverse but often most suitable for our purposes. A brief summary of the types of sources follows; this will also suggest the nature of the material to be used or created for any foreign country.

The best materials are those based upon explicit research carefully controlled as to method. Periodicals such as the American Journal of Sociology and the American Sociological Review contain many excellent studies, usually of specific aspects of American life. There are also more extended works on such specific features, as well as a few studies which aim at a comprehensive coverage of America.

Community studies have a long history in American social science, some of them having attained the substantial position of classics in the field. New problems and the development of new methods to deal with them have extended the use of this approach.

The technique known as content analysis, which is represented in a growing literature, promises to be one of the most useful methods for the verification of hypotheses relevant to the problem of cultural comparisons. It is, for example, adapted to the comparative study of themes as patterns. Today a distinction is usually made between the culture of a people and the shared or modal aspects of their personalities. Studies of the personality or national character of literate peoples have proved highly controversial, but they exist for America as well as for many other countries.

To be used with caution is a wide range of writings by enlightened observers who have no explicit methodology for analyzing contemporary cultures. Literary critics, certain historians, journalists, and men in public life often produce stimulating and valuable studies which should not be overlooked. Indeed, much of the data for modern European countries will be found in just such sources. In general the observations of these writers may be accepted provisionally as a series of hypotheses, to be subjected to careful analysis and verification.

The source materials which have been mentioned and the experiences of those familiar with the country supply data for the understanding of the areas of culture chosen as significant. To make certain that no important aspect is overlooked, there are various research aids that can be employed. Murdock's Outline of Cultural Materials consists of an elaborate series of cultural categories which is used as the basis of the Cross-Cultural Index. Techniques and categories are discussed in a handbook published by the Royal Anthropological Institute which is designed to aid those with little experience in studying a particular facet of a culture to ask properly detailed and comprehensive questions concerning it. A very different sort of work is that of Hall and Trager, which applies the viewpoint and certain methods of structural linguistics to the study of culture. The authors' conceptual scheme provides a number of analytic tools which, although yet untested, appear promising. This work can be used to construct checklists to assure the adequacy of the understanding of an aspect of culture.

In the analysis of selected facets of a culture, certain obvious structures such as institutions, associations, and cultural complexes will be encountered. Beyond these, however, are patterns or configurations, which are structural regularities of even greater importance for our purposes. Patterns cut across more than one aspect of a culture and serve to integrate diverse materials. The term "value orientation" has been used for one type of pattern related to values. A very similar concept is that of cultural "themes," an old idea which has recently been given an exact definition. Opler uses the term "theme" in a technical sense to denote a postulate or position, declared or implied, and usually controlling behavior or stimulating activity, which is tacitly approved or openly promoted in a society.

Although Opler formulates his themes as postulates, they can also be given short headings such as "success," "competition," "ritual cleanliness," etc. Any culture has a limited number of themes, and these can be identified at almost any stage of the analysis. Once a theme is assumed to exist, special efforts can be made to establish its existence and importance by such methods as noting how many diverse kinds of cultural materials are patterned by it.

These broad, integrative concepts have certain advantages. We need not bewilder the student by the presentation of a large number of individual traits. A few well-chosen items can make him aware of the existence of the pattern. There are generally not many patterns of the theme type in a given culture. Consequently, all those that can be identified are worth considering as points of primary importance about which teaching materials may well be organized. Very often they will fall in the very areas that the examination of national sterotypes has already suggested as highly significant.

IMPLEMENTATION

With the above techniques of analysis and tools for research, it should be possible to determine significant and relevant patterns and traits of a given culture—French, German, Spanish, American, etc. The next essential step is to employ such a body of cultural data in arriving at a reasoned determination of cultural objectives (appropriate types of cultural insights) for the different levels of language instruction and a clear direction of effort toward the attainment of those objectives.

The important cultural differences, as these are popularly conceived, will not usually involve the geographical detail or the piquant customs in dining and clothing which fill so many textbooks. Any misunderstanding between America and a foreign nation is more likely to center in a disagreement on values—a kind of disagreement that is often only skirted by the reading materials we now have. The bland travelogue that avoids such ticklish matters provides a conception of the foreign culture which the student may reject because of its obvious bias, or which he may accept until more extended experience disillusions him. By avoiding such controversial matters, the language teacher or textbook author not only fails to do justice to the culture, but in addition he deprives students of a subject matter which they might find of deep personal interest.

This leads us to the determination of the illustrative material that should go into the composition of a given text. Obviously no single textbook can attempt to illustrate the entire body of patterns and traits representative of a culture. In the selection of content and method, the writers of textbooks and other instructional materials, including the audiovisual, will need to bear in mind such questions as the following:

1. Does the material focus upon characteristic and significant aspects of the foreign culture?

2. Can the material be so organized that the student will leave the course with a fairly clear idea of some salient aspects of the foreign culture?

3. In using this material, can important traits or themes be compared or contrasted with typically American behavior? And can this be done in a manner leading to a better understanding of American life?

4. Is the student stimulated to search for historical or other explanations for values which differ from his own?

5. Do the materials foster an awareness of the validity of the mode of life in any given society?

6. Is the material free from dubious or undesirable value judgments?

7. Does the material lead by implication to a clearer understanding of the nature of culture in a general sense?

Illustrative materials may be drawn from (1) the literature of a given culture; (2) accounts by native or foreign observers, either trained or untrained; (3) periodical writing of an expository or argumentative nature; (4) historical writings; and (5) travel literature. If appropriate materials are not available in any of the above or other types of sources, recourse to the essay written for the special purpose will be inevitable.

The presentation of these materials need not be entirely in contemporary terms. Whenever it is possible to find suitable selections which will account for the trait or be-

havior pattern on historical grounds, these will lend variety and depth in approach.

Brief introductory comments in English should suggest to the student the relevancy of a given American trait and should point up the nature and the significance of the passage that follows. Purely factual information that may be considered necessary for a fuller understanding of the text should be relegated to the notes. To achieve a greater involvement of the student, study questions, preferably in the foreign language, should call for reflection in the attempt to heighten his appreciation and understanding of our own as well as of the foreign way of life. Illustrations, supplementary exercises, outside readings in English and in the foreign language, and in general the treatment and presentation of the material will vary considerably from text to text, depending on level and type.

EVALUATION

This seminar has been concerned with the development and clarification of general principles relating to the development of cultural insights through foreign language study, which we hope will have practical application. In addition, we have attempted to indicate how these general principles should be translated into textbooks and teaching methods. Whoever undertakes to do this will necessarily be concerned also with evaluating the effectiveness of the changes thus introduced. We hope that changes in materials and methods will give our students some valid insights into the life and thought of another people and act as a corrective to cultural bias. How, then, will their behavior differ from that of present-day students? What will be the consequences of these new attitudes and modes of understanding?

The experimental evaluation of teaching methods and materials is a familiar practice in educational psychology. Like an arrowsmith conducting a controlled experiment with a new serum, the teacher with his new materials and devices must exempt some subjects from treatment if the usefulness of the innovations is to be determined. He must, in fact, maintain a control group matched with his experimental group in all relevant dimensions except that one—in this case the proposed teaching materials—whose effects are to be charted.

It is generally easier to test for the attainment of the more familiar goals of language teaching than for attitude changes. Language teachers have traditionally been concerned with three kinds of objectives:

1. The acquisition of language skills: reading, translation, composition, oral expression, aural comprehension. These are the skills which are commonly tested.

2. The acquisition of cultural facts. We test less regularly for factual knowledge of cultural materials, which may help explain why students often pay little attention to the content of cultural readers. We do know, however, how to test for this kind of subject matter.

3. The appreciation of a foreign literature. Here we are likely to have in mind something more subtle than we can easily test. Knowledge of the names of authors, the plots of plays, the opening lines of poems are imperfect indices of that literary sensitivity which we hope to develop; critical essays, though more pentrating and subtle, are difficult to evaluate objectively.

The language course which aims directly at developing cultural insights of the type envisaged in this report moves beyond mere cultural fact into the realm of cultural understanding. We expect this to result in changed attitudes and sympathies on the part of our students—psychological subtleties that will require great experimental ingenuity if they are to be adequately appraised. Several techniques might be used in assessing these changes:

1. On the level of language skills, we may eventually be less interested in the student's ability to translate than in his ability to recognize what is not translated or translatable. Instead of asking him to render French into English, we may ask him to point out what is lost as the French passes over into English. A perceptive reading in the light of a broadened cultural understanding may reveal aspects of the French mind that do not always come across in translation. In this way we can illustrate the imperfect translatability of languages instead of promoting notions of simple equivalence that make some aspects of the study of language seem trivial.

2. The direct verbal test. Questionnaires and rating scales for measuring nationalistic attitudes and cultural bondage are already in existence. They may be of some value. It seems likely, however, that the intent of such material is too obvious for many college students. After a very few class hours, the astute student can easily assume the attitudes that will please his teacher.

3. The indirect verbal test. One possibility here is the employment of creative materials in which the student composes stories or essays, and his writings are evaluated for the cultural understanding they reveal. Materials for such tests can be selected in such a way that it will be impossible to guess the purpose of the measuse. It would be best to administer these tests somewhere other than in the language class, so that the student will not be motivated to simulate the attitudes of the teacher. Thus, for example, students in a class in social studies or in English might be asked to write a composition discussing the frequent changes in the French Government. The performances of the control and experimental groups could then be compared for the cultural understanding displayed. The techniques of content analysis make it possible to do the job reliably and to determine the statistical significance of the results. The tester will have to depend upon the help of the language teacher in the creative task of devising situations and asking questions to serve as the basis for the content analysis. It will be important here to examine not only the understanding of the particular foreign culture, but in addition the attitudes held toward America itself and toward alien cultures in general.

4. The action level. This is perhaps the most important level to be examined, but it is also difficult to control experimentally. How does the proposed course in Spanish, for example, affect the students' reading of Spanish novels, their attendance at Spanish movies, and, very significantly, their dealings with Spanish-speaking people? The election of additional courses in Spanish and in cognate areas, expanded travel plans, choice of vocation, etc., might be indications of a growing understanding of Hispanic culture.

The detailed problems of experimental design—the selection of a sample and the experimental controls—have not been discussed here because these questions have already been encountered many times and have been dealt with satisfactorily. Our principal concern has been with the creative aspects of the evaluation process, in which the collaboration of the social scientist and the language teacher is necessary.

LANGUAGE STUDY AS A MEANS OF DEVELOPING CULTURAL INSIGHTS

While the importance of achieving cultural insights within any program of American education cannot be denied, the question remains whether such insights can be effectively transmitted in the foreign language class, and if so, whether this can be done in a language class any more effectively than elsewhere. There seems little doubt that language is an important tool in the understanding of culture, but as we pointed out earlier, foreign language study is itself being increasingly advocated as the appropriate means by which cultural insights can be established and sharpened in the students.

The question may be considered on both a theoretical and a practical basis. In dealing with the problem theoretically, we may begin by recognizing the existence of a popular or naive view that reality presents itself to all men in the same form, and that all languages are sets of codes for expressing this single reality. From such a concept arises the assumption of complete or nearly complete translatability; all that is necessary is to substitute the relevant parts of one code for another, let us say English for Italian, and precisely the same message will be conveyed.

A study of non-Indo-European languages casts considerable doubt upon this assumption. The Navaho, for example, have one word for the colors that we call gray and brown. Totonac, a Mayan language, has distinct forms of the verb to be for subjects that are sitting, standing, or lying. Hupa, a language of northern California, has tenses for its nouns, and can thus distinguish by means of inflectional endings alone between a house now existing, one in ruins, and one not yet built. Hopi, by virtue of its verb forms, is better equipped to deal with vibratory phenomena than is English or any other Western European language. In short, a linguistic system is an expression, though not a complete one, of the system of perception which a social group has of its surroundings and of itself.

It is true, of course, that the linguistic structures of the principal European cultures are to a great extent similar and that an attempt to establish discriminating insights based upon purely structural features is not likely to yield tangible results, but the lexical differences are considerable and can be more easily interpreted.

The lexicon of a language is a remarkably revealing inventory of the culture of the people who natively speak the language. There certainly is a relationship of approximate translatability between many lexical items in the various modern European languages. Students are likely to mistake this for a relationship of perfect translatability—a view that is reinforced by the presentation, in standard textbooks, of long lists of supposedly equivalent items of vocabulary. It is quite true, of course, that the French word "mère" is a translation of the English word "mother." If, however, meaning is broadened beyond simple denotation to include the emotional and cognitive associations which are not purely personal but common to all the participants in a culture, then it is clear that the translation is only approximate. For such abstractions as "truth" and "goodness" the untranslated residue is likely to be greater. To comprehend a language fully, one must share in the culture of the people who speak it. Foreign languages are not alternative codes for the familiar American reality. The language teacher who wants to convey not only the code but also its meaning cannot avoid interpreting the foreign culture, and in doing this effectively, he will illuminate the general nature of culture itself.

The importance of language for the real understanding of culture is being more and more felt by students of civilization. No civilization can be fully understood by one who ignores its linguistic means of expression. Modern anthropologists cannot work any more through interpreters if they want to collect reliable material. In general, language mastery has come to be a necessary prerequisite for participation in an area study program. Finally, there can be little doubt that in the areas of greatest intellectual and artistic subtlety, in the works of the poets and philosophers, knowledge of

the language in which they are written is an absolute essential for a full comprehension.

Turning to more practical considerations, it seems that there is at the present time no place in the high-school or college curriculum where a systematic attempt is regularly made to give the student a well-directed insight into a particular culture other than his own. Basic courses in the social sciences are generally concerned with presenting analytic tools and comparative data rather than an acquaintance with a particular culture. History, though it contains some of the materials for the interpretation of a particular culture and provides indispensable perspectives, is by definition not primarily concerned with providing a comparative insight into contemporary cultural values.

As a rule the language teacher is, by his familiarity with materials of the foreign culture, in a position of decided advantage. Given an awareness of the comprehensive cultural purposes described above and an acquaintance with the methods by which these insights can be attained, he can make a most effective contribution to an understanding of the major problems of human relationships that confront us today.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our meetings this summer constituted an initial attack, in terms of general principle, upon an educational problem which seemed to us of primary importance. This concern with a broad overall point of view, since it was conducted on an interdisciplinary basis, led us into a number of hitherto unexplored or at best very casually explored areas, and by the very nature of the situation, we were forced to ask many questions which we could not hope to answer definitively. This method of operation places upon us the responsibility of suggesting subsequent projects and further avenues of investigation. They may be considered under three headings: Workshops, teacher training, and problems for future research.

1. Workshops and seminars: The obvious next step is to suggest ways of achieving, in terms of one or more specific languages, the educational aims which have been presented here. This will undoubtedly be more effectively accomplished through a series of seminars and workshops, each composed principally of teachers concerned with one particular language, than through so broadly diffused a group as constituted the present seminar. Ideally, three workshops should be arranged for the summer of 1954, in French, German, and Spanish, the primary purpose of each to be the creation of second-level teaching materials for that language, which would be designed to achieve an insight into the culture of the foreign country.

As an initial phase of activity, the essential elements of the culture of the speakers of that language should be analyzed and compared with the corresponding elements in our native culture. Such a cultural analysis and the subsequent evaluation of the various points of difference would have to be undertaken with the assistance of area specialists; thus the first stage of the workshop would be interdisciplinary in its operational scheme. These activities should result in the formulation of objectives (in terms of cultural insights) for the three languages.

The second stage of the workshop will be bibliographical, with the language teachers assuming the principal responsibility for the activities of the group and the social scientists serving principally as resource personnel. Various types of reading selections containing the key attitudes which have been selected as teaching objectives should be sought out, and in each instance the particular selection must also be judged in terms of its level of reading difficulty. Those selections which are too difficult and which will lend themselves to simplification must be rewritten. For each course also the various objectives must be organized into the sequence which will lend itself to most effective presentation. Further stages in the workshop will deal with the formulation of study questions, conversational materials based upon the reading selections, and tests of the material to be presented.

These workshops could be organized according to any one of several possible patterns. They could be sponsored by a language teachers' association or a State educational agency. Probably the most feasible arrangement would be to establish them as a part of the regular summer instructional program of a college or university, carrying academic credit for those students who desire it. Each workshop should be under the direction of a well-qualified representative of the language-teaching profession, preferably one who has had some contact with the present seminar. Another possibility would be to include in the personnel of a single workshop both teachers of a particular foreign language and teachers of English to native speakers of that language, with the idea of creating cultural materials for the teaching of both the foreign language and of English.

Ideally each workshop would be provided with approximately 10 summer fellowships, carrying stipends sufficiently attractive to encourage the best high-school and college teachers to apply for them. Moreover, in order to assure actual field trials of the materials devised in connection with the workshops, the institutions employing the teachers who are given fellowships should guarantee the use of such materials in their classes for a 2-year period.

It would be well to divide each workshop into two parts. The first, in which the general principles of intermediate language teaching for the purpose of cultural orientation are set forth, should be open to any qualified student. The second, more directly concerned with the construction of teaching materials and tests, should be limited to students receiving fellowships. Any workshop organization should provide teacher training for a qualified group, result in a set of materials, and assure their being put into use.

2. Teacher training: No matter how deftly or ingeniously text materials may be constructed, they will not achieve their aim without teachers who can employ them intelligently and sympathetically. And even if we must get along for some time without the materials which we have envisaged, the training of foreign-language teachers in the direction of a greater cultural understanding would still be a desirable end in itself.

Considering that language exists only in a society, that in fact it constitutes the unifying force which holds a society together, we believe that those disciplines which have as their chief function the study of man as a social being have much to contribute toward our understanding of language. All too frequently the humanist views language as the vehicle for a highly restricted kind of communication, important and exalted though it may be, and concentrates upon the employment of that language by a small minority of gifted individuals, overlooking its potentialities as a reflection of the total culture of those who speak it.

Moreover, if a primary aim of the study of a foreign language is to overcome the misunderstandings and tensions which exist between or within nations, we cannot neglect those aspects of the study of man which are concerned with the whole social structure. The conclusion seems obvious; the teachers of foreign languages will find certain concepts, attitudes, procedures, and factual information drawn from the social sciences useful to them in their work.

The practical question is where, in an already crowded curriculum, such training can be included. Certain solutions may be suggested. Students preparing to teach foreign languages might well be encouraged to elect social science courses as cognates, or a suitably constructed interdepartmental social studies program as a teaching minor. The courses in teaching methods or other parts of the required professional training could be revamped to include those concepts and attitudes drawn from the social sciences which we believe will make for more effective teaching. The social science departments might well be asked to prepare a collaborative service course designed for teachers of language. On the graduate level, and also for those engaged in college teaching, collaborative or interdisciplinary seminars could be established. The Modern Language Association could perform a useful service by preparing a pamphlet which would explain the bearing of the social sciences upon the teaching of foreign languages. It would be distinctly helpful, also, for the association to insist upon the need for group planning and close cooperation with educators who are confronted with the broad problems of educational objectives, integration of subject matter, and student guidance.

3. Research: Much of our discussion throughout the seminar was less definitive than we should have liked simply because certain kinds of information are not available. This suggests the desirability of further research in a number of areas. Certain basic or fundamental matters have not yet been dealt with adequately, and in addition many practical questions remain unanswered.

The following have occurred to the seminar as presenting opportunities for further study. As problems for basic research we suggest:

1. Exploration of the relationship between language and thought, with particular reference to European languages (to be carried out by a linguistic scientist and a psychologist in collaboration).

2. Problems of translatability. What can be satisfactorily translated from one language to another and what is incapable of translation?

3. Inquiries into the nature of foreign cultures, particularly those which are within the orbit of the Indo-European languages, employing the techniques which have been used in analyses of American life. This would envisage the extension to other countries of such compilations as Gardner Murphy's In the Minds of Men, which presents a well-founded picture of India as it now exists.

4. Comparisons of values and culture patterns between various national states.

5. Inquiring, country by country, into the value reorientations resulting from foreign experience. Exchange students and teachers would be excellent subjects for this kind of research.

6. Extension of content analyses to more foreign literatures.

No strict line can be drawn between the so-called basic and applied research, but the following questions seem to have immediate applicability to the foreign-language program we propose:

1. Why has not a knowledge of a foreign language and contact with a foreign people heretofore resulted in attitudes which are less culture-bound?

2. What ways can we devise to test the kinds of teaching materials we seek to develop?

3. What kinds of materials are chosen for translation from one language to another, and what are the factors determining this choice?

4. What further bibliographical resources would be most useful to the teacher of foreign languages, and how can they be made available?

This is not an exhaustive list, but it will serve to indicate the directions of activity that would make for more effective teaching of foreign languages if they are to perform the educational function that our position in world affairs clearly demands.

Respectfully submitted.

Roger W. Brown, John E. Englekirk, David H. French, Marjorie C. Johnston, Victor H. W. Lange, Albert H. Marckwardt, Robert L. Politzer, Alf Sommerfelt, Benjamin W. Wheeler.

Report to Constituents by Hon. Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the story is told of a certain underworld character suddenly blossoming out as a deacon of the church and when this man was asked about it, he justified his selection to this position of leadership on the grounds that even the unrighteous are entitled to representation. Unlike that church deacon, and in all seriousness, I have never considered in my own case any special group obtained representation out of proportion to the entire population as far as the First Congressional District of Washington State was concerned. I may add, too, that during the 1st session of the 84th Congress my constituents have been unusually kind in recognizing my desire to put the public interest first and support what would promote the greatest good for the greatest number. Perhaps this understanding attitude was due to my activity during important debates on the floor of the House and, therefore, my position and reasoning on these public issues became a matter of public record and, of course, the members of the press do a very excellent job of keeping the public well informed.

The record, in my case, will show consistent support of President Eisenhower's program. In foreign policy matters and the administration waging its peace campaign I am listed as a 100 percenter; on domestic issues, while I have never put partisanship above conscience, it has been a great privilege to be able to support our great Republican leadership in practically every major measure.

There is no political party that has a monopoly on wisdom but to me, a Republican, it is a source of great pride that mine is a party of fiscal responsibility. For example, during the past 100 years, if you take all the years when the Republicans were in control of Congress, you find there has been an accumulated Federal Government financial surplus of receipts over expenditures of more than $5 billion as against the record of the years with Congress controlled by the Democrats when there was accumulated an aggregate deficit of nearly $269 billion.

Now I am taking great satisfaction from the prosperity which has come under the policies of my party and which might result in a balanced budget even this fiscal year. Quiet now are the dire, dismal and dour Democratic prophets of doom and gloom. Silent are those who actually seemed to wish public confidence shaken in order to discredit the administration. Right now more American wage earners are receiving more disposable income and producing more goods than in any peacetime year in our history. Yes, peace and prosperity are being waged successfully by the Republican administration and by our great President. It is certainly pleasing to be able to return to my home district and my neighbors and friends under these circumstances and in the light of the Nation's progress.

Legislativewise much in the way of important legislation remains for consideration at the next session. This is in part because a Democratic Congress, such as this one, will never be able to enact any civil-rights legislation, and partly because this Democratic Congress is fearful that the Eisenhower Republican label will be attached to measures prior to the 1956 election.

Fortunately, two projects of great interest to my district were nonpartisan in character. Certainly the million dollars to commence construction of the Eagle Gorge flood control dam will be greatly appreciated by my constituents.

Also my district benefits from planning funds given the United States engineers for the Shilshole breakwater off the Ballard Locks in Puget Sound. For 27 years the people of Seattle have sought this project, and after having it authorized last year, I am hopeful of its critical need being recognized and construction funds appropriated next year.

One of the congressional duties I greatly enjoy is appearing before various House committees to explain the projects before the Congress of particular interest to my constituents. For example, I like to think my personal effort in behalf of such projects as Eagle Gorge Dam and Shilshole breakwater has been an influencing factor. But nothing can diminish the credit due to local citizens' groups and individuals who labor long and hard to get the merits of such improvements recognized. In this connection, I am asking congressional approval of the name "Howard Hanson Dam" after the chairman of the local committee which for years worked for a program to stop the periodic floods in the Kent-Auburn Valley south of Seattle. In Bremerton, in my district, is the Puget Sound Naval Base Association. I wish it were possible to name some naval vessels for some members of this organization who have worked with me in civic matters. I am very fortunate to have such friends on the homefront.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude these brief remarks. In doing so, I want to express to friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle my appreciation of being associated with them. We have often personal differences of viewpoint, but we all recognize, I know, that it is our very conflict of opinion and our public debate which makes America a great country and ours a great Government. I have increasingly enjoyed being the Representative in Congress from the First District of Washington State and I look forward to future service with keen satisfaction and pleasure.

What Congress Did

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the August issue of the Farm Journal entitled "What Congress Did," which I believe will be of special interest to our farmers:

WHAT CONGRESS DID

1. It forbade draft officials to railroad farm boys into the draft because we have farm surpluses.
2. Boosted considerably the school lunch, agricultural research, extension budgets, and ACP payments for 1956.
3. Let the REA lend up to 75 percent of its telephone and electric money instead of having to hold 50 percent of it back.
4. Reserved $300 million of foreign aid funds for sale of United States surpluses to "soft currency" countries.
5. Repealed the 1954 Holland amendment that made compliance with acreage allotments a condition for getting ACP payments. This relieves corn growers who want to raise corn for feed.
6. Encouraged cotton exports by relieving exporters from having to replenish their stocks from CCC purchases.
7. Exempted durum wheat States from restrictive quotas.
8. Cut the minimum burley acreage allotment from 0.7 to 0.5 acre and authorized USDA to study putting burley allotments on a poundage basis, to reduce overproduction.
9. Extended the disaster loan program and provided a uniform 3 percent interest rate instead of 3 to 5 percent.
10. Authorized the Interior Department to keep up through 1963 its research program aimed at cheaply converting sea water into sweet water for irrigation and other uses—a great boon, if accomplished, to all coastal areas.

Producers With Largest Quantity of Products Under Loan on the 1954 Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Agricultural Act of 1954, which provided for continued price supports for agricultural products, I included in my speech—page 8997-8998, July 1, 1954—the breakdown by States of producers with the five largest quantities of corn, wheat, and cotton under loan for the 1953 crop.

At this time I would like to include in the RECORD the following list, just prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture at my request, of recipients of such loans on the 1954 crop:

Producers with largest quantity of products under loan on the 1954 crop

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
ALABAMA		
COTTON		
J. B. Hain, Jr., Sardis, Ala	746 bales	$131,425.95
J. C. Moore Mercantile Co., Marion, Ala	441 bales	74,529.43
W. A. Ganguet, Cuba, Ala	188 bales	31,390.54
T. W. Oliver, Route 5, Montgomery, Ala	197 bales	29,113.82
D. C. Davis, Cedar Bluff, Ala	158 bales	28,100.98
ARIZONA		
COTTON		
J. G. Boswell, Litchfield Park, Ariz	1,178 bales	365,646.44
Bing K. Wong Farms, Inc., Marana, Ariz	1,587 bales	251,571.42
L. D. Ulmer, Marana, Ariz	910 bales	144,623.01
Jones Ranch, Eloy, Ariz	821 bales	141,089.87
Santa Cruz Ranch, Marana, Ariz	740 bales	114,949.63
ARKANSAS		
COTTON		
J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes, Ark	3,998 bales	624,754.20
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna, Ark	1,967 bales	358,305.75
Tillar & Co., Tillar, Ark	1,791 bales	271,602.03
Lindsey Mercantile Co., Caldwell, Ark	780 bales	142,810.66
W. M. Smith & Sons, Birdeye, Ark	647 bales	113,307.58
RICE [1]		
Craighead Rice Milling Co., Jonesboro, Ark	95,298 hundredweight	431,853.99
Southern Rice Farms, Inc., Carlisle, Ark	81,545 hundredweight	350,824.89
George Smith, Wayne Fly, etc., DeWitt, Ark	54,579 hundredweight	252,963.05
J. O. Bennett & Sons., Lonoke, Ark	41,221 hundredweight	167,448.95
K. L. and Roy Wixson, Fisher, Ark	22,885 hundredweight	101,149.85
WHEAT [2]		
Wesson Farms, Victoria, Ark	56,805.72 bushels	134,002.12
E. B. Chiles, Jr., Joiner, Ark	15,375.09 bushels	34,601.29
A. J. Lewis, Route 1, Manila, Ark	14,879.17 bushels	33,141.16
H. T. Dillahunty, Hughes, Ark	14,777 bushels	33,101.99
Dr. Porter R. Rodgers, Searcy, Ark	12,723 bushels	29,135.67
CALIFORNIA		
COTTON		
Charles Schwartz Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif	2,435 bales	385,488.77
Giffen, Inc., Box 218, Huron, Calif	1,725 bales	317,253.08
Maricopa Farms, 325 3d Ave., Arvin, Calif	1,635 bales	266,893.84
Buller & Neufeld, Bakersfield, Calif	1,546 bales	248,320.03
Mirosol Co. (Buerkle Bros.), Buttonwillow, Calif.	1,477 bales	233,798.47
RICE [3]		
Fratus Bros., Oroville, Calif	391 hundredweight	2,009.74
Palm Farm, Inc., Buttonwillow, Calif	33,000 hundredweight	153,739.15
Myrna Pottle Gray, Yuba City, Calif	600 hundredweight	2,084.22
WHEAT [4]		
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles, Calif	54,221 bushels	119,183.37
Heilmann Bros., Atascadero, Calif	31,606 bushels	69,959.88
Hammonds Ranch, Inc., Five Points, Calif	27,604 bushels	61,154.86
White Ranch Co., Shandon, Calif	25,029 bushels	55,401.69
The Desert Ranch, Firebaugh, Calif	28,848 bushels	52,653.16
COLORADO		
WHEAT [5]		
Joseph Kejr, Woodrow, Colo	19,562 bushels	43,134.21
Curtis C. James, Burlington, Colo	19,000 bushels	39,520.00
William Stretesky, Julesburg, Colo	17,565 bushels	38,818.65
Smyth, Richards & Smyth, care of Gilbert R. Smyth, Julesburg, Colo.	15,047 bushels	33,253.87
Clayton Farms, Otis, Colo	13,389 bushels	29,188.02
DELAWARE		
CORN [6]		
Hiimer L. Bryon, Lewes, Del	4,236 bushels	7,540.08
Wilson E. Campbell, Dagsboro, Del	3,941 bushels	7,014.98
C. A. Taylor, Harrington, Del	2,693 bushels	4,793.54
Henry I. Short, Georgetown, Del	1,916 bushels	3,410.48
Joseph Schmidt, Middletown, Del	1,750 bushels	3,115.00
WHEAT [7]		
Randall Willin, Seaford, Del	4,865.77 bushels	11,531.87
C. N. Lester, St. Georges, Del	4,196.51 bushels	10,029.66
Allen D. Figgs, Seaford, Del	3,273.55 bushels	7,643.51
Charles B. Moore, Bear, Del	3,041.00 bushels	7,359.22
J. Medford Davis, Sr., Smyrna, Del	2,846.16 bushels	6,528.06
FLORIDA		
COTTON		
Hubert C. Johnson, Baker, Fla	57 bales	$8,296.82
J. J. Sale, Lovett, Fla	36 bales	5,466.28
John R. Johnson, Baker, Fla	28 bales	3,924.30
Richard Finlay, Jay, Fla	11 bales	1,953.69
Broadus Willoughby, Madison, Fla	6 bales	894.10
GEORGIA		
COTTON		
J. G. Brandon, Route 1, Cartersville, Ga	379 bales	64,581.23
W. M. Clemons, Rome, Ga	310 bales	52,250.51
W. H. Lovett, Dubline, Ga	337 bales	52,113.12
J. H. Rowland, Midville, Ga	245 bales	43,606.41
Paul B. Dye, Waynesboro, Ga	230 bales	37,068.76
WHEAT [8]		
Ralph C. Collier, Colbert, Ga	10,170.27 bushels	23,672.15
F. H. Willis, Louisville, Ga	9,734.46 bushels	21,192.62
H. G. Lewis, Davisboro, Ga	5,567 bushels	13,226.73
Marvin Hartley, Davisboro, Ga	5,017 bushels	11,690.22
Gunn Farms, Byron, Ga	5,059 bushels	11,939.24
IDAHO		
WHEAT [9]		
E. C. Hay & Sons, Tekoa, Wash	116,710 bushels	243,642.00
Wagner & Sons, Craigmont, Idaho	89,600 bushels	183,591.00
Roy Green & Sons, Grangeville, Idaho	61,323 bushels	121,530.00
Ira McIntosh & Sons, Lewiston, Idaho	54,149 bushels	109,811.00
Merritt Meacham & Sons, Culdesac, Idaho	48,962 bushels	98,973.00
ILLINOIS		
CORN [10]		
Chas. R. Bartels, St. Marys, Mo	49,806 bushels	82,757.19
Rebecca Lowrie, Mark Allard, agent, Henry, Ill.	45,912 bushels	75,295.68
Coultas Bros., Winchester, Ill	38,422 bushels	61,030.38
Sam Stevenson, Carman, Ill	28,091 bushels	45,505.80
Ben Graff & Dunhams, Inc., Route 4, Elgin, Ill	27,181 bushels	44,848.65
WHEAT [11]		
Valley Farms care of Robert Wietzer, Carrollton, Ill.	25,235.69 bushels	58,380.93
R. W. Shafer & C. C. Losch, Route 1, East Alton, Ill.	14,561 bushels	34,394.80
Loitz Bros., Grant Park, Ill	19,936 bushels	32,695.04
L. L. Cooke, trust care of Chas. T. Meek, Carrollton, Ill.	13,375 bushels	31,411.95
Karl Meisenback, Pearl, Ill	13,227.46 bushels	30,203.33
INDIANA		
CORN [12]		
Emil Savich, Rensselaer, Ind	88,595 bushels	145,148.20
Richard Gumz, North Judson, Ind	79,798 bushels	130,868.72
Bettsma Bros, Hebron, Ind	33,175 bushels	54,407.00
William Rader, Hebron, Ind	24,818 bushels	40,701.52
M. E. Zellers, Kewanna, Ind	24,581 bushels	40,067.03
WHEAT [13]		
James Bower and M. D. Guenther, Evansville, Ind.	27,445 bushels	63,123.50
Capehart Farms, Washington, Ind	9,536 bushels	21,742.08
Gettinger Farms, Sullivan, Ind	8,661 bushels	20,266.80
Emge Packing Co., Fort Branch, Ind	7,868 bushels	18,131.69
B. F. Clark, Lafayette, Ind	7,035 bushels	16,391.55
IOWA		
CORN [14]		
Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt, Iowa	115,566 bushels	179,127.30
C. C. Davis, Box 94, Pasadena, Calif	35,100 bushels	54,054.00
Gus Ostermann & Sons, Ocheyedan, Iowa	33,764 bushels	51,658.92
Ray Van Steenhuyse, Mount Auburn, Iowa	29,998 bushels	47,612.76
Varro E. Tyler (trustee for Martha P. Cresap), Nebraska City, Nebr.	28,165 bushels	44,782.35
WHEAT [15]		
M. M. Payne, Hamburg, Iowa	16,218.67 bushels	39,741.16
Varro E. Tyler (trustee for Martha P. Cresap), Nebraska City, Nebr.	13,748 bushels	33,305.79
S. G. Lodwick, Wever, Iowa	7,479.36 bushels	17,982.70
Vern Meek and J. L. Meek, Athelston, Iowa	4,665.33 bushels	11,395.74
Geo. Kellogg Estate, Missouri Valley, Iowa	5,176.83 bushels	11,302.83

[1] Estimated State average per rice loan, $6,873.88.
[2] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $3,615.
[3] 3 loans only, all redeemed.
[4] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $8,516.
[5] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,500.
[6] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,059.33.
[7] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,205.19.
[8] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,128.
[9] Estimated State average per wheat loans, $2,962.
[10] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,335.84.
[11] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $571.66.
[12] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,646.68.
[13] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,288.25.
[14] Estimated State average for corn loan, $1,909.41.
[15] Estimated State average for wheat loan, $1,218.21.

Producers with largest quantity of products under loan on the 1954 crop—Continued

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
KANSAS		
WHEAT [16]		
Garvey Farms, Colby, Kans.	61,365.82 bushels	$146,820.24
Iron H. Mueller, Bird City, Kans.	30,802.33 bushels	65,015.80
H. A. Hills, Colby, Kans.	25,389 bushels	55,292.46
C. Wilbur White, Goodland, Kans.	22,522 bushels	48,872.74
W. D. Ferguson, Colby, Kans.	17,405.33 bushels	41,531.52
CORN [17]		
A. L. Broderick, Denton, Kans.	16,008 bushels	25,612.80
Walter Kemig, Atchison, Kans.	15,924 bushels	25,478.40
Chas., Dean & Edw. H. Reese, Hiawatha, Kans.	12,969 bushels	20,750.40
John F. Brant, Robinson, Kans.	11,572 bushels	18,515.20
V. P. Rush, Bendena, Kans.	10,245.50 bushels	16,392.80
KENTUCKY		
CORN [18]		
S. S. Wathen, 1531 Frederica St., Owensboro, Ky.	20,522 bushels	34,682.18
Bower Bros., a partnership, 421 Walnut St., Evansville, Ind.	16,365 bushels	27,657.86
Jas. Wilson & Paul Harmond, Wickliffe, Ky.; 14 Northwest 3d St., Evansville, Ind.	15,857 bushels	27,115.47
Joseph E. King, Route 1, Henderson, Ky.	15,081 bushels	25,486.89
Grace Townsend, Nebo, Ky.	12,371 bushels	21,278.12
WHEAT [19]		
E. G. LaMotte, Route 1, Hopkinsville, Ky.	7,811 bushels	17,581.69
J. W. Hancock & Son, Morganfield, Ky.	5,738 bushels	11,980.55
Essel Mitchell & Sons, Dixon, Ky.	4,925 bushels	11,327.50
Thurmond & Gee, 1737 South Main, Hopkinsville, Ky.	4,626 bushesl	10,437.66
Mrs. Nannie Mae Dawson, Almstead, Ky.	4,545 bushels	9,227.55
LOUISIANA		
RICE [20]		
Mayo Romero, New Iberia, La.	12,567 hundredweight	61,546.43
J. M. Petit Jean, Lake Arthur, La.	15,316 hundredweight	85,310.12
Welsh Canal, Welsh, La.	15,489 hundredweight	77,511.23
Louisiana Irrigation & Mill Co., Crowley, La.	104,992 hundredweight	486,725.77
Herskel B. Wilder, Crowley, La.	12,156 hundredweight	60,911.06
COTTON		
Harriss & Son, Vidalia, La.	548 bales	92,280.25
George B. Franklin, Holly Ridge, La.	383 bales	68,771.90
Jesse Anderson, Tallulah, La.	282 bales	50,481.15
M. P. Utz Estate, Tallulah, La.	214 bales	37,738.63
Watson, McDonald, Jr., Delta, La.	181 bales	29,994.56
MARYLAND		
CORN [21]		
R. T. White, Gaithersburg, Md.	4,589 bushels	8,168.42
Elmer W. Bryan, Trappe, Md.	4,308 bushels	7,668.24
Marvin D. Tyndall, Newark, Md.	4,012 bushels	7,141.36
P. E. Jenkins, Easton, Md.	3,619 bushels	6,441.82
Roland Mullinix, Woodbine, Md.	3,321 bushels	4,308.10
WHEAT [22]		
B. F. Shriver Co., Westminster, Md.	13,905 bushels	33,957.16
A. W. Feeser Co., Inc., Westminster, Md.	10,083 bushels	23,810.71
R. T. White, Gaithersburg, Md.	8,561 bushels	19,685.06
Thomas Eliason, Chestertown, Md.	6,144 bushels	13,942.27
Malkus Bros., Cambridge, Md.	5,356 bushels	12,802.56
MICHIGAN		
CORN [23]		
Mueller Bros., Britton, Mich.	27,229 bushels	45,744.72
Bainbridge, Inc., Marcellus, Mich.	12,209 bushels	20,144.85
Arthur Segerdahl, Schoolcraft, Mich.	11,922 bushels	19,790.52
Foster Mitchell, Breckenridge, Mich.	10,351 bushels	17,389.68
Palmer Becbe, Saginaw, Mich.	8,263 bushels	13,633.95
WHEAT [24]		
Walot Farms, St. Charles, Mich.	12,289.82 bushels	30,227.81
Richard Price, Saginaw, Mich.	11,194.91 bushels	26,969.19
I. J. and B. L. Cousino, Erie, Mich.	10,013 bushels	22,658.19
Gerald Wright, Vandalia, Mich.	8,168 bushels	18,623.04
Claude Wood, Brown City, Mich.	7,920.10 bushels	17,978.62

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
MINNESOTA		
CORN [25]		
John C. Boote, Worthington, Minn.	21,502 bushels	$32,683.04
Parker D. Sanders, Redwood Falls, Minn.	19,276 bushels	29,492.28
Lee Ruebel, Olivia, Minn.	18,678 bushels	28,764.12
Henry Walser, Minnesota Lake, Minn.	16,245 bushels	25,017.30
Joseph Kreps, Rose Creek, Minn.	15,548 bushels	23,943.92
WHEAT [26]		
Frank Kiene Estate, Kennedy, Minn.	37,428 bushels	82,621.72
Eli Kiene, Kennedy, Minn.	19,601 bushels	43,906.24
Glidden Grain Farms, Hallock, Minn.	7,753 bushels	17,319.12
Victor Younggren, Hallock, Minn.	7,043 bushels	15,591.60
Duane & Henry Lindberg & Ronald Larson, Kennedy, Minn.	6,711 bushels	15,099.75
MISSISSIPPI		
COTTON		
Delta and Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss.	7,554 bales	1,292,472.25
Roy Flowers, Mattson, Miss.	1,385 bales	224,688.92
C. P. Owen, Robinsonville, Miss.	1,211 bales	218,309.05
R. Hancock, Bentonia, Miss.	1,068 bales	188,022.25
D. Seligman, Shaw, Miss.	973 bales	165,683.82
RICE [27]		
J. K. and C. E. Greer, Hollandale, Miss.	33,861 hundredweight	177,624.03
Heger Bros., Shaw, Miss.	22,612 hundredweight	121,977.36
R. T. Wade and B. F. Simmons, Minter City, Miss.	20,668 hundredweight	105,264.31
J. C. O'Neal, Cleveland, Miss.	19,960 hundredweight	99,075.11
J. C. Cherry, Sledge, Miss.	22,256 hundredweight	97,923.16
MISSOURI		
COTTON		
Walter Richardson, Marston, Mo.	118 bales	20,327.16
U. S. Holiman and W. M. Fortner, Gideon, Mo.	do	19,376.00
Julian Streeter, Painton, Mo.	94 bales	14,254.22
C. D. Heaton, Poplar Bluff, Mo.	50 bales	8,174.29
John R. Hutchison, Caruthersville, Mo.	39 bales	6,507.85
RICE [28]		
Hoyt Bros., Leachville, Ark.	9,615 hundredweight	49,901.85
Dirl Bagby, Dexter, Mo.	1,135 hundredweight	45,202.10
Starnes & Highfill, Parma, Mo.	7,511.70 hundredweight.	31,098.44
A. T. Earls Gin Co., Bragg City, Mo.	10,702 hundredweight	28,575.97
Manuel B. Ainley, Jr., Corning, Ark.	4,395 hundredweight	22,618.95
CORN [29]		
Saline County Farms, Marshall, Mo.	37,316 bushels	61,571.40
The Albert Painton Co., Inc., Painton, Mo.	27,154 bushels	45,618.72
N. H. Bruckerhoff, St. Marys, Mo.	19,772 bushels	33,216.96
Esther R. Giffin and Donald Hurst, Tarkio, Mo.	19,354 bushels	30,772.86
Sonnenmoser Bros., Rushville, Mo.	14,270 bushels	23,084.20
WHEAT [30]		
W. D. Earnst, Sarcoxie, Mo.	18,989 bushels	44,244.37
Carl Donath, Palmyra, Mo.	16,681 bushels	37,031.82
Parretta Bros., Kansas City, Mo.	15,210.17 bushels	34,685.02
G. E. Irvin, Gage, Okla.	12,749 bushels	30,087.64
Wise Bros., Stephens, Mo.	13,118.03 bushels	30,883.81
MONTANA		
WHEAT [31]		
Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont.	208,881 bushels	430,691.00
H. B. and Allen Kolstad, Chester, Mont.	109,060 bushels	224,003.00
Bill Frazer and H. B. Kolstad, Chester, Mont.	56,498 bushels	115,649.00
McNutt Bros. (operate farm in Liberty County, Mont.), Eugene, Oreg.	48,640 bushels	100,714.00
Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin, Mont.	35,799 bushels	73,522
NEBRASKA		
CORN [32]		
M. B. & Q. Farms, Ralph I. Brown, manager, Fremont, Nebr.	37,036 bushels	58,146.52
Ernest Hundahl, Tekamah, Nebr.	26,161 bushels	41,072.77
Hynes Ranch, Herman, Nebr.	17,481 bushels	27,619.98
P. F. Verzani, Ponca, Nebr.	17,680 bushels	27,355.40
E. C. Weller, Atkinson, Nebr.	16,000 bushels	24,960.00

[16] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,759.
[17] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,672.
[18] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,735.88.
[19] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,216.94.
[20] Estimated State average per rice loan, $5,107.43.
[21] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,386.
[22] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,128.70.
[23] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,272.76.
[24] Estimate State average per wheat loan, $1,108.35.
[25] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,572.
[26] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,200
[27] Estimated State average per rice loan, $9,706.
[28] Estimated State average per rice loan, $7,040.83.
[29] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,396.44.
[30] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,186.04.
[31] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $4,926.32.
[32] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,045.

Producers with largest quantity of products under loan on the 1954 crop—Continued

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
NEBRASKA—Continued		
WHEAT [33]		
Ramey C. Whitney, Chappell, Nebr	40,426 bushels	$100,130.94
Cleo Harmon, Adams County, Nebr	42,671 bushels	96,521.91
Morrison & Quick, Hastings, Nebr	41,499 bushels	89,812.72
Hill Construction Co., Mankato, Kans	26,516 bushels	60,456.48
Grace Land & Cattle Co., Lewellen, Nebr	25,900 bushels	50,907.00
NEW JERSEY		
CORN [34]		
Hugh Oakley, Freehold, N. J	5,977 bushels	8,128.72
Cspregi & Hendrickson, Freehold, N. J	5,449 bushels	7,410.64
Roland Parenteau, Freehold, N. J	5,400 bushels	7,344.00
Gordon H. Hurff, Swedesboro, N. J	5,350 bushels	9,737.00
Charles Wikoff, Jr., Englishtown, N. J	5,176 bushels	7,039.36
WHEAT [35]		
William T. Smith, Freehold, N. J	9,614 bushels	23,169.74
William J. Clayton & Son, Freehold, N. J	9,317 bushels	22,433.97
Henry D. Suydam, Hightstown, N. J	8,235 bushels	20,093.40
E. R. Gordon, Trenton, N. J	7,203.33 bushels	17,025.99
Cross Bros., Holmdel, N. J	5,587 bushels	13,408.80
NEW MEXICO		
COTTON		
Moutray Bros., Artesia, N. Mex	1,308 bales	240,754.05
Hayner Ranch, Las Cruces, N. Mex	1,449 bales	235,236.36
Hal Bogle, Dexter, N. Mex	792 bales	145,415.24
Richins Farms, Animas, N. Mex	780 bales	134,947.25
Thigpen & Funk, Lake Arthur, N. Mex	735 bales	126,363.81
WHEAT [36]		
Marvin L. Smith, Clovis, N. Mex	12,991.75 bushels	27,412.59
Skarda Bros., Clovis, N. Mex	8,748 bushels	18,020.88
G. H. Simms and I. D. Johnson, Clovis, N. Mex.	8,261 bushels	17,017.66
J. M. Ross, Rogers, N. Mex	6,375 bushels	14,088.75
Leon Beaver, Clovis, N. Mex	6,152 bushels	12,673.12
NEW YORK		
WHEAT [37]		
L. L. Lamb & Sons, Hamilton, N. Y	9,135.33 bushels	22,877.66
Elbert Torrey Estate, Stafford, N. Y	6,568 bushels	15,720.91
Norman Demler, Niagara Falls, N. Y	6,233.99 bushels	14,898.64
Bush Sales & Service, Mount Morris, N. Y	6,016 bushels	15,045.04
Everett Blazey, Canandaigua, N. Y	5,723 bushels	13,677.97
NORTH CAROLINA		
COTTON		
Long Bros., Garysburg, N. C	241 bales	42,451.14
T. B. Upchurch, Raeford, N. C	241 bales	39,043.90
Mrs. Agnes U. Johnson, Raeford, N. C	185 bales	30,155.89
A. D. Gibson Store, Laurel Hill, N. C	124 bales	21,149.25
H. R. Currie, Jackson Springs, N. C	134 bales	20,366.21
CORN [38]		
J. C. Small, Jr., Elizabeth City, N. C	6,119 bushels	10,891.82
N. C. Larabee, Elizabeth City, N. C	4,566 bushels	8,127.48
Franklin Wilson, Rocky Mount, N. C	3,867 bushels	6,921.93
Robert S. Chappell, Jr., Elizabeth City, N. C	3,722 bushels	6,625.16
C. G. Westerbeck, Pinetown, N. C	3,683 bushels	6,555.74
WHEAT [39]		
John Crowder, Lattimore, N. C	4,887 bushels	11,265.44
A. M. Waddell, Rockingham, N. C	4,758 bushels	11,333.32
C. E. Secrest, Monroe, N. C	4,677 bushels	10,934.19
S. P. Jackson, Kinston, N. C	4,586.59 bushels	10,427.17
Dockery Farms, Rockingham, N. C	4,353 bushels	9,547.38
NORTH DAKOTA		
CORN [40]		
Walter Loff, Colfax, N. Dak	7,420 bushels	11,130.00
Neil McDougall, Morreton, N. Dak	5,414 bushesl	8,121.00
Russell Mead, Wyndmere, N. Dak	4,401 bushels	6,601.50
Gerald Olson, Wahpeton, N. Dak	4,089 bushels	6,133.50
Dotzenrod Bros., Wyndmere, N. Dak	3,923 bushels	5,884.50
WHEAT [41]		
The Witteman Co., Mohall, N. Dak	36,734 bushels	79,712.78
Otto Engen, Minot, N. Dak	21,083 bushels	42,998.26
Peter A. Nygaard, Alexander, N. Dak	15,886 bushels	33,801.88
Leo Mondry, Ardoch, N. Dak	15,072 bushels	32,419.86
Weyrauch Bros., Ray, N. Dak	13,518 bushels	29,022.93
OHIO		
CORN [42]		
Walton & Case Farms, Prospect, Ohio	46,570 bushels	$77,771.90
Chaswil Farm, Sabina, Ohio	37,732 bushels	62,635.30
Dunlap Co., Williamsport, Ohio	31,832 bushels	53,160.00
Landen Farms, Foster, Ohio	27,825 bushels	46,189.50
Dale Roe, Rudolph, Ohio	22,604 bushels	37,749.00
WHEAT [43]		
Orleton Farms, London, Ohio	43,522 bushels	72,681.74
Walton & Case Farms, Prospect, Ohio	21,719.33 bushels	49,302.88
J. J. Beck & Sons, Napoleon, Ohio	7,109.33 bushels	17,248.66
D. G. Wing, Mechanicsburg, Ohio	7,223.40 bushels	16,758.04
Heckert Bros., Bucyrus, Ohio	7,195.70 bushels	15,552.34
OKLAHOMA		
COTTON		
Wayne Winsett, Altus, Okla	520 bales	87,728.86
Clark T. McWhorter, Blair, Okla	232 bales	36,928.17
R. P. Roudebush, Humphreys, Okla	139 bales	23,468.69
S. H. Vineyard & Son, Altus, Okla	124 bales	20,409.26
E. R. Fowler, Roosevelt, Okla	123 bales	19,679.50
WHEAT [44]		
Margaret and Lula Petree, El Reno, Okla	17,009.83 bushels	36,060.84
F. W. Zaloudek, Kremlin, Okla	24,033.67 bushels	50,951.38
E. B. Mitchell & Sons, Enid, Okla	15,315.66 bushels	33,464.29
Herb Coulter, Meno, Okla	15,087.17 bushels	34,273.91
Hugh L. Akin, Frederick, Okla	18,149.57 bushels	38,260.54
OREGON		
WHEAT [45]		
Wilcox Investment Co., Arlington, Oreg	77,730.02 bushels	185,713.26
Marion T. Weatherford, Arlington, Oreg	65,760.65 bushels	154,823.69
E. M. Hulden, Arlington, Oreg	62,637.48 bushels	151,434.83
Harold Barnett, Pendleton, Oreg	53,518.07 bushels	112,167.88
Loyd E. Smith & Sons, Mayville, Oreg	47,000.04 bushels	103,684.32
PENNSYLVANIA		
CORN [46]		
H. B. Kreider, Annville, Pa	12,692 bushels	22,718.68
York Stone & Supply, York, Pa	7,175 bushels	12,843.25
Charles H. Schriver, York, Pa	6,800 bushels	12,172.00
B. J. Forney, Millersburg, Pa	5,796 bushels	10,374.84
A. B. and W. S. Haines, Landsdale, Pa	4,551 bushels	8,146.29
WHEAT [47]		
E. O. Mastin, Quakerstown, Pa	8,195 bushels	18,753.45
Samuel Firebaugh, New Freedom, Pa	7,393.33 bushels	18,269.24
J. L. Miller, York, Pa	5,871 bushels	14,187.31
W. E. Bittinger, Hanover, Pa	5,258.01 bushels	12,257.09
Hykes Hagy & Son, Harrisburg, Pa	4,870.11 bushels	11,196.99
SOUTH CAROLINA		
COTTON		
Frank B. Rogers, Bennettsville, S. C	600 bales	97,159.33
McGee Bros., Starr, S. C	482 bales	78,483.37
Cokers Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, S. C	462 bales	73,088.31
P. A. Wallace, Wallace, S. C	378 bales	61,018.84
J. E. Mayes, Mayesville, S. C	360 bales	57,109.18
WHEAT [48]		
R. V. Segars, Oswego, S. C	8,085 bushels	19,323.15
J. V. Spigener, Allendale, S. C	7,026.20 bushels	15,182.03
W. L. Long, Estill, S. C	4,935.50 bushels	10,660.68
Bruce Harter, Fairfax, S. C	3,846 bushels	8,307.36
E. S. Willis, Florence, S. C	3,621.66 bushels	8,474.68
SOUTH DAKOTA		
CORN [49]		
Bones Hereford Ranch, Parker, S. Dak	20,091 bushels	30,136.50
Milton Ayers, Madison, S. Dak	16,019 bushels	24,028.50
Jamesville Colony, Utica, S. Dak	15,603 bushels	23,500.53
Elmer Bottolfson Estate, Esther Bottolfson, administratrix, Vermillion, S. Dak.	15,097 bushels	22,796.47
Otto J. Hafner, Mitchell, S. Dak Richard Naasz, Alexandria, S. Dak	12,714 bushels	19,071.00
WHEAT [50]		
J. E. Cheek, Pierre, S. Dak	49,089 bushels	110,941.14
W. J. Asmussen, Agar, S. Dak	28,346 bushels	61,512.31
Orville Schwarting, Batesland, S. Dak	26,039 bushels	28,874.10
Harold Kuckartz, Denver, Colo	14,976 bushels	33,845.76
William Letellier, Belvedere, S. Dak	14,642 bushels	32,639.24

[33] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,540.
[34] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,713.
[35] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,300.
[36] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,791.33.
[37] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,425.
[38] Estimated State average per corn loan, $2,184.
[39] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $805.
[40] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,418.
[41] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,410.
[42] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,400.
[43] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $800.
[44] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,003.38.
[45] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $5,300.
[46] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,500.
[47] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,060.
[48] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,439.
[49] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,600.
[50] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,000.

Producers with largest quantity of products under loan on the 1954 crop—Continued

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
TENNESSEE		
CORN [51]		
Johnson & Teeter, Guthrie, Ky	5,524.34 bushels	$9,612.35
J. Kenneth Stackpole, Guthrie, Ky	1,567.36 bushels	2,742.88
R. D. Campbell, Stevenson, Ala	1,899.20 bushels	2,563.92
John L. Bailey, Dresden, Tenn	1,495.03 bushels	2,556.50
S. D. Dunbar, Woodlawn, Tenn	1,426.82 bushels	2,482.67
COTTON		
N. J. Henderson, Ripley, Tenn	146 bales	25,093.24
I. R. Sanders, Somerville, Tenn	55 bales	9,898.34
R. L. Bond, Denmark, Tenn	39 bales	6,770.54
Lynn Hawkins, Bells, Tenn	36 bales	6,076.36
Mrs. E. H. Buford, Stanton, Tenn	34 bales	6,030.99
RICE [52]		
Norman Burks, Dyersburg, Tenn	3,742 hundredweight	17,281.76
O. P. Piper, Collierville, Tenn	1,474 hundredweight	7,163.64
WHEAT [53]		
G. S. Moore & Son, Springfield, Tenn	6,003.67 bushels	12,182.42
B. E. Glass, Jr., Burlison, Tenn	5,283 bushels	12,072.86
H. A. Dewberry and Jim S. Brock, Lawrenceburg, Tenn.	5,476.14 bushels	11,198.69
Dale Glover, Obion, Tenn	4,753.32 bushels	10,932.63
Johnson & Teeter, Guthrie, Ky	5,037.33 bushels	10,779.88
TEXAS		
COTTON		
Chandler Co., Saragosa, Tex	3,945 bales	814,801.73
Buchanan Farms, Pecos, Tex	2,298 bales	449,661.96
Lowe Bros., Midland, Tex	2,186 bales	385,273.45
A. J. Hoelscher, Pecos, Tex	1,171 bales	239,176.38
C. & L. Ranch, Dell City, Tex	1,209 bales	220,369.26
RICE [54]		
Peltier Bros., Danbury, Tex	36,949 hundredweight	210,675.60
Koop Bros., Edna, Tex	36,603 hundredweight	200,656.42
Gulf Coast Rice Farms, Inc., Bay City, Tex	36,662 hundredweight	200,451.50
R. E. Smith, Houston, Tex	37,606 hundredweight	192,520.50
Blue Creek Rice Farm, El Campo, Tex	34,482 hundredweight	191,731.86
WHEAT [55]		
Waggoner Estate, Vernon, Tex	107,673.97 bushels	244,783.39
Perrin Bros., Hereford, Tex	47,555.80 bushels	103,098.51
Delmar Durett, Amarillo, Tex	41,955.61 bushels	96,879.74
J. R. Durrett, Amarillo, Tex	37,183.72 bushels	79,923.58
Fred Zimmerman, Jr., Floydada, Tex	28,032.65 bushels	71,311.59
UTAH		
WHEAT [56]		
Lee's Ranch, Brigham City, Utah	20,437 bushels	38,831.08
Lawrence G. Whitney, Tremonton, Utah	14,598 bushels	29,396.00
Potato Marketing Co., Milford, Utah	10,504 bushels	21,412.76
A. D. Rich, Tremonton, Utah	10,158 bushels	20,316.00
Howard Glenn & Sons, Tremonton, Utah	9,387 bushels	18,774.00
VIRGINIA		
CORN [57]		
W. E. Hudgins, Jr., Fentress, Va	7,554.93 bushels	13,502.75
Hall Bros., Norfolk, Va	7,276.50 bushels	12,952.17
R. C. Etheridge, Back Bay, Va	6,350.07 bushels	11,366.63
G. F. and H. T. Nettles, Portsmouth, Va	4,695.14 bushels	8,404.30
J. B. and Roger Sawyer, Lynnhaven, Va	4,221.23 bushels	7,556.00
VIRGINIA—Continued		
WHEAT [58]		
Taylor & Caldwell, Inc., Walkerton, Va	7,333.85 bushels	$17,444.25
Evelynton Plantation, Charles City, Va	6,884.87 bushels	15,700.09
Brandon Farms, Spring Grove, Va	6,559.30 bushels	14,686.76
Paul Kreynus & Sons, Tunstall, Va	6,282.81 bushels	14,335.69
Adolph Hula, Charles City, Va	6,280.17 bushels	14,228.51
COTTON		
Allen J. Harris, Drewryville, Va	14 bales	2,089.20
Robert M. Owen, Emporia, Va	6 bales	946.05
William F. Ferguson, Emporia, Va	5 bales	886.70
W. V. Rawlings, Capron, Va	6 bales	879.28
H. E. Outland, Norfolk, Va	4 bales	608.82
WASHINGTON		
WHEAT [59]		
Broughton Land Co., Dayton, Wash	136,969.39 bushels	298,308.08
Grote Farms Inc., Walla Walla, Wash	122,281.15 bushels	286,830.31
R. H. Phillips, Lind, Wash	111,969.49 bushels	208,830.53
Vollmer & Bayne, Prosser, Wash	101,784.17 bushels	226,724.68
Horrigan Farms, Prosser, Wash	97,104.17 bushels	219,221.93
WEST VIRGINIA		
CORN [60]		
John C. Davis, Glennwood, W. Va	4,894 bushels	6,557.96
Andrew McCausland, Pliney, W. Va	3,316 bushels	4,443.66
Carroll Elliott, St. Marys, W. Va	3,210 bushels	4,301.40
William Dale McClure, Williamstown, W. Va	2,739 bushels	3,670.26
D. H. Corbin and Norman Ingram, St. Marys, W. Va.	2,130 bushels	2,854.20
WHEAT [61]		
Oliveboy Farms, Charles Town, W. Va	1,789 bushels	4,132.59
C. L. Nicodemus, Charles Town, W. Va	1,318 bushels	3,000.71
John S. Rissler, Charles Town, W. Va	1,104 bushels	2,512.40
Bonney Youngblood, Harpers Ferry, W. Va	948 bushels	2,159.40
H. A. Kimble, Upper Tract, W. Va	948 bushels	2,158.53
WISCONSIN		
CORN [62]		
Earl Putney, Brodhead, Wis	12,195 bushels	19,999.80
Orrin House, Prescott, Wis	11,113 bushels	17,780.80
Jerome Blaska and J. M. Blaska, Sun Prairie, Wis.	10,489.3 bushels	17,097.64
Batz Seed Farms, Sun Prairie, Wis	9,087 bushels	14,812.10
August Maier, Route 2, Baraboo, Wis	7,900 bushels	12,798.00
WHEAT [63]		
Kichlbauch, Bros., Sturtevant, Wis	3,811 bushels	9,022.62
Leo Hribar, Sr., Caledonia, Wis	2,210 bushels	5,270.80
Milo Hagan, Rio, Wis	1,838 bushels	4,135.50
Charles Kuiper and Henry Kuiper, Union Grove, Wis.	1,632 bushels	3,895.98
Arthur Hribar, Caledonia, Wis	1,636 bushels	3,844.60
WYOMING		
WHEAT [64]		
T. W. Poage, Lost Springs, Wyo	13,331 bushels	28,128.41
Jacob Goertz, Slater, Wyo	7,837 bushels	17,056.86
W. T. Young, Pine Bluffs, Wyo	7,514 bushels	16,380.52
E. C. Lund, Cokeville, Wyo	7,453 bushels	14,610.21
Morris Hitt, Sr., LaGrange, Wyo	7,116 bushels	14,659.51

[51] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,672.21.
[52] Rice loans were made to only two producers in Tennessee. Estimated State average per rice loan, $12,222.70.
[53] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $910.
[54] Estimated State average per rice loan, $14,775.17.
[55] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,192.79.
[56] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,654.
[57] Estimated State average per corn loan, $3,434.03.
[58] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $930.39.
[59] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $8,500.
[60] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,786.
[61] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,188.
[62] Estimated State average per corn loan, $1,356.11.
[63] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $1,175.
[64] Estimated State average per wheat loan, $2,240.

George Meany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure I insert in the RECORD an article from the August issue of Sign magazine, from the pen of Victor Riesel, captioned "One-Man Task Force." This article forcibly treats with the fearless Christian leadership of the president of the American Federation of Labor, George Meany.

The article follows:

ONE-MAN TASK FORCE—AT THE WORLD CONGRESS OF LABOR AMERICAN DELEGATES STOOD UP TO SOCIALIST SNOBS OF FOREIGN LABOR—MR. MEANY LED THE ATTACK

(By Victor Riesel)

For several hours in the early morning of May 19 the Soviet secret police had its chance to put its hands on a one-man American task force who has done the enemies of our land as much harm as anyone since Sergeant York and Dwight D. Eisenhower were soldiers in the ranks.

That one-man task force was George Meany, president of the AFL, soon to lead America's 15 million unionized working people when the AFL and the CIO merge next December 5.

In the early hours of May 19, Meany and six others in his party were driving through the Russian zone of Austria as swiftly as the night and fatigue would permit them to get from the German border to Vienna. They had been driving since 3:30 p. m. the day before. At that time they had left the

Zurich Airport by the only transportation available—a crowded, rented car. Their transatlantic ship had been delayed. They had missed their reserved airline connections. A chartered plane would have been extraordinarily costly for the AFL, which does not have the money of some of its ebullient affiliates.

The only scheduled plane for Vienna was solidly booked. Several Americans on it offered Meany their seats. But, as he put it, he had come with his people all the way from the States. He would not leave them now. He would not ride in comfort and leave the others stranded. He rented a car, disregarding the fact that he had no "gray card" required by the Soviets for passage through their zone.

For almost 17 hours they drove, through Switzerland, Germany, and finally the Soviet check points. And George Meany and his people got to Vienna for the early preconference parleys which preceded the Fourth World Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

In the days that followed that grueling ride, Meany slowly, diplomatically, but tenaciously shifted the leadership of world labor from the pipe-smoking, knighted, British union chiefs to the cigar-chewing Americans.

Never again will the Socialists of Britain, the Social Democrats of Germany, the hyperthyroid left wing neo-Communist Socialists of Japan, or the down-the-nose-looking, successful Scandinavian labor chiefs view American labor leaders as just money bags with hair grown over.

It would not be fair—and George Meany would be the first to say so—to infer that Meany accomplished all this by himself. That could not be done. There were 20 other American labor chiefs hammering out policy and lobbying with foreign delegates. But there was no doubt Meany was their leader and symbolized their weariness with the endless verbiage and outmoded slogans of Europe's not overly successful, Socialist unionists.

Regardless of differences you've had with this bloc of American labor chiefs, or with Meany himself, your heart would be a dead one indeed if you were not excited by the Americans' pragmatism, their utter refusal to stand for nonsense, the disdain for the class struggle sloganeering, the unwillingness to compromise with neutralism, the Russians, or any other dictatorship.

They saw this world congress of labor for what it really was. True, it represented 54 million unionists in 79 free nations. But, like the Emperor in the ancient fable, it lacked clothing. Seen stark naked, it was a good show in the big hall of the Viennese Konzerthaus, just up the street from Stalinplatz and the four-power Commandatura. It was colorful with its knighted Englishmen; its fiery Latin Americans (especially the Cuban who wanted to drop the big bomb anywhere, soon); its Nemro delegate from Sierre Leonoe, replete in sari, and its Indians in leggings.

But it was heavy with that old Socialist hangover of anticlericalism. It was freighted with intellectual snobbery and snide laughter for Americans. It was loaded with free loaders who had tied themselves to sinecures in the ICFTU. It was veering dangerously toward an appeasing neutralism. The Germans were and still are opposed to rearmament. It was filled with friends of Dictator Tito.

And it was moribund.

It was fighting a powder puff cold war against a powerful Soviet espionage and propaganda network in the rival World Federation of Trade Unions, which is headquartered just a short taxi ride from the Americanized Hotel Bristol in Vienna.

The American delegation, with Meany in the lead, was not going to play the Patsy for the Socialist snobs of foreign labor. That's a harsh phrase, but accurate reporting demands that it be so described.

The anticlericalism, which found its way into several speeches, was directed against the Christian Trade Unions of Germany. This was soon handled quietly, behind the scenes.

The intellectual snobbery was handled by Meany—both subtly and bluntly. The subtle touch came when I found the musicians' Jimmie Petrillo thumbing through a manuscript in his front-row seat. I asked him what secret document he had that I could steal. He laughed and retorted:

"Meany wants me to make a speech, so I dug into my trunk. Lucky I had this one around for such an emergency."

It was my turn to snicker. But nobody laughed after Jimmy had swung into his talk to the delegates from around the globe. Jimmy clowed a bit. But then Jimmie quit clowning, as he can.

"My visit to Vienna is, in a sense, a pilgrimage to a shrine," he said.

"To me and to the 252,000 members of the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada, this city has a very special meaning. Much of the finest music the world has ever known was born here of the genius of Hayden, Mozart, Beethoven, and the tragic Schubert."

And so on went Jimmie, leaving most of his listeners away out in the cultural bleachers. America is rebuilding the Viennese Opera, he pointed out. And this they understood, for they could see the scaffolding outside the Hotel Bristol.

"For us there is a deep satisfaction that the United States—the richest and most generous of nations—was the first to help restore music and the cultural arts in Europe," Petrillo said. "We of the Western World have long been the target of Communist propaganda which describes us as money grubbers, a materialistic nation with no interest in the arts. Our ready assistance to other nations in building their cultural outlets goes far to disprove their charge."

There were those among the Americans who were a little embarrassed by the thought of a speech on music at this august gathering. But the delegates listened and they applauded well.

Petrillo spoke at the request of George Meany. It may not have convinced the British or the German laborites that we can hum anything more than Rock and Roll and Davy Crockett, but it had its impact on many a delegate.

Later I walked back to the headquarters hotel with Jimmie Petrillo, resplendent in a big white and black checked cap.

"I hated to face that crowd, but I'd read that speech to those Russian soldiers, if Meany wanted it."

I have never heard a tough labor leader talk that way of an AFL chief in all my years on this beat.

But there were blunter moments.

By the time Meany got up to make his first speech, the British had said over and over again in private talks that this was not the moment to rock the boat or annoy those who would soon be meeting at the summit. The Russians might take umbrage. They might not come to the summit if nasty things were said in Vienna. Meany and the rest of the American labor delegation listened.

Then early on the opening day of the world congress Meany arose—and laid it on the line.

"Remember—and this applies to all countries—without first defeating Communist infiltration and subversion at home you can never stop Communist invasion and slavery from abroad. * * * Yes, it is only from positions of strength that the forces of peace and freedom can advance their cause. Never can the cause of human liberty and world peace be served by appeasing aggression or retreating before imperialism—whether it be the new, the Soviet, brand which in reality is not new but as old as tyranny itself—or any other type of colonial exploitation and oppression.

"When we of American labor say we are for freedom, it is not a matter of speaking for the record. The only record we know, the only record that counts, is the record of action, the record of deeds and not demagogy. To us freedom is the most serious matter of all. Without freedom, there can be no free trade unions in any country. We talk and work for freedom because we believe in it and are ready to fight for it."

A few days later, the pussyfooters in the World Labor Congress were still not ready to whip the organization into a fighting outfit. Meany was at his seat in the front row. He had his translating earphones on. Suddenly they came off. The cigar tilted at an angry angle.

He asked for the floor. Meany put it on the line. No accord between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union would soften labor's hostility toward the Soviet slave regime, he warned.

He lashed out at the heads of the western states. He wanted no world half slave and half free. The Communist and the democratic system could not coexist, he warned, no matter what arrangements the heads of states might feel it necessary to make to prevent war.

The men of Moscow are determined to destroy free labor, he charged.

The neutralist delegations from European, Indian, Japanese, and African unions listened hard. Later some of them changed their positions. The British shifted, too. At first they had contended that Meany and the other Americans wanted to change the structure of the ICFTU leadership so that American money would be required—and that would give the Americans control of the world congress of labor.

But they changed their minds and left only the German Socialists of the powerful delegations muttering that the Americans wanted to take over.

Meany demanded that the ICFTU get off its swivel chairs and crusade against communism. He left little doubt that the organization's secretary, J. H. Oldenbroek of the Netherlands, was a bureaucrat who couldn't provide any more inspiration than a sewing circle discussion of silk gauze curtain fashions on the modern window.

Meany wanted action. The American delegation wanted action. The Communist world has crept over one-third of the earth's land mass. Its bayonets encircle more than 1 billion of the world's 2,500,000,000 people. Its money is subverting unions everywhere. Here is the congress of free labor and nothing is being done.

There were secret meetings all over the place. When they were over, the ICFTU high command had decided that it will have a director of organization from now on. He will have three assistants. Their assignment will be to beat the Communist global apparatus to the punch wherever there are no unions.

Furthermore, the director of organization and his aides are to survey the world and discover where the Communists are digging in and might take over by default.

Once the trouble spot is located—be it Indonesia or Latin America, the new task force is under orders to get there and coordinate the fight against Communist infiltration and subversion. For such work the American delegation is willing to contribute $100,000 above its regular dues.

Amazingly enough, the other key delegations agreed to increase their contributions sharply, too.

This was a great victory for American labor. Evidence that it was a victory for the mainstreets of America, from which have poured forth so many young soldiers, can be seen in the fact that the Daily Worker

was really upset by the revitalizing of the ICFTU.

And well it might be. The Communist world appears to have taken a holiday from violence. It must depend entirely on subversion of unions in critical areas—especially in the Orient. To succeed without Soviet bayonets, the Russians' Communist parties across the world must infiltrate unions and use them as a base not only for sabotage, but to capture government power as they did in Guatemala.

They must provoke riots such as the one which killed 400 textile workers in Pakistan last year. Or the riot in Singapore some months ago.

They must control the transportation and electric-power workers in such critical areas as Hong Kong, Macao, and Indonesia. They must get to the African workers first to stir violence and hatred as they did in Kenya.

Only that way can they now turn nations and people against us and stack the odds against the Western World so steep that they would again be tempted to turn the cold war in for a hot one.

Now, because of one man's leadership of the American labor team at Vienna, the world congress of labor is more than just a spinning mimeograph machine turning out stentorian statements, unmatched by even mouselike actions.

Now it will have the money and the manpower to fight back and keep the Soviets from occupying positions we would need many divisions to recover. This fight in Vienna was far from being an esoteric, philosophical exercise. In the strange, new world of fast political footwork, infiltration, and subversion, new types of counteroffensives are needed. Not all battles are won by the military. In fact, fewer and fewer are won by the force of arms, old-fashioned or nuclear.

Meany's victory and American labor's victory saved the lives of many a future GI.

These victories also marked the coming to maturity of a powerful force in American life. It showed that the musicians, the plumbers, the men's-pants pressers, the ladies'-garment workers, the sheetmetal workers, and the people of the American slums, the ghettos, and Hell's Kitchen have given the world an intellectuality, a courage, and a political and diplomatic dexterity of which all can be mighty proud.

First Session, 84th Congress Record in Behalf of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the 84th Congress convened in January the Nation was confronted by a growing recession in agriculture. The average of farm prices had dropped 22 percent below the level of February 1951. Net farm income in 1954 had dipped about 30 percent under the income of 1947. The parity ratio was at the lowest since 1941. Farm operating costs remained near record highs, and farm debt was increasing. Farmers' purchasing power had declined to the lowest level since 1940.

Moreover, our farmers awaited a further deterioration of their income in 1955, under the lower price supports enacted by the preceding Congress at the behest of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson.

This was the situation in agriculture at a time when all other major segments of our economy enjoyed unparalleled prosperity.

The House Committee on Agriculture, which it is my honor and privilege to serve as chairman, immediately set to work to stem this recession in agriculture, and again to put our farmers on the road toward income equality with our nonfarm population.

My purpose in addressing the House at this time is to report on our work.

The most apparent and the most effective action open to us was to undo the damage of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which required that, beginning in 1955, flexible—lower—price supports should be applied to the basic crops.

Our work was opposed by the Secretary of Agriculture, who made it plain to our committee that a Presidential veto was likely for any bill that sought to return to a system of firm price supports for agriculture.

Notwithstanding, the committee on March 10, 1955, reported H. R. 12 to the House.

This bill called for a restoration for 1955, 1956, and 1957 of 90 percent of parity price supports for wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts—along with tobacco which has a continuing program of 90 percent of parity supports. This legislation proposed repeal of that part of the 1954 act which allows the supports on all these crops, except tobacco, to go as low as 82½ percent of parity in 1955 and down to 75 percent in 1956, and subsequent years. The bill also placed the minimum level for support of dairy products at 80 percent of parity, instead of 75 percent under present law. It enlarged the school milk program; it extended the program for eradication of brucellosis in dairy herds. The bill, as approved by the committee, proposed a two-price system for wheat, authorizing producers to hold a referendum on whether to accept the existing price support program for wheat or a new program under which wheat consumed domestically as human food would be supported at 100 percent of parity and that going into other domestic uses and into export would sell at world prices. The two-price provision for wheat later was taken out of the bill, to be considered in separate legislation.

The House passed H. R. 12 on May 5 by a vote of 206 to 201. The bill now is pending in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which is conducting extended hearings on the general farm program.

Mr. Speaker, although H. R. 12 won approval by the House, the debate was to agriculture a dark foreboding of the troubles that lie ahead. It disclosed that those who seek to destroy or weaken the farm program, built up through so many trying years, have succeeded to an alarming degree in dividing farmers, to set one group or one region against another, so that their common interests are confused. We saw the damaging effect of the effort to beat down farm prices, even at this time when the per capita income of farm people is only half the income of that 87 percent of our population that lives in our cities and towns.

I shall not use this occasion to single out those responsible or to place blame. But I do want to refer the Members of the House to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1955, page A4249, and of June 27, page A4651, in which I emphasize the need to get across to the people of this country the truth about agriculture. I hope that each of you, before the 2d session of the 84th Congress convenes next January, will make it your business to learn and preach the truth about agriculture, so that we shall come back here ready to act promptly and positively to reverse the recession in agriculture that not only is causing widespread hardships among our farm people but also holds a threat over the prosperity of our total economy.

In this it is my hope we may return to a nonpartisan consideration of the farmers' problems and the legislative remedies necessary to restoration of a sound agricultural economy. Through some 20 years, while we were building the farm program, our Committee on Agriculture considered farm legislation from a purely nonpartisan standpoint, and in the debates on this floor we saw the Members discussing the bills on their merits, devoid of political reference. Recently we have seen farm legislation in danger again of becoming a political football. We must know the truth about agriculture, and we must understand that the farm problems are of such tremendous economic importance to this country that they must be kept entirely out of partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, while H. R. 12 represented our major effort to stop the recession in agriculture, the Committee on Agriculture was busy throughout this session on other legislation, dealing with the problems of small farmers, with foreign markets for our farm products, with farm credit, program improvements, distribution of food to needy persons, and other matters of importance to farmers and to our people generally.

Four hundred and fifty bills were referred to the committee in the first session of this Congress. On the same date in the first session of the four previous Congresses the total number of bills referred were: 80th Congress, 120; 81st Congress, 250; 82d Congress, 96; 83d Congress, 184. Hearings were held on every bill for which hearings were requested by its author, and the committee took official action with respect to more than half of the bills referred to it. The committee reported favorably to the House on 53 bills, and 39 bills within the jurisdiction of this committee were enacted and signed by the President.

The Congress provided funds through appropriations to finance the various programs in behalf of agriculture.

Among the major subjects handled by our committee were:

LOW-INCOME FARMERS

The Congress, through Public Law 132—S. 1755 and H. R. 6092—put a ceil-

ing of 3 percent per annum on the interest rates for emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration. This legislation, of special benefit to small farmers, was prompted by the action of the Department of Agriculture, effective January 3, 1955, which raised the interest rate on emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration from 3 to 5 percent. In this legislation the Congress took the position that a farmer in distress, who must go to the FHA because he is unable to get a loan from a private commercial banking institution, should not be forced to pay a higher rate of interest than 3 percent.

Through Public Law 360—S. 2098—the Congress authorized additional appropriations to the extension service for special programs to aid low-income farmers.

Our committee and the Congress recognize the necessity of improving the income and living standards in the low-income rural areas. Congress in the past has provided special credit facilities and other services for this purpose, including the program that has aided tenant farmers to become farm owners.

However, in recent years the number of farms in the United States has decreased and the tendency now is toward larger and larger farms. Meanwhile, many small-farm operators receive inadequate incomes for a satisfactory standard of living.

The fading out of the family owned and operated farm is of great concern to the Nation. The steady lessening of the number of family farms in recent years has resulted in the deterioration of many prosperous farm communities, and many rural churches have been closed as the farm population dwindled away.

This is a development warranting the attention of the Congress.

Moreover, there is a need for consideration of the part-time farmer who supplements his meager income from agriculture by working part time in town.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have appointed a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, under the chairmanship of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON of Texas to make a thorough study of the ways and means to protect, foster and promote the family farm as the continuing dominant unit in American agriculture, and to improve the income and living standards of low income farm areas. This will include special attention to the manner in which we can adjust our farm programs to accommodate the convenience, productivity, and prosperity of the family farm unit.

This study will be entirely devoid of partisanship. Both major political parties are pledged in their platforms to safeguard the family farm.

FOREIGN TRADE

Through Public Law 387—S. 2253—Congress provided for a vast expansion of operations under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480 of 83d Congress. The original act established a principle that America's abundance of food and fiber should be managed to expand international trade and to promote the economic stability of agriculture in the United States and the national welfare. To expand foreign trade outlets for farmers and to develop new markets, this act authorized sales of our food and fiber for local currencies of other countries. The 83d Congress provided $700 million to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities taken out of its stocks, to convert to dollars the local currencies of other countries received by private American exporters for goods delivered abroad under this program. Public Law 387 just enacted more than doubles this amount, making available $1,500 million for this reimbursement purpose. Several improvements were made in the language of the original act, to facilitate movement of this commerce.

Public Law 25—S. 752—enacted by this Congress, also improves operations under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, by removing the requirement that private stocks exported under title I be replaced by CCC stocks.

FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

The Congress took an important step to open wider the doors to storehouses of abundant foods for the relief of our needy people at home.

Through Public Law 311—H. R. 2851—it authorized, until June 30, 1957, distribution of wheat flour and cornmeal to needy individuals and families upon the request of the governor of a State. The distribution to a central location or locations in each State will be made by the Secretary of Agriculture, using up to $15 million a year for this purpose. This makes bread available to the needy, who previously have been receiving principally perishable commodities, such as butter, cheese, and dried milk, from the Government food holdings.

This legislation helps meet an immediate need among unemployed coal miners and others.

Moreover, the committee is conducting thorough studies of the food-stamp plan and the various other proposals for the most beneficial use of the abundance of our agriculture.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

A major enactment in the agricultural credit field was Public Law 347—H. R. 5168—which opens the way for greater farmer ownership and control of the cooperative farm-credit agencies. The farm-credit system is an entirely separate operation from the Farmers' Home Administration, which makes direct loans from appropriated funds for many farm purposes where private funds are not available, and FHA insures private loans in several fields. The lending institutions of the farm-credit system are the Federal land banks which make long-term farm-mortgage loans, the Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit associations, and the banks for cooperatives which finance the operations of farmers' cooperative associations.

Other enactments related to agricultural credit included:

Public Law 55—S. 941—authorizes the Federal land banks to purchase in bulk the remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in their respective districts.

Public Law 117—S. 1582 and H. R. 5822—to extend for 2 years the period of making emergency loans under Public Law 727, 83d Congress, which provided $15 million of economic disaster loan authority.

Public Law 166—H. R. 4915—to extend the period for making special livestock loans for 2 years.

Public Law 273—S. 1758 and H. R. 6914—to simplify administration of the insured-mortgage provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Public Law 270—S. 1621—authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust or compromise debts of settlers on the Angostura project at Hot Springs, S. Dak.

Public Law 132, putting a 3-percent ceiling on the interest rates of FHA emergency loans, already has been mentioned in the discussion of legislation relating to low-income farmers.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Public Law 42—H. R. 1573—repeals that portion of the Agricultural Act of 1954 that denied agricultural conservation program payments to any farmer who knowingly harvests any basic commodity in excess of his acreage allotment.

Our committee found that this provision in the 1954 act would seriously retard the agricultural conservation progam and that, in fact, it was in direct conflict with the spirit of several provisions of the acreage allotment and marketing-quota laws.

The committee said that programs designed to stabilize the price and the supply of specific agricultural commodities are and should be kept entirely separate from those programs having as their objective the preservation and improvement of our soil and water resources.

The marketing quota penalties and the loss of price supports in the case of acreage allotments have proved sufficient deterrents to overproduction of those commodities which are accorded price support in return for this measure of production control by farmers. Conservation programs are designed for the long-range benefit of the Nation as a whole. The carrying out of proper conservation measures, in many instances, may actually be unprofitable to the farmer who is working the land. The objectives of this program are entirely separate and different from the objectives of our price-support programs and should be kept so.

Public Law 264—S. 1167—provides that persons carrying out conservation practices on federally owned noncropland be eligible to receive ACP cost-sharing assistance if such practices directly conserve or benefit nearby or adjoining privately owned lands and such persons who use and maintain such Federal land, under agreement with the Federal agency having jurisdiction.

RESEARCH

Public Law 352—S. 1759—consolidates into 1 act the provisions of 12 acts authorizing expenditures for agricultural experiment stations. The new act is intended to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the experiment stations by simplifying their procedures.

TOBACCO

Public Law 21—H. R. 4951—directs the Secretary to redetermine the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year. Authorizes reductions in redetermining this quota, by an amount not exceeding one-tenth of an acre the existing burley allotments which are seven-tenths of an acre or less but more than five-tenths of an acre. Makes a permanent change in the minimum acreage allotment by establishing the new minimum as the smallest of the allotment established for the farm for the immediately preceding year, five-tenths of an acre, or 10 percent of the cropland. Provides that excess tobacco acreage for 1955 and thereafter shall not be considered as part of the farm history in establishing future acreage allotments. Penalizes tobacco producers who file, or aid in the filing of, false reports on tobacco acreage grown on their farms. Increases the excess-marketing penalty from 50 percent to 75 percent of the average market price for such tobacco for the preceding marketing year.

Public Law 96—Senate Joint Resolution 60—directs the Secretary to conduct a study of the burley tobacco program and report to Congress not later than November 1, 1955.

Public Law 279—S. 2297—provides that if marketing quotas on any kind of tobacco are disapproved in three consecutive referenda subsequent to 1952, a referendum on each kind of tobacco would be held only once every 3 years thereafter unless at least one-fourth of the growers of such kind of tobacco petition the Secretary prior to November 10 for a referendum before the end of the 3-year period.

Public Law 351—S. 2295 and H. R. 6847—provides that for the 3 years 1956 to 1958 the acreage allotment for any farm which has not been retired from agricultural production shall not be reduced below the acreage allotment which otherwise would be established because the harvested acreage was less than the allotted acreage unless the acreage harvested was less than 50 percent of the allotted acreage in each of the preceding 5 years, in which case it shall not be reduced for such reason to less than the largest acreage harvested in any year in such 5-year period.

Public Law 361—S. 2296 and H. R. 6846—provides that the production of tobacco on a farm for which no farm acreage allotment has been established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an "old" farm, provided that by reason of such production the farm need not be considered as ineligible for a "new" farm allotment but such production shall not be deemed past tobacco experience for any producer on the farm.

RICE

Public Law 29—H. R. 4647—increases each 1955 State rice acreage allotment by 2 percent. Provides each State with a 1955 rice allotment at least equal to its 1950 allotment. Provides each county whose base acreage for 1955 exceeded by at least 2 percent its base acreage for 1950 with a 1955 rice allotment at least equal to its 1950 allotment. Increases each State reserve for new producers and new farms to a minimum of 500 acres.

Public Law 28—H. R. 4356—provides that joint acreage allotments of rice shall be divided on the basis of acreage planted by each participant instead of on the basis of each participant's share of the crop.

Public Law 27—H. R. 2839—authorizes the reapportionment of land which will not be planted in rice, and is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee, to other farms in the same county.

Public Law 228—S. 2511—provides that for 1956 no national rice acreage allotment be established which is less than 85 percent of the final allotment established for the immediately preceding year.

Public Law 292—S. 2573—provides that in States where farm rice acreage allotments are established on a producer basis only the past plantings of rice by the producer within the State and acreage allotments previously established in the State for the producers shall be used in determining such allotments.

WHEAT

Public Law 8—S. 145—amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for increased durum wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas for the 1955 crop for farms located in Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Provides that this increase in allotments shall be in addition to the national, State and county wheat acreage allotments, and that acreage of class II durum wheat thereon shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Public Law 70—H. R. 5376 and S. 1531—modifies the State allotment formula by making 25 percent, instead of the present 50 percent, of the annual loan fund appropriations subject to State allotment on the basis of unelectrified farms during the first 6 months of the fiscal year. Thereafter the unexpended or unobligated funds will be merged with the remaining 75 percent of the annual loan funds which will be available without allotment, with not more than 25 percent of the unallotted loan funds to be employed in any one State, or in all the Territories. Loan funds which are not loaned or obligated may be carried over to the following years.

FARM LABOR

Public Law 319—H. R. 3822—extends until June 30, 1959 the Mexican farm-labor program. Relieves employers of double liability for the cost of returning a worker to Mexico where the employer has paid once for such movement but the Mexican does not return and is later apprehended. Specifies that the Secretary of Labor is to obtain information on the availability of domestic workers, prevailing wage rates, and labor shortages in the area, and then post publicly the number of workers to be imported.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

Public Law 82—S. 1398 and H. R. 4514—to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, by extending the subpena power to investigations as well as proceedings under the act.

Public Law 174—H. R. 122—includes onions in the commodities subject to regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Public Law 248—S. 1051—authorizes the Secretary to adjust the fees and charges for registrations and renewals under the Commodity Exchange Act.

MARKETING PENALTIES

Public Law 272—S.1757—provides that anyone who knowingly falsely marks or causes to be marked an agricultural commodity as being officially inspected or graded, when it has not in fact been so marked or graded, shall be liable to a fine of not more than $1,000 or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

OTHER ENACTMENTS

Public Law 30—House Joint Resolution 107—authorizes the Secretary, upon consent of California Department of Agriculture, to release reversionary rights to the Vineland School District, Kern County, Calif.

Public Law 43—H. R. 1831—protects from claims and suits innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen.

Public Law 54—S. 1133 and H. R. 4576—authorizes payment equal to 50 percent of losses incurred, but not exceeding any State indemnity, in Iowa for swine destruction due to vesicular exanthema.

Public Law 81—S. 998 and H. R. 1762—provides for conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Woodward, Okla.

Public Law 116—H. R. 2973—conveys all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education.

Public Law 237—H. R. 4280—directs the Secretary to release on behalf of the United States conditions in 2 deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina.

Public Law 257—S. 72—provides that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary as national forest lands.

Other legislation of importance to agriculture was passed by the Congress, including Public Law 86—H. R. 1—extending the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; and Public Law 84—H. R. 5106—amending the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing.

Public Law 344—S. 2604 and H. R. 7541—increased the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $10 billion to $12 billion. Public Law 14 repealed the law providing a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

The House Committee on Agriculture developed legislation in several fields where final action awaits the deliberations of the 2d session of the 84th Congress. These included:

SUGAR

The committee reported and the House approved H. R. 7030 to reenact and extend for 4 years, to December 31, 1960, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, with further amendments dealing primarily with adjustments of quotas intended to give domestic producers a fair share in the growth of the United States sugar market and to bring about an equitable participation by foreign suppliers in this market.

The legislation now is pending in the Senate. The Sugar Act, in the absence of any action by the Congress, would expire December 31, 1956.

Participation by the United States sugar producers in the future market growth in this country, as provided in H. R. 7030, does no more than restore to them the status they had under sugar-quota legislation prior to World War II.

In the Sugar Act of 1948, quotas for the domestic areas were limited to fixed quantities in order to assist Cuba in making the transition from wartime to peacetime conditions by assigning to her virtually all of the increases in the United States sugar market. It was recognized at the time that the change was of temporary nature and that at the appropriate time the domestic areas should resume participation in market growth.

Cuba, under H. R. 7030, retains its status as our largest foreign supplier. The actual tonnage which Cuba will market in the United States is expected to increase from year to year because of her participation in our market growth. Additional quotas granted to other foreign suppliers, as provided in the bill, are in line with our national policy of broadening our trade relations.

MARKETING FACILITIES FOR PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

H. R. 4054 seeks to reduce the cost of food to consumers and to improve the income of farmers through more efficient marketing of perishable agricultural commodities.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to insure loans by private lending institutions for the improvement and development of wholesale marketing facilities, designed to lessen the uneconomic practices in antiquated facilities that now cause greatly increased costs, undue losses, excessive waste, spoilage, and deterioration in the handling of these perishable foods.

Our Committee on Agriculture approved this bill for action in the House and Senate in the second session of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our committee and this House made a proud record in behalf of the farm families of America during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, although we confronted hard and sometimes bitter opposition in our efforts to stop the growing recession in agriculture.

In closing, I want to stress that the farmers' problem is everybody's problem; that we cannot have a continuing prosperity in America without prosperity in agriculture; and I again appeal to each of you that, in these intervening months until we meet again, you acquaint yourselves with the plight of our farmers and their families, and that we return here ready to act promptly and decisively to remedy this blight of economic injustice on our farms.

More Facts on Small Tracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years America has experienced a rebirth of the homesteading spirit. The popular phrase of the 1860's—"doing a land-office business"—has taken on new meaning as thousands upon thousands of pioneering Americans have discovered that our land frontiers have yet to be reached and have acted to take advantage of that fact.

The American dream of some land to call my own has been given a healthy new channel in the Small Tract Act of 1938, and once again families are moving out onto the dormant public domain and through perseverance and hard work are making this once-wasted territory a contributing part of our expanding western economy.

Nevada, the State with the largest amount of federally owned land, has become the focal point of small-tract activity but the modern homesteader is dreaming, planning, and working in every State in the West.

While the 19th-century homesteader found his greatest challenge in the elements, his 20th-century counterpart is most beset by the tangled complexity of our 5,000 public-land laws. In applying these laws to local conditions, many valuable suggestions have been received from numerous individuals and organizations in the State. One of the most helpful groups in this respect has been the Southern Nevada Home-Siters, Inc. We are to some extent still pioneering in the small-tract field, trying to work out sound rules to enable the best use of our land resources to be effected.

The most frequent questions asked by the people I serve are with regard to regulations surrounding the Small Tract Act. Last year I was able to assist hundreds of land applicants in this respect by compiling a series of questions and answers entitled "Clear Facts on Small Tracts."

Since publication of that data, there have been numerous new developments in the small tract field. Accordingly, I have again endeavored to obtain authoritative and up-to-date information on this vital subject, More Facts on Small Tracts.

It is my hope that this material will serve to clarify the rights of the small-tract applicant and the procedures under which he is presently required to proceed.

First. How much land is available for small-tract entry in the State of Nevada?

Public lands become available for small tract entry only when they are classified as chiefly valuable for residential, recreation, business, or community sites by the authority of the Secretary of the Interior—43 CFR 257.1. The lands may not be leased or sold until classified for small-tract purposes and may not be occupied until the lands are leased or sold.

As of May 1, 1955, a total of 89,000 acres of public lands has been clasified as chiefly valuable for small-tract purposes in Nevada. Of this area, approximately 28,000 acres had been leased or sold. Approximately 50,000 acres of the unleased land has been applied for. The number of lease applications pending on June 1 was 14,010.

Small tract lease or lease and sale applications may be filed by any qualified person or any vacant and certain reserved public domain tracts of 5 acres or less whether they have been classified or not under the Small Tract Act.

Theoretically, small-tract applications could be filed on any of the vacant public lands and certain reserved public lands in Nevada, totaling 47 million acres.

Second. How can one find out which land in Nevada is classified for small tract entry?

Each classification order by which lands are classified as chiefly valuable for small tract purposes is published in the Federal Register and is posted on a bulletin board in the Land Office of the Bureau of Land Management at Reno, Nev. The order contains a detailed list of lands affected. A notation that such order has been signed is placed in the official plats and tract books in the Land Office at Reno in the section of such records pertaining to each legal subdivision that is affected. The official plats and tract books and other public land records are open to public inspection during regular office hours.

Third. How do I go about filing for a small tract in Nevada? Must I appear in person?

A qualified applicant may file an application on form 4–776 in conformity with the instructions therein except for lands which have been classified for direct sale at public auction. Copies of the form may be obtained from the Land Office at Reno, the Office of the Bureau of Land Mangement at Las Vegas, or the Bureau of Land Management, Washington 25, D. C. Applications should be filed by mailing or appearing in person at the land office in Reno. The duplicate forms must be signed by the applicant.

It is not necessary that the applicant appear in person to file the application but the applicant must certify that he has examined the land sought or lands within a mile thereof. Any person desiring to purchase a tract classified for sale at public auction may submit a bid in accordance with the provisions of the classification order.

Fourth. Once my application is filed, how long will be it before a lease is issued to me?

There is no single answer to this question. The amount of time required for

the processing of an application for a lease is extremely varied, depending upon, first, whether the lands have already been classified for small tract purposes; second, whether there are previously filed conflicting applications; third, whether there are conflicting mining claims; and, fourth, other variables including the status of workload in the local Bureau office.

A large work backlog has delayed the handling of all applications up to a year or more in addition to the working time required on each case. Cases are taken in the order in which they are received or become available for processing unless grouped for economy of processing.

Fifth. Can I buy a small tract directly from the Government without first securing a lease?

Yes, under two separate situations. First, where the land has been classified for direct sale by public auction. This is stated in the classification order. Second, where the law has been subject to a small tract lease which has been terminated, relinquished, or cancelled, and where the land is offered for sale at public auction.

Sixth. After I get a lease, can I then buy the land from the Government?

Leases for lands classified for lease and sale will contain an option-to-purchase clause. This clause will afford the lessee or his duly qualified successor in interest an opportunity to purchase the tract at any time within the term of the lease, provided all conditions of the lease have been met.

Seventh. Is it possible to buy a small tract at public auction?

Yes, under the two situations mentioned in the answer to question 5 above.

Eighth. It has been said that there are four options in buying a small tract which is under lease. What does this mean?

All of the so-called four options are available only to lessees who hold lands under lease that were classified as suitable for small tracts prior to August 9, 1954. Only options 1 and 2 may be applied to lands classified on or after that date. The use of option 2 is discretionary with the officer of the Bureau of Land Management who has authority to classify the lands. The four options, briefly, are:

Option 1: Construction of a home or other improvements of the minimum type and character specified in the lease, possibly including but not consisting of only a satisfactory domestic well.

Option 2: Construction of improvements for the minimum type and character specified in the lease, consisting of only a satisfactory domestic well.

Option 3: Tender of an offer to purchase the land at a reappraised price representing present fair market value.

Option 4: Tender of an offer to purchase the land at a reappraised price representing a so-called convenience factor, computed under the following formula: Estimated cost of improvements under the standards of the lease, less salvage value of materials, plus the price of the tract specified in the lease.

Ninth. (a) There has been mention also of a fifth option arising from paragraph 257.13 (d) (1) appearing in Circular No. 1899, published in the Federal Register January 15, 1955, which states that "groups of lessees of small tracts in any area may enter into binding agreements among themselves to observe, in the development of their leased tracts, standards of building, sanitation, and health requirements consistent with the terms of their leases. Lessees who participate in this agreement may exercise at the discretion of the Bureau of Land Management their option to purchase without prior compliance with the improvement requirements of their leases." With regard to this quoted paragraph, what is meant by "groups of lessees of small tracts in an area"? Can this be only 2 or must it be a larger number, such as 10 or 20 lessees?

The number may be two or more. Any group of small-tract lessees may avail themselves of this so-called option regardless of the date of their lease, providing they can meet the requirements of the option.

(b) What is meant by "binding agreements among themselves"? Would this contract be recorded and would it be binding on successors in interest?

A binding agreement among lessees is an irrevocable contract which is enforceable under State laws. The regulations are purposely silent as to the details of such agreements in order to permit applicants to work out that type of agreement that under State laws would most adequately fit their particular situation. All agreements, however, must have certain basic features. They must be enforceable, that is, they must contain provisions to insure compliance with their terms. They must also be irrevocable, and the terms of the contract must be consistent with the small tract leases of the contracting parties. Since acceptance of the agreements is at the discretion of the Bureau of Land Management, the agreements must also be consistent with the proper development of the area involved.

Several possibilities are available. Agreements making certain conditions covenants running with the land will work well in certain situations. Escrow agreements whereby title will be held by a trustee until compliance with their terms may prove satisfactory under many conditions. Officials of the Bureau will assist interested groups in working up acceptable agreements.

As to recording of these agreements, State law governs. Generally, State law requires recording of transactions affecting land titles.

The agreement must be so drafted that a successor in interest to the lessee would be bound to its terms.

(c) What is meant by "standards of building, sanitation, and health requirements consistent with the terms of their leases," and who would determine these?

The standards provided for in the classification order or the leases or both, as established by the officer of the Bureau of Land Management who has authority to classify the lands, are the minimum standards the agreements must call for. Lessees desiring by agreement to establish higher standards for their area are, of course, free to do so.

Tenth. Does paragraph 257.13 (d) (1) referred to above mean that merely by signing a binding agreement I can secure a patent to my small tract without putting any improvements thereon?

Yes, providing you hold a lease with an option-to-purchase contract. However, an acceptance of the agreement is discretionary with the Bureau of Land Management. This discretion is retained by the Bureau so that assurance can be had that minimum standards will be observed and so that compliance is had with the basic provisions of the Small Tract Act. The Bureau will have the responsibility of determining the methods used to insure the binding nature of the agreement and the terms to which the lessees bind themselves.

Eleventh. How do I know where the boundaries of my small tract are and what, if any, right-of-way is reserved for roads or other uses?

Small tracts are sometimes surveyed and marked or staked on the ground by the Bureau of Land Management. If such is the case, each tract may be located on the ground by reference to the corner stakes.

Small tracts which are not individually surveyed and staked by the Bureau of Land Management may be located on the ground by reference to the monuments of the regular rectangular public survey in the vicinity. The location of the corners of the small tract, in such event, may be determined by ordinary methods used in private land surveys. The services of a private land surveyor may be necessary.

The rights-of-way, if any, reserved in a small tract lease or patent are specified in the classification order and will be specified also in the patent.

Twelfth. If I obtain my tract, how can I can get water, roads, and sewage facilities?

These are matters in which the Federal Government can offer no direct help. The responsibility to obtain these utilities rests with each individual lessee or patentee in accordance with the local conditions in the area and the availability of local community or public utility services. However, the Government helps by reserving rights-of-way for streets and roads, ordinarily along the boundaries of the tract.

Thirteenth. Can I get a FHA or VA loan on my small tract?

This is a matter to be taken up with the FHA and VA authorities. It is understood, however, that FHA or VA loans are not available on small tracts while in lease status. Small tracts which have been patented are subject to application for FHA and VA loans on the same basis as any other privately owned lands.

Fourteenth. What is a reasonable fee to pay somebody for filing a small tract application for me?

There is no single answer to this question. The reasonable amount of the fee, if the services of a person are hired, depends upon the utility of the services rendered to the person who hires them and the amount of labor or other costs involved to the person who furnishes them. In some instances, filing services have caused a disservice to applicants by misleading them as to the quality of

the land or the lease and sale requirements or filing for them on lands that are under prior application by other persons.

The services offered by persons who prepare applications for a fee are varied depending upon the circumstances. None of the services is licensed or regulated by the Federal Government. Such services afford the applicant no preference over other applicants who file the applications themselves.

The services of land locators are not necessary so far as the Government is concerned. All that is necessary is that an application be filed in accordance with the law and the regulations. Whether a filing service is used is strictly a matter for individual choice.

Fifteenth. What is the conflict between mining claimants and small-tract applicants that is discussed so frequently in the newspapers?

After small-tract applications are filed for public lands that have not been classified by the Bureau of Land Management for small-tract purposes, it is necessary that the Bureau examine the status and character of the lands applied for in order to determine their availability and suitability for small-tract classification. It is sometimes discovered that such lands are embraced within mineral locations filed under the United States mining laws and the mining laws of the States in which the lands are located. Such locations, recorded in the county records, constitute prior claims against the land. Such lands are not available for small-tract lease or sale unless and until the claims are abandoned, relinquished, or canceled.

If upon examination it is determined that charges should be brought against the claims by the Government, a contest is initiated. In the meantime, the pending small-tract applications may be either rejected or suspended, as the officer in charge may determine, subject to a right of appeal.

If after due process in accordance with law the conflicting mining claims are declared to be null and void, the lands may be classified and opened to small tracts.

Sixteenth. How many acres are in conflict between mining claimants and small-tract applications in Nevada?

This figure has been estimated at 39,000 acres.

Seventeenth. Several hearings were held in Nevada during December 1954, between some of those who had filed mining claims and certain small-tract applicants. What was the decision on these cases, and is it being appealed?

The hearings, held in November and December 1954 involved contests brought by the Government against certain sand and gravel mining claims in Clark County, Nev. The decision of the hearings officers was that the Crocus No. 1, Crocus No. 2, a portion of Bradford No. 1, and Bradford No. 2 placer claims are valid; and that a portion of Bradford No. 1 and all of Bradford No. 3 placer claims were void from their inception.

The mining claimants have appealed to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management from the adverse decision pertaining to Bradford No. 1 and Bradford No. 3.

The intervenors in the hearings representing small tract applicants have requested a new trial to present additional evidence concerning all of the claims.

Eighteenth. How many steps are there in an appeal from such a decision and how long will this take?

Any party aggrieved by a decision of a hearings officer in a mineral contest may appeal first to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, who issues a decision either affirming or reversing the decision. Any party aggrieved by the Director's decision may appeal to the Secretary of the Interior.

Appeals are ordinarily time consuming because of complicated issues involved. Decisions on appeals are additionally delayed because of a backlog of appeals work.

It is impracticable to forecast how long the various steps will require in any individual case.

Nineteenth. Are more hearings on these conflicts being planned for the State of Nevada in the future?

Additional hearings have been tentatively planned for August 1955. Definite dates have not been set.

Twentieth. Can the Bureau of Land Management withdraw land from mining claim location when it has been classified for small tracts?

Lands classified for small tract lease, lease and sale, or sale are segregated from all appropriations, including locations under the mining laws, except as provided in the order of classification or in any modification or revision thereof.

Twenty-first. Is it possible for nonprofit clubs and organizations to secure small tracts of public land?

An application under the Small Tract Act may be made by an association, each of the members of which is a citizen of the United States or has filed declaration of intention to become a citizen. An application may be filed by a corporation, including nonprofit corporations, authorized to do business in the State or Territory in which the land is located.

Twenty-second. Can political subdivisions of government, such as municipalities, obtain federally owned lands for public purposes?

A State or any political subdivision thereof, including a municipality, may make an application for a tract of 5 acres or less under the Small Tract Act. States and Territorial governments, including instrumentalities and subdivisions, may also apply for the lease or sale of larger tracts of public lands for recreational and public purposes under the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U. S. C. 869). Information concerning the sale or lease of public lands for recreation and public purposes is contained in 43 CFR, part 254—Circular 1880.

Twenty-third. What is being done to speed up the rate of issuing leases and patents in the State of Nevada.

The Bureau of Land Management has increased its staff in Nevada insofar as possible under the available appropriated funds. Additional office space is being made available to relieve crowded conditions in the land office at Reno.

Under the recent Bureau reorganization, all cases may be completely handled within the Bureau offices in Nevada. The steps required to process cases have been streamlined.

If additional appropriations are made available for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, additional staff and facilities will be assigned to Nevada. Other developments, including the completion of mineral examinations, will permit the expedited issuance of leases and patents in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955.

Twenty-fourth. Does the Bureau of Land Management have any long-range plans for Nevada to prevent being swamped by applicants in the future?

The long-range objective is to carry out the intent and purposes of the Small Tract Act and related public-land laws as effectively and efficiently as possible. The operating plans to make this possible are under continuous scrutiny.

No fixed long-range plans have been adopted, but a number of alternatives are under consideration. Valuable suggestions and advice have been received from members of the Nevada congressional delegation, State and local officials, associations of "home siters," and others. Adjustments in operating plans will be made wherever appropriate under the circumstances.

Twenty-fifth. What facilities does the Bureau of Land Management have to help me in locating a small-tract homesite?

All of the public-land records in the land office are available for public inspection. These include the public survey plats and field notes, the land-status plats and tract books, and the land-classification orders. In addition, land status for Clark County is maintained in the Bureau office in Las Vegas within 24 hours of the notations made at Reno.

Upon request, the Reno Land Office will supply without charge the status of any particular tract of public land which has been described by reference to the public survey. A copy of any official map or record maintained in the Land Office may be obtained upon payment of a fee. Copies of classification orders and lists of public lands, when available, for free distribution may be obtained upon request.

Application blanks and circulars containing the applicable provisions of the laws and regulations may be obtained from the Land Office. Local offices of the Bureau will assist applicants in preparing aplication blanks upon request.

Twenty-sixth. What fees must be remitted with my application?

No fees or payments are required with veterans' drawing entry cards.

Each bid by mail for a tract being sold at direct public auction must be accompanied by a certified or cashier's check, post office money order, or bank draft for the amount of the bid. These are returned if the bid is not successful.

Any application for a lease must be accompanied by the following amounts: $10 filing fee plus 3 years' advance rental at the rate indicated in the classification

order or, if no classification order has been issued, advance rental of $15. The $10 filing fee submitted with lease applications is nonreturnable and will not be refunded even though the lease application is rejected; however, if the lease application is fatally defective, the entire payment will be returned. By "fatally defective" is meant that the application is improperly prepared and, therefore, returned to the applicant without being considered.

The John Marshall Bicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the Congress are all aware, I am sure, that September 1955 has been designated by joint congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation as "John Marshall Bicentennial Month."

Since I have the honor and privilege to be a member of the United States John Marshall Bicentennial Commission and chairman of the executive committee of the Commission, I consider it appropriate to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of the reasons for the designation of John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and of the objectives and operations of the Commission.

Known as the Great Chief Justice, John Marshall, born in Virginia September 24, 1755, served as the fourth Chief Justice of the United States from 1801 to his death in 1835, and has been universally credited as chiefly responsible for establishing and fostering the broad principles which made the Supreme Court of this Nation the most outstanding appellate body in the history of jurisprudence.

His home was in Richmond, in my district, where many of his great accomplishments took place. The celebrated trial of Aaron Burr was held in Richmond, in our Virginia State Capitol. It was on this occasion, of course, that John Marshall established one of the greatest principles of American law.

Chief Justice Earl Warren recently said of Marshall, in an address which inaugurated the bicentennial ceremonies:

> Stone by stone, he built the foundation of our constitutional structure, and he constructed it sufficiently strong to support everything we have since built upon it.

The significance and purposes of the John Marshall bicentennial celebration are summed up in an Appeal to All Americans, written by Mr. Edgar N. Eisenhower, as vice chairman of the United States John Marshall Bicentennial Commission, in which he said:

> It is the American way, and in the best tradition of our great Republic, to pay tribute in this country to the heroes of peace, as well as to the heroes of war. John Marshall, of Virginia, may justly be described as a hero of both war and peace, but it is for his great effort in building up the constitutional safeguards of our present Government and manner of living for which all Americans should honor the memory of John Marshall during the bicentennial of his birth on September 24, 1955.
>
> John Marshall was a true product of the frontier—a resourceful and well-rounded American. He is remembered for his military services as a Revolutionary soldier, for his important work as a minister to France, for his statesmanship as Secretary of State, for his service in the Congress, and for his lasting contribution as the first great supporter and expositor of the principles of constitutional government in this country as Chief Justice of the United States, 1801–35. His precedent-setting decisions established the framework for those great principles of American constitutional law which are paramount today in protecting the rights of our people and in defining the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.
>
> John Marshall was a very human man—he had the common touch, being very informal in dress, in speech, and in his associations with his fellow men during his lifetime. He was fond of good fellowship, good sportsmanship, and a good life, in the best meaning of the word, to Americans of his time and of today. He was noted for his devotion to his wife and family.
>
> In my capacity as vice chairman of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, I call upon all interested Americans, both individuals and groups, in all walks of life, to unite in many types of celebrations in recognition of the life and achievements of John Marshall, great American.

With regard to the establishment of the John Marshall Bicentennial Commission, I have received a report from Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service of the United States Department of the Interior, who is serving as executive officer of the John Marshall Bicentennial Commission. I quote pertinent excerpts as follows:

REPORT OF MR. WIRTH

On August 13, 1954, the 2d session of the 83d Congress of the United States adopted a joint resolution designating the month of September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and creating a commission to supervise and direct the observance of such month.

On July 13, 1955, the President of the United States, acceding to the request contained in the congressional joint resolution, issued a proclamation on John Marshall Bicentennial Month.

After my designation as executive officer of the Commission, offices were set up for the Commission in room 2023 of the Interior Department Building and Mr. Rogers W. Young, of the historical branch of the National Park Service of the Interior Department, was named as administrative officer of the Commission.

Subsequently, appropriate facilities for carrying out the work of the committee, as outlined by Congress and the President, were provided and there was established an Office of Public Coordination under the direction of Edward K. Moss, to carry out the activities of the Commission concerned with gaining a wider public knowledge and appreciation of the achievements of Chief Justice Marshall; to help arrange and coordinate the public observance and celebration of John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and to serve as a center of information for all participating groups through the country.

One of the first activities of the Commission staff was the preparation, by Edmund C. Gass, historian, of a handbook of information and suggestions for John Marshall bicentennial celebration.

As stated in the introduction, this handbook is designed to help those who want to plan programs commemorating John Marshall. It does not prescribe any particular type of program and is not a manual of procedures, for every group and locality is urged to use its own resources and ingenuity to develop whatever type of program it wants. Nor is the handbook a complete work on John Marshall. Instead it is a booklet of information and suggestions.

In addition to the introduction, the 63-page handbook contains sections on purposes and uses of this handbook; organizing programs honoring John Marshall; what you should know about John Marshall bicentennial celebrations; texts of the congressional resolution and the Presidential proclamation; suggestions for planning any type of program and several sample plans for specific types of programs; information about John Marshall, his times, and the Supreme Court; a short, condensed biographical sketch of John Marshall's life; a bibliography of books and articles on John Marshall; the Supreme Court in John Marshall's day; descriptions of the Supreme Court when Marshall was Chief Justice; leading cases on John Marshall's constitutional views; quotations from John Marshall; what some noted Americans have said about John Marshall; and the Edgar Eisenhower appeal to all Americans.

The handbook is already proving of great usefulness to many individuals and organizations planning various types of celebration programs and observances of the bicentennial month. Copies have been distributed to each State governor and to some 2,500 mayors of cities and towns of over 10,000 population. The mayors have been asked to establish local committees to initiate and carry out programs and special observances during the John Marshall bicentennial month.

The American Bar Association has extended the Commission invaluable assistance and cooperation in many ways. It has distributed copies of the handbook to its 3,000 branches throughout the country and requested local bar association presidents to cooperate with mayors and local committees in planning and programing local celebrations and special events. In each case the local bar association has been asked to appoint a representative to act in liaison capacity to help coordinate the activities of the local committee.

To date the response has been heartening indeed. Commemorative programs and special events have already been scheduled in Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Richmond, and Williamsburg, Va., the Panama Canal Zone, and in many other leading cities and towns throughout the country.

The speeches of President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Warren at the ceremonies in Philadelphia on August 24, jointly sponsored by the Commission and the American Bar Association, will inaugurate the general public observance of John Marshall Bicentennial Month.

Among other organizations already extending their cooperation to the Commission are the National Education Association and 15 of its affiliated organizations, and the American Municipal Association. Both of these groups have offered their active support to the Commission and given practical assistance in gaining its objectives.

The United States Post Office Department has announced the issuance of a 40-cent John Marshall stamp of the new ordinary series. This stamp, the ninth of the new series to be released, will be first placed on sale in Richmond on September 24.

The Commission is sponsoring an illustrated brochure on John Marshall with text written by Prof. Edward S. Corwin, professor emeritus of jurisprudence of Princeton University, a noted historian and authority on the Supreme Court.

The Library of Congress is devoting the month of September to an exhibit of the John Marshall books and papers. The American Library Association is arranging for the cooperation of local libraries all over the United States in staging similar exhibits.

Numerous schools and colleges throughout the country have indicated their intention of observing in various ways the John Marshall Bicentennial Month. The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va., will conclude a year-long series of Marshall programs with ceremonies on September 22. The college has gotten together a collection of the unpublished letters and papers of John Marshall which are on exhibit at the college library.

Harvard Law School will honor John Marshall on September 24 when Chief Justice Warren will be principal speaker. Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., is organizing a celebration to honor John Marshall throughout a substantial region of the State.

The Political Executive and the Senior Civil Service—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the National Civil Service League, a leader in public efforts for better public service since 1881, has called upon the public to become acquainted with the tremendous executive problems of government. Writing in Good Government, the nonpartisan league's bimonthly magazine, the executive director, James R. Watson, declares that "too few people in too many walks of life realize the degree of leadership, inspiration, and responsible guidance required of the public executive."

I have long been interested in the problems involved in improving and strengthening the merit system as developed in the civil service, and I am confident that this is the abiding concern of the 50,000 Federal employees in the Fourth District of New Jersey which I have the honor and privilege of representing, as well as of the 2½ million civilians employed by the Federal Government in every conceivable type of occupation. It is because of this abiding interest that I have introduced a number of bills providing personnel improvements and have, in addition, spoken on this subject on the floor of this House in condemnation of the so-called Willis directive which invited political recommendations for Federal positions.

With this in mind, I am including in my remarks a letter from Mr. Watson as well as his article in the May–June 1955 issue of Good Government entitled "The Political Executive and the Senior Civil Service":

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE,
New York, N. Y., June 24, 1955.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I was pleased to have the opportunity of meeting you on Wednesday.

Let me take this occasion to again commend you for the fine leadership which you are showing in the field of civil service.

I am hopeful that during the coming year, we can work on some aggressive programs which will mean much to the career people as well as the general public.

Should you have any suggestions about our work, please send them.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. WATSON,
Executive Director.

[From Good Government magazine of May–June 1955]

THE POLITICAL EXECUTIVE AND THE SENIOR CIVIL SERVICE

(By James R. Watson)

A STRONG CAREER SERVICE IS NEEDED TO IMPROVE PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Efficiency has become a byword of American life. We have efficiency studies, efficiency experts—even efficiency kitchens. In industry one of the major objectives is efficient production based primarily on a dollars-and-cents profit motive. In government the measure of efficiency is based on a broader concept: The best possible service for the largest number of people at the least cost—achieved through our democratic process.

While many techniques for better management are interchangeable between industry and government, there are important differences in incentives and pressures that must be recognized. For example:

1. The necessity in industry for dealing with organized labor and complying with the NLRB are pressures for good personnel management which government does not have. Although government has an increasing number of workers in employee associations, the full-fledged collective-bargaining process is not applicable.

2. No company anticipates the possibility of a complete change of policy every 4 years.

3. Government is not subject to pressures from competition or the profit motive. There is not the same compelling reasons for it to use its manpower on a basis of dollars-and-cents efficiency. The businessman either utilizes his labor force effectively or he suffers in the most sensitive area—the profit column.

These factors take on a particular significance when we recognize that the quest for efficiency in all phases of activity depends upon people—the men and women who perform the jobs. Successful, progressive industry has made great advances in the field of personnel and improved management. But we must bear in mind some of the differences when we attempt to adapt the same business techniques to improve the personnel management of government.

New era in personnel

Personnel management in the Federal service is at the threshold of a new era.

Today the Federal Government employs almost 2½ million civilians in every conceivable type of occupation. The total annual payroll is approximately $9 billion. The Federal Government is looked upon as one tremendous unit. The executive direction, the marshaling of the talents, facilities, and energies represented is probably the biggest and most important management problem in the world. The evolution of new and changing governmental activities, the constantly increasing burden upon the Chief Executive and his aids, the extension of the career civil service to levels never before reached throw into new focus a problem which has become overwhelming and which can no longer be avoided—the need for competent, stable management of Government affairs. Without such management, the burden of those in the top ranks becomes an impossible one.

The President has accepted full responsibility for Government personnel policies. For the first time a clear line of responsibility from the Executive Office to the lowest Government clerk exists. The merit system is accepted. Patronage is no longer seriously defended. The deficiencies of our personnel system are great, but they are being recognized, and serious efforts are being made to bring about improvements. The members of the civil service are on the whole competent and loyal. Many have achieved distinction.

One of the major barriers to Government efficiency remaining is the lack of a plan for securing expert and continuous managerial direction. Successful functioning of Government in the future will depend even more than ever before on our success in training and utilizing a supply of highly qualified public managers at all levels.

Task force on personnel and civil service

It was with full consciousness of the overwhelming urgency of this problem that the Task Force on Personnel and Civil Service of the Second Hoover Commission began its assignment to examine the system of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government and to suggest changes that would lead to a more effective service. The task force believes that the path to efficint Government lies in strengthening the top management. It has done more than any previous study—there have been five major ones in the last 20 years—to emphasize the importance of the executive function. Too few people in too many walks of life realize the degree of leadership, inspiration, and responsible guidance required of the public executive.

The problem: All those responsible for charting Government management have faced the problem of attempting to distinguish between political levels of responsibility and those responsibilities which can be fulfilled only through a career system. Through the task force, we have for the first time a measure by which this distinction can be made. According to the task force, political executives properly comprise the principal subordinates of the President, responsible agency heads and the aids and assistants—whatever their titles—who should share the task of responsible political leadership. "The role of this entire group of political party executives," states the task force, "is at the heart of representative government."

The complementary group of career administrators, the task force suggests, should be carefully chosen from all parts of the civil service solely on the basis of "demonstrated competence." They should be employed flexibly in many positions calling for high administrative talents: For example, administrative assistant secretaries, bureau chiefs, heads of regional offices, heads of budget, personnel, and other staff offices.

Interpretation and defense of administration policy should lie within the province of the political executive. The career man should never be required to undertake such duties. Recognizing the mutual dependability between these groups, the task force reviewed some mistakes that have developed by allowing career people to assume political responsibility. It is felt that the career man must be removed quickly from certain political functions. Once he moves into the realm of politics, it is difficult if not impossible to return to the nonpolitical role.

"Political neutrality once gone can hardly be recaptured."

Political executives: Noncareer executives in Government are usually thrust unprepared and untrained into the unfamiliar world of political struggle and they seldom stay long enough to become entirely familiar with their complex duties. Average service is from 2 to 4 years as contrasted with over 18 years for top career officials. Yet this is "the key group in making representative government work within the executive branch * * * the necessary expendables who give flexibility to the machinery of government and who make it possible for the Chief Executive to adapt his management team to changing circumstances. Constantly criticized, frequently attacked, and seldom praised, they are an essential element of responsible government in an age of big administration."

The task force outlines why it is so difficult to find and hold the men and women needed for these 600 to 800 vital positions:

"The traditional patronage system does not today produce political executive talent for top jobs." [1]

State and city executives can sometimes be drawn into Federal service, but in insufficient numbers. The only source large enough to supply the talent needed is private life—business, the professions, education, labor unions, farm and civic organizations.

Finding the talent: The task force sums up the problem of finding this talent:

1. The topmost political level requires men with well-developed executive ability and well-developed qualities of political leadership; with toughness, intelligence, and devotion to the public interest. Such a combination of abilities is relatively rare.

2. American life has not been geared to developing political executives. Few people have felt the inclination or responsibility for administering public affairs.

3. Practically, it has been difficult to shuttle back and forth between public office and private life. A man who leaves his business or profession normally loses out in the process.

4. The psychological and financial barriers to interchange are real. The political executive is neither well paid by American standards nor has he a very high or secure place in American society.

Clarence Randall, chairman of the board of Inland Steel Co., touched on some of the differences between Government and business administration which make difficulties for the businessman turned public administrator: his failure to understand the "why" of Government restrictions on hiring, firing, and spending, the vastness of the problems, the slowness of progress toward decision and action, the "overpowering sensation of the incredible complexity of the problems and the magnitude of the responsibility which must be faced." [2]

Task force prescription

The task force suggests steps for increasing the supply of political executives:

The administration in power should establish an advisory group with an executive secretary on the White House staff, to give advice and sustained support to the recruiting effort. It should recruit young people with legislative experience; use junior political executives of previous administrations of the same party; encourage younger political executives to establish themselves in the political life of their own States and cities; earmark some political executive positions as training positions.

Political executives should keep active in State and local civic and political affairs and help develop young political talent at home.

Party organizations should "devote at least as much effort to supplying talent as they do to locating jobs"; see that political executives who leave Government are absorbed into party affairs when they return home.

Private employers should make it attractive for men to serve in political posts.

Salaries should be raised. Assistant secretaries should get $25,000 a year, and other political executives should be compensated in proportion.

The senior civil service

To provide the highly competent career administrators upon whom the political executive necessarily must and will depend, the task force has proposed a senior civil service.

The task force proposal confirms what is already a political reality: the fact that a comparatively small group of top career people carry the heaviest burden of the Federal Government's business. By strengthening this top group all aspects of Government administration will be improved. The primary objective is "to have always at hand in the Government a designated group of highly qualified administrators * * * who will make it easier for political executives to discharge their responsibilities; and who will add to the smoothness, the effectiveness and the economy of governmental operations."

The plan contemplates establishment of a system by which government can identify those within its service who have capacity for assuming important managerial posts. The task force strikes sharply at some of the weaknesses of the civil-service system. "It has no means of officially recognizing competence after it is demonstrated. * * * The civil-service system emphasizes positions, not people. Jobs are classified, ranked, rated, and paid on the bland assumption that they can always be filled like so many jugs, by merely turning the tap. New concepts, policies, and procedures are needed which are designed specifically to supply career administrators at the higher levels."

British parallel: The task force proposal suggests a parallel with the British administrative service, where the strong tradition of a politically neutral, technically competent and experienced career service has given the government continuity and able performance, unaffected by but politically responsive to political change.

Authority for establishing the senior civil service would be given a full-time, bipartisan, 5-member board composed of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Director of the Budget, and three citizens appointed by the President. The board would evaluate and chooose senior civil servants from among career employees nominated by their employing agencies. The basis of selection would be qualities of leadership, judgment, adaptability, skill in working with people and capacity for growth. Political endorsements of any sort would be rigidly excluded.

Rank would be vested in the individual, not the job. Members could move from one assignment or location to another without loss of rank or drop in salary or could be put in inactive status for a time. Pay would range upward from $10,800 possibly to $25,000—the latter being the salary proposed for the political Assistant Secretary. The President would fix the strength of the service within broad limits. An initial 1,500 and an ultimate 3,000 is suggested.

Political neutrality: The concept of a senior civil service can exist and flourish only in a climate of strict political neutrality. Clement Attlee in a recent article [3] paid tribute to this aspect of the British Administrative Service as "one of the strongest bulwarks of democracy." "The first thing a minister finds on entering office," he wrote, "is that he can depend absolutely on the loyalty of his staff, and on leaving office he will seldom be able to say what the private political views are even of those with whom he has worked closely."

The place of the senior civil service must be understood and honestly accepted by the public, by both political parties, by political executives and by Government employees themselves. Like their British counterparts, members must be fully prepared to serve faithfully each administration that takes office. "They must avoid such emotional attachment to the policies of any administration that they cannot accept change." They must forego not only the political activities enjoined by the Hatch Act, but anything that would tend to identify them with a party policy.

The role of patronage: In our Government patronage has played a historical and unique role. If we are to have a senior civil service this role must be changed. We shall continue to have political appointments, but they will be in the areas where political responsibility lies. They will not encroach on the career service.

A classic document

The task-force report [4] evidences concentrated study and expert analysis. It will undoubtedly remain for years to come a classic document in the field of public personnel administration. It is a rich source of information about the actual working of the Federal civil-service system as well as a guide to how it could and should work. Its recommendations are realistic as well as idealistic. It is interesting to discover that the Hoover Commission—perhaps because it is more politically oriented than the task force—ignores some of the latter's recommendations and modifies others which would involve tangling with powerful vested interests. To its credit, however, it referred to Congress the full task-force report, along with its own report.

Action?

What has been done toward putting the report's recommendations into effect? What are the chances that these vital, even revolutionary, improvements will ever be adopted? That the report will ever be more than a reference for students of public administration? The proposal for a senior civil service was opposed even by two members of the Hoover Commission itself and met with skepticism from a third. It has been attacked in influential public employee circles as being a caste system and a means of playing favorites. A Washington Star political reporter suggested that the Hoover Commission will have to educate a lot of politicians before the senior civil-service program can become a reality.

Some changes would have to be accomplished through legislation, but others would need only administrative action. Neither the White House nor any congressional committee has yet revealed a plan for implementing the recommendations.[5] The Civil Service Commission is said to have asked its staff to study the report and suggest action to

---

[1] The administration's schedule C allows a certain freedom of appointment. Despite this, the demand for talent has overcome the demand for patronage. Seventy percent of the positions in schedule C are filled by people who were in Government before January 1953.

[2] A Good Word for Washington, Life magazine, April 4, 1955.

[3] The Civil Service, the Political Quarterly, October-December 1954.

[4] The Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (February 1955) can be obtained from the U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 75 cents.

[5] Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, has introduced a series of bills embodying some of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

be taken. Is all the impetus to come from citizen groups like the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, the League of Women Voters, and the National Civil Service League? If this is the prospect, then citizens must start their own campaign immediately. They must talk up the need and the goals. They must stimulate enthusiasm for business efficiency in Government. Will citizens accept the challenge? The stakes are enormous. As the Hoover Commission concludes its report, "Every segment of our society would benefit from better direction of governmental affairs."

The Political Executive and the Senior Civil Service—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the National Association of Federal Career Employees in which the point is made that this organization believes that greater protection should be given those disabled veterans with an occupational handicap in reduction-in-force programs. The author of the letter, Mr. Isadore Rosenthal, legislative director of the association, says that—

We believe the disabled veteran with an occupational handicap is justly entitled to this superseniority in view of the sacrifice he has made in the defense of our country.

In order to clear up any misunderstanding that may have arisen as to the actual position of this organization on this important question I am including this letter as part of my remarks.

The letter follows:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FEDERAL CAREER EMPLOYEES,
August 1, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: As legislative director of the National Association of Federal Career Employees, I have followed with great interest the introduction of the following bills in the House of Representatives: H. R. 6546, 6547, 6548, and 6549 on May 27, 1955. Our association greatly appreciates your efforts in strengthening the merit system.

We have as our primary goal the establishment, maintenance, and safeguarding of a true merit system in Government. Our organization is represented by chapters in various Government agencies throughout the United States. As pointed out by the sixth American assembly, one of the major obstacles to a true merit system is section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. This viewpoint is also supported by the National Federation of Federal Employees, National Customs Service Association, the National Civil Service League, as well as the Hoover Commission. Recent editorials, copies of which are enclosed, also point up the need for modification of section 12.

Being a veteran you are thoroughly familiar with section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and its many ramifications. When the law was enacted there was only 13 percent veterans than employed by the Federal Government. Due to section 12 and the many reduction-in-force programs which have been effected, today veterans constitute over 50 percent and are still increasing. In the male group this percentage is even greater—63 percent.

Much of the work now being done in the Federal Government in the Department of Defense is in the process of being contracted out to private industry. This policy is decreasing the nonveteran Federal population at a terrific rate. We have an impressive file of affidavits of recent date from highly skilled long-term career employees who have been displaced by veterans of considerably lesser tenure. The service of these displaced nonveterans range from 10 to 28 years. Our files also contain letters from veterans who are much opposed to the practice of displacing long-term nonveteran career employees with ablebodied veterans of lesser tenure. These files are available for your review upon request.

When it is realized that the law was enacted to protect a minority group, it is obvious that it has accomplished its objective. This was aptly pointed out by Mr. Philip Young, Chairman, Civil Service Commission, in his testimony before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session. In response to a question by a member of the subcommittee as to the need for greater protection to the nonveteran employee, Mr. Young replied:

"We have given some thought to that problem, because yours veterans' situation is one which becomes increasingly serious. After all, the Veterans' Preference Act was passed at a time when veterans were a small minority of the total Federal population. It was to protect the interests of the minority. Today it is discriminating against the minority, because the veterans are in the majority, which was something it was never designed for in the first place. That is the basic trouble."

However, the National Association of Federal Career Employees believes that greater protection should be given those disabled veterans with an occupational handicap in reduction-in-force programs. We believe the disabled veteran with an occupational handicap is justly entitled to this superseniority in view of the sacrifice he has made in the defense of our country. We believe the able-bodied veteran should be in group two for consideration in reduction-in-force programs with preference over nonveterans limited to a fixed period after employment by the Federal Government. As you are aware, the head of an agency can promote or assign a Federal employee providing he meets the civil-service requirements. However, in a reduction in force when section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act is applied, that administrator cannot retain that qualified employee regardless of the employee's outstanding performance and length of service, if that employee does not have veterans' preference. This mandatory practice does not promote efficiency or economy in the operation of the Federal Government.

You, no doubt, are also familiar with the findings of the Sixth American Assembly, held at Arden House, Harriman, N. Y., October 7–10, 1954. Their findings are in detail in "the Federal Government Service: Its character, prestige, and problems." It is our understanding that a large percentage of the participants were veterans. For your convenience, article VI, page 6 of their October 10 release is quoted below:

"Existing veterans' preference provisions constitute a major obstacle to effective personnel administration. These provisions violate the principle that competence should be the primary qualification for selection and retention of personnel.

"Preference in employment of veterans is established national policy but should be modified for the good of the service as follows:

"(1) Veterans' preference should not apply in the higher ranks of the civil service.

"(2) Preference for nondisabled veterans should be limited to a fixed period following completion of military service.

"(3) Preference for nondisabled veterans should be usable only once.

"(4) Special appeals procedures for veterans should be eliminated.

"(5) Disabled veterans should be granted certain preferences, but the definition of disability should be based on an occupational handicap and the preference should be such as to facilitate their employment and retention in positions for which their disabilities do not unduly limit their effectiveness."

Our organization supports these findings.

The effect of section 12 on nonveterans has been discussed with the three major veterans' organizations, although the official action which will be taken by them is unknown at the moment.

So that you can be fully informed as to our great interest in obtaining a true merit system in the Federal Government, enclosed are our informational booklet which gives the history of our organization, seven reasons why we believe section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act should be modified, and a flyer which tells what we are, why we are, and for whom. We are also enclosing copies of recent editorials emphasizing the need for modification of this law.

We are indeed grateful for the legislation introduced on May 27 to strengthen the merit system and hope that you can give support to improving reduction-in-force practices which can be obtained only by remedial legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ISADORE ROSENTHAL,
Legislative Director.

The Political Executive and the Senior Civil Service—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, much of the work now being done in the Federal Government is in the process of being contracted out to private industry, a step that is decreasing the nonveteran Federal employees at a terrific rate, as the National Association of Federal Career Employees points out.

In his message delivered to the Congress on July 13, 1955, the President said, in approving H. R. 6042, that—

I do not, by my approval of H. R. 6042, acquiesce in the provisions of section 638, and to the extent that this section seeks to give to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authority to veto or prevent executive action, such section will be regarded as invalid by the executive branch of the Government in the administration of H. R. 6042, unless otherwise determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Earlier in his message the President says that—

The Constitution of the United States divides the functions of the Government

into three departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, and establishes the principle that they shall be kept separate.

Now, while the President speaks of the separation of powers in his message he must surely know that line or section veto of legislation enacted by the Congress is unconstitutional. He must also recognize that the determination of whether legislation is constitutional or unconstitutional is a function expressly reserved to the judicial branch of the Federal Government.

The President's position is clearly in direct conflict with the position taken by Abraham Lincoln in his First Inaugural Address in which he said:

I take the official oath today with no mental reservations and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hypercritical rules; and while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed than to violate any of them trusting to find impunity in having them to be held to be unconstitutional.

On the fundamental basis that it is for the Congress to say how and on what conditions public moneys shall be spent, the position of the General Accounting Office has always been to accord full effect to the clear meaning of any enactment by the Congress so long as it remains unchanged by legislative action and unimpaired by judicial determination. The General Accounting Office is responsible for seeing that the appropriations made by the Congress to carry out the provisions of law are disbursed and accounted for in accordance with the laws relating thereto. I am confident that the Congress has made itself unmistakably clear as to its intent by the plain and positive provision of section 638 of H. R. 6042.

The establishment of a senior civil service, as provided in my bill, H. R. 6549, would, I believe, be of assistance to the President in avoiding the kind of egregious errors he seems to have made in his message regarding H. R. 6042.

I include as part of my remarks the letter by my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, PORTER HARDY, JR., in which he seeks an official determination by the Comptroller General of the issues involved in the President's message. Also included is the text of the President's message.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
The Comptroller General,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Section 638 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1956 provides that funds appropriated in that act cannot be used for the performance under contract with private industry of functions theretofore carried on by civilian Government personnel if the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives disapproves.

Under date of July 13, 1955, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a statement setting forth his position in connection with section 638. He stated, in substance, that he had approved the bill, but that were it not for the urgent need of the funds by the Department of Defense he would have withheld his approval of the bill, since he had been advised by the Attorney General that section 638 constitutes an unconstitutional invasion of the province of the Executive; that he believed it to be his duty to oppose such a violation; and that while Congress has the right to deny an appropriation, it has not the right to confer upon its committees the power to veto executive action in the administration of an appropriation. A particularly pertinent part of the statement reads as follows:

"Since the organization of our Government, the President has felt bound to insist that executive functions be maintained unimpaired by legislative encroachment, just as the legislative branch has felt bound to resist interference with its power by the Executive. To acquiesce in a provision that seeks to encroach upon the proper authority of the Executive establishes a dangerous precedent. I do not, by my approval of H. R. 6042, acquiesce in the provisions of section 638, and to the extent that this section seeks to give to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives authority to veto or prevent executive action, such section will be regarded as invalid by the executive branch of the Government in the administration of H. R. 6042, unless otherwise determined by a court of competent jurisdiction."

The question upon which I should like to have your advice concerns the authority and the responsibility of the General Accounting Office in the audit of appropriated funds to disallow credit for payments which contravene the provisions either of the act which makes the appropriation, or of any other applicable statute.

I am in full accord with the President when he refers to the fact that three separate and independent branches of government were established by the Constitution of the United States; when he refers to the duty and responsibility of each of these branches to refrain from exercising functions which properly have been conferred upon another branch; and when he refers to the duty of public officials to resist encroachments upon their constituted responsibilities. However, I must part company with the President when he takes to himself the right to declare unconstitutional the provisions of any law prior to a binding decision by the Supreme Court of the United States.

If I interpret the President's statement correctly, he takes the position that since he believes section 638 to be unconstitutional, upon advice by his legal adviser, the Attorney General, he does not intend to comply with that section unless it be declared valid by a court of competent jurisdiction. I had always thought that once a bill is passed by both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President of the United States, the provisions of that law were binding on all of us. I had always thought that personal views with respect to constitutionality, no matter by whom those views might be entertained, could not detract one iota from the conclusive effect of the law so long as it remained on the books unrepealed, or until its provisions were declared to be unconstitutional by a court of last resort. In this I am reminded—and I might say supported—by a portion of Abraham Lincoln's first inaugural address, in which he said:

"I take the official oath today with no mental reservations and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hypercritical rules; and while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed than to violate any of them trusting to find impunity in having them to be held to be unconstitutional."

Unless I am greatly mistaken, former Comptroller Generals have taken the position that it is not a proper function of that office to determine constitutionality of laws duly enacted by the Congress. I believe, too, that in the past when there have come to the attention of the Comptroller General facts which indicate an intention not to conform to duly enacted provisions of law, firm steps were taken by the General Accounting Office to obviate such intended violations of law, even to the extent of withholding funds from the agency involved. Specifically, I should like to know what the General Accounting Office intends to do in the situation at hand.

Sincerely yours,

PORTER HARDY, JR.,
Member of Congress.

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today approved H. R. 6042 making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. I have done so because the funds which the bill makes available are urgently needed by the Department of Defense. Except for this imperative need, I would have withheld my approval of the bill, for I am advised by the Attorney General that one of its provisions, section 638, constitutes an unconstitutional invasion of the province of the Executive.

Section 638 deals with the authority of the Department of Defense to rid itself of many of the manifold activities that it has been performing with its civilian personnel, and that can be adequately and economically performed by private industry without danger to the national security. That section states that funds appropriated in the bill cannot be used to enable the Secretary of Defense to exercise this authority if, in the case of any activity of the Department proposed to be terminated, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives disapproves such proposed termination.

The Constitution of the United States divides the functions of the Government into three departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—and establishes the principle that they shall be kept separate. Neither may exercise functions belonging to the others. Section 638 violates this constitutional principle.

I believe it to be my duty to oppose such a violation. The Congress has the power and the right to grant or to deny an appropriation. But once an appropriation is made the appropriation must, under the Constitution, be administered by the executive branch of the Government alone, and the Congress has no right to confer upon its committees the power to veto executive action or to prevent executive action from becoming effective.

Since the organization of our Government, the President has felt bound to insist that executive functions be maintained unimpaired by legislative encroachment, just as the legislative branch has felt bound to resist interference with its power by the Executive. To acquiesce in a provision that seeks to encroach upon the proper authority of the Executive establishes a dangerous precedent. I do not, by my approval of H. R. 6042, acquiesce in the provisions of section 638, and to the extent that this section seeks to give to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives authority to veto or prevent executive action, such section will be regarded as invalid by the executive branch of the Government in the administration of H. R. 6042, unless otherwise determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

One other rider added to the bill is most unfortunate. This rider—contained in section 630—virtually precludes the Services

from considering the purchase of foreign made spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth.

This rider—attached to the bill without adequate opportunity for reasons against it to be presented—runs directly counter to the steps which have been taken by the administration in the field of Government procurement policy. No reason appears why foreign made spun silk yarn, or indeed any other article or commodity of foreign origin, should be singled out for special exemption from the general provisions of the buy-American legislation. By making it virtually impossible for our friends abroad to sell us goods when such goods are materially less expensive to our taxpayers than those that can be procured domestically, such provisions could effect a deadly attrition of our whole international trade policy and bring about impairment of our relations with other nations.

It is my earnest hope that as soon as possible the Congress will repeal section 630 of the bill in its entirety.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 13, 1955.*

Annual Report of Hon. Stuyvesant Wainwright, Member of Congress, First District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is my annual report to you, the citizen, the taxpayer. As your Congressman, I am your employee; consequently, you are entitled to know what has transpired in the Congress of the United States this year.

To properly present the picture to you, we must start with the President's state of the Union message in January. At that time President Eisenhower asked the Congress for specific legislation for the benefit of all of the people. He set the guideposts for Congress to follow. Rather than say whether this was a good or bad Congress, let me present a basic score chart. Then you can determine whether we were useful or whether we were "do-nothing." Remember one thing: This Congress was controlled by the Democratic Party. They had enough votes alone to carry out the President's program had they been so inclined.

THE EISENHOWER REQUESTS

First. A badly needed national highway program was offered. This was killed by a straight Democratic Party vote.

Second. A strong resolution on the defense of Formosa was requested. This was passed with only three dissenting votes.

Third. Extension of flexible farm supports to help all farmers was part of the Eisenhower Republican program. This was defeated by a coalition of midwestern Republicans and the Democrats.

Fourth. Extension of the draft was recommended. This measure was passed by a bipartisan vote.

Fifth. A military Reserve program was proposed. The Congress, on a split-party vote, gave the President a very weak manpower law.

Sixth. Federal aid to school building was called for. The Democratic leadership refused to let the measure be debated.

Seventh. Better health and welfare requirements were urged. The Democratic leadership refused to let this measure be debated.

Eighth. A reasonable increase—from 75 cents to 90 cents—in the minimum-wage law was suggested. Big union pressure forced the Democrats to pass a $1 minimum. By this action they killed all chance of widening coverage. The 90-cent figure would have offered the opportunity to give coverage to those unfortunate people who do not have the benefit of big union representation.

Ninth. The President's atom-powered merchant ship proposal would have done much to advance our practical application policy for the peaceful use of atomic energy. The Democratic-controlled committes of Congress turned down this reasonable request on straight party-line votes.

Tenth. Statehood for Hawaii was defeated by the Democratic leadership forcing Alaska into the vote.

Eleventh. Pay increases for the military and for the Federal employees were passed by a large bipartisan vote.

Twelfth. Foreign military assistance was passed by a moderate bipartisan vote.

These 12 major items are symbolic of the treatment the President received. As you can see six measures were defeated outright. The balance, except the noncontroversial, were reduced in potentiality.

It is difficult to understand why, for example, the Democratic leadership turned a deaf ear to the President's request for juvenile delinquency studies. In the field of foreign affairs, tariff and trade, the Democratic Congress has supported the President rather well. But this impression has tended to mislead the public into believing that this has also been true with respect to domestic matters. While I have mentioned a number of key items in the President's program which the Congress killed or pigeonholed, additional mention must be made on one issue: Roads. What better way of expressing my own opinion than to quote the President's statement:

> I am deeply disappointed by the rejection by the House of Representatives of legislation to authorize a nationwide system of highways.
>
> The Nation badly needs new highways. The good of our people, of our economy and of our defense, requires that construction of these highways be undertaken at once.
>
> There is difference of conviction, I realize, over means of financing this construction.
>
> I have proposed one plan of financing which I consider to be sound. Others have proposed other methods. Adequate financing there must be, but contention over the method should not be permitted to deny our people these critically needed roads.
>
> I would devoutly hope that the Congress would reconsider this entire matter before terminating this session.

Congress did not reconsider; 214 Democrats joined 7 Republicans in voting down the President's proposal. But they went even further; 128 Democrats voted against their own road bill. This is another example proving the difficulties a Republican President must endure with a Democratic Congress. Newspaper accounts tend to overplay what has been done; they skip lightly over the failures.

Yet the President on his own initiative carried out two more Republican pledges. He obtained the release of our fliers, unjustly imprisoned by the Chinese Communists. But possibly more important, he also put forward the key to peace at the Geneva summit conference. There is now a cautious hope for world harmony.

A report to the people that neglected to present these facts to you would be worthless. Now you can be the judge of this 1st session of the 84th Congress.

CONTINUED LOCAL PROSPERITY

In my annual report of 1954 I predicted for Long Island—for 1955—abundance and prosperity. I predicted a continuance of our population increase; of our building boom; of continued industrial expansion. My political opponents cried, "Politics." Yet every bureau of Government shows that, for once, people in a peacetime economy "never did have it so good." The population figures obtained from unofficial sources—we do not have a census until 1960—shows that this congressional district is probably well over 600,000, or double the size at the time of my election in 1952.

For the next 12 months, I predict a continuation of this expansion and prosperity for Long Island in nearly all manner or means with the principal exception of the potato farmer. And why is he suffering? Overproduction is the simple and correct answer. California, for example, has planted thousands upon thousands of new acres in potatoes. But what is worse is to be found with the sometimes termed free-ride farmer. He is being paid by your Government not to plant wheat and corn. So what does he do? Why, of course, he plants potatoes; and, this activity has greatly added to this year's overlarge crop. The farmers' price has been cut to a diminutive figure. The Congress opposed my proposals to restrict the so-called free-ride farmer from planting potatoes in diverted acres.

However, your Congressman has attacked this problem by recommending to the Department of Agriculture a 7-point program. We have held a series of meetings with the Department leaders and with the potato industry in an effort to define an effective policy. It is not quite as easy as it sounds: 400 million bushels will be grown this year; the country can absorb only 340 million by home consumption and through export. What does one do with the 60 million bushels? Dump them in the ocean? This even goes against the grain of the socialist types. Crop price support? Maybe. It is certainly better than starvation. The ultimate answer is less production; but, how do you tell a free American farmer not to plant this or that? By this potato

example you see but one of the major problems a Congressman must face.

POSTAL MATTERS

On the positive side of our efforts in the postal field, I am pleased to point up some of the present achievements:

A. Obtained new postoffice facilities for Bayport, Centereach, North Massapequa, and Rocky Point.

B. Obtained an extension of R. F. D. services from the Central Islip office.

C. Obtained city delivery for the Parkdale area from the Farmingdale Post Office.

D. Awaiting an appropriation of up to $725,000 for a new post office in Babylon.

E. Approved city delivery in the village of East Hampton on a permanent basis.

F. Obtained the continuance of operation of the Shinnecock Hills Post Office—the Department had closed this facility.

G. Obtained city delivery for West Sayville.

MILITARY AND FOREIGN ACTIVITIES

Our military appointments have been most successful. Two young men from Suffolk were among the 21 sent by New York to the new Air Force Academy. As you can see, this county can well be proud to send 10 percent of New York's representation when we have less than 2 percent of the population. The periodic grades of the young men in all of the service academies are sent to me. I have written them letters of encouragement, and sometimes, of warning. Next year I will fill additional vacancies based, as usual, on a comprehensive examination.

One great field of service by our office involves foreign travel. Our office expedited the issuance of over 50 passports. From the date of application a passport takes nearly 6 weeks before it is issued. We are averaging slightly better than 10 days.

People say the Refugee Relief Act has not been working. This is fallacious. This year we have assisted more than 40 people in obtaining admission to this country, and over half of these were admitted under this act. Of seven private immigration bills introduced in this past session of Congress, favorable action was taken by the House of Representatives on all but one. Two have already received final action by the President. The other four bills will be acted upon by the Senate early in the next session. It is anticipated that final action by the President would be taken no later than March 1.

We have serviced over 50 veterans' cases, clarifying such matters as national service life insurance dividends and disability compensation. We have gone to the Veterans' Administration in 10 instances of reported abuses by builders in veterans' housing matters. For all but one instance the complaints have been successfully resolved; and, in this one, we believe a settlement wil be obtained.

We have received over 80 requests from servicemen for compassionate transfers and emergency leaves or discharges. The policy for our Government must be observed, yet in certain very desperate situations we have been able to bring a boy home in time to visit with a dying parent. We are able to obtain special discharges in cases of extreme hardship. In one instance we were able to arrange, on 8 hours' notice for a mother to fly to England to visit her GI son, badly injured in an auto accident.

EROSION AND PUBLIC WORKS

In the field of public works for Long Island, we believe that more has been achieved, with one major exception, than in any single year. For example, Fire Island Inlet was accepted as a permanent maintenance project. The United States Army engineers have allocated funds for studies of both the Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets. This will require an expenditure of $16,400. Based on these studies, permanent programs will be instituted. In addition to these achievements, for the two inlets in question, the Coast Guard has made sizable commitments with regard to their receiving new channel markings

For years the users of Mattituck and Montauk Harbors have been demanding a better channel. This year we succeeded, and dredging work has just been completed. More must be done. For example, in the Montauk Harbor case we will make an all-out effort to obtain funds for repair and maintenance of the southeast jetty. Maintenance funds were obtained for the dredging of the Great South Bay inland waterway channel. This, too, must be kept open or else the advantage of this natural waterway is lost.

One unfortunate story must be related. Due to a refusal on the part of the Governor of the State of New York to permit the contribution of $12,500, a $50,000 cooperative study has been willfully delayed. No progress on erosion can be realized until the United States Army engineers make the survey in question. Fifty percent of the funds must come from State and local sources and 50 percent from the Federal Government. Late last year the county of Suffolk put up its share—$12,500. This was to be added to last year's token amount provided by the Federal Government. Congress completed the balance of the Federal funds this year. However, even after a visit to Suffolk County, and, recognizing our plight, the Governor of New York—Averell Harriman—withheld State moneys from this project until recently. It is utterly incomprehensible why politics should be injected into beach erosion. In Washington, Republicans and Democrats work in harmony where the public welfare requires. Why should this not be true in New York State?

HURRICANE WARNINGS

You may remember that directly after hurricane Carol, in September 1954, I visited with the Chief of the Weather Bureau and his staff. At that time I recommended vast changes in the hurricane advisory services. The results will be seen this year in the excellent warning systems provided when and if a hurricane is sighted.

The Weather Bureau is only one phase of hurricane work. A disaster plan on the local level is essential.

MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to these major projects, a number of local and miscellaneous items should be called to your attention:

First. A special column has been written for your weekly newspaper. In this manner you can be constantly aware of current problems. For the balance of this year my column will be written by members of the President's Cabinet and other executive heads.

Second. A regular radio broadcast report has been made over all local radio stations each Sunday from January through August. These will be resumed in January 1956.

Third. Office hours are held periodically in Huntington and Wainscott. In addition, the Washington office will provide daily service 52 weeks a year and members of my staff will be available on Long Island at all times.

Fourth. Consultations have been held with the Director of Fish and Wildlife and the Secretary of the Interior in an effort to have the special Long Island wildfowl hunting season continued.

Fifth. Prohibited the closing of the Shinnecock Canal bridge by the United States Army Antiaircraft Command. Had this action taken place, Southport would have been cut off during the crucial weekend traffic periods.

Sixth. Have advocated and am pursuing the possibility of erecting a new bridge across the Shinnecock Canal to accommodate present traffic demands.

Seventh. Have interceded in behalf of local residents with the United States Army to see that no community harm occurred in the selection and operation of Nike sites. This often proved difficult, due to the personal interests involved. However, location of the existing sites are in the best interests of the national defense.

Eighth. Polled, at my own expense, a cross section of the citizens of the district on the issues of the day. Only by sampling your opinion can I be kept constantly aware of your views.

Ninth. Conducted an Americanism essay contest for youngsters with the prize—a framed parchment of the oath of allegiance—being presented to the winner by President Dwight Eisenhower in his office in the White House. Not only were the winner and his family present, but also the leaders of Suffolk County's veterans' organizations participated.

Tenth. Established and presented a political-science prize at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point. While this institution is not in the district, we on Long Island are all proud of its record.

Eleventh. Assisted First District small-business firms in obtaining their fair share of defense contracts.

Twelfth. Introduced legislation for the reimbursement of federally impacted school districts which had already gone ahead with their school-building programs. This legislation passed the House of Representatives, the Senate, and was signed by the President of the United States. Many Long Island school districts have benefited from this, as well

as other school districts throughout the United States.

As usual, it has been a pleasure to serve you for another year. Your patience, where we have tried and have not been successful, is especially appreciated. Your comments, advice, and suggestions are always welcome.

Activities of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives—The Chairman's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Small Business was created in the 84th Congress by House Resolution 114, agreed to on January 27, 1955. Creation of the present committee marked the seventh consecutive Congress in which a Small Business Committee has been appointed since the first such committee was created in 1941, by a resolution which I introduced.

During the first session of the 84th Congress, as in past years, a large part of the committee's time and staff assistance has been taken up with the handling of a large volume of day-to-day requests from small businesses. These requests were referred to the committee, for the most part, by Members of the House. They cover, it would seem, almost every topic under the sun. The bulk of these, however, have been from small-business men who have become enmeshed in a procedural snarl while attempting to conclude some business transaction with the Government, who wish to transact some business with the Government, or who find that some Government procedure or regulation is working a hardship. Not a few of the complaints reaching the committee concern alleged violations of law, or alleged malfeasance or misfeasance on the part of Government personnel, and the complainant wishes to preserve a degree of confidentiality from the executive branch, or is not sure of the proper place to make his complaint.

Altogether there have been many hundreds of requests for individual assistance or information, and these have required a large volume of correspondence and a large number of meetings. The committee has given attention to each request made of it, and has tried in each instance to render useful assistance or advice. The committee has given particular attention, however, to those requests which indicate that in helping an individual firm, we will also help small business generally. In short, the committee has paid particular attention to requests which indicate that some Government practice or procedure is adversely affecting small business, or that some other condition exists which may adversely affect numbers of small-business firms.

PROSPERITY OF SMALL BUSINESS

The large volume of requests for assistance in transacting business with the Government may reflect in part the not-too-prosperous state of the small-business segments of business. The unprecedented earnings and dividend payments enjoyed by many of the big corporations during recent months reflect a business prosperity in which smaller firms have not fully shared. Reports of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission for the first quarter of this year show that profit rates of manufacturing corporations were graduated in accordance with the corporate-size class. Furthermore, while profit rates of the largest manufacturing corporations have gone up in recent years, profit rates of smaller corporations have drastically fallen. Annual rates of profits—after taxes—for four selected size groups of manufacturing corporations may be compared for the last several years, as follows:

[In percent]

Asset size of corporations	1952	1953	1954	1st quarter 1955
Less than $250,000	9.3	6.8	3.2	3.6
$1,000,000 to $5,000,000	8.0	7.5	5.6	7.9
$10,000,000 to $50,000,000	9.7	9.9	8.7	9.3
Over $100,000,000	11.8	12.1	12.1	13.8

(Profits as percent of stockholders' equity.)

While there are no official figures for profits in the trade and service fields, Dun & Bradstreet's reports of business failures suggest that small firms in these fields have likewise failed to keep pace in the big business prosperity. Although there were slightly fewer failures in retail trade and commercial service during the first 6 months of the year than there were in the business downturn of the first half of 1954, failures in both of these fields have been considerably greater than in the 2 previous years. The number of retail-trade failures in the first half of 1955 were 36 percent and 31 percent greater, respectively, than in the first half of 1952 and 1953. Similarly, failures in commercial service firms were 33 and 28 percent greater than in 1952 and 1953. Failures in wholesale trade have increased steadily since 1952, and the number of such failures in the first 6 months of 1955 were 47 percent greater than in the first half of 1952. Substantially all of the failures in these three fields—retail, wholesale, and service trades—have been failures of small firms, where liabilities of less than $100,000 were involved.

FORMAL INVESTIGATIONS

In addition to its day-to-day operations, the committee has organized five subcommittees to carry on planned programs of study and investigation. On February 23, 1955, the committee met in open session and announced work programs which encompass a wide variety of subject matter. On introducing the committee's work program at this meeting I pointed out that—

It has been principally for the reason that so many subjects impinge upon the welfare of small business that the House of Representatives has maintained a Small Business Committee during the last 14 years. This committee's job is to study these subjects from the standpoint of small business, and to keep the House advised. For the same reason, however, our committee can hope only to investigate those subjects which are of the more pressing importance to small business. Yet, even so, our agenda is an ambitious one.

I should like to take up now, a brief review of each of the subcommittees' programs and the progress of each during the session of Congress recently closed.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 ON FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Subcommittee No. 1 is composed of the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, chairman; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York; and Hon. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio.

The subcommittee has as its goal a careful study and investigation of the organization and procedures of some 6 or 8 independent Federal regulatory agencies. The duties of these agencies include enforcement of trade and anti-monopoly laws, and the regulation of several major segments of business. Several of these so-called regulatory agencies, such as the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, exercise powers to decide which private firms shall be licensed to operate the quasi-monopolistic business under the jurisdiction of these agencies, and under which terms and conditions these business franchises shall be enjoyed. Manifestly, the manner in which these agencies exercise their powers determines competitive relationships in which small business has a vital concern. The Federal Trade Commission, while it has no duties for regulating commerce, in the strict sense of the phrase, is no less of vital importance to small business. Its function is to try to maintain competition so that competition will be an effective regulator of those segments of business which are not regulated by the other regulatory agencies. It has the duty of enforcing certain of the anti-trust laws, including the Robinson-Patman Act, which have been designed to protect small business and the public generally from monopolistic practices.

One frequently made allegation which the subcommittee is looking into is that these regulatory agencies have lost their independence, through reorganization, and have in practical effect become a part of the executive branch. In announcing the program of the subcommittee, the chairman [Mr. EVINS] said:

We shall pay particular attention to those commissions which have been reorganized under a Hoover Commission reorganization plan. These regulatory commissions were originally conceived to be nonpartisan, or at least bipartisan, and they were intended to be of a judicial character. Most certainly, they were set up to be independent of the executive branch of the Government. The Hoover Commission plans made a radical change from this original conception. These plans made the chairman of each commission responsible to the President, to serve at the pleasure of the President, and they gave the chairman complete control and direction over the commissions' staff. It is now time to find out how these reorganizations have worked out.

The subcommittee has collected and analyzed a considerable body of information bearing upon the organization and enforcement procedures of the FTC and the FPC. In addition, public hearings were held at which officials and former officials of the FTC and the FPC testified on July 18 through 22 and on July 27 and 28.

Conceptually, the independent regulatory agencies operate under delegations of Congress' powers to regulate commerce. They were originally intended to be arms of the Congress and were charged with the enforcement of no policy but the policy of the law. Hence, if through reorganization, or otherwise, these agencies have come under big-business domination, control or even influence, then the Federal agencies and laws which were intended to give impartial treatment to small business have been subverted.

Investigations to date have revealed that if the top managements of the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Power Commission have not demonstrated injudicious leanings in favor of big business, these officials have demonstrated at least a lack of candor in accounting to congressional committees, and to the public generally, for their stewardships of these public agencies.

FACTS AND CLAIMS ABOUT FTC AND FPC

With reference to the Federal Trade Commission, the record reveals several items of too serious a nature to be lightly dismissed.

First. The present Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission—Mr. Howrey—while holding this judicial office, became a member of a group known as the Attorney General's National Committee to Study Antitrust Laws, and assisted that group in preparing a major lobbying effort against the antitrust laws. Among other things, the FTC Chairman assigned staff members of the FTC to assist this group in writing its report, thus diverting funds which had been appropriated by Congress for enforcement of the antitrust laws to the benefit of a private lobbying group whose efforts are directed at wrecking the antitrust laws. The membership of this group was well known when the FTC Chairman joined it; and the group was well known to be made up almost exclusively of lawyers who specialize in defending big business clients in antitrust suits. Another fact which Mr. Howrey could easily have learned before joining this group, if he did not know, was that half of the lawyers in this group were representing defendants in antitrust suits which were actually pending at the very time these lawyers set out to write their report. Subsequently Mr. Howrey signed the report of this group, thus lending the prestige of his high office to a long list of recommendations for weakening the antitrust laws, including both recommendations for tricky changes in the interpretation of these laws by the FTC and the courts and recommendations for weakening these laws by new legislation. Several of the antitrust laws which would be wrecked or substantially weakened by these recommendations, including the Robinson-Patman Act, are among the laws which this official took an oath to uphold and enforce.

Second. During the 2 years of Mr. Howrey's chairmanship of the FTC, he and his General Counsel—Mr. Kintner—have made numerous public references to the Chairman's alleged purity of judicial conduct in disqualifying himself from participating in cases in which he had represented big business clients before the FTC as a private lawyer. Moreover, FTC's General Counsel testified under oath before the subcommittee that the Chairman had never discussed with him the FTC's quantity limit case against the rubber-tire manufacturers, a case in which Mr. Howrey had been counsel for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. Yet 2 minutes later, the Chairman of the FTC was forced to admit that he had accompanied the FTC's General Counsel on a secret visit to the Solicitor General of the United States and that together they discussed this case with the Solicitor General. In explanation for their conduct, both FTC Chairman Howrey and Mr. Kintner told the subcommittee that the purpose of their visit to the Solicitor General was to urge him to comply with a formal request of the Federal Trade Commission that he petition the Supreme Court of the United States to review this case. The facts show that after the informal visit from the FTC Chairman and his General Counsel, the Solicitor General rejected the FTC's formal request. An inevitable result of this was that the case was remanded to a United States district court; and a probable further result will be that another 10 years will elapse before this case reaches the Supreme Court, during which time the FTC's cease-and-desist order will be held in abeyance, and the tire companies involved in this case will be free to continue the monopolistic practices which the FTC's order was intended to stop.

Third. Both the FTC Chairman and his General Counsel have made a number of speeches during the past 12 months giving the impression that the FTC had mobilized to combat the wave of business mergers which has been receiving a great deal of public attention, and that this agency was going vigorously about the enforcement of the new antimerger law. For example, on January 27, 1955, FTC's General Counsel made a speech which was headlined in the press as "Mergers Jam FTC Work, Official Says."

A subcommittee questionnaire answered by the FTC in March shows, however, that through mid-February 1955 only 6 percent of FTC's expenses had been made for antimerger work, including a substantial sum spent in making a study of mergers. A further answer to the subcomittee's questionnaire revealed that the FTC had not issued a single antimerger complaint in the 9½ months since Chairman Howrey's much-ballyhooed reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission, which was to mobilize the FTC to cope with mergers and other monopoly problems.

In mid-May 1955, the Federal Trade Commission released a 230-page report on mergers. Data in this report showed that 522 corporate mergers had been made by combines having in excess of $50 million of assets, and the report shows such other facts as these: 22 big corporations had acquired and merged 244 other corporations; 1 huge corporation had acquired and merged 48 other corporations in the dairy-food field, and another huge corporation had acquired and merged 17 corporations in the same field. FTC still had issued no antimerger complaint during the fiscal year 1955. In June 1955 a hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary revealed that FTC had still issued no antimerger complaint during the fiscal year 1955, and that it had made only 4 field investigations of mergers.

Fourth. Over the past 18 months the FTC Chairman and his General Counsel—Mr. Kintner—have made numerous speeches describing a new and vigorous program for prosecuting violations of the FTC cease-and-desist orders which have accumulated over the years. In testimony before the subcommittee on July 18, 1955, FTC's General Counsel was forced to admit that under Mr. Howrey's chairmanship the FTC has not brought a single suit seeking penalties for a violation of FTC's cease-and-desist orders in antimonopoly cases. The vigorous new program, which is under the General Counsel's direction, has, however, resulted in civil penalty suits against small-business firms for alleged violations of orders against allegedly misleading advertising.

The factual basis for FTC's recent claims that its work during the past fiscal year has set an all-time record for vigorous enforcement of the antimonopoly laws are yet to be examined. The FTC publicity handouts make much of the point that 30 cease-and-desist orders were issued in antimonopoly cases during the year, as compared to an average of 24 per year in the 4 previous years. These handouts neglect to mention, however, that 18, or nearly two-thirds, of the 30 antimonopoly orders issued during the past fiscal year were worked out in agreement with the alleged law violators, and were consented to by them without contest. The quality of the orders issued even without the violator's consent, moreover, is a matter which can be appraised only after the contents of these orders are carefully compared with the exact charges previously made against the alleged violators in the FTC complaints. A former FTC Commissioner told the subcommittee, with reference to these statistics, that "it is very easy to make out a case of great activity if you do not differentiate the elephants from the rabbits."

The other basis on which the FTC lays its claims to record-sitting antimonopoly activity is the fact that it issued 36 new complaints in the past year, as compared to an average of 29 new complaints in the 4 previous fiscal years. An often-made allegation is that FTC has recently directed its antimonopoly complaints at small-business firms and has thus shifted its fire from the monopoly "elephants" to the monopoly "rabbits." This allegation could be quickly and definitely set-

tled by comparing the asset sizes of the firms against which complaints have been issued during the past several years. On July 19, 1955, the subcommittee requested FTC Chairman Howrey to submit such comparisons, but to date this information has not been received by the subcommittee.

With reference to the Federal Power Commission, the investigation to date likewise indicates that if the top management of this agency has not shown injudicious leanings in favor of big business, it, too, has been less than candid in discussing with congressional committees certain of its actions which have favored big business.

First. The subcommittee's investigation revealed that the FPC and certain of its staff members advised on and assisted in the drafting of the proposed Dixon-Yates contract. Evidence adduced at the hearings on July 28, 1955, reveals that the General Counsel and two assistant general counsels of the FPC's Bureau of Laws had been asked for legal opinions on the Dixon-Yates contract at the time this contract was being negotiated and that these three officials had rendered opinions strongly condemning the proposed contract. Two legal memoranda on this subject prepared by the Acting General Counsel and the Assistant General Counsel of the FPC were submitted to the FPC in late August of 1954, and the FPC formally heard the opinion of its General Counsel on the same subject in mid-September of 1954. Yet in November 1954, when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy sought to obtain from the FPC Chairman—Mr. Kuykendall—any opinions which FPC's Bureau of Laws might have rendered on the Dixon-Yates contract, the FPC Chairman told that committee that the Bureau of Laws had not been asked to render an opinion.

Second. While the Small Business Committee has not and will not attempt to appraise the question whether the public interest would have been better served by the construction of Federal high dam in Hells Canyon than by turning this power site over to a private utility for the erection of low dams, the committee has noted that in its announcement of August 3, 1955, the Federal Power Commission states that it formally decided this question on July 27, 1955. In testifying before the subcommittee on July 28 the FPC Chairman refused to answer questions pertaining to the Hells Canyon matter on the ground that this matter was pending before the Federal Power Commission for decision.

QUESTIONS OF INDEPENDENCE

The subcommittee's studies to date indicate that a number of the regulatory agencies were reorganized not only as a result of the Hoover Commission reorganization plans, but that they have subsequently been reorganized to meet recommendations of private firms of management consultants, or consultants employed for this purpose. Information obtained from the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Power Commission indicate that all of these agencies have been twice reorganized since 1950.

The investigations and hearings to date have raised a number of important issues about which the subcommittee has not yet reached conclusions. It may be noted, however, that a diversity of views has been expressed concerning the system whereby the Chairmen of these Commissions are named by the President.

With reference to the FTC, the Chairman—Mr. Howrey—testified that he approves the present system. Commissioner Gwynne indicated that he likewise favors the system of a permanent Chairman and believes this system contributes to more prompt handling of the Commission's work. Commissioner Secrest indicated that because of his limited experience on the FTC he had no recommendation on the question whether the system of Commission selection of its Chairman, or Presidential selection, is better, but Commissioner Secrest did recommend taking away the power of the President to change the Chairman. Commissioner Mead, who will retire from the FTC on September 26, strongly recommended a return to the system whereby the FTC selects its own Chairman, with the creation of a strong executive officer to be responsible to the whole Commission. Former Commissioners Carson, Spingarn, and Caretta—who likewise served on the FTC both before and after the Hoover Commission reorganization plan went into effect—made similar recommendations. Former Commissioner Freer, who is now a practicing attorney before the ICC and the FPC, gave the subcommittee a history of the various organization plans which have been tried in those Commissions, and strongly urged a return to the system whereby the regulatory Commissions select their own Chairmen.

Testimony of officials of the FPC was unanimous on the point that this Commission is intended, and must be in fact, an arm of Congress, free from executive influence. Hearings brought out that the Chairman—Mr. Kuykendall—had sought and received from the White House an opinion concerning the scope of his power and duties as Chairman.

The Chairman—Mr. Kuykendall—expressed agreement with the reorganization plan under which the FPC now operates, although he pointed out that he had not been a Commissioner prior to the adoption of this plan. Commissioner Draper, who has been a member of the FPC for 22 years, told the subcommittee that he preferred the old system and that he had dissented on the reorganization plan.

Commissioner Steuck told the subcommittee that he was appointed to the Commission since the adoption of the reorganization plan, but that he thinks under the plan the FPC is pretty efficient.

Former Commissioner Leland Olds indicated that he has had no firsthand experience with the reorganization plan, but he strongly advised against any plan of organization which tends to isolate the Commission's staff from the Commission or which tends to inhibit the free exchange of policymaking considerations and technical information between the Commission and its staff.

Investigation and study of the independent regulatory agencies will continue throughout the fall and winter.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT, DISPOSAL, AND LOAN ACTIVITIES

This subcommittee is composed of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, chairman; Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee; and Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York.

For several years now we have had laws which declare our public policy to be that small business shall have a fair share of the Federal business transacted with private firms. These declarations of policy have been especially clear with reference to Government purchases and Government disposals of surplus property, and they have also applied at times to Government-provided inducements for expansion of business capacity. One of the primary functions of the Small Business Committee has been—likewise for several years—to determine to what extent this policy is being carried out and to recommend steps for seeing that the policy is carried out.

In announcing the program of the subcommittee on February 23 the chairman [Mr. MULTER] said:

> Of course, we already know many of the answers; the problem is in many respects not new to us. The solution of the problem requires constant attention and hard work. Perhaps our public policy can never be carried out completely, but we think that improvements can be made. Great improvements already have been made in past years, largely as a result of the work of this committee.
>
> • • • • •
>
> The procedures and practices surrounding the Government's transactions with private firms are vastly complex. It was largely for this reason that the programs of the Small Business Administration were established. In instituting these programs, Congress created an agent to stay on the job constantly, to work continuously at finding ways to carry out our public policy on safeguarding small business in these procurement and disposal matters, and to provide certain technical and informational assistance to small business of all kinds so as to build up the Nation's economic strength.

As the Small Business Act of 1953 was to expire on June 30, 1955, the first order of business of the subcommittee was to appraise the operations of the Small Business Administration and to determine whether there was a substantial need for continuing this agency. Consequently, during the past session of Congress the subcommittee devoted a major portion of its time to these problems. Since the SBA was created as a planning agency, with quasi-supervisory duties over the operations of certain programs of tht other Federal agencies, it was necessary to review the operations of these programs in order to obtain a comprehensive review of SBA's operations, and to appraise the success of its mission.

Public hearings were held on 8 days during March. Officials of the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission testified concerning their procurement and disposal programs, and

concerning SBA's part in these programs. In addition, SBA officials testified on its activities in these fields, as well as on its loan, technical assistance, and other programs. Several small-business men, officials of small-business trade associations, and several Members of Congress testified concerning their experiences with SBA and made thoughtful recommendations for improving the agency's operations. The subcommittee's report—House Report No. 1045—was filed with the Clerk of the House on July 1, 1955. Since that date investigations and study have continued, particularly for the purpose of devising recommendations for a new law. Several of the recommendations thus made were adopted by Congress and appear in the new law—Public Law 268—which was signed by the President on August 9, 1955.

The subcommittee found almost unanimous agreement that there is a substantial need for continuing a Federal small business agency to carry out the functions which SBA has been authorized to perform. The committee also found, however, the SBA's performance of these functions has fallen considerably short of the success that could be hoped for.

SMALL HELP TO SMALL BUSINESS

One of the principal functions of the SBA is to carry out the financial assistance programs authorized by the Small Business Act. It has long been recognized that there is a serious gap between the legitimate needs of small firms for business capital and the amount of such capital which can be supplied under the present organization of private financing institutions. Generally speaking the central equity markets do not provide a practical means whereby small business can raise funds. Moreover, the local commercial banks upon which small business must generally depend for loan funds cannot supply such funds adequately or on the terms which loan funds are available to big business. In view of the ever-increasing need for business loan funds, the deficiency in such funds available to small business is an especially serious matter. With the abolition of the RFC in mid-1953, the SBA was given the job of helping to increase the flow of loan funds to small business.

Information made available by the subcommittee indicates that although SBA has operated its loan program under rather narrow definitions of "small business," there are at least 3½ million firms falling within these definitions, and they account for somewhere between one-third and one-half of the total volume of nonagricultural business done in the Nation. Yet, the maximum amount of business loans which can be credited to SBA's activities over the past 2 years has amounted to only $1 out of every $1,700 of business investment in new plant and equipment during these years. Similarly, the maximum amount of business lending which can be attributed to SBA—including lending from private funds—has amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of the total expansion in business debt during these years.

SBA has received inquiries from small-business men concerning loans at an average of better than 11,000 per month. In its entire 21 months of operations, however, only 5,085 of these inquiries successfully passed SBA's screening tests and became formal applications for loans. And of these few which SBA did allow to become formal applications, it approved only about one-fifth, or a net of 1,141. Only 395 of these approved applications were for direct loans, which involve no bank participation, and SBA had actually made disbursements of only 276 of these.

Although $80 million had been appropriated for SBA's loan fund, as of April 30, 1955, it had actually disbursed only $19.1 million on business loans, of which $2.5 million of principal had been repaid. SBA had, however, charged its loan fund with $4.1 million for the administrative expense of its financial-assistance program.

The second major function of the SBA is to carry out its statutory obligation to assist small business in obtaining a fair share for Government purchases and production contracts. The volume of such purchases and contracts continues to account for an important part of the total sales of manufactured goods. The Department of Defense alone is awarding contracts at the rate of approximately $16 billion a year, and is, in addition, distributing between $1 billion and $1.5 billion a year to encourage research and development. Manifestly, the way in which these production contracts and these funds for research and development are distributed will have a continuing effect upon private competitive relationships for many years to come.

SBA has handled its all-important obligation for seeing that small business obtains a fair share of defense contracts by its joint determination program. This program is one by which SBA reviews proposed procurements and recommends to the military procurement officers that certain of these procurements be earmarked for distribution among firms having less than 500 employees. From August 1953, through March 1955, the contracts so earmarked amounted to 1 percent of the total value of all the military contracts awarded in that period, and the contracts so earmarked that were actually awarded to firms with less than 500 employees amounted to less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the value of all the military contracts awarded in the period. In the same period, military contracts awarded to firms with less than 500 employees, whether or not earmarked, amounted to 15 percent of the value of all the contracts awarded. In contrast to the 15 percent of the defense business which firms with less than 500 employees actually obtained, and to the three-fourths of 1 percent of the contracts which such firms obtained as a result of SBA's efforts, firms with less than 500 employees normally account for about 42 percent of all the manufacturing in the United States.

SBA's failure to achieve more than microscopic results from its two major programs has inevitably raised a grave question whether the expense and trouble which this agency has caused small-business firms have not, on the whole, been greater than its positive contributions to small business; and this does not take account of the intangible effects of holding out false hopes to small-business men that assistance can be had where, according to the record, the overwelming odds are that assistance cannot be had. It is strongly hoped, however, that SBA's performance will rapidly and markedly improve.

Your Small Business Committee will watch and work for improvements in the SBA and in this effort the committee will need and welcome the observations and suggestions of every Member of the House. The new small business bill which was recently passed into law gives the SBA additional and broader authorities for assisting small business, but only public opinion and the continuing attention of Congress can compel that these authorities be used. It should be plain by now that without the continuous support and help of the peoples' elected representatives, who are in a unique position to know about and understand the complex ways by which the Government can be organized and run for the special benefit of a few giant corporations, our Nation would soon be paying the price of a totalitarian control over our economic lives.

Several programs and activities of the SBA are urgently in need of immediate review and decision. The new SBA law prohibits the SBA from engaging in activities which duplicate the activities of other Federal agencies. This does not mean that where there is now a forbidden duplication the SBA will necessarily be the agency to withdraw from the activity; but it does mean that a number of so-called technical assistance programs for small business must be either centered in the SBA or another agency, such as the Department of Commerce. The committee will appreciate any suggestions from Members of the House concerning any of these specific activities.

Without question it is proper and necessary that small-business men who apply to SBA for a loan be investigated as to their credit standing, their general character, and their business reputation, as is common in commercial practice. Small-business men naturally expect to be so investigated. It has recently been revealed, however, that in addition to investigations of the type which are normal in commercial practice, SBA has secretly been subjecting small-business men who apply for loans to security or suitability investigations similar to those required for Federal employees. This too, to my mind, raises questions for reappraisal, both as to the necessity and propriety of Federal prying into personal histories beyond the requirements of prudent commercial safeguards.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 ON MINERALS AND PRODUCTION MATERIALS

This subcommittee is composed of the Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, chairman; Hon. TOM STEED, of Oklahoma; and Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois.

The subcommittee has as its work program investigations of certain minerals and other basic production materials which have been in recurring short supply. In announcing the program of the subcommittee on February 23, 1955, the chairman [Mr. YATES] said:

This whole matter of recurring shortages of certain raw materials needs a searching investigation. The small businesses that depend upon these essential production materials cannot survive unless steps are taken to see that they get a fair share of whatever supplies are available.

Shortly after this announcement was made the subcommittee received a number of requests for help from the nonintegrated aluminum fabricators. Shortages of aluminum became more acute, and a number of small fabricators reported they were able to obtain only a fraction of the amount of aluminum they normally use and need. Such reduced supplies appeared to be considerably less than were required to maintain their plants at normal operating levels. Businesses which had expanded in anticipation of adequate supplies of primary aluminum found themselves unable to obtain the amounts needed, making it necessary for them to curtail production.

The subcommittee undertook hearings in an effort to help alleviate the shortage. Hearings were held on 6 days during May 1955, at which members of the industry and officials of the Government testified. In addition, on June 21, 1955, the subcommittee had hearings in the nature of a roundtable discussion among all segments of the industry, hoping to establish standards which would assure equitable distribution of the aluminum released from stockpile requirements. Both the primary producers and the nonintegrated users indicated that they felt that the hearing had been constructive. For example, the executive secretary of one of the fabricator trade associations wrote the subcommittee, in part, as follows:

In conclusion, we wish to compliment the committee for the attention given to this serious problem in the aluminum industry and also commend the members for holding a special hearing on June 21, in Washington, in which all segments of the aluminum industry were present. This indeed was an accomplishment, since it was the first time that all segments of the aluminum industry were afforded the opportunity to sit down at a roundtable and present the facts and discuss them in the open. A continuance of this type of hearings would be in order so that problems of the aluminum industry, and particularly those affecting the independents, could be voiced and solutions offered.

The investigation indicated that the acute shortage stemmed, in part, from a serious miscalculation of the increasing industrial demand for aluminum. It was indicated, too, that operations of the Government stockpiling program has aggravated the situation, by taking the entire surplus aluminum production over and above the estimated demand for industrial uses. Inasmuch as the stockpile proposed to take all aluminum produced in excess of industrial demand, when estimates of industrial demand were drastically in error, the quantities of aluminum allocated for delivery to the stockpile materially added to the pinch on small aluminum businesses.

With an inadequate supply to go around to all aluminum users, and in the face of competition in fabrication by the three primary producers, small fabricators had to press constantly to obtain enough raw materials to stay in business. A further complication was the continued purchasing by the primary producers of aluminum scrap, which resulted in some measure in raising the price of aluminum scrap.

The subcommittee is continuing to make a careful and detailed study of the aluminum problem, in order to arrive at recommendations which will safeguard both the interest of national defense and the small fabricators. One of the underlying considerations is that the producers of primary aluminum have reached their present stage of output with considerable Government assistance. Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, productive capacity for primary aluminum has been more than doubled, largely as a result of Government-provided incentives. These incentives include Government contracts to purchase surplus output under specified terms and conditions. Conversely, however, these contracts also call for the producers to make specified quantities of primary aluminum available to the nonintegrated users. One of the questions which the subcommittee has under study, therefore, is whether there should be more vigorous enforcement of the Government's contractual rights on behalf of the small fabricators. Similarly, the subcommittee has under study questions whether the executive departments, such as Office of Defense Mobilization, the Office of Export Supply, and the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce, are following policies and procedures which properly protect the interests of small business. Finally, the subcommittee also has under study the question whether a new expansion program should be encouraged.

Considerable staff work has been done on copper and nickel. In addition, careful study was given to the plan for disposing of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants which was submitted to Congress early in the session, and the chairman [Mr. YATES] testified before the House Armed Services Committee, pointing out several respects in which the plan drawn up by the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission could be improved from the standpoint of safeguarding the interest of small rubber fabricators.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 ON THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

This subcommittee is composed of Hon. TOM STEED of Oklahoma, chairman; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California; and Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut.

The mission of the subcommittee is to complete an investigation which was begun during the last term of Congress. Its primary concern is with the aircraft parts industry, which is largely a small-business industry. This industry is comprised of firms which make a countless variety of parts, pieces, components, instruments, and so forth, which go into the assembled aircraft.

The problems in this industry arise from two conditions, as were explained by the chairman [Mr. STEED] on February 23, as follows:

First, the prime contractors are negotiating the subcontracts on private deals instead of placing them on competitive bids. This means that the smaller parts makers are getting a smaller share of the subcontracts in the first place.

* * * * *

In the second place, the small parts maker who does get subcontract work can never be sure that he can keep it. Whenever production schedules are curtailed, or the prime contractor has idle capacity for other reasons, he is likely to pull the parts work into his own plants. Thus, the prime contractor stabilizes his workload while the subcontractor may be in production one day and out the next.

Because of recent high levels of aircraft production and limited staff assistance needed for more pressing problems, active investigation of the aircraft industry has been held in abeyance. The subcommittee is maintaining a watchful eye for new developments, however, and plans to complete its investigation at an early date.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 ON DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS

This subcommittee is composed of Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California; Chairman Hon. TOM STEED, of Oklahoma; and Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois.

The subcommittee has a planned program of investigations of the problems of small business in the distribution fields. The chairman [Mr. ROOSEVELT] explained the nature of these problems on February 23, as follows:

Our subcommittee is concerned with what—to my mind—are some very serious sore spots in our business system. These arise in the trade relations between numerous small and highly competitive firms on the one hand, and a few big monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic suppliers on the other hand. In the typical distribution pattern today, you find these small companies dependent upon such monopolistic suppliers—either for the products they distribute or for essential production materials—and there is a constant struggle to try to get fair and equitable treatment. If these monopolistic sore spots are not cleared up, not only will the small-business man suffer, but the consumer will be paying higher prices.

Even prior to the organization of the subcommittee, a great number of complaints had been received from retail gasoline dealers and their trade associations concerning alleged coercive and discriminatory practices on the part of the large oil company suppliers. More specifically, these complaints are to the effect that while there are approximately 200,000 retail gasoline dealers in the United States which are said to be independent dealers, these dealers are, in fact, independent to operate their businesses only on the terms and conditions dictated by their oil company suppliers.

The subcommittee held hearings on 11 days in March through June and heard 68 witnesses, including retail dealers from all sections of the country, officers of their trade associations,

representatives of the major oil companies, and officials of the Federal Trade Commission. Representatives of the retail dealer's trade associations estimated that of the 200,000 retail gasoline dealers in the United States, as many as one-third go out of business each year. Considerable evidence was presented, moreover, to show that the turnover of retail gasoline dealers involves an overall loss to the individual dealer running to several thousands of dollars, which losses frequently represent an individual's life savings and exhaustion of credit and veterans benefits.

Much of the testimony centered upon the arbitrary control which the oil companies exercise over the retail dealers by virtue of the short terms of the leases which the oil companies enter into with their lessee dealers, and the clauses characteristically contained in these leases affording conveniences by which the oil companies may cancel their leases.

The subcommittee also heard testimony concerning oil company practices of discriminating in the prices charged for gasoline, as between competing dealers, which practices are allegedly for such purposes as disciplining price cutters, eliminating outlets for off-brand gasoline, or for moving surplus stocks of gasoline which may occur in a particular market area. Vigorous complaints were also heard concerning the practice of some of the oil companies of requiring their retail dealers to handle and sell exclusively certain designated lines of tires, batteries, and other auto accessories. Several of the major oil companies in question admitted to arrangements whereby they received an override or kick-back from the manufacturers of tires and auto accessories on sales made by their gasoline dealers.

The subcommittee's interim report—House Report No. 1423—makes a number of recommendations for vitally needed steps which must be taken to correct the unfair practices found in this industry. This report recommends, among other things, several amendments to the antitrust laws to better protect small and independent businesses, and it recommends that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission review several other problems set out in the committee's report in the light of present antitrust laws, and make reports and recommendations to Congress as to the adequacy of these laws for meeting these problems.

The subcommittee's unanimous report subscribes to the purposes and principles of H. R. 11, a bill for strengthening the Robinson-Patman Act, and H. R. 7096, a bill for freedom of choice in trade, the latter of which was introduced by the chairman [Mr. ROOSEVELT] as a result of the subcommittee's study and findings.

Pursuant to the subcommittee's plans for investigating small-business problems in the distribution of automotive parts and accessories, electrical equipment and appliances, and many food items, considerable staff work has been done on these topics.

ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

One of the more serious problems which has occupied the committee and its staff has arisen from the numerous proposals which have recently been made for amending the antitrust laws. Not a few of these proposals, while perhaps well-meaning, misconceive the purpose and effect of those sections of the antitrust laws which were especially designed to protect small-business men from monopolistic practices; and there has been considerable momentum in the drive to amend these sections of the law in ways which would substantially weaken them.

On March 31, 1955, the chairman [Mr. PATMAN] issued a report analyzing the proposals contained in the report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws; and on May 10, 1955, testified before the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, explaining, among other things, the legal aspects of the Robinson-Patman Act and the practical trade problems which led to the passage of this antitrust law. It was pointed out that the experiences of substantially all of the members of the Attorney General's committee had been with legal and theoretical matters, rather than practical trade matters, and that more than half of the lawyers on this committee were representing defendants in pending antitrust suits.

On July 13, 1955, the chairman [Mr. PATMAN] testified before the same subcommittee in opposition to H. R. 6875, a bill which the Department of Justice had recommended for removing the provision of section 4 of the Clayton Act which makes it mandatory a violator of the antitrust laws be assessed threefold damages, where a plaintiff in a private suit proves that he has been damaged through a violation of these laws.

During March, the chairman [Mr. PATMAN] testified before the House Armed Services Committee on the plan of the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission for disposing of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants, calling attention to certain monopolistic aspects of the plan and recommending certain alternative provisions for better safeguarding small business.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Select Committee on Small Business is not a legislative committee and therefore does not report bills. The committee has, however, adopted formal resolutions of recommendation on legislative proposals, as follows:

A series of resolutions recommending extension of the Small Business Act of 1953, and recommending several amendments to that act to broaden the authority of the SBA for assisting small business.

A resolution in support of the principles and purposes of H. R. 11—introduced by Mr. PATMAN—a bill for strengthening the Robinson-Patman Act.

A resolution in support of the principles and purposes of H. R. 7096—introduced by Mr. ROOSEVELT—a bill for freedom of choice in trade.

A resolution in opposition to changing the mandatory triple-damage feature of the provisions for private damage suits contained in the antitrust laws.

Moral Rearmament Statesmen's Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under general permission to extend remarks, I am submitting additional material completing my speech on the Moral Rearmament statesmen's mission which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 1, 1955:

Mr. Speaker, national leaders who were hosts to or received the statesmen's mission were Ichiro Hatoyama, Prime Minister of Japan; the Foreign Minister and Acting Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea; President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, and O. K. Yui, Prime Minister of the Republic of China; Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Republic of the Philippines; Ngo Dinh Diem, President and Prime Minister of Vietnam; Field Marshal Pibulsonggram, Prime Minister of Thailand; Dr. Ba U, President, and U Nu, Prime Minister of the Union of Burma; Sir John Kotelawala, Prime Minister of Ceylon; Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of India; Mohammed Ali, Prime Minister of Pakistan; His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran and Prime Minister Hussein Ala; Burhanuddin Bashayan, Foreign Minister of Iraq; Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser, Prime Minister of Egypt; Members of the Council of Ministers of Kenya and the Mayor of Nairobi; and the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Turkey.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The Government of the Republic of Korea arranged for a delegation from the mission to visit Seoul. The delegation was received by members of the cabinet, chiefs of armed forces, and leaders of education and social welfare.

The first positive turn to the vexed problem of Korean-Japanese relations was given by a message of apology from leading members of the Japanese Parliament conveyed on their behalf by former NATO Chairman Ole Bjorn Kraft to the Foreign Minister and other members of the Korean Cabinet.

The Foreign Minister, who was also Acting Prime Minister under President Syngman Rhee, said:

I am convinced that unless the world catches this spirit of moral rearmament, another world disaster will be inevitable.

Members of the mission were honor guests at the ceremonies on June 25 marking the fifth anniversary of the invasion of South Korea in 1950.

MALAYA

Under a headline, "Way To End the Emergency," the influential Straits Times welcomed a delegation from the mission to Singapore and Malaya. Conferences and meetings were held with the rival Malay and Chinese political parties, with heads of the chamber of commerce and trade-union leadership, and with educational and student lead-

ers of the country's Communist-infiltrated school system.

A farewell reception, tendered by the Chinese chamber of commerce, many of whose members have close family ties with Communist China, was attended by Singapore's chief minister, David Marshall, and other notables from the Malaya, Chinese, British, and Indian communities.

Dr. Thio Chan Bee, noted educationalist and legislative council member, who was responsible through MRA for bringing the rival Malay and Chinese communities together after the war, joined the special plane as Singapore's representative on the world mission.

VIETNAM

With the people of South Vietnam only 12 months away from the fateful July 1956 deadline when they must vote for or against the Communist North, President Ngo Dinh Diem on July 5 welcomed as Government guests a delegation from the MRA world mission.

An hour after the special plane landed at Saigon Airport, the President and his Cabinet formally received the mission in the same Palace of Independence where recently he had turned the tide in his civil war against the sects. He said:

You are carriers of a noble ideal and powerful advocates for this idea—I would even say of a vast movement for the unity of men and nations. You have straightaway won the active sympathy of the Vietnam people. * * * For myself I understand the immense repercussions that will come from this mobilization of spiritual forces in the world which you have undertaken in effective cooperation with all men of good will. You have confronted an ideology that supposes to unite the world on the basis of hatred, fear, and strife with an idea which proclaims love and understanding and which proposes to bring about unity to the world by way of the heart and spirit.

In sharing your idea I have the firm conviction that a worldwide renaissance of moral and spiritual forces which we are all aiming for in the depths of our hearts, will be accomplished in the coming days, for the greatest benefit of us all. This will be the dawn of a new age which will see the transformation of the world.

Next morning, first anniversary of Diem's taking office after the Geneva armistice, he invited the mission to address the crowds from the palace steps. In his introduction he referred to MRA as "the great ideology that is sweeping the world."

That evening he gave a state banquet in honor of the MRA mission to which the diplomatic corps and chief Government leaders were invited.

Before leaving Saigon, members of the mission spent an afternoon with the Minister of War and 50 picked officers responsible for indoctrinating the country for next year's critical vote. The Chief of Psychological Warfare, Dr. Phuoc, said:

We were grateful for American military and economic aid, but lacked an ideology. Now you have given us the idea which can win.

Foreign Minister Vu Van Mau, who used his official reception to the mission to announce Vietnam's long-deferred acceptance of the principle of free elections, stated concurrently that a Vietnamese delegation would attend the MRA world assembly in Switzerland.

THAILAND

In Thailand, keystone of SEATO, the MRA world mission were official guests of the Prime Minister, Field Marshal Pibulsonggram, who opened the Bangkok premiere of the Vanishing Island and welcomed his visitors on behalf of my Government and the Thai people.

At a reception and dinner for the members of the mission, including the United States Air Force plane crews, the Prime Minister referred to his visit to the MRA World Assembly at Caux, Switzerland, the month before. He declared that "peace-loving peoples will sooner or later yield to the ideology of MRA," which he described as "a strong force that answers world materialism." He continued:

Our honored guests are from all walks of life and are sacrificing themselves for the sake of the peace of mankind. The MRA mission aims to build up unity between nations and to bridge East and West. Its ideology is pure and sincere. Since its inception MRA has been growing larger and larger and will continue to grow with great force. The doors of Thailand will be gladly opened to MRA at all times.

Gen. Phao Sriyaon, Bangkok's powerful chief of police, and members of the Cabinet and Diplomatic Corps, attended the reception.

Commenting on the Prime Minister's welcome, American Ambassador Peurifoy told members of the Mission that the field marshal, when asked by the press what had most impressed him on his recent visit to the United States and Europe, had replied: "The advance and influence of Moral Rearmament."

In introducing the play at the theater of the Ministry of Culture, the Prime Minister declared:

The Vanishing Island is a remarkable play and teaches us a unique lesson. It will be a most potent weapon for casting away doubt and fear and so healing the differences between nations.

For the first time breaking a firm rule against attending theatrical productions, 15 members of the supreme Buddhist council, including the president of the council and other high priests of the Buddhist faith, attended the second performance of The Vanishing Island as the Prime Minister's personal guests. The president of the council said:

MRA has the same purpose for righteousness as the Lord Buddha. The ability of MRA to change men is proof that MRA has the power to unite the world.

Concluding their visit in this heart of the Buddhist world, which numbers some 400 of Asia's millions, the mission was received for 2 hours by the Lord Abbot of Wat Mahatat, one of the largest monasteries in the land, who said:

As a Buddhist, I take the greatest pleasure in receiving this mission. Our Buddhist faith teaches us to keep company with what is good, and from MRA I find in the four absolute standards something which is good. You can be assured that I shall be only too glad to serve you in any capacity. And I say this in front of the Lord Buddha. I am less lucky than you, because I am not able to accompany you. But I am happy you are accompanied by some who will be traveling on my behalf. It is a great tribute to Dr. Frank Buchman that a force like this can travel around the world—and such a strong force. This should be regarded as one of the great and important events in the history of humanity. Dr. Buchman is one of the great men of the world.

Among those present at the play were delegates to the current SEATO military talks.

IRAN

The MRA world mission, including the United States Air Force crews who flew the special planes, were personal guests of the Shah and Government of Iran.

In the official reception line at Teheran Airport were representatives of the court, the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the services, the universities, and industrial, labor, and women's organizations.

A 2-hour national broadcast, directed by the Vice Premier and the Minister of Education, and keynoted by the President of the Supreme Court, inaugurated a visit described by Foreign Minister Entezam as "a world move to bring international relations into a new dimension."

Prime Minister Hussein Ala spent a morning with representatives of the mission. He said:

My Sovereign and Government are wholeheartedly with you in support of moral rearmament. We consider it a fundamental step toward uniting nations for the creation of peace which the common people of every land need and long for. What you are doing is perhaps the only hope of the world if we are to create understanding and prosperity for all peoples. The Koran and Islam sponsor and favor moral rearmament. You are showing the world how to put aside the old ideas of 19th century imperialism from which we have suffered in the Middle East and replace them with moral standards which are universal. You are giving a superior idea to communism and that is why you will succeed in winning the world.

The Minister of Education, Dr. Mohmoud Mehran, took first steps toward the ideological training of Iranian youth. He said:

Moral rearmament has a vital role to play in giving to our youth an ethical ideology which is the only answer to materialist ideas and propaganda.

Special lunches, dinners, and receptions were given in honor of the mission by the heads of every principal national organization and an extensive series of industrial visits brought them into touch with workers and managers on a factory level.

The Iranian premiere of the Vanishing Island was a command performance for the Shah and Queen Soraya given by royal order on a specially constructed stage in the grounds of the summer palace. The impact of the play was such that by imperial command the palace grounds were, for the first time in history, thrown open to the public to witness the last two performances of the play.

An Iranian Goverment delegation is being formed to attend the Caux Assembly in September.

Before leaving for Baghdad the mission were honored guests at the 50th anniversary celebrations of the Iranian Parliament, the Majlis.

IRAQ

Members of the MRA mission were guests of Burhanuddin Basbayan, Foreign Minister of Iraq, during a 4-day visit to this heart of the ancient world.

The Vanishing Island had its Baghdad premiere in the King Feisal II Theater before a cross-section of the governmental, diplomatic, industrial, and labor life of the capital.

Dr. Fadhil Jamali, former Premier and chief of his country's United Nations delegation, and who as Chairman of the Iraqi delegation at the Bandung conference had appealed for Asian-African unity on the basis of moral rearmament, gave a thought-provoking evaluation of the play to the press of Baghdad. The following is a translation from an interview by Dr. Jamali in Al Akhbar, leading Arabic daily of Baghdad:

Without doubt the theater is one of the most effective of the fine arts in propagating good character, the social virtues, and a lofty example to mankind. This is the task to which moral rearmament is actually applying itself. It portrays in its stage presentations a picture of human society, whether it be in the home, in the factory, in business, or in international relations, stating the problem and making clear the answer. It was my privilege to witness a number of these plays in America.

The day before yesterday I saw The Vanishing Island. Without doubt this play produces an amazing artistic effect and evokes real appreciation. The most important point about this play is its human, social, and political implications. The play presents two islands. One of them stands for democratic freedom, but materialism and selfishness have so led it astray that its people pay no attention to an imminent threat to their way of life. They do not believe that destruction peers at them from behind the door.

In the portrayal of this kingdom is a telling lesson for the anti-Communist countries which believe that they are right—completely right—forgetting that they themselves are rules by materialism, selfishness, and exploitation.

The second act portrays a land under Communist government where dictatorship, slavery, and cruelty reign, where with the death of individual liberty human feelings are forgotten. Thus all of mankind is led along in slavery by chains of materialism.

These two regimes which are equally engulfed in materialism have no one to guide them aright. It is the good king of the first country who foretells the imminent danger to his island which is complacent in its freedom. When finally they refuse to accept the advice of their king, their island disappears and does not return until after they have repented and returned to their senses.

This good king is mankind's apostle and rescuer, the one who unites the social order, divided into leftist and rightist elements, by presenting a superior plan—a program of absolute purity, absolute love, and unselfishness among all the peoples of the world. Here the play ends by asking that the principles which MRA stands for be applied among all men. These principles are part of all the inspired religions. Together they are the essence of Islam, as they are of Christianity, Buddhism, and Hinduism. These principles are not the special property of any one religion or nation or geographical area, but are common to all mankind.

These principles are not new. What is new is that the world stands in greater need of them than ever before in history. In this atomic age mankind has before it the choice either to change human nature and thus to change human destiny by establishing these principles, or to continue to a war of extinction. Moral rearmament believes that the first thing to be effected is a change of character, and that this change is the effective way for individuals and societies. On this basis MRA is spreading in all parts of the world through a change of heart based on the light of God's guidance. This light of faith is the way which will save mankind from final destruction.

We absolutely cannot hold back from accepting this ideology presented by Moral Rearmament. I urge that we all work together to purify and dedicate ourselves to absolute honesty, unselfishness, and love in all our work and in our family, social, economic, political, and international life. What this ideology calls for is a faithful confirmation of the verse from the holy Koran which says, "God does not change the condition of a nation until the men of that nation change themselves."

EGYPT

The Vanishing Island opened in Egypt with a gala performance in Cairo's famous opera house. Top diplomats from all over the world, including the Ambassadors from Afghanistan, China, Ethiopia, Japan, Libya, and Pakistan; as well as diplomatic representatives from Canada, Germany, Greece, Romania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Switzerland were present in the historic theater built 80 years ago for a performance of the world premiere of Verdi's "Aida" on the occasion of the opening of the Suez Canal.

Among other distinguished guests were His Excellency the Governor of Cairo, Abdul El Latif Salem; the chief of police of Cairo, Abdel Aziz Mifreh; Secretary General of the Arab League, Abdel Khalek Hassouna; and Deputy Minister of Sudan Affairs, Abdel Fettah Hassan; and five generals and the Under Secretary for War.

Earlier Hassouna was host at a reception for the entire mission. Official from every department of the Arab League were present. The Secretary General, who is a former Foreign Minister of Egypt, in welcoming the mission on behalf of the Arab League, paid tribute to what had been accomplished in the last 2 months. He specially referred to Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, initiator of Moral Rearmament and said:

We will be working with them through the four absolute standards of MRA for the salvation of humanity and the well-being of the whole of human kind.

One of the key figures in Egyptian public life, Brigadier Abdel Fettah Hassan, Deputy Minister of Sudan Affairs, came to the play for the second night in succession and told members of the cast, "I have been thinking of this play ever since last night and I couldn't keep away."

Chinese Ambassador Ho Feng-shan, dean of the diplomatic corps, gave a dinner for some of the delegates. He said:

We have been talking about honesty and unselfishness for thousands of years, but these standards have not come into a concrete force as we see now in MRA. We have been talking too much and philosophizing without an effort to practice. Here is a force to inundate the world for generations to come.

The whole mission are guests of Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser, president of the Revolutionary Council of Egypt, and the Government. They came to Cairo in response to the president's cable which read:

I wish to welcome to Egypt the delegation of the Moral Rearmament Organization which is intending to visit our country. The principles and objectives of your organization are highly appreciated in Egypt where all efforts are mobilized to restore moral values, social justice, human dignity, and freedom.

Colonel Nasser received the whole Moral Rearmament world mission in his office in the presidency. He told them that he much appreciated their coming to Egypt.

In an exclusive interview given the following day to the Cairo weekly newspaper, Rose El Youssef, when he was asked the question, "What is your impression of MRA?" Colonel Nasser replied:

This ideology could be a solution to save the world from the conflict between the so-called West and East. We should all believe in it. It is a solution.

Labor members of the mission were given a tremendous reception by 100 trade-union leaders who were from the liberation rally. Those present included 7 heads of federations and 12 heads of trade unions and many officials and workers. At the end of the meeting Maj. N. Noor, the chief provisional officer of the Egyptian trade unions, declared:

As a trade unionist I am absolutely dumbfounded by 4 words—the 4 words of the absolute standards. I want to help to give these to our whole country and the whole world.

At the close of the meeting the speakers were inundated with requests for literature and entire stocks were emptied.

Ten members of the mission were given a warm reception by Minister of Education Kemal Edin Hussein—youngest member of the Council of Revolution. The Minister assured the mission of the warmest interest and support and told them, "It is a tremendous and worthwhile task you have undertaken." When the delegation left he asked them for a supply of MRA literature which he proposed to have translated into Arabic for use in the schools and universities. He expressed the keenest appreciation at the presence of the 32 Egyptian students at Caux.

KENYA

Nineteen hours after closing at Cairo, the cast of The Vanishing Island opened before a packed multiracial audience in the Kenya National Theater in Nairobi, 2,500 miles south of Cairo, where the Governor of Kenya, Sir Evelyn Baring, received members of the Moral Rearmament mission.

Kenya officials greeted the entire mission of 192 on their arrival. Mayor I. Somen welcomed the party on behalf of the city of Nairobi. A. B. Patel, Minister for Asian Affairs in the Kenya Cabinet, and Alan Knight, commandant of the Athi River Mau Mau detention camp, were also at the airport.

At the Athi River camp, 500 hard core Mau Mau leaders had earlier renounced their Mau Mau oaths as a result of ap-

plying Moral Rearmament principles, and Knight brought 24 pounds starling which had been contributed in shillings and pence by 150 detainees to help finance the mission. The men earn only 1 shilling a day.

Hon. Michael Blundell, minister without portfolio and member of the Emergency War Council, came to the theater to express the warmth of his welcome to Kenya, while Cabinet Minister Patel told a gathering of the Asian community.

Under the inspiring leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman, MRA has made great strides in the last years. It is an ideology essential to the progress of the human race if we are to establish peace.

At the premiere, former Communists, Africans, Asians, Europeans, and Maoris from New Zealand all spoke from the stage. The first members of the mission to be introduced were Mary Waruhiu, daughter of a senior Kikuyu chief, and Mrs. Agnes Hofmeyr, daughter of a famous English settler. The fathers of both had been murdered by the Mau Mau.

At the camp a group from the mission, including Congressman CHARLES B. DEANE of North Carolina and Basil Okwu, Member of the Eastern Nigeria Parliament spoke to 500 detainees gathered in the camp theater, giving their own experience of MRA and of its uniting impact across the world.

Among those present at performances of the Vanishing Island were African chieftains, members of the legislative council, leading trade unionists and businessmen. In the audience also were Lady Mary Balfour, daughter of the late Lord Balfour, diplomats and other leading Europeans, Africans and Asians.

The Japanese Consul, K. Kaneoko, held a reception for 100 of the mission to which many of the diplomatic corps came including representatives of Ethiopia, India, Pakistan, Germany, Holland, the United States, Denmark, Sweden; and the Swedish Minister to Ethiopia, the administrator of the East Africa High Commission and the president of the Indian Chamber of Commerce.

The Facts Regarding Echo Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it will be recalled that S. 500, the Colorado River storage project, passed the Senate on April 20. It is now under consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, along with companion bills that have been introduced by Members of the other body.

During Senate consideration of the upper Colorado storage project, an amendment was offered which would have deleted the Echo Park feature of the measure. The amendment was defeated and Echo Park remained in the bill that was passed by the Senate.

The principal objection to the inclusion of Echo Park, as expressed on the floor of the Senate, was that irreparable damage would be done to the natural beauty of Echo Park and to the wildlife of the area. Conservationists opposed Echo Park and did their utmost to have it taken out of the bill.

While I am certain that they were absolutely sincere in their opposition to the inclusion of Echo Park, I am equally certain that they are mistaken. Rather than damage the cause of the conservationists, the Echo Park feature of the project, if carried through to completion, would prove beneficial to the preservation of the scenic beauty and the conservation of the wildlife of the region.

One of my constituents, Mr. John A. Cron, on May 24 wrote an informative letter to Mr. Charles H. Callison, the conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, whose headquarters are here in Washington. The letter which was written on behalf of the Loveland Wildlife Association, of Loveland, Colo., so effectively demolishes the arguments of the opponents of Echo Park that I would like to have it included in my remarks. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOVELAND WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION,
Loveland, Colo., May 24, 1955.

Mr. CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director,
National Wildlife Federation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your circular letter sent out May 1 to member clubs of the federation has been referred to me by Loveland Wildlife Association, a member of the Colorado Federation, with the request that I give you some firsthand information about Echo Park and the views of the Loveland Association thereon. I have seen Echo Park on a trip specifically made for the inspection of that area as a site for the proposed dam, as it might affect the water interests of the State of Colorado and the interests of sportsmen.

At the time of making the trip I was a member of the Colorado Water Conservation Board.

The Green River and the Yampa River, which join at Pats Hole not far from Echo Park, are muddy alkaline streams flowing at the bottom of steep canyons, and although those canyons are spectacular they are very arid and sustain very little wildlife, consisting chiefly of gophers, rabbits, and rattlesnakes, and a very sparse population of these. A small area of wild goose nesting habitat, where not more than a dozen pair of Canadian geese have nested in the past, will be inundated at Lily Park.

The Colorado game and fish department has made studies from which it reported that there would be no interference of any deer migration by the creation of the reservoir.

It is the opinion of the residents of the area, technicians of the Colorado game and fish department, and other people who have seen the area firsthand and have experience in the ultimate effect upon an area of the storing of a body of water of this kind that the habitat will be vastly improved for wildlife generally, particularly for waterfowl, including both ducks and geese, and fish.

The only fish which the area supports at present, other than catfish, are rough fish and a rather small population of even these, but the reservoir, when created, will be a deep water reservoir suitable for almost all species of game fish.

Access to Echo Park, Pat's Hole and other points of interest in the canyons will be tremendously improved in two ways, one by the construction of a good access road to the dam itself, and second, by water transportation.

A handful of people make the not too hazardous trip from somewhere near Craig, Colo., down into Utah following the Yampa River, or the more hazardous trip from Wyoming through Colorado into Pat's Hole, the confluence of the Green River and the Yampa River, and on through Colorado into Utah.

A few more make the trip into Pat's Hole over dusty, rough and winding roads over the long distance from the nearest point on a good highway.

It is true that the view in Pat's Hole will be changed and Steamboat Rock will be about half inundated, but whether the view will be improved or damaged by the additional water is a question of viewpoint.

The construction of Echo Park will add tremendously to the recreational value of the area and will distinctly be in the interests of conservation, both of wildlife and of our precious water.

Why the National Wildlife Federation, under the guise of conservation, should oppose this dam is something of an anomaly, and the manner in which this had been done, even going to the extent of overriding the agreed position of the Colorado Wildlife Federation not to take a position opposing this dam. When the representative of that Federation went to your national meeting he was not authorized to oppose Echo Park Dam on behalf of the Colorado Wildlife Federation, and neither I know, are you entitled to represent that you are speaking for the membership of the entire National Wildlife Federation when you oppose this measure.

We of the Loveland Wildlife Association are very much antagonized by your boasting about your opposition to Echo Park Dam which seems to us not only to be against the real interests of conservation, but just about as stupid as boasting of having killed the last of the passenger pigeons.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. CRON.

Social Security Coverage for Members of the Dental Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have written to Dr. Garrett Reilly, president of the Congress of American Dentists for Old Age and Survivors Insurance. This is an organization that has been recently formed to work for the inclusion of all self-employed members of the dental profession under the coverage of social security benefits. I support the efforts of this organization and welcome the assistance of the dentists in extending old-age and survivors insurance to

the members of this distinguished and worthy profession.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1955.

J. GARRETT REILLY, D. D. S.,
President, Congress of American Dentists for OASI, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOCTOR REILLY: Allow me to say how pleased I am that the Congress of American Dentists for OASI is working to bring about social security coverage for members of the dental profession. I am sure that the support of your organization will help immeasurably in getting the legislation through the Congress.

You may know that I have been the sponsor of bills both during this session and in the last session of Congress that would make Federal old age and survivors insurance available to members of your profession.

The amendment I first introduced to extend social security benefits to dentists during the 83d Congress was prompted by the result of a poll taken in my own State of Minnesota. At that time Minnesota dentists gave overwhelming support to the extension of the old age and survivors insurance program to cover their own profession.

Quite recently I have received further proof that the dentists of Minnesota wish to receive the benefits of the social security system. The Minnesota Dental Society completed a poll on June 10, 1955, in which 1,423 voted approval of old age and survivors insurance for dentists and only 232 were opposed. This means that 85.9 percent of the dentists in my State favor being included under social security coverage.

I understand that this unusually high percentage of support has also been reflected in other polls carried on recently, indicating that 87.8 percent of the dentists in New York and 86.5 percent of the dentists in Illinois likewise support extending OASI to members of your important profession. Other evidence that has come to my attention, both as a result of the mail I have received and on the basis of conversations I have had, convinces me that a large part of the dental profession in the United States favors being covered by old age and survivors insurance. I think they would demonstrate this in numbers in proportion to those revealed in the polls I have cited, if they were given a chance to do so in all parts of the country.

This indicates a wise choice on the part of dentists of America, for they will benefit greatly from having social-security coverage extended to them. As they undoubtedly know, being included under the old-age and survivors' insurance system will assure them that they and their families will be protected beyond the age of 65, or in the unfortunate event that the head of the family should die before he has been able to provide adequately for the family.

I believe that Representative KEAN, of New Jersey, has already given you in some detail the benefits social-security coverage would bring to your fine profession. His letter, which you called to my attention, did point out, however, that it is important that the program be extended to dentists as soon as possible. I would like to reiterate that point. As the 4 years of lowest earnings can be dropped from the calculation upon which retirement benefits are determined from the beginning date of January 1, 1951, unless the dentists are brought under social-security coverage soon, the years during which they are not covered will be counted as zero earnings and so will pull down the total upon which their average wage is based. But if legislation is passed in time to include the dental profession under old-age and survivors' insurance before April 15, 1956, they will not have to include any zero earning years when figuring their average and so will receive the maximum in benefits.

I feel that the evidence that has come to my attention indicates that the vast majority of dentists want to receive the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance, and I surely welcome the efforts of your organization in seeking to help bring about this worthy objective. I hope that you will do everything possible to bring to the attention of the dentists of our country the importance of commencing the program during the coming year if they are to enjoy the maximum of benefits. I assure you that I intend to do everything possible in the coming session of Congress to assure that we are successful in passing legislation that will provide social security to the dentists of America and their families.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Sheepmen Hard Hit by Drought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will not tire of my speaking on the subject of drought relief in Colorado. I assure them that the people of Colorado and the Great Plains States are very appreciative for the quick action which has been taken by both the 83d and 84th Congresses to expedite drought-relief and wind-erosion money.

As an example of the situation and the way it affects the farmers and ranchers, I would like to read into the Appendix of the RECORD at this time an article by Cal Queal, Denver Post staff writer, which was written at Glenwood Springs on July 21, and appears in the Denver Post. It is entitled: "Sheepmen Hard Hit by Drought." It quotes Mr. Brett Gray, who is secretary of the Colorado Wool Growers Association. Those of us who have had an opportunity to work with Mr. Gray appreciate his great ability and knowledge of the wool industry. We believe that a statement of his is certainly worthy of passing on to the Members of this Congress.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHEEPMEN HARD HIT BY DROUGHT

(By Cal Queal)

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, July 21.—Colorado's wool clip next summer will drop 10 percent and growers will lose more than $500,000 unless the State receives general rain soon.

Brett Gray, Denver, secretary of the Colorado Wool Growers' Association, made the statement Wednesday, after woolgrowers from all over the State, in convention here, reported dangerous dryness on the ranges. In some areas the loss will be irreparable within 2 weeks and in others in about 30 days, Gray said.

TWO THOUSAND PRODUCERS

The last general rainfall came in most State areas in late May or early June, and some areas have had no moisture since March. Dangerous dryness exists in areas affecting some 2,000 producers with 800,000 sheep, Gray said.

He added that the only place in the State with adequate moisture has been a small area near Norwood.

"Winter range has been hardest hit," Gray said, "but even in the high country, parks and hillsides are turning brown."

CRAIG GRASS GONE

Around Craig, the State's biggest wool-producing area, Gray said, there is no grass whatsoever. There are an estimated 250 producers in Moffat County, with herds totaling over 100,000 sheep.

Dryness causes excessive dirt and grease in wool, Gray said. He believes the normal 50-50 wool-to-grease-and-dirt ratio may well be around 42-58 next year because of current dryness.

Hon. Lyndon Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials about our great leader be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, Tris Coffin, noted Washington commentator, recently broadcast a moving tribute to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this broadcast be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and broadcast were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle of July 21, 1955]

BACK-BREAKING JOB

The heart attack which struck down Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas Democrat, earlier this month has focused attention on what has become one of the toughest jobs in Government—that of Senate majority leader.

Outside the Presidency itself, the Senate floor leadership is perhaps the most taxing and vexing post in Washington. It is said that the job either maims men physically or kills them politically. It has done one or the other to many who have held it.

Senator JOHNSON, in the 6 months he has been majority leader, has demonstrated the rare combination of abilities needed for the job. He has made the Senate run on the track, and on time.

He has had the extremely difficult task of leading a party which had only a two-vote margin as opposition to a popular Republican President and an often uncooperative Republican minority. He reunited the members of his own party to a high degree, and he has pushed through much of the Eisenhower legislative program.

The chief ingredient to Senator JOHNSON'S success formula has been sheer hard work—12 to 15 hours a day, week in and week out.

He has not been a flashy floor leader; he has made few speeches indulged in almost no tirades. But he gets things done. He has prodded chairmen constantly to get key bills out of their committees; he has worked for days with leaders of both parties to iron out differences before they reach the floor.

The results show in the statistics of this session, compared with the 1st session of the 83d Congress in 1953.

As of June 30, the Senate Calendar—which lists all bills reported by committees but not yet acted on—contained only 19 measures. On June 30, 1953, the Senate calendar listed 135 bills for consideration.

On June 30, committees had reported 445 bills and acted on 408. At the same time a year ago, only 366 bills had been reported and 296 disposed of.

Senator JOHNSON's work has been taken over by other capable Democratic leaders, but men of good will of both political parties will hope for the speedy and complete recovery of Texas' Senator JOHNSON.

[From the Barnesville (Ohio) Enterprise of July 14, 1955]

EISENHOWER LOSES TWO GREAT CAPTAINS

In the White House only 2½ years, President Eisenhower, in this short time, has twice suffered the loss of outstanding majority leaders in the United States Senate.

First came the death of Senator Robert A. Taft on July 31, 1953, when the Eisenhower administration was only 7 months old. Last week, a heart attack removed Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, just short of 2 years after Taft's death.

The Ohio Republican lived long enough to guide the brand-new administration and set it on a course that may make an inexperienced President one of the great Presidents of all times.

The Texas Democrat maintained what Taft started despite the fact that he was the leader of the opposition party. It is fortunate that he remained at the helm until the closing days of the present session of Congress. Republicans and Democrats alike hope for his eventual recovery from the heart attack which laid him low.

No President has ever had more helpful Senate leaders than Mr. Eisenhower has had in the man he defeated for the nomination and also in the man who conceivably might have been his opponent in the next election. To each must go much of the credit for the success of the Eisenhower administration, for the President's popularity, and for the era of good feeling that has finally spread over the country.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 26, 1955]

ABOUT SENATOR JOHNSON

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

During this period of LYNDON'S illness, there is very little he can do other than to read some of his mail and look over a few editorials and newspaper stories. One editorial that he particularly treasures I clipped from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch shortly after it appeared on July 5.

This is difficult for a man of his vigorous temperament and it means much to have something cheerful and encouraging that I can show him. The editorial from the Post-Dispatch is one of the best things I have for that purpose—just as it is one of the finest that has ever been written about him—and I shall always be grateful to you and your wonderful newspaper.

Mrs. LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Reno (Nev.) State Journal]

LYNDON JOHNSON, OF TEXAS

Political writers are now assessing the domestic and foreign accomplishments of the Congress which has just packed up and gone home. One aspect stands out above all others in that scene. Veteran, nonpartisan observers are unanimous in their opinion that this session was one of the most harmonious and businesslike in many years.

The facts did not bear out White House prelection predictions last fall that a Democratic-controlled Congress with a Republican President would mean a cold war between the executive and legislative departments. Instead, it was the Democrats who helped out the President's program—in many ways more than his own party, especially in foreign affairs.

One man in Congress stood head and shoulders above all others in keeping partisanship to a minimum and the country's welfare at a maximum. He was Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, whose prodigiousness and long hours of work brought on a heart attack 1 month before the recess.

The announcement this week that Senator JOHNSON will be back as Senate majority leader in January is good news for the entire country. His stature as a legislative tactician was revealed in a quiet, efficient yet amiable manner this year as he faithfully followed what he has referred to as the role of "responsible opposition"—guiding much of President Eisenhower's program through the Senate.

Three days before he was hospitalized, it was Nevada's Senator ALAN BIBLE who paid tribute to his majority leader. He called the Senate's attention to an article praising the lanky Texan's legislative dexterity and booming him as a Democratic presidential candidate at least by 1960.

For Senator JOHNSON last January the job of trying to weld together all divergent factions of the Democratic Party into a smooth-working team appeared herculean. There were the thoughtful conservatives from the Deep South, the sprinkling of cloud-riding liberals and Oregon's unpredictable WAYNE MORSE who tipped the Senate's balance of power to the Democrats by a slim 49–47 margin.

A man with little time for windbaggery and lost causes, Senator JOHNSON put hardheaded partisanship in the back seat in comparison to the larger call of duty to his country.

The illness that removed Senator JOHNSON from the Senate for a brief period may well be a blessing in disguise. For this man, young at 46 in legislative circles, it will mean that he must delegate more responsibility to his helpers rather than burden himself with backbreaking detail. With that faculty, he may well be a force to build the Democratic Party and our two-party system of government to greater accomplishments. The country will see and hear more of JOHNSON, of Texas, in the years ahead and profit thereby.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News]

SENATOR JOHNSON

There will be no party lines among those who hail with gratification the news that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, has left the hospital and is now on the road to recovery from the illness with which he was stricken weeks ago.

Senator JOHNSON was liked and respected by his colleagues in the Senate. He has made a favorable impression upon the people of the country. As an able leader of the majority in the Senate he has served his party in a way that means service to the country. That he will probably be back in the Senate and again serving as leader is good news.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News]

JOHNSON IS BETTER

In his first news conference since he was stricken by a heart attack some weeks ago, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Senate majority leader, vows he will return to his key position when the Congress reconvenes in January.

We sincerely hope so, because Senator JOHNSON is an able legislative leader and one of the brightest stars in the United States senatorial firmament.

The Senator says his doctors say he will be good as new by sometime this fall, and that, too, is good news, for the Democratic Party and the country sorely need him.

It is regrettable, however, that the mere fact he has had one heart attack, however complete the doctors consider his recovery, probably has ruined forever his chances of becoming a presidential candidate.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) News]

(This editorial is composed of excerpts from an editorial by John S. Knight)

CONGRESS' RECORD GOOD DESPITE SPLIT IN RULE

Immediately after last fall's election, some prophets of despair were predicting that a stalemate Congress would result from the election of a slim majority of the party opposed to the President.

In his Editor's Notebook of November 13, John S. Knight reassured Daily News readers that split-party Government would not ruin the country.

The 84th Congress did not adopt all of President Eisenhower's recommendations, by any means, but it certainly did not, through action or inaction, seriously damage the Nation.

On the contrary, the session was, on the whole, constructive. The good feeling between the President and Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, was remarkably high.

This was particularly true in the field of foreign affairs, where the chances of war and peace in a critical period give the subject matter overwhelming importance.

At the moment, the prospect of peace is increasingly hopeful. But this shift in affairs is due to the firmness of the Government when firmness was called for.

Congress was almost unanimous in supporting the President's request for authority to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. The Senate unhesitatingly ratified a mutual-defense treaty with the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Without this demonstration of national strength and unity, the progress recently reported from Geneva at the Big Four meeting, and dimly hoped for from the "Little Geneva" Conference now going on, would probably not have taken place.

Congress gave the President almost exactly the defense appropriations that he asked for; only slightly less than he wanted in foreign aid; and a military Reserve program much weaker than he desired to make up in part the reductions in active military manpower. Other appropriations went through about as the administration planned.

The President was able to hold the line against a strong Democratic drive for an unjustified tax cut of $20 for every personal income-tax payer.

Congress raised his proposal for a 90-cent minimum wage to $1.

It defeated his proposal for a greatly expanded Federal highway program, sure to be one of the hottest issues in the next session beginning in January.

Federal aid for school construction was shelved because southern Members feared an antisegregation rider.

A housing bill, in part unsatisfactory to the President, was enacted in the last hours of the session.

Partisanship was by no means asleep during the session. It flared up notably in the Dixon-Yates controversy, from which the city of Memphis helped Eisenhower to escape.

It was evident in the investigation of Air Secretary Talbott's private business interests. This inquiry had wholesome results and ended by increasing, rather than diminishing, the President's own stature.

Senator KEFAUVER and others count heavily on Dixon-Yates and the Talbott affairs as campaign issues next year. It would be reasonable to expect the Democratic leadership to push investigations into every ques-

tionable aspect of the administration during the next session.

That is all to the good. It is the function of an opposition party to search out the records of its opponents; the better job they do, the better for the country.

The aging Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, emerged from the session with greatly increased prestige.

So did the new Senate leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. Neither is available to the Democratic Party as a presidential candidate, GEORGE because of his age and JOHNSON because of the illness that struck him late in the session.

Aside from these men, no Democrat or Republican in Congress achieved any notable growth in stature during the session. Senator MCCARTHY came out greatly diminished.

No Republican came up capable of taking Ike's place if he should retire. No Democrat arose who, at this writing, seems able to challenge him successfully if he runs again.

[From the Greenville (Tex.) Banner]

THE DOMINANT THREE

The AP's Washington news analyst, James Marlow, notes that while each session of Congress usually produces 1 dominant figure, in the sense of being effective or being in the spotlight, the session just concluded produced 3—count them, 3.

Two were Texans, 1 by birth, 1 by adoption. LYNDON JOHNSON is the native who by virtue of unexampled leadership—oldtimers say nothing like it had ever been seen in the Senate before—astonished the Senate itself, to quote Marlow, "with the amount of work it got done with a minimum of argument." There was no sign of a filibuster in the 84th.

SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, was born in Tennessee but came to Texas as a child and became as much of a Texan as if he had helped dig the rivers and set out the mesquites. "Mr. SAM" could be called "Mr. Democrat" without doing violence to the facts, but that does not complicate the esteem and respect in which he is held by both parties.

The third dominant figure in the 84th was Georgia's 77-year-old WALTER GEORGE, a Democrat whose voice to all intents and purposes became the voice of the Republican White House in foreign affairs.

"Mr. SAM" is a bounding 73, while LYNDON JOHNSON at 47 is the youngest leader of the Senate, either minority or majority, in history. So well had he done his job that when he suffered a heart attack and had to immobilize himself, the work of the Senate went right on without a bobble.

Nobody will quarrel with Marlow's assessment of this trio's dominant role in the 84th Congress.

[From the Longview (Tex.) News-Journal]

GOOD NEWS FOR TEXANS

An unusually fine tribute was paid to an unusually able Texan in the closing hours of the Senate session when Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, spoke in tribute to Texas' senior Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who is recuperating following a heart attack.

The Senate, as well as the Nation, greatly missed the leadership of Senator JOHNSON during the closing days of the session, said Senator SYMINGTON—himself well known to the people of Longview and in other parts of Texas where he has visited a number of times in past years.

Senator SYMINGTON, a good friend of Texas and one of the most able and alert men in the United States Senate, in his address before the Senate put Texas' beloved LYNDON JOHNSON in the role of a continuing national leader. It has been many years, SYMINGTON said, since the illness of a public figure has brought such a spontaneous outpouring of anxiety from every corner of the country.

Texans everywhere, and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON himself, know our feelings, our respect and admiration for this great Texas statesman. For that reason, we want to let Senator SYMINGTON's tribute to JOHNSON get through to our people in the distinguished Missourian's own words:

"People in every walk of life and in every region have prayed for his speedy—and complete—recovery," SYMINGTON told the Senate. "Protestants, Catholics, and Jews have invoked Divine intervention in his behalf. Hard rock miners in the West and seamen on the Great Lakes, cattle ranchers and cotton pickers, steelworkers, and businessmen—all have expressed their deep concern.

"Fully as significant has been the editorial comment. Newspapers in every part of the United States and representing every shade of opinion have expressed their appreciation of his leadership and their hopes for his speedy and complete recovery.

"There appears to be one subject upon which the Dallas News and the New York Herald Tribune, the Portland Oregonian and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the New York Mirror, and the Washington Star, can agree. It is that LYNDON JOHNSON is one of the great statesmen of our times—a man that the country needs.

"This editorial comment speaks the heart of America. I ask unanimous consent that a compilation of editorial excerpts be included in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks."

"Had JOHNSON been able to be up and about, attending to his duties in the Senate, these tributes in the RECORD at this season would have been voiced by Senators. Similar tributes have been voiced on several occasions before.

"The people of Texas have just cause to be proud of this great leader—this Texan who has captured the imagination of the whole Nation," said SYMINGTON. "Everbody who voted for him and everybody who voted against him—every citizen of the State—can be proud of the spontaneous tributes that have appeared from every direction.

"These are tributes to a man but they are also tributes to a policy—to a policy of responsibility which has struck a responsive chord in the breasts of all Americans.

"LYNDON JOHNSON has placed patriotism above partisanship, country above party. He has sought to reconcile differences and the objective of his reconciliation has always been to preserve the security and the prosperity of these United States.

"In this objective, he has succeeded consistently. But he has succeeded at a high price in terms of physical exhaustion.

"I think it is highly significant that LYNDON JOHNSON opposed night sessions during the last Congress but we had them anyway—and lost nine Senators. He opposed night sessions during this Congress and we did not have them—and we did not lose a single Senator.

"Every Senator who has stayed to work during the evenings this year did so knowing that he could call the office of the majority leader—no matter how late—and the majority leader would be there to answer the call.

"I was with him myself until late in the night on the Friday before he suffered his heart attack on late Saturday afternoon. I happen to know that on the preceding Thursday, he was discussing atomic energy problems with the senior Senator from Louisiana and the senior Senator from Alabama as late as 11:30 p. m.

These were not unusual nights for LYNDON JOHNSON. In fact, it was a very rare evening which found his office doors locked before 10 or 11 p. m. He applied the policy of shorter working hours to everyone except himself."

SYMINGTON added that with encouraging medical reports on JOHNSON's condition, it now appears if nothing goes wrong that JOHNSON "will be as good as new" by January. "This is good news for Texas and for the country."

"I know that all of us—on both sides of the aisle—will welcome him back as a personal friend who is close to our hearts and as one of the great leaders of our times."

[From the Eldorado (Ark.) News]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

News that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, the Democratic majority leader, has been stricken with a heart attack and will be incapcitated for the remainder of the congressional session will be received with grave concern not only by his constituents in Texas but by the Nation as a whole.

Senator JOHNSON has demonstrated that he is a power in the Senate and the key to much constructive legislation that must or should be enacted at this session of Congress.

His illness points up the fact that men in his position are under almost unbearable pressure. In our infrequent visits to his office in Washington, we have seen him talking over two telephones at the same time while conferring with constituents and receiving reports from the Senate floor. We are not surprised that he has overdone himself.

Senator JOHNSON is a man of tremendous energy and great legislative skill. We have been impressed with his middle-of-the-road tactics and his apparent determination to keep the welfare of the Nation above partisan politics.

We wish him a speedy recovery for he will be sorely missed in the Senate.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner]

BEST WISHES, SENATOR JOHNSON

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's serious illness is a matter of deep concern to all who know him personally, or who know him simply by name as the Senate majority leader.

An important responsibility passed to him when congressional control shifted last year to his party's hands. For the most part, he has exercised that role as a balance wheel—neither unresponsive to the dictates of conservatism as embodied by respected Southern Senators, nor amenable to the legislative demands of wild-eyed "liberals" in their partisan handiwork.

Quite a calendar of unfinished business remains at this time, with hurdles to be cleared without undue delay if Congress is to adjourn on the indicated date, July 31. The Nation is concerned about that. It looks to Senator EARLE CLEMENTS, as majority leader pro tempore, to skillfully use the reins of that driver's seat.

America's best wishes go to Senator JOHNSON for a speedy and complete recovery.

[From the Anderson (S. C.) Mail]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

There have been few instances in which the illness of a United States Senator has caused so much general concern in both parties as that of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, who is currently suffering from a severe heart attack.

As Senate Democratic leader, Mr. JOHNSON had the respect of members of both parties, although at times, of course, not all members of the opposing party saw eye to eye with him on issues.

The heart attack is listed as "moderately severe," and Mr. JOHNSON's condition as "serious." While it will prevent him from returning to the present session of Congress, it will not, we hope, terminate his legislative career.

Mr. JOHNSON is known as one of the hardest workers in Congress, and if the current session of the Legislature is operating according to schedule, it is largely due to his efforts and his example. Perhaps, too, his

strenuous activities contributed to the attack he has just suffered.

Certainly the messages of regret and encouragement now reaching him from Congressmen on both sides of the aisle tell of the widespread affection and regard in which he is held.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News]

PRAYER FOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the Democratic leader in the Senate, is a popular, respected, and effective leader. While an enthusiastic Democrat, he has frequently demonstrated his capacity and will to rise above narrow partisanship. His sudden illness, resulting from a heart attack Saturday, came as a shock to his colleagues. He will be sorely missed in any absence from active Senate duty.

Yesterday Senators, Senate attachés, and gallery guests observed a minute of silent prayer for the stricken leader, after tributes had been made to him. It was an unusual, if not unprecedented, Senate scene. President Eisenhower wrote to the Senator expressing his wishes for a speedy recovery. The country joins in this sentiment.

Our people are proud to honor a leader of high caliber and anxiously hope that he will before long be restored to health and full activity.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Mail]

DON'T LOOK NOW, BUT THIS MIGHT BE THE SECOND ERA OF GOOD FEELING

The illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and the apprehension over his absence from the Government underline a curious fact: Almost without knowing it, the United States is nearer an era of good feeling than it has been since the administration of President Monroe. And to make this even more curious, the political ingredients of this happy state are almost totally unlike those which insured Monroe his placid tenure.

In 1817, Monroe had the good fortune to preside over a nation which was almost completely united in the Republican Party of his day. In sharp contrast, President Eisenhower has the luck to inherit a two-party system which is almost evenly divided and a Congress of the opposite political faith. And yet the plain fact is that the Republican Eisenhower gets along considerably better with a Democratic Congress than Harry Truman did, and most of the efforts to engage them in a pitched battle have failed dismally.

There is dissension, of course, and strangely enough it has a consistent pattern. A Democratic minority which clusters under the banner of Americans for Democratic Action complains bitterly that the congressional majority has gone too far to the right in accommodating itself to the President's popularity. Similarly, a Republican minority can be heard objecting that the President has gone too far to the left to win Democratic support.

It is all very confusing and to the highly partisan, who like their issues drawn sharply, downright nerve-wracking. But through it all there runs a clarifying and stabilizing purpose. This is what the President means by the "middle of the road," a course so carefully and considerately mapped that all but the most rabid and discontented can travel it in reasonable comfort and convenience.

This seems to be a matter of temperament with President Eisenhower. He is the least partisan of Presidents and, despite his military background and perhaps because of it, the least belligerent. But it should not be discounted that it may be also an act of the shrewdest political insight. Perhaps when historians are as far removed from Eisenhower as we are from Monroe, it will be clear that he was the first to sense that his generation was mortally tired of war, of perpetual crisis, of the endless political wrangling and the extravagance of disagreeing simply for the sake of appearances and the most successful in making a political career out of the attempt to mediate, harmonize and compromise differences where all of his predecessors had sought to inflame them.

Certainly, and whatever the final judgment on his role in these proceedings, events have combined to bear out his trust in the power of intelligence and good faith. The Nation is prosperous. Even organized labor has admitted that it "never had it so good." The world is nearer to peace than it has been since World War II. Even the Russians feel compelled to put a new and pleasanter face on their part in world affairs. The forecasts of dark days ahead are as plentiful as ever, of course, but the remarkable thing about them is that they do not come true. And paradoxically, while there is an audible dissension, it has for its theme the fact that the politicians are not dissenting enough to satisfy the extremists.

It sums itself up in the reaction to Senator JOHNSON's heart attack. Never before, we believe, have so many people agreed that the worst thing that could happen to the President's program would be the permanent retirement of the leader of his opposition in the Senate. It is a mute and oblique testimonial to the underlying appeal of the President's search for a middle way—a way between boom and bust, between war and appeasement.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times]

A DOUBLE LOSS

The incapacity of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON is a grave blow to the Democratic Party in Congress and almost as serious a loss to the Eisenhower administration.

The smooth, hardworking gentleman from Texas has served both with near brilliance, and has done it without compromising himself or his party. His has been the leadership that has put the normally verbose Senate so far ahead of its usual schedule that his illness now probably will not delay adjournment beyond the early days of August. His has been the dealership that has welded the Democrats in the Senate into a presentable unity and at the same time has advanced much of the administration's vital legislation.

To accomplish all this, Mr. JOHNSON has driven himself to the point where his vigorous and youthful (he is not yet 47) physique broke under the strain. He will, with good fortune, prudence, and the approval of his constituents, live to serve more years in the Senate. But he will have to turn over the reins of his party to other hands. For the country's sake, we hope they are as able as his.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S RECOVERY

Wirephoto pictures of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON transmitted from Washington last weekend show Texas' senior Senator and majority leader to be slimmed down and relaxed. If it were not for the knowledge that he had suffered a severe heart attack a month ago, it would be difficult to believe anything had happened to his health.

Edward Jamieson, correspondent for the Times, wrote after visiting Senator JOHNSON in Bethesda Naval Hospital that "the Senator looks physically better today than he has for several years."

There is every assurance that JOHNSON will be able to resume his senatorial duties next January and retain the high party office he has held in the first session with such distinction.

The rapid recovery he has made is not only heartening to his fellow Senators on both sides of the aisle, but to the thousands of well-wishers all over the country from whom he has heard during his illness.

Qualifying his opinion as that of a layman, Vice President NIXON expressed the viewpoint that "there was a time when an attack like that suffered by JOHNSON would have killed a man's future career but with all of the new medical knowledge about this problem I do not believe that LYNDON need worry about his future."

It is a remarkably discerning statement and one that sums up the situation adequately.

[From the Plainview (Tex.) Herald]

NATIONAL FIGURE

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's illness, from which he is showing a remarkable recovery, brought many minds throughout the Nation to concentrate on the Texan and his station.

Never have we seen such an outpouring of candid expression of esteem and regard for any man in politics, as those which came from many sources, even those who are in opposite political camps.

After his apparent health comeback, and his announced intention of reducing his work to normal load for a man in his station, there has been a continuation of these expressions of esteem and of gratitude on his recovery to date.

For example, the New York Times, August 10, under the heading "Senator JOHNSON's Recovery," said:

"A heartfelt sigh of relief must have gone up in many parts of the country when the word went out that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority floor leader, had been released from the hospital and was on the road to recovery from his severe illness. We join in the hope that the recovery will be rapid and permanent.

"Senator JOHNSON was in the midst of a first-class job of legislative leadership when he was stricken on July 2. The good wishes that go out to him now are therefore more than expressions of personal sympathy. They are tied up with the desire to see our country served by men who can serve it well. Senator JOHNSON certainly belongs in that category. We are delighted that he is so much better, for his sake and for ours."

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal]

CONGRESS GOES HOME

The 1st session of the 84th Congress has officially concluded its meetings, and its Members are streaming away from Washington. Some have gone to their homes; others have set forth on the various missions that take Congressmen to all parts of the world during recess time.

This first session has been a peculiar sort of one. There haven't been very many like it. In the first place, it has been controlled by a party different from the one represented by the President, and that hasn't happened too frequently in the life of the country, although it is by no means unusual.

The thing which has made this session different is the amount of cooperation which has existed between the administration and the Democratic Party, which has controlled both Houses. Often very little is accomplished when the majority of Congress comes from one party and the President from another. This has not been true so far in the 84th Congress, although things may be different when it comes back in January for the second session. Then an election will be drawing nigh, and elections sometimes change things.

A contributing factor to the unanimity which has prevailed throughout the first session has been the seriousness of the world situation. It has been imperative that the United States present a united front in world affairs, and it is to the credit of the Democratic majority, as well as to President

Eisenhower, that there usually has been close unity on foreign policy.

A great deal of the credit for this must go to the leadership provided by Senator JOHNSON in the Senate and Speaker RAYBURN in the House. JOHNSON especially emerged as an outstanding leader until a heart attack incapacitated him the last few weeks of the session. If he is unable to assume direct charge of the majority next year, the effect of cooperation may be shattered.

The chief accomplishment of this Congress seems to have been in foreign affairs, just as that has been the principal forte of the Eisenhower administration. Not nearly as much progress has been made on the domestic front as in the foreign field. There has been as a matter of fact, a minimum of important domestic legislation passed.

The administration has been successful in getting some legislation passed it desired but suffered defeats on such measures as its big highway-improvement bill, housing legislation, and public-school construction.

Efforts by Congress to draft its own legislation in these fields also was less than satisfactory.

This Congress has been characterized by a paucity of investigations. One reason, of course, has been that there hasn't been as much to investigate as was the case when the Truman administration held sway.

What investigations have been held have devoted themselves to efforts to unearth campaign issues. Such matters as the Talbott case, the Dixon-Yates project, and the fiasco of the handling of polio vaccine fall in this category. It is unlikely any of them will meet the Democratic need for an election issue. More efforts along this line may be expected in the second session.

All in all, this session has been a generally satisfactory one. By its very lack of spectacularity it has been able to keep the Nation operating on an even keel. It hasn't done a great deal, but at least it hasn't done any great harm. And that is an accomplishment not to be sniffed at.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald]

GEORGE, RAYBURN, AND JOHNSON DOMINANT IN CONGRESS

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON.—Every session of Congress produces at least one dominant figure, dominant in the sense of being effective or being in the spotlight. This year's session produced three dominant men who were outstandingly effective.

All three were Democrats: 77-year-old Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia; 73-year-old SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, Speaker of the House; and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, 47-year-old Democratic majority leader of the Senate.

Democrat GEORGE was Republican President Eisenhower's chief reliance in Congress on foreign affairs. GEORGE is chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee.

RAN CONGRESS

JOHNSON and RAYBURN, as bosses of their respective Houses, ran Congress. They got less public attention than GEORGE but were highly effective in a far wider field than GEORGE's specialty.

They, more than anyone else in Congress, steered through to passage the year's bundle of legislation of all kinds with a minimum of fuss and feathers. This was one of the least talkative sessions of Congress.

That these three men—all quiet, undramatic, unsensational—should be the outstanding men in the Capitol in 1955 is the best evidence that this was a peaceful and businesslike year in Congress.

All three were creative in the sense that they were for something: They backed programs.

CASE OF M'CARTHY

Very often it's the men who make a record for being against something—like Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, who cheerfully attacked both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations—who can dominate in the sense that they monopolize the spotlight.

The spotlight's full glow was on MCCARTHY last year as it was ever since 1950 when he began making his charges of Communists in Government. Last year, however, he had to share the center of the stage with the two men who put the skids under him: FLANDERS, of Vermont, and WATKINS, of Utah, both Republicans.

This year MCCARTHY, FLANDERS, and WATKINS all disappeared back into the comparative obscurity from which they had emerged.

GEORGE'S INFLUENCE

GEORGE's influence and prestige on the side of Eisenhower came at a handy time for the President whose own Republican Senate leader, KNOWLAND, of California, was frequently critical of his ideas on foreign affairs.

As GEORGE, without bluster, took full control in the foreign field in the Senate, KNOWLAND had less to say and disappeared further into the background.

GEORGE went down the line for Eisenhower and at least once seemed to provide the nudge that pushed Eisenhower into action. It was GEORGE who first suggested the President meet with the Russians a few weeks before Eisenhower agreed to it.

TWO PROFESSIONALS

JOHNSON and RAYBURN are as fine a pair of professionals—in getting legislation passed or blocked—as Congress has seen in at least a generation. Both work quietly behind the scenes lining up votes and agreements.

Under JOHNSON's guidance the Senate astonished itself with the amount of work it got done with a minimum of argument.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal]

THE RECORD OF CONGRESS

The session of Congress just ended was the first in 25 years or so in which a Republican President had to deal with a Democratic Congress. Fears of a cold war, however, did not turn out to be justified. On the contrary, there was a good deal of cooperation, especially in the field of foreign affairs.

By and large, the Eisenhower wing of the Republican Party moved into control. The prestige of the Old Guard group diminished notably. The openly professed anti-Eisenhower faction had a rough time, as witness the 77-to-4 defeat of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY's resolution to limit the President's freedom of action at Geneva.

Another noteworthy development was the skill with which the Texans, Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House, and Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate, got the Democrats to bury the hatchet and vote pretty much as a unit so often. The Democrats hail this development as a fortunate omen for 1956.

Conservative Democrats for the most part held the chairmanships of committees, and so the business of investigating dwindled somewhat and lost its sensational characteristics. Comparatively little was heard of the Red menace, though Congress did remain alert. It was a change of manner that was noticeable.

The Senate displayed strong bipartisanship in such matters as the Austrian Treaty, the Formosa resolution, the Paris pacts, and foreign aid. The Reciprocal Trade Act was extended for 3 years. Both parties strongly supported the President in what he did and said at Geneva. Outstanding in the session and as a promise for the future was the dominance of Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, in backing the administration's foreign policy.

The draft was extended and a peacetime military Reserve bill was enacted, though not just what the President wanted by any means. Congress acted in accordance with Eisenhower's request to extend corporate and excise taxes, and then went along with him in killing Democratic efforts to reduce income taxes.

The Democrats went over the President's head to increase minimum wages to a dollar an hour, as compared with his request for a boost from 75 to 90 cents. Congress hiked its own pay and that of Federal judges from $15,000 to $22,500 a year, or 50 percent. Members of the Armed Forces and a lot of other Government employees got raises.

Democrats managed to get through the House a measure to do away with flexible farm-price supports in favor of rigid 90 percent parity, but the Senate paid that no mind. The Senate also failed to act on a measure to extend social security benefits.

Congress swept under the rug for 1956 consideration what the President wanted on highways, statehood for Hawaii, postal rate increases, amendment of the Refugee Act, and a plan for health reinsurance. School construction proposals were bypassed, as were Taft-Hartley amendments and numerous other administration desires. A compromise housing bill was enacted right at the last.

On the whole, the President fared very well on foreign affairs and ran into far more difficulty in domestic matters. For all that, however, Congress did not find it expedient to be sharp with the President as an individual. In the long view, it seems fair to say that the Democrats were saving some matters that might make good issues in an election year.

The atmosphere of the session was certainly more salubrious and the people generally welcomed relative lack of name-calling and lurid political fireworks. There was a sound measure of unity and achievement, and there is a fair presumption that any lack of excitement will be made up for next year.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star]

CONGRESS GOES HOME

The 1st session of the 84th Congress has officially concluded its meetings and its Members are streaming away from Washington. Some have gone to their homes; others have set forth on the various missions that take Congressmen to all parts of the world during recess time.

This first session has been a peculiar sort of one. There haven't been very many like it. In the first place, it has been controlled by a party different from the one represented by the President and that hasn't happened too frequently in the life of the country, although it is by no means unusual.

The thing which has made this session different is the amount of cooperation which has existed between the administration and the Democratic Party, which has controlled both Houses. Often very little is accomplished when the majority of Congress comes from one party and the President from another. This has not been true so far in the 84th Congress although things may be different when it comes back in January for the second session. Then an election will be drawing nigh and elections sometimes change things.

A contributing factor to the unanimity which has prevailed throughout the first session has been the seriousness of the world situation. It has been imperative that the United States present a united front in world affairs and it is to the credit of the Democratic majority, as well as to President Eisenhower, that their usually has been close unity on foreign policy.

A great deal of the credit for this must go to the leadership provided by Senator JOHNSON in the Senate and Speaker RAYBURN in the House. JOHNSON especially emerged as an outstanding leader until a heart attack incapacitated him the last few weeks of the session. If he is unable to assume direct charge of the majority next year the effect of cooperation may be shattered.

The chief accomplishment of this Congress seems to have been in foreign affairs, just as that has been the principal forte of the Eisenhower administration. Not nearly as much progress has been made on the domestic front as in the foreign field. There has been, as a matter of fact, a minimum of important domestic legislation passed.

The administration has been successful in getting some legislation passed it desired but suffered defeats on such measures as its big highway improvement bill, housing legislation, and public school construction.

Efforts by Congress to draft its own legislation in these fields also was less than satisfactory.

This Congress has been characterized by a paucity of investigations. One reason, of course, has been that there hasn't been as much to investigate as was the case when the Truman administration held sway.

What investigations have been held have devoted themselves to efforts to unearth campaign issues. Such matters as the Talbott case, the Dixon-Yates project, and the fiasco of the handling of polio vaccine fall in this category. It is unlikely any of them will meet the Democratic need for an election issue. More efforts along this line may be expected in the second session.

All in all, this session has been a generally satisfactory one. By its very lack of spectacularity it has been able to keep the Nation operating on an even keel. It hasn't done a great deal but at least it hasn't done any great harm. And that is an accomplishment not to be sniffed at.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette]

IT WAS NO COLD WAR

The 1st session of the 84th Congress was not a stormy one.

It flowed more placidly than most.

President Eisenhower's once-expressed fear that it would be something like a cold war if the Democrats controlled it, while he, a Republican President, was in the White House, proved unfounded.

Of course, the Democrats were not rubber stamps for Ike.

They supported him when they thought he was right and opposed him when they thought he was wrong.

Some of the laws which he proposed were in line with legislation which the Democrats had supported during the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman. Other bills were not to their liking and they followed their own ideas.

Nothing vital was lost to the country as the result of the difference in political affiliations between the White House and the majority in the House and Senate.

On foreign policy, the Democrats on the whole gave the President better support than his own party. None of the Democrats took such marked issue with him as did the Knowland faction of the GOP.

The Democrats are to be commended for their refusal to play politics with foreign policy. They have tried to go along with Eisenhower in a bipartisan foreign policy.

They have recognized the constitutional authority of the President to take the initiative in matters of foreign policy. They have not obstructed for the sake of obstruction.

The Republican Party still continues to be weaker at the polls than Ike is personally.

It is now generally expected that the Democrats will win the Congress again in 1956 even if Eisenhower should run again and be elected for a second term.

One of the tragedies of the 1st session of the 84th Congress was the heart attack suffered by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, the Democratic leader of the Senate.

JOHNSON is an able leader and enjoys the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He seems to be recovering as well as could be expected, but whether he will care to assume again the heavy burdens of Senate leadership is not known at this time.

JOHNSON'S job was competently filled during the last weeks of the session by Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, Democratic whip of the Senate.

In the House, leadership was in the expert hands of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and majority floor leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

[From the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche]

SOME GOOD NEWS

It's good news that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has been able to leave the hospital and return to his Washington home, following a serious heart attack on July 2. It is reassuring to the Senator's many friends and supporters in Texas to know that his next-door neighbor, Dr. O. E. Reed, describes the Senate Democratic leader as looking "better than before he had his attack."

If Senator JOHNSON carries out physician's orders to take it easy the next few months the chances are good that he'll be able not only to return to his senatorial duties in January, but, also, to resume command of the upper House majority.

Both of these probabilities are pleasant to contemplate.

RADIO BROADCAST BY TRIS COFFIN

In that greatest of all forums, the United States Senate, he stood like the captain of a good ship—calm, confident, sure of his men and his sails.

This was LYNDON JOHNSON, who—his admirers say—is the greatest Texan of them all. Young—he is but 46, tall and straight, with raven black hair turning grey, and a pleasant smile and drawl—Senator JOHNSON is a fallen warrior. He fell making democracy work, and lies like a bird with torn wings, recovering from a heart attack.

LYNDON JOHNSON was the Senate majority leader this last session. His small mahogany desk, looking absurdly like a school child's, was the focus of the Senate. Here came men of all beliefs—round-faced HARRY BYRD, as conservative as the Virginia squires he springs from; sharp-tongued WAYNE MORSE, the independent liberal from the West; solid and stubborn BILL KNOWLAND, the political heir of Robert Taft; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the lean Yankee aristocrat from Massachusetts.

LYNDON JOHNSON brought these men and their ideas together. That was his work and pride. He hated the noisy public fights on the Senate floor, the splitting of tempers, the ugly words spoken in anger, the endless nerve-wracking wrangling between Congress and the flat valley below. He believed democracy, as we know it, was born in compromise and works best in the easy give-and-take of friendly men. He said in his quiet drawl, "As I see it, the American people don't want anyone to rock the boat. They went to see how quietly and effectively their Government can work."

LYNDON JOHNSON broke into politics in 1937 with national headlines and interest.

This was the time the conservative wing of Congress came out of the cloakrooms, where they had grumbled in private, to do battle with Franklin Roosevelt on the floor. No one in Congress was sure where the public stood in this fight, and waited for an omen. LYNDON JOHNSON was the omen.

He won a special election for Congress in Texas over die-hard conservatives. He was the young NYA State director, an all-out Roosevelt supporter. JOHNSON rode back in triumph to Washington with President Roosevelt, who by one of those contrived chances, happened to be in the neighborhood. Mr. Roosevelt said, "LYNDON, I think you would be a good man to help out on naval affairs. Here's a telephone number. When you get to Washington, call it and ask for Tom. Tell him what we've talked about."

This "Tom" was the famed Tom Corcoran.

A few days later, freshman LYNDON JOHNSON stood in the rear of the House. One of the great elders, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, who has done more for America's armed services than any general or Secretary, came to him.

"Young man," Georgia's VINSON drawled, "I'm most indebted to you for a good dinner and an excellent conversation." The freshman looked at him in surprise. Mr. VINSON went on, "I was invited to the White House for dinner, and the President was a most delightful host. I was wondering just what he wanted from me, when he said most casually, 'CARL, there's a fine young man just come to the House, and I think he would be a real help to you on naval affairs.'"

As the two stood there, the Clerk of the House in his toneless voice announced JOHNSON'S appointment to the Naval Affairs Committee. There, the young Texan became the prize pupil of CARL VINSON. He pushed the investigations into mismanagement and corruption.

I remember LYNDON JOHNSON then. He had his office way up on the attic floor of the old House Office Building. I've climbed the stairs many a time looking for a story from LYNDON JOHNSON, the two-fisted crusader.

He held that role when he came to the Senate in 1949, to take the place of Pappy O'Daniel. LYNDON JOHNSON ran a heads-up investigation of raids on our synthetic rubber factories.

Then, a new and more mature phase began. Senator JOHNSON began to slough off the skin of a crusader, and take on the wings of a statesman. It was a metamorphosis, beginning with his election as assistant Democratic floor leader. There, he found his greatest skill was in handling men and ideas. It was the discovery of the artist in his real talent.

There was joy and satisfaction in this work, and you saw it in LYNDON JOHNSON'S face and manner, as he stood so calmly by his desk, or walked down the hall arm in arm with a fellow Senator.

At first, some of the liberals grumbled privately that he had deserted them. But he talked to them quietly, "The way to win your aims is not to divide the Senate into hard lines, and make enemies. It is by making new friends."

One of the first converts was HUBERT HUMPHREY, brilliant and a shrewd strategist; then thoughtful PAUL DOUGLAS, and even that irrepressible battler for human rights, WAYNE MORSE.

The United States Senate, under LYNDON JOHNSON'S calming hand, lacked the fire and brimstone that brought reporters pushing through the swinging doors to the gallery. But it had a new dignity and friendship and swift pace. Bills were rarely lost in committees, hidden there by the spite or bias of a tyrannical chairman. Long, ranting filibusters did not fill the midnight air with stale words. It was a house of moderation and compromise.

For that, we can thank Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who fell—victim of a serious heart attack—from the hard discipline of leadership. The prayers of all who believe that freemen can progress without quarrels go with LYNDON JOHNSON.

This is Tris Coffin reporting from Washington.

Resolutions of the American Legion, Department of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on July 28–30, the American Legion, Department of Oregon, held its annual convention in Redmond. At that meeting the following two resolutions were adopted unanimously. Because of their general interest I submit them for the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Legion, Department of Oregon, has sought for some time a means for Veterans' Administration care of the chronically geriatrically ill wartime veterans; and

Whereas through Veterans' Administration usage these cases have become known to us as nursing home cases; and

Whereas central office of the Veterans' Administration has recently released 100 beds at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Vancouver, Wash., for patients needing nursing care; and

Whereas by order of central office of the Veterans' Administration, 70 percent of those beds were filled by men sent here from the State of California, leaving Oregon and Washington with a completely unsolved problem; and

Whereas the patients assigned to nursing care beds are ambulant to the extent that they take meals in the mess hall and do not require constant bed care, but actually fall in the category of domiciliary patients: now therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, in national convention assembled in Miami, Fla., October 9–13, 1955, That central office of the Veterans' Administration be advised of our displeasure in their handling of the nursing care problem in the Oregon-Washington area; and our renewed plea for nursing care beds to be assigned those veterans who require constant, on-the-ward bed care, because of chronic geriatric disabilities; be it further

Resolved, That the need for domiciliary beds now appears to warrant the full use of the facilities at Camp White, Oreg., and we urge the use of those facilities for that purpose.

JOSEPH MCDONALD,
Department Adjutant.

Whereas the American Legion has always considered the disabled veteran, his care, and comfort a necessary and legitimate cost of war; and

Whereas the American Legion has always insisted that the United States of America owes its very life and existence to its veterans; and

Whereas the American Legion has always believed that part of the Nation's debt to its veterans must be paid through adequate hospitalization and domiciliary care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, in national convention assembled in Miami, Fla., October 9–13, 1955, That the policy of the American Legion as regards hospitalization and domiciliary care for American veterans be reiterated and reemphasized; be it further

Resolved, That Veterans' Administration at National and State levels be reinformed of said policy and requested to act accordingly in furnishing hospitalization and domiciliary care for the wartime veteran whose disabilities require hospital care and treatment and/or domiciliary care, and that special attention be given the problem of providing hospitalization via intermediate-type beds for those wartime veterans whose chronic or geriatric disabilities make him subject for such care.

JOSEPH MCDONALD,
Department Adjutant.

Waterline Finished by Springs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate and have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a release which appeared in the Denver Post headlined "Waterline Finished by Springs." In the last month, we have heard and read much which I would describe as conjecture about the availability of water in the Colorado Springs' area. It is pleasing to me, therefore, to be able to insert this clipping which states that the final section of the 54-mile pipeline has been completed and that this line, which has a capacity of 18 million gallons daily, will carry that amount of additional water to Colorado Springs storage facilities on Pikes Peak.

This new line is part of the Blue River diversion project costing the city of Colorado Springs nearly $5 million, and water will be flowing through it about August 1. This is a good example of Colorado Springs' ability and determination to furnish the necessary water for continued growth and development.

I can only hope that this actual accomplishment in providing water can be as reassuring to my colleagues in the Congress as it is to me, and will allay some of the doubts and misconception which have been common on this subject recently.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERLINE FINISHED BY SPRINGS

COLORADO SPRINGS, July 22.—Final sections of Colorado Springs' $4.6 million 54-mile Montgomery pipeline will be completed Friday according to Chief Engineer Ray Nixon.

The line, which has a capacity of 18 million gallons daily, extends from the city's Montgomery Dam near the Continental Divide to Lake George. The line connects with a 20-mile pipeline laid last year from Lake George to Pikes Peak. The line will carry water by gravity from near the divide directly to Colorado Springs storage facilities on Pikes Peak.

First water is expected to start flowing through the line about August 1, Nixon said.

The new line is a part of the city's Blue River diversion project.

Nixon said that during the heavy runoff period diversion will exceed the line's capacity and excess will be stored in the city's $2½ million Montgomery Dam, now under construction.

Do Not Recognize Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Do Not Recognize Red China," written by Mr. Ralph E. Heinzen, editor and publisher of the Nutley Sun, Nutley, N. J.:

DO NOT RECOGNIZE RED CHINA

I was a political prisoner of Hitler's Nazis. In midwar I spent a year and a half, guarded by Himmler's Gestapo, in internment in Germany's Black Forest. I know the moral depravity of prison guards; I know the sufferings of hunger and confinement.

I, for one, will be opposed, ever, to rewarding torture and treachery with honor and decency. I refer specifically to Red China, which is trying to buy its way into the United Nations and to gain United States recognition by liberating a handful of fliers whom it held in its prisons against all of the fundamental clauses of the Geneva Convention, and whom it subjected to all of its degenerate brutalities of an inferior mind—brainwashing, torture, solitary confinement, and starvation.

It is inconsistent, to say the least, to read a front-page dispatch from Geneva reporting progress in the talks between the ambassadors of Red China and the United States and then to read in the next column a dispatch from Tokyo reciting the tortures through which our 11 captive airmen passed in two and a half years of imprisonment.

Let Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., United States Air Force, tell you of his torture:

"I was subjected to types of torture and persuasion that civilized people do not subject other people to. I was kept in solitary confinement for two and a half years, never speaking a word to anyone. My hands were manacled so that circulation of my blood was shut off. My fingers then would be jerked by the guards, causing great pain clear up to my shoulders. My ankles and feet were tightly bound, and, so bound, I was forced once to stand for 30 hours. I was struck in the face, spat on, kicked, and beaten over the head and back with sticks."

The shame of such infamous torture must hang forever over the heads of the Chinese Communists and their regime. No American can defend inhumanities in his own heart. Only a perverted regime could build its strength on such depravity.

The story in Washington is that the United States was ready to announce bilateral talks with Communist China before Geneva, but hit a snag over terms, and so the news had to wait.

It also is reported that the Soviet officials, after the Geneva summit talks, rushed off a wire to Peking urging it to make hay with the United States while the Eisenhower sun still was shining—that the American President was in the mood for reaching terms with Communists both in Europe and in Asia, and that Peking should hurry up and free the fliers and the United States civilians.

Peking has freed 11 American fliers and is expected shortly to free the civilians, but has to have a quid pro quo for the latter in some kind of "release" of Chinese students in the United States. These are not the principal issues dividing the United States and Communist China. The ones Peking wants settled—in its favor, of course—are United States recognition, a seat in the U. N., more trade. Currently, at least, it has no chance of getting these—that is, not until

it publicly and positively renounces the use of force to achieve its goals.

I, for one, would be ashamed if my country was to extend the hand of diplomatic recognition to such an uncivilized regime. I would be ashamed if my country abandoned the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa and agreed to seat Red China among the civilized nations of this world in the United Nations. If there are Chinese students here who want to return to Communist China willingly, let them go free. I would be ashamed if my country bargained with the lives of men.

R. E. H.

Resolutions of Minnesota Federation of Post Office Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted at the 1955 convention of the Minnesota Federation of Post Office Clerks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE MINNESOTA FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS 1955 ANNUAL CONVENTION

STUDY TIME FOR POST OFFICE CLERKS

Whereas clerks in post offices must spend much of their free time studying complex distribution schemes; and

Whereas scheme study is an essential part of the work performed by distribution clerks and has been so recognized by the Government in allowing other employees credit for study time as part of their working hours; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance that a new clerk, assigned his first scheme, be taught methods of study which will enable him to attain proficiency in mail distribution; and

Whereas under the present system each new clerk must attempt to discover a method of learning complex schemes entirely on his own, which makes it very difficult for a new clerk to evolve a study plan which will expedite his learning and increase his retentiveness; and

Whereas a method designed to teach a new clerk how best to learn his first scheme will increase his confidence and add to his interest resulting in a more efficient clerk: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a program of supervised study in a study room on the premises be initiated where a new clerk can be taught for 30 minutes a day, as part of his working tour, how best to study his scheme; and be it further

Resolved, That any clerk, when studying subsequent schemes, be granted study periods of 30 consecutive minutes daily as part of his working tour; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Postmaster General, regional and district personnel officers; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the House and Senate Post Office Committee and to each Member of Congress from Minnesota.

POSTAL CONGRESSIONAL POLICY—CONTINUATION OF SERVICE AND PRINCIPLE

Whereas prior to 1851 the view adopted by both Congress and Postmaster Generals was that the objective of the Post Office was to balance receipts exactly with expenditures; and

Whereas this view of the Post Office as a business led to exorbitant rates and ineffectual service to our young Republic; and

Whereas in 1851 Congress adopted a new postal policy that reversed the view of self-sustainment and invoked the principle that the Post Office was a service institution just the same as other departments of the Government designed to promote the general welfare; and

Whereas the adoption of such a new policy that the paramount duty of the Post Office is to furnish the most useful facilities which can be provided at charges which lead to the widest possible use, through workers who are assured fair play and working conditions, has led to the building of one of the greatest service organizations in the world; and

Whereas because of the tremendous inflation since 1940 and the increase in costs to the Post Office of about double the cost in 1940, with little appreciable raise in postal rates, has made an increasing postal deficit; and

Whereas this increased deficit has motivated an increasing number to advocate the old view that the Post Office is a business and should be self-sustaining, which the present Postmaster General appears to champion; and

Whereas such a view has proven to be unsuccessful by prior experience, and as lacking in fundamental faith in the principles, growth, and development of this great Republic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the MFPOC in convention assembled at Mankato, Minn., June 16–18, 1955, reassert its belief in the Post Office as a service institution, and urge the Minnesota delegation in Congress and members of the Senate and House Civil Service and Post Office Committees, that in any consideration of adjustment of postal rates and consideration of salary increase that they adhere firmly to the service principle, and oppose vigorously the policy of a self-supporting institution and the principle that the Post Office is a business.

Legislative Division, Department of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the Department of the Interior and its Legislative Division for their outstanding and improved legislative service to the committee and the Congress during the session of Congress just ended.

The Department has made an invaluable contribution to our House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Congress with respect to timely submission of requested reports on legislation, making available departmental witnesses when requested, and in their continuing service in supplying needed informational background material.

A comparison of the activities of the Department in submitting reports during the 83d and 84th Congresses reveals that experience gained early in the Eisenhower administration has resulted in streamlining of this important liaison function. In the session just ended we had reecived 163 reports on pending bills against 236 requests. For the same period during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, Interior submitted reports on 90 bills against 233 requests.

I am advised that of a total of 732 such requests from all committees during the first session of the 84th Congress, Interior had submitted 489 reports, and that with cancellations deducted only 210 requests were pending at adjournment. This compares with 571 requests for the comparable period in the 82d Congress, when 235 reports were submitted and 351 were pending at adjournment. For a like period—the 1st session of the 83d Congress—630 reports were requested by all committees, 234 submitted, and 273 pending at adjournment.

An inquiry directed to the Department has revealed how these beneficial procedural changes were made possible.

I am advised that Interior, based on experience gained during the last Congress, completely revamped reporting procedures in 1954 by establishing a Legislative Division reporting directly to the Department solicitor. Prior to that, I understand, final draft reports were prepared by the several bureaus and agencies under Interior, in addition to their other day-to-day duties, and that presently reports are actually written in the Legislative Division, based on memorandum opinions from the bureaus and agencies.

This centralizing of reporting procedures, in addition to markedly speeding up elapsed time between report request and report submission, has substantially reduced the total personnel assigned to this function in the Department and has freed bureau and agency personnel to concentrate on their principal duties. Further, it has placed in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Legislative Division a single desk responsible for the legislative liaison function with Congress; this permits direct inquiries to one source when it is necessary to determine the status of pending requests.

In light of the foregoing, I wish to commend the Secretary and the office of the Legislative counsel and his aides in the Legislative Division of Interior for their work which has made possible improved assistance to the Congress and the committee in their functions.

Why Hells Canyon Must Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in May 1953 the St. Louis Post-Dispatch ran a

series on Hells Canyon Dam. The third article, which appeared on May 26, 1953, was practically prophetic. It therefore seems particularly pertinent to have it reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY HELLS CANYON MUST BE PROTECTED

Today the Post-Dispatch prints the third in a series of news articles about the controversy which has boiled up out of Hells Canyon, on the Snake River, where that deep and narrow gorge separates western Idaho from eastern Oregon.

Why so much attention to a wild, almost unpopulated region, some 1,600 miles from here?

Because every resident of the United States has a stake in what happens at Hells Canyon.

Because people in Missouri and Illinois should be no less concerned with what goes on there than the people of Idaho and Oregon.

The Hells Canyon issue could hardly be any plainer or simpler than it is:

Shall this great natural dam site be turned over to a private power company for a limited development for power production only as the Eisenhower administration now in effect proposes?

SECRETARY M'KAY'S REVERSAL

Or shall it be reserved for future maximum development by public authority, in which flood control, irrigation, and navigation possibilities are coordinated with electric power in a multiple-purpose project?

The official position of the United States Government in the Truman administration was for the maximum power, comprehensive-purpose project. Thus, in recent years, the Department of the Interior, under Oscar L. Chapman, steadfastly opposed the application of the Idaho Power Co., for authorization to build a relatively small power dam at Hells Canyon.

This official attitude has now been reversed. The Interior Department, under GOP Secretary Douglas McKay, has withdrawn its opposition to the application of the Idaho Power Co. When the hearing before the Federal Power Commission starts July 7, the conviction that Hells Canyon is a valuable spot in the Federal domain which should be protected for maximum public use will no longer be public policy.

AREA'S ALL-OVER NEEDS

There is no need to repeat all the pros and cons here. The Post-Dispatch correspondent, Richard G. Baumhoff, has assembled the arguments on the two sides with a wealth of detail.

A presentation with a thousand times as many facts would not alter the fundamentals of the case as stated in the alternatives above.

The Idaho Power Co.—which notwithstanding its name is a Maine corporation that meets in Maine annually—doubtless can begin work on its project sooner than the Federal Government could start. The private company could begin the flow of power quicker since there is no prospect that this Congress will authorize a public project at Hells Canyon. But to see Hells Canyon in terms of an immediate but restricted output of electricity and without integration with the area's over-all needs is to see the issue primarily as a private profit venture—or not to see it at all.

Muscle Shoals could have been ruined 30 years ago. Limited projects could have been installed at Grand Coulee and Bonneville. But in each instance the national interest stood out paramount and received needed and merited protection by the Federal Government.

Hells Canyon can now be spoiled for all time for maximum development. President Eisenhower's appointment of Jerome K. Kuykendall, public power opponent, to the Federal Power Commission, soon followed by Secretary McKay's withdrawal of opposition to the essentially selfish aspirations of the Idaho Power Co., suggests what is fast shaping up. The warning signals are out for all to see.

GUARDIANS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Fortunately there are Senators today like Hill, Anderson, Magnuson, Jackson, Morse, Douglas, Fulbright, and Kefauver, and Representatives like Mrs. Pfost, of Idaho, who can be expected to fight for the protection of this great site just as the late Senators Norris, Borah, La Follette, and Walsh guarded the great power sites a generation ago. The new guardians need public interest and support in the battle over Hells Canyon, if they are to win it.

Thus far President Eisenhower has said little that is specific other than that local sentiments should be a main factor in deciding what happens in such situations. Secretary McKay publicly has done no more than withdraw opposition to the private application and to say that he favors private power over public power when it does not conflict with orderly development.

But the Secretary's own words should stir him to protect the people's heritage. Allow the Idaho Power Co. to build a limited-capacity, single-purpose project and Hells Canyon is taken out of the orderly development of the great natural resources of the Pacific Northwest, taken out for all time.

It taxes credulity to believe that Dwight D. Eisenhower, after the offshore oil giveaway, will be no more vigilant in guarding the possession of all the people at Hells Canyon.

Somewhere, sometime, the President surely must turn back on the course. He could have no better inspiration than at the wild, rolling, but fabulously beneficial and potentially productive waters of the Snake River.

Protect Hells Canyon for the future.

Parity on Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Co., of Golden Valley, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS GRAIN CO.,
Golden Valley, N. Dak., July 2, 1955.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

At the annual stockholders meeting of the Farmers Grain Co., of Golden Valley, N. Dak., held on July 2, 1955, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by 167 stockholders:

"We, the stockholders of the Farmers Grain Co., of Golden Valley, N. Dak., hereby go on record that we are in favor of 100 percent parity as long as we have curtailed acreage."

LESLIE JACOBSEN,
JOHN LINDERNAUR,
Resolutions Committee.

Mr. Orme Lewis, an Outstanding Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1955, I learned officially that Mr. Orme Lewis has announced his retirement as Assistant Secretary of the Interior, effective September 15, 1955.

As chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 83d Congress, and as ranking minority member of that committee in the present Congress, it has been my honor and privilege to work closely with Orme Lewis since he was appointed Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management of the Department of the Interior by President Eisenhower on February 10, 1953.

To understand the responsibilities accompanying that office is to realize that the primary mission in public land management is the conservation of human and natural resources. The broad scope of the responsibilities is best understood by specific reference to the functions of Interior through its Assistant Secretary of Public Land Management.

Five important bureaus come under the jurisdiction of the office headed by Mr. Lewis. He has, during the past 30 months, directed the activities of those 5 key offices and, in a sense, has thus headed up a corporation employing more than 27,000 persons.

PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT

As a lifetime resident of Arizona and one of the State's outstanding lawyers, Mr. Lewis was able to bring to Washington a broad understanding of some of the problems raised by reason of Federal land ownership, which in his own State of Arizona amounts to more than 30 percent of the total land area.

The Bureau of Land Management has under its exclusive jurisdiction nearly 470 million acres in the continental United States and Alaska. In the conservation of natural resources, Mr. Lewis has encouraged and directed actions which will result in lasting benefit to our Nation.

A program of multiple use and protection of the public lands initiated by the Congress during his tenure will end many of the legalized abuses which marked the past administration of public lands and national forests.

A revised Federal range code containing regulations for administration of Taylor grazing districts has been developed and is now awaiting approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

A 20-year program of soil and moisture conservation was instituted last year and will provide the Department, for the first time, with the weapons to make headway against the forces of erosion and forage depletion which have been wasting vast areas of the public range, Indian reser-

vations, and other lands administered by Interior.

Under his direction, the Department has had under continuing study, with resulting modification of regulations, a program to assure compliance with the intent of Congress in amending the legislation providing for small tracts entry on the public domain and, similarly, regulations have been developed to end abuses under Federal statutes providing for issuance of prospecting oil and gas permits and leases.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

As a resident of a State containing nearly one-fifth of the Indian population of the United States, and intimately acquainted with the Federal-State-local Indian relationship, Mr. Lewis brought to the Department a perspective which assured a sound, sensible, and humane approach in the field of Indian affairs administration.

During his tenure, legislation has been enacted, appropriations obtained, and regulations put into effect to provide, through an emergency program for Navaho education, an educational opportunity for each Navaho boy and girl by September 1955. Programs were initiated for improving the health of the Indian people under administration by the United States Public Health Service and to provide machinery under which enlightened and self-sufficient Indian tribes and individuals will have the opportunity to terminate their dependency upon the Federal Government.

Through his contribution, a substantial portion of the more than 56 million acres of Indian tribal and trust land holdings will receive the benefits of improved intensive long-range resource management, development, and utilization measures.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The fact that his native State of Arizonia is second in the Nation in total land area set aside to provide the recreational, scenic, and historic values made available through the National Park Service, particularly qualified Orme Lewis for this administrative responsibility.

His administrative direction of the National Park Service has resulted in expansion of the physical boundaries within the park system and the integrity of that system has been protected and strengthened by numerous actions rejecting proposals not in keeping with the system's high purpose. That the long cycle of neglect of the parks has been turned into one of improvement is best indicated by the 40-percent increase in Park Service appropriations for the current year and the expansion of the ranger force to its greatest strength in park history.

While his retirement precedes the finalizing of the program, much of the impetus behind the "mission 66" legislative program proposed to be transmitted to the Congress during this adjournment comes as a result of his energetic and active role in its development. "Mission 66," anticipating accomplishment by 1966—the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service—if enacted into law, would assure a 10-year intensified program of development of facilities for areas within the national park system, provide for employee housing, roads and trails development, campground expansion, acquisition of non-Federal lands within the exterior boundaries of the system, improvement of such utilities as water and sewerage and related matters.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Under his direction, the Fish and Wildlife Service has carried out vigorous programs designed to expand and improve wildlife refuges which, with other steps taken, has resulted in placing the Fish and Wildlife Service in its strongest position in history to carry out the important program entrusted to it. The Service has been greatly strengthened for meeting its responsibilities in the field of commercial fishing by the enactment of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act and appointment of an American Fisheries Advisory Committee.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

The Department has under its jurisdiction American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the trust territory of the Pacific, in addition to Hawaii and Alaska. Exclusive of Alaska, this means that there are under Interior's jurisdiction—if the atolls and separate islands constituting the trust territory are broken down into single units—2,161 islands in the Pacific and Caribbean. One hundred and seventeen of these are inhabited, with a total population in excess of 3.3 million.

In the field of Territorial affairs, a notable achievement was the revision of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands. This act conferred a greater degree of self-government on the local inhabitants and will place the island government on a sound and economical footing. In Puerto Rico, a long-overdue liquidation of the Puerto Rico reconstruction administration was successfully accomplished to the mutual satisfaction of the commonwealth government and the citizens most closely involved in its operations. In Alaska, the Alaska Railroad, historically a deficit operation of the Federal Government, through injection of leadership from private industry, found itself operating in the black for the first time. Numerous administrative actions and individual legislative measures providing for industrial, commercial, and agricultural development of Alaska have received favorable action during the tenure of Mr. Lewis.

Hawaii, by securing congressional approval of several measures involving territorial land use, has been assured fuller development of its agricultural industry and one of its major commercial attractions—tourism.

Finally, with respect to the Trust Territory of the Pacific, the Office of Territories, under the direction of Secretary Lewis, has made substantial progress in continuing the development of proposed legislation which would create an organic act for this vast land and water area in the Pacific, and in the implementation of the obligations of the United Nations Trusteeship Council. Matters affecting the government and administration of American Samoa and Guam, key outposts of the United States in the Pacific, have assured more orderly development and administration of the human and natural resources of those areas.

The foregoing is devoted almost exclusively to the ability of Mr. Lewis in matters of administration and leadership in one of the most complex functions of our Federal system.

DEVOTION TO DUTY

There is another aspect deserving comment, involving his intense and continued devotion to duty.

Through frequent personal contacts with Mr. Lewis in his official capacity, I, with my fellow committee members, have found him an outstanding example of a highly qualified and dedicated public servant.

In his appearances before our committee, his frankness, candor, his obvious interest in, and full comprehension of, the matters under discussion have been notable. In his presentation and under direct detailed examination by committee members, he demonstrated a knowledge of the subjects under discussion which could only have resulted from a precise, logical, and workmanlike advance study. Perhaps the true mark of his stature as a lawyer and in his official capacity is his ability to say, "I do not know," or "That is one of the aspects of this problem with which I am not familiar," when a question is put to him. As rarely as this happened, his immediate willingness to candidly and honestly so reply was a refreshing departure from a different approach too often employed by our public servants.

He will return to Arizona to resume his law practice, and in so doing I trust that he carries with him a conviction that his has been an outstanding contribution to the welfare of the Nation. I cannot believe that it will mark the end of his public-service contribution. Demands will always be made for the type of leadership and service in the public interest which Orme Lewis has so ably demonstrated his ability to contribute. I wish for him and his fine family continued successes and happiness for the future and congratulate the State of Arizona on recapturing one of its most outstanding citizens.

Peterson Chosen as Morrow Conservationist for 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon farmers are very serious about this business of conservation. Conservation becomes more and more a way of life on Oregon farms; 4–H Clubs, juvenile granges, and scout troops, put into practice the principles of sound conservation as part of their excellent programs. As adults they compete now for honors as

practicing exponents of conservation, and in nearly every county annually a farmer is celebrated as the "conservation man of the year."

The following selection, Mr. President, was recounted in the Pendleton East Oregonian and describes the splendid accomplishments of Donald E. Peterson, of Ione, Oreg., award winner in Morrow County for 1955.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have it included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETERSON CHOSEN AS MORROW CONSERVATIONIST FOR 1955

HEPPNER.—Farm operations packed with a variety of conservation practices have won Donald E. Peterson, Ione, the Morrow County Conservation Man of the Year award for 1955 on his 1,073-acre ranch located in the Eightmile section.

A successful stubble mulch program not common in his area, deep furrow seeding and farming on the contour are among the major conservation practices followed by Peterson who is applying more conservation methods to solve his problems than any other rancher considered in the contest, committee members pointed out.

Other practices followed by Peterson on 873 acres of wheat land, divided almost equally in wheat and summer fallow, and 200 acres of range land include sodded waterways to carry water safely from the fields and seeding of steep land and diverted wheat acres to grass and alfalfa on a rotation basis to develop organic material in a long range wheat-summer fallow program.

In his stubble mulch program a stubble cutter, a subsurface tillage plow, rod weeder, and deep furrow drills complete his equipment. Timeliness of operation have been his key to success in eliminating the cheatgrass problem.

Two ponds have been constructed in a canyon on a corner of his place for livestock water and irrigation.

Credit was given Peterson for participation in new experiments including one of the county's five grazing alfalfa demonstrations sponsored by the Morrow County Livestock Growers Association. Fifty acres are divided equally to Nomad, Rhizoma, Ladak, and Sevelra alfalfas seeded in alternate rows with crested wheatgrass. An additional 25 acres of grass and alfalfa are seeded on steep ground.

For protection and beauty a windbreak planting extending about 1,800 feet from the highway to Peterson's home, a 150- by 200-foot wheat fertilizer trial plot and grass nursery are State extension service demonstrations incorporated on the ranch.

Also new in the area, Peterson has sown Stewart and Carleton oats, from which he sold seed last year, and 20 acres of safflower, new to Morrow County, on diverted land. In cooperation with the State game commission he has three-fourths of a mile of border shrub and tree plantings covering about 5 acres for game protection.

Peterson pointed out that stubble mulching was pioneered in the Eightmile area and practiced about 15 years by his father, Oscar Peterson, from whom he is buying his ranch on a sales agreement. Peterson harvested his first crop in 1950.

With his father and brother, Gerald, Peterson has a partnership in a commercial Hereford herd of about 100 cows, which they winter on their ranches and summer on a 2,000-acre mountain ranch in the south of the county. Grass and alfalfa plantings on diverted acres and steep land are utilized with the cattle operation.

Peterson, who is married and has a son, Kerry, 5, and daughter, Kris, 3, studied agricultural engineering at Oregon State College following service in the Seabees in the South Pacific from 1943 to 1946.

Active in county and community affairs, Peterson is vice chairman of the Heppner Soil Conservation District, vice chairman of the production land use committee of the Wheat League, past commander of the Ione American Legion and is a member of the Ione Willows Grange, Morrow County Cattle Growers Association, the Valby Lutheran Church, and the Elks.

For assistance with his conservation program, Peterson gave recognition to his father, the county agent and the Heppner Soil Conservation District.

Competing with Fred Mankin, Heppner, and Norman and Fred Nelson, Lexington, local winners picked by granges, Peterson's selection was made by Frank Anderson, chairman of the conservation committee of the Morrow County Wheat Growers Association and Charles Carlson, advisory member of the Heppner Conservation District. N. C. Anderson, county agent, was an advisory member.

Lessons for the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSONS FOR THE PRESIDENT

Dixon-Yates and Talbott cases raise question of what Mr. Eisenhower is learning about public office, writer says; states that administration's "cloud of moral superiority" screens doctored records and manipulations behind President's back.

T. R. B. IN THE NEW REPUBLIC

Anyone who will compare what Ike was telling the press about Dixon-Yates and what was actually happening will conclude that this is the first clear-cut example in this administration of what everybody feared—an amiable, attractive President being kept ignorant on a big matter by those around him. The Dixon-Yates story is important, really, from that aspect.

Last year on August 17, for example, Ike told the press with weary patience that they could get the "complete record" from the Budget Bureau and Atomic Energy Commission. "It is all yours," he said.

Instead, these agencies are now seen to have held back crucial facts—facts which make it appear more and more as though this were a grandiose Wall Street scheme to wreck not merely TVA but the whole public-resource-development program. On June 29 of this year Ike again told the press that the banker-business man Adolphe Wenzell "was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract." This was untrue: Ike didn't know it, but the manipulation was going on behind his back.

In a third instance Ike told the press, with restrained irritation, that it would get "every single document that was pertinent to this thing." But now it is disclosed Ike's subordinates put out a fatally incomplete and doctored record.

At a later press conference, July 27, Ike, his face furiously pink, flared up. Pressed by reporters on inconsistencies he angrily declared, "I don't intend to comment on any more at all. * * * I don't know exactly such details as that. How can I be expected to know? I never heard of it."

So there it is. Ike "never heard of it."

In summary the President—a high-minded, well-meaning ex-soldier heartily dislikes public ownership and has surrounded himself with wealthy businessmen-bankers who share his views. They know he will approve their general, idealized objectives, and they keep details of their little tricks to themselves. They operate in a cloud of moral superiority.

This is a situation made to order for skulduggery. The Dixon-Yates contract is now canceled, but Senator KEFAUVER is only just bringing out the bigger story of what really happened and what was involved. The observer keeps asking himself: Can Ike learn from this experience?

Can Ike learn from the Talbott affair? What startled Washington politicians, Democrats and Republicans alike, was the delay in Talbott's resignation. But is not that only natural in an administration which regards its every act as automatically virtuous?

Politicians know what can, and cannot, be done in public life. Businessmen like Talbott take a long time catching on. Talbott is the bridge-playing friend of Ike, who helped run GOP fund-raising drives for Dewey and then Eisenhower. Again one asks, Can Ike learn? What went through his mind as he read the Talbott record on his Gettysburg farm?

There was another great general who became President once; he is buried on Riverside Drive and his motives, too, were honorable.

Responsible and Constructive Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the record of this Congress has given America good government, and the prediction of a "cold war of partisanship" between Congress and the White House has failed to materialize. There is still much important work remaining for the next session—aid for highways and school construction are two big musts for 1956—but the accomplishments so far are impressive. Below are listed my stand on key issues before this Congress:

Voted for extension of selective service and strengthening Reserves; stepped up production of jet bombers and fighter planes; special funds to prevent 22,000-man cut in Marine Corps; mutual-security program to strengthen free world defenses; resolution calling for United States aid to defense of Formosa; resolution opposing admission of Red China into U. N.; 3-year extension of reciprocal trade agreements program; Government Reorganization Act of 1955; salary revisions for Federal employees, judges, and officials; code of fair practices for congressional committees; improvements in Federal employees' retirement system; aids to absentee voting for GI's and Government workers; railroad re-

tirement system improvements; plugging loopholes in 1954 tax law; increase in minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour; increased penalties for violations of antimonopoly laws; continued renegotiation of Government contracts to eliminate excess profits; bill to provide United States currency with inscription "In God We Trust"; continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen; incentive pay increases and allowances for the Armed Forces; extension of VA direct-loan program; greater control over commodity speculation and manipulation; assistance to States for Salk polio-vaccine program; increased authority for FHA home mortgages; surplus Government material for schools and civil defense; increased penalties for narcotic violations; prohibition on use of mails to transport obscene literature; aid to States for airport construction; and life of Small Business Administration extension.

Voted against exemption of natural gas producers from regulations and the Chicago "water steal" from Lake Michigan.

Unfinished business: The Senate has still to pass legislation, which I voted for in the House, to broaden social security and to provide income tax reductions for low- and middle-income families. The urgently needed highway bill, for which I voted, needs action at the next session. So does other legislation which I favor, but which never reached the floor, such as a liberalized immigration law, aid for school construction, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, home rule for the District of Columbia, and a new veterans' hospital at Wood.

It Would Be Tragic if the Geneva Conference Caused Us To Slacken Our Information and Cultural Offensive—A Federal Advisory Committee on Cultural Interchange Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Advertising Council, a nonprofit organization representing all phases of advertising and dedicated to the uses of advertising in the public service, recently returned to this country after a 6-month study of United States information and propaganda methods in the Orient, the Near East, and Europe under the auspices of the Eisenhower exchange fellowships. The head of this great organization, Mr. Theodore S. Repplier, is the first nongovernment American to study our information activities abroad.

Mr. Repplier has written me in part as follows:

I can testify from firsthand experience that sending samples of American culture abroad, from art shows to symphony orchestras to trade fairs, is a tested way to explode the damaging myth that Americans are cultureless dollar chasers. Often one American exhibit or performance can create a favorable impression that has lasting weight.

I heartily concur also with your view that an advisory committee could be helpful in counseling on this cultural offensive, although I am sure there are people better qualified to serve than I.

It seems to me important that there be wider recognition of the all-important fact that the more the danger of atomic warfare recedes, the more certainty there is that the ultimate outcome of the struggle between the Communist and free worlds will be decided by ideas and ideas alone.

It seems to me that victory is increasingly likely to go to the side which most successfully projects its ideas and ideals to the rest of the world. It would be tragic if the Geneva Conference caused us to slacken our information and cultural offensive just when it is beginning to hit its stride.

Thank you so very much for your attention to my earlier remarks. And congratulations on your grasp of a subject the importance of which is so often underrated.

In a brilliant speech at the Hotel Pierre, New York City, on June 30, 1955, at a meeting of the Advertising Council's board of directors and guests, Mr. Repplier reported on his study of our information methods abroad. He said our propaganda offensive needs to sharpen its ideas. Also, we need to draw into our propaganda program more of the skills and talents of America. Mr. Repplier is convinced that no group of professional propagandists, however able, can project a true image of the country, at an art exhibit, a trade fair, or anywhere else. "In America we have private organizations—from the Philadelphia Symphony to the Advertising Council—whose weight must be added to the idea war," he declared.

We can win the cold war but we cannot win it in a walk. It is time we started running. Mr. Repplier pointed out in his speech that—

The idea war needs more firepower. We are terribly outgunned. We now spend less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our military budget on propaganda. How can we possibly expect that truth can triumph over falsehood with that sort of niggardliness? The propaganda appropriation should be greatly increased.

Mr. Repplier is not alone in making these recommendations. A firm and open decision "to win the cold war," as the "surest way to prevent a hot war," was urged upon our Government by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, in a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955. Pointing out that the Kremlin's fixed goal is world dominion by means short of an all-out war, General Sarnoff declared:

Logically we have no alternative but to acknowledge the reality of the cold war and proceed to turn Moscow's favorite weapons against world communism. Our political counterstrategy has to be as massive, as intensive, as flexible as the enemy's.

The question, in truth, is no longer whether we should engage in the cold war. The Soviet drive is forcing us to take countermeasures in any case. The question, rather, is whether we should undertake it with a clear-headed determination to use all means deemed essential, by governments and by private groups, to win the contest.

General Sarnoff's memorandum entitled "Program for a Political Offensive Against World Communism," grew out of his discussion of the subject with President Eisenhower in Washington on the morning of March 15, and announced at the time by James Hagerty, White House press secretary.

The same afternoon, at the President's request, General Sarnoff conferred with Nelson Rockefeller, Special Assistant to the President on psychological warfare, and officials from the United States Information Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency. At the end of the meeting he undertook to submit his views on the subject and a suggested program of action.

The result was his memorandum, in which he emphasized that—

We must go from defense to attack in meeting the political, ideological, subversive challenge. The problem—

He said—

is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity of action. The expanded offensive with nonmilitary means must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it.

General Sarnoff urged the establishment of a Strategy Board for Political Defense, the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side. As to financing such a strategy board, the general recalled that appropriations over the past 4 years for our military defense averaged approximately $45 billion annually. In contrast, he noted, it is significant to note that for the fiscal year 1955 the total appropriation for the United States Information Agency was $79 million, of which $17 million is available for the worldwide activities of the Voice of America.

As a working hypothesis General Sarnoff suggested that a specific and more realistic ration between military and nonmilitary appropriations be worked out: say an amount equivalent to 5 or 7½ percent of military-defense appropriations to be granted to the Strategy Board for Political Defense—this, of course, without reducing the military budget and not counting foreign military aid and point 4 types of expenditure. General Sarnoff made this further point:

I am convinced that if the American people and their Congress are made fully aware of the menace we face, of the urgent need for meeting it, and the possibility of doing so by means short of war, they will respond willingly as they have always done in times of national crisis. They will realize that no investment to win the cold war is exorbitant when measured against the costs of the bombing war we seek to head off.

In a historic speech at the National Press Club here in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, said that our reliance upon armed strength is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected. He pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries "sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected

to perform, but to give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced."

Like General Sarnoff and Theodore S. Repplier, Mr. Hearst advocated the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence. This board should be, he said, scrupulously nonpartisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available, both in public and private life. He said on this that—

It should survey the whole global scene and develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems.

Who can doubt that America would emerge on top in any such competition?

My suggestion is not blueprinted. It may even be a little vague. But formulating and implementing it would be the job of the planning group of men and women, each devoting time and energy to developing an overall American strategy in those nonmilitary fields for 1955—and for the next generation.

We have a National Security Council. I would like to see a national competitive coexistence council to combat communism.

One side or the other is going to win the battle of competitive coexistence.

It had better be our side.

Everyone and everything we love and cherish is at stake.

There is, of course, deep and profound concern in the Congress with cold war strategy. Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas has called for the "greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war" and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, speaking at the Wayne University student forum, has called for all-out support of the proposals before the 84th Congress for the establishment of a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. Hearings have been held on H. R. 6874 and a number of related bills which would make such a program a permanent part of the armament of our country in this cold war period and action is expected on them early in the second session of this Congress.

The Congress recently appropriated $5 million to continue the President's emergency fund for participation in international affairs. With funds supplied by this fund the United States is fighting the cold war on two new fronts. Both are important and on both the Communists have a head start on us. Under the program the United States has participated in 15 trade fairs during the current year, and more than 23 cultural projects have been undertaken. Among the most successful of the cultural programs sent abroad under the fund are Porgy and Bess, which toured Europe, and the symphony of the air which was a smash hit in Asia. In the sports field, the program includes tours by star athletes who have been sent abroad by the State Department in cooperation with the Amateur Athletic Union. Trade fairs and cultural activities are areas of the cold war which the United States cannot neglect any longer.

Communist goods exhibited at trade fairs have often been of inferior quality—but how are other peoples to know that if there are no United States exhibits to make the contrast clear? In the absence of first-rate American participation, the Communists have been winning by default.

In the cultural field it is, again, only a question of giving other peoples an opportunity to see, listen, and judge. Here, again, we have the goods. The best rebuttal of Communist charges that Americans are uncultured, crass, material-minded barbarians, a favorite Communist propaganda line, is to present our country's cultural programs abroad. For years the Communists have tried to present themselves as devoted to the arts, to the better things of life. For years troupes of artists from the U. S. S. R., and more recently from Communist China, have been sent abroad by their governments to make friends and influence people for communism. That the Russian ballet, admittedly among the best in the world, has its roots in Czarist Russia is ignored. The ballet is Communist, they say. It is a potent argument for the Marxian line. Music, art, sports—all are grist for the Communist mills. They exploit their artists and sportsmen as they exploit everything else, and they have been doing it effectively, make no mistake about that.

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives Frank Coniff of the Hearst newspapers had this to say in support of the activities being carried on under the President's emergency fund for participation in international affairs:

Mr. ROONEY. Now, Mr. Coniff, we shall be very glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF FRANK CONIFF

Mr. CONIFF. Thank you, Congressman ROONEY, for the opportunity to be here. I am sorry Mr. Hearst himself is not here. I talked to him yesterday. He is on a business trip through Europe, and he said he would certainly be here if his schedule had permitted.

I have here a report on Russia which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD. These are a series of articles which appeared in our newspapers several months ago.

Mr. ROONEY. If you have sufficient copies and will leave them here, we shall see that each member of the committee gets one. It costs a lot of money to print these, but each member will have an opportunity to read it.

Mr. CONIFF. This booklet is interesting in view of the fact it was written mostly in the week of February 13, which was 5 days after the Malenkov upheaval in Russia, and I think it accurately forecasts the shift in Russian tactics we have encountered in recent months. We were there at the time the new shift was heralded, when Malenkov stepped down, and Mr. Khrushchev became the chief power in Russia.

While we were there we gained the impression that our policy of building armed strength had proven a detriment to Russia in any thoughts Russia might have of precipitating a third world war as a means of gaining its end. Anything I say is predicated on the belief we should continue to build our strength and continue to build our technical proficiency to the extent they will exceed anything Russia can bring against us.

However, as Mr. Hearst says in this booklet—and again I say this was written at a time when alarmist reports filled most of the air and the press in the wake of the disturbance in Russia so that even at the time we were writing this we wondered if we were right, and we are gratified we did not give anyone a wrong steer—Mr. Hearst says on page 46:

"The Soviet Union can't stand a war with the West within the foreseeable future, and therefore won't start one. I have further predicted that Russia's realistic rulers will exert a cooling influence to keep the Chinese teapot from boiling over."

This was at the time of the Tachen evacuation, when it looked like war would break out at any moment. [Continuing reading:]

" 'We're glad the fire in Korea was put out,' Khrushchev told us. 'We don't want to see another one start up.' "

Mr. Hearst writes:

"The democracies won't start a war with the Soviet Union because it is against the very nature of democracy to launch an aggressive war.

"The only spark that might touch off an atomic showdown, as I have repeatedly stated, would be the failure of the West to keep up its guard and encourage the Kremlin to think we were weak and defenseless."

Then Mr. Hearst writes—and I think it gets to the core of what you gentlemen are considering here:

"If I am right in thinking that war is no solution to the current struggle, and that Russia will not pull the trigger for varying reasons, then we pass into the much more difficult battleground of peace.

"The West is well equipped in any trial at arms. But are we prepared practically and philosophically to surpass communism in the thornier problems of peace?"

It was a strange impression to gather in Russia that these leaders who were talking so belligerently on the floor of the Supreme Soviet were so anxious to convey the impression back here that they were not going to start a war, but we did gain the impression that they had the idea that in the coming years they could so manipulate events that they would gain an edge on us in this cold war, which I think is now more a soft war. A cold war is a form of a hot war, and this soft war will be another form of a hard war, a hard war by another means, so to speak.

In accordance to their own theory, the Russians seem to feel that every form of endeavor is subject to the ideological struggle, and a thing like sports and the theater and an avenue like literature are weapons to the Russians in this struggle with us.

If there was any one frightening thing to us in talking to these Russian leaders, it was their belief that in coming years communism would gain the upper hand. Khrushchev said to us in so many words that communism would gain the upper hand in the long run. That is quite jarring to Americans and leads to the conclusion that it is up to us to devise a strategy to help in preparing America for this conflict that the Russians do not think we have a chance of winning. They think we are going to ignore most of these fields and leave them open to the Russians and to Communist infiltration and Communist propaganda, and that in our concentration on material things we will ignore these things of the spirit.

They have taken such a subject as sports and they are taking dead aim on the Olympics next year as a source of great prestige for the Communist idea. We have enjoyed the fact that America has dominated the Olympic games for some time. They hope to appeal to the youth of the world with their athletes who, in 1956, and certainly in 1960, will pose a serious threat to our superiority.

In the other fields, in the theater and in literature, they are also using their own artists and their own performers as agents of Communist imperialism. They do it very subtly. The artists know they are subject to the State and must carry out their dictates.

It is the impression of Mr. Hearst and Mr. Kingsbury Smith and myself that our American artists can help also in winning opinion among our allies, among the uncommitted nations, and even back of the Iron Curtain we can do a lot to dispel the thought that America is concerned only with material things. Some headway has already been made in that.

It is our belief, after seeing and talking to the Russians and seeing what they have in the limited scope of our trip, that America has so much to offer, so many fine things to be seen, and so many more decent and good things to show, that we must bring them to bear in whatever way we can in this struggle, which, of course, we think will continue within our time and certainly within the foreseeable future.

I hesitate to inflict an opinion on the committee because the operations of Congress are not exactly my purview, but I do think that some start has to be made, and in saying this I echo the opinion of Mr. Hearst. Some start has to be made first in comprehending the phase of communism we are now entering, and secondly, in fashioning the weapons that will aid us in winning this struggle.

Mr. Hearst said at the National Press Club, and has repeated in numerous statements, the belief that one side or the other one will prevail. We are in agreement with Mr. Khrushchev on that, that the second half of this century will determine which way of life will gain the upperhand, and our observations—Mr. Hearst's, Mr. Smith's, and my own—have seen our country emerge into world leadership whether it asked for it or not, and we have seen it acquit itself of this responsibility in a way which I believe no previous recorded history presents any example quite as fine or as magnificent.

If I may use Mr. Hearst's words in approaching this subject, he said we of this generation can see very clearly that perhaps we are not in immediate danger, for strategic reasons we feel our generation will survive any attempt to overthrow it, but he says we have to think of the future years, of our children and the kind of world they will live in, and therefore it becomes necessary to organize the planning and the thinking that will enable us to emerge victorious in this struggle.

It is fundamental with Mr. Hearst and with our appreciation of what is going on in the world that the struggle with communism will last a long time, that these complacent interludes are more difficult to understand and to win than the sheer showdown of a shooting war or of a tense period in international relations. He wrote in February that the cold war—and we were using the term at the time—that the cold war is going to be much more subtle than it was under Stalin. Of course at that time we had no means of knowing that the moves of the Russians were then in progress, the Austrian settlement and the overtures to West Germany and things like that. So it will be more subtle and more difficult to understand, and in passing I might say that the Communists by their own theory will make any move and condone any move if it helps them in their struggle. For instance, Khrushchev and Bulganin went to Belgrade recently in a mood that might be interpreted as an apology, with hat in hand, but it was not an apology and Tito understood it was a shift and a tactical move.

We say in here—again pointing out it was written in February when much alarmist talk filled the air—we say Russia wants peace because it needs peace. It is not equipped for a showdown with us at this time on a shooting basis so they are bargaining for time. If there is a part of this booklet we are proud of it is chapter 3, dealing with Russia's weaknesses. Communism in Russia, as we saw it, is under great stresses. They have many conflicts that might well be insoluble. They have problems which, even without a cold war, would still remain, and they are having terrible trouble in solving them.

I do not want to take too much of your time, but this is all a prelude to our thinking that a good deal of planning for the coming phase of what we call competitive coexistence is needed. If there is some money available that will aid us in this year of 1955 to accurately anticipate Russian moves, that will bring us into contact with them in ways that will not provoke a war but will still enable us to make ground in this struggle, we are confident the net result will be a gain to the United States.

I must apologize for not having our idea of a competitive coexistent council in more concrete terms, but, as we say in this book, that would be the task of a planning board, to understand the struggle and to perhaps plan the ways of bringing it to a successful conclusion.

I understand before this committee is a specific recommendation for certain moneys to be allotted for cultural endeavors. We believe that any of our artists that go abroad should recognize that in a sense they are American citizens who are doing a duty to their country and that their appearance and their performance and their conduct will have a direct bearing on the results of our trouble with the Communists. We think that they should attempt to get close to the people in the countries where they perform, they should be available at clinics where the young people who might be interested in the theater or in sports could get to them, and it should not be regarded as a triumphant parade or excursion, but as a definite contribution to good competitive coexistence.

I was reading that Oklahoma will be shown in Europe, and I think that is fine, and I understand some dignitary is giving the cast a garden party and that it will be the social event of the season. A little social life does not hurt anybody, but my opinion is that it will not particularly contribute to our success in the ideological struggle; but if it could be arranged, by planning and by knowledge of what is going on, for them to see the young people and talk to them and answer their questions, I am sure it would be a step forward.

We just came back from Russia so full of the belief that the American way of life has so much more to offer than the Russian way of life that if we can let the people of the world see it, believe me, any comparison is bound to tip the balance in our favor.

I think I am rambling a little bit here and perhaps getting away from the core of what you gentlemen are interested in, but that is our only message, the message of Mr. Hearst, that some comparison of what is going on must be grasped by our policymakers now, and some means of combating this cold war must be devised.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you for your very interesting statement. You must realize that the committee has the advantage of advice from the State Department from the top level and has access to intelligence, and so forth, in regard to the situation between the Soviet Union and the United States today.

The conclusion reached by Mr. Hearst, General Sarnoff, and Theodore Repplier was that our propaganda offensive needs to sharpen its ideas and needs to be increased many times in size. Also, that we need to draw into our propaganda program more of the skills and talents of America. As Mr. Repplier says, "In America, we have private organizations—from the Philadelphia Symphony to the advertising council—whose weight must be added to the idea war."

One place to begin adding the weight of private organizations to our idea war would be to bring them in, in an advisory capacity, and thus make them part of, any program for the expansion of cultural, scientific, and social contacts which the Federal Government undertakes. Authority for this very step is contained in Public Law 402, 80th Congress, particularly in title VIII, section 801 (6). In carrying out the purposes of this act the Secretary of State is authorized "to create, with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange, such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act." It is my understanding that the powers and authorities granted under this act of the Congress for the appointment of such an advisory committee on the arts and cultural exchange have never been exercised. In any event, now would seem to be a particularly appropriate time to create such an advisory committee.

This advisory committee, if it is appointed, will obviously be of great importance in our relations with other nations and it should, therefore, be composed of men of the highest caliber and leadership ability. If I may take the liberty of making a few suggestions I would think the following admirably exemplify the qualities needed: Theodore S. Repplier; Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff; Senators Alexander Wiley, H. Alexander Smith, Karl S. Mundt, Theodore Francis Green; William Randolph Hearst, Jr.; Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer, of the Washington Post and Times Herald; James C. Petrillo, George Meany; Walter Reuther; Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president, National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council; Alan T. Waterman, National Science Foundation; Dr. Leonard Carmichael, of the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Sammy Lee, outstanding American athlete who recently made a special tour to 12 countries in the Far East to tell about the American way of life in behalf of the Department of State; Clarence E. Pickett, American Friends Service Committee; and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

Also, from the world of business and philanthropy: Nelson Rockefeller, Henry Ford II, and Harvey Firestone. From the theater and movies: Robert W. Dowling, president of the congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy; Dr. Gilbert V. Hartke, president of the American Educational Theater Association; Ralph Becker, of the National Association of Legitimate Theaters; and Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.,; and Lee Norvelle, president of the National Theater Conference.

From the art world, David E. Finley, director of the National Gallery of Art; Lloyd Goodrich, chairman of the Committee on Government and Art; Henry

R. Hope, editor of the College Art Journal.

As architects: Wallace K. Harrison, Pietro Belluschi, Eero Saarinen, and Otto Eggers.

From music: Dr. Howard Hanson, president of the 800,000-member National Music Council; Bruno Walter, conductor; Rudolf Bing, of the Metropolitan Opera Co.; Patrick Hayes, chairman of the Cultural Development Committee of the Washington Board of Trade; Dr. Frederick Fall, conductor of the United States Department of Agriculture Symphony Orchestra and former conductor-in-chief of the Vienna Volksoper; and Dr. Warner Lawson, head of the department of music at Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Also, Milo Christiansen, past president, American Recreation Society.

For composers and authors: Richard Rogers; Oscar Hammerstein II; Ira Gershwin; Norman Dello Joio; Gian-Carlo Menotti; William Faulkner and Ernest Hemingway, Nobel Prize winners; Harold Spivacke, of the Library of Congress; and Howard Mitchell, conductor of the National Symphony Orchestra, Washington, D. C.

Not Exactly in High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been troubled by the delays and confusion that have been notorious in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act.

The following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch suggests the experience of one single community with the law and the almost barren results that have followed as a result of what we in Congress hoped would be a useful piece of legislation:

NOT EXACTLY IN HIGH

The arrival of 34 refugees from Europe this week was a heart-warming experience for St. Louis as well as for the newcomers. They lived originally in Eastern Europe. Driven from there by war, they had spent years in oppression, wandering and confusion. Finally they reached the Statue of Liberty, where they read that great welcome to "the huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

These 34 refugees were rescued from the huddle of postwar Europe under terms of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. So this is a good time to ask, once more, how the work of that legislation is progressing.

Readers will remember the congressional uproar last spring over the firing of Edward J. Corsi as deputee refugee administrator. It was disclosed then that while the law called for admission of 214,000 refugees by the end of 1956, only 3,000 bona fide refugees had been admitted. Criticism centered equally on the law itself and on its administrator, Scott McLeod, State Department security officer.

In the 5 months since then Mr. McLeod and the State Department have offered several hopeful statements about putting the program into "high gear." And the Department now says that "about 30,000" persons have been admitted to our shores, not specifying how many actually were refugees.

In short, half the time allotted for the refugee program has expired, and one-seventh of the number of refugees supposed to be admitted has been admitted.

Myths About Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Congress are aware of my long-term interest in the special problems which face the older members of the American community in our time. I have always insisted that we must obtain more information as to the nature and complexity of these problems so that we may act intelligently and humanely to relieve them. We know that one result of the fact that our life expectancy has been increased by about 20 years since 1900 has given more people a chance to live longer. We know that census estimates indicate that, by 1975 there will be 20 million people aged 65 and over in this country—or nearly twice the number we have today.

Last year, in introducing my bill (H. R. 3313) to establish a commission to study old-age and retirement benefits, I said:

Some people talk as if the facts of our time—this miracle of a longer life—is in the nature of a national calamity. I do not agree with that kind of thinking for 1 minute. We have never, in this country, been afraid of problems growing out of progress. And one of the healthiest indications of the dynamics of democracy is the evidence that American communities, churches, labor unions, and public officials are starting to study these problems with the confidence that intelligence, sympathy, and imagination will produce good answers.

Mr. Speaker, the results of one such study have just appeared in the form of a 172-page report, The States and Their Older Citizens, conducted for the Council of State Governments. Summarizing the contents of this report, the Christian Science Monitor made the following comments:

The Council of State Governments has produced an excellent study of the needs of older people in the United States in response to a request from the Governors' Conference of 1954. Entitled "The States and Their Older Citizens," it draws together the findings of many studies made in various States and localities in the last few years.

The outstanding feature of this report is its indication that people of retirement age or near are more concerned now about retaining the opportunity to work than they are about increased pensions or other retirement income. This does not mean that company pensions, old-age insurance, and old-age assistance are unimportant, but that, with these foundations laid, the average oldster does not wish to incur idleness as the price of security.

The bill of objectives for older people formulated in the study lists, first, equal opportunity to work. In a program for action, the report urges governments, employers, and unions to abolish compulsory automatic retirement at a fixed age and to substitute flexible, selective retirement policies. It urges State governments to lead in abandoning the age critierion in hiring or laying off employees.

Other recommendations include: Assurance of adequate minimum income, including more liberal old-age assistance where needed; encouragement of older people to live in their own homes so far as feasible; provision to homelike institutional care for those who require it; rehabilitation work, including vocational retraining; and opportunity for older citizens to participate in recreational and other community activities.

Not all of the matter of employment opportunities is to be reached by legislation or even working contracts. "A prime requisite," says the study, "is an extensive program of public education—one that will dispel popular myths about aging. * * * Once the myths about aging and its inevitable helplessness are dispelled, the major roadblocks to constructive action for older citizens will have been removed."

I am convinced that a thorough study of this report would be of inestimable value to all of us. For it contains the statistical story of what is happening to our senior citizens in terms of the inadequacy of their income, of the problem of living arrangements and family relations, and the problem of employment. Moreover, it goes beyond this necessary background data to show how hundreds of communities throughout the country are beginning to seek the kind of good answers I predicted we would find.

We must, of course, know the facts—many more facts than we have available at the present. For in its own important way the factual story dispels some of the myths which have grown up in our time. One of these myths is that our older citizens retire from their jobs as soon as possible to live the rest of their years in the sun.

But, as this report shows, the facts are quite the opposite. Most older persons want to work and continue working as long as they are physically fit and can find employment. Less than 1 out of 25 workers retire to enjoy leisure, the remainder are compelled to retire either for reasons of health or because they have lost their jobs and cannot find new employment. Also cited in the report are the preliminary findings of a study of 3,515 employees aged 63 and 64, working in 265 businesses, industrial, governmental, and private organizations in 23 industries, which showed that older workers are opposed to compulsory retirement at a fixed age. According to these findings, 77 percent of the workers interviewed said that, if it were up to them alone, they would continue working for the same employer. Similarly, results of the 20th century fund retirement survey, also cited, show that 57 percent of pensioners are retired by the company because of age, that another 25 percent are retired because of poor health or accident, and that only 9 percent retired voluntarily to have some time to themselves. In my own State of New Jersey, for example, 42.4 percent of persons aged 65 and over are still working, another 16.5 percent are receiving old-age social-security benefits, and just 4.6 percent are receiving old-age assistance.

These are the kind of facts which will help to dispel the myths which so often becloud the real issues when we consider the problems of our older citizens. The time has come when we must consider those problems against the broad-gage background used in this study. For, as this report emphasizes, the overall problems of aging involve problems of opportunity to work, of inadequate income, of home and family relations, of physical and mental health, and of leisure time activities.

In many respects the second section of the report is the most challenging. For here the data goes behind the facts which are developed to show activity now underway in various communities throughout the land to meet the complex problems facing our senior citizens.

To meet the problem of housing—a special problem for the older members of our population—a former logging camp, in Ryderwood, Wash., is being transformed into a new community of retired workers. A Philadelphia settlement house, the Lighthouse, enlists volunteers to pack and deliver two meals a day to older people living alone in furnished rooms. In Boston, the first project of the Commonwealth Housing Foundation will contain 300 dwelling units for 400 persons at low rentals, of whom at least 50 percent are to be 65 years of age or over.

To provide the opportunity for older workers to participate in recreational activities in Detroit, the Automobile Workers Union, in 1953, established the first of three drop-in centers. The activities include educational and discussion programs, group games, community singing, hobbies, visiting sick persons in hospitals, and certain welfare activities. A day-center program in New York City combines the cooperation of the city's department of welfare, which supplies the staff; private social agencies, which provide building space and some equipment; and citizens who organize a separate board of directors for each of the 14 centers. One analysis of the value of this program showed that a group of older persons reduced their attendance at health clinics 50 to 70 percent after joining a center.

These, then, are a few of the many examples cited in the report of the activities now just beginning to develop on behalf of our senior citizens. But, as the report makes clear, they are few and far between. Indeed, the major conclusion growing out of this study is that we have only just begun to overcome the apathy and neglect which has too often characterized our attitude toward our senior citizens. We are just beginning to learn what society, the economy, and Government can and should do for the older person. We are just beginning to understand that each older person has an indispensable role to play in our society. We are just beginning to recognize that, in the words of the report:

Older as well as younger persons should be guaranteed their fullest expression, and that is impossible if attempts are made to impose uniform and preconceived ways of life upon them. For a great many older people, moreover, and for most of those with good health, the prerequisite of successful living is opportunity to be as productive both economically and socially as their capacities will permit.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we should have more studies of this kind. My own bill, H. R. 574, would establish a commission on old-age and retirement benefits. Under its provisions a 12-member bipartisan commission would be established, the membership to be equally representative of the Government and of private citizens. For I have been concerned with the fact that we know almost nothing about the character and amount of present old-age benefits in terms of their adequacy. I have been greatly concerned with the economic plight of so many of our older men and women, and I believe we must separate the myth from the reality in this very vital area. Such a commission as I propose would accomplish such a purpose.

Meanwhile, I applaud the action of the Council of State Governments in preparing this admirable study and for making it available to all of us. For I am convinced that, in coping with the problem of aging, all resources must be mobilized—those of the public at large, the economy, and of Government at all levels.

Commercial Airline Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to include in the RECORD a point-by-point rebuttal by the McClure Syndicate on the attack made by Pan American World Airways, Inc., on Ray Tucker's column of June 30, 1955, whose column appears in approximately 200 newspapers throughout the country and is distributed through the McClure Syndicate.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

John A. Creedy, Pan American World Airways press agent at New York, has challenged the accuracy of my June 30 column on the attempt by the White House, the Budget Bureau, and the House of Representatives to reduce costly and unnecessary airline subsidies.

His criticism, although nowhere supported by facts or figures, raises the question of Tucker-Creedy integrity, as well as that of accuracy. In response to suggestions from numerous editors, I am replying to him, item by item.

Editors will note that my answers are substantiated by facts, figures, and official statements from such Federal agencies as the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Post Office Department, the General Accounting Office, congressional records and hearings, and the Supreme Court, with specific references to documents, dates, and pages.

My reply is, of course, too lenthy for publication, and I did not so intend or design it. I may note, however, that it is valuable data for a newspaper morgue, since it is a factual study of airplane subsidies, as well as of the attempt of a single company to operate permanently and profitably at the expense of American taxpayers, whereas rival lines facing the same problems pay their own way.

Sincerely,

RAY TUCKER,
Washington Columnist, McClure Newspaper Syndicate.

MEMORANDUM

TUCKER COLUMN

1. "It will decide whether Pan American World Airways shall continue to receive Federal subsidies which have totaled more than $1 billion since World War II."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

No such decision was before the Appropriations Committees. Who gets how much subsidy is determined by a judicial proceeding before the Civil Aeronautics Board laid down by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Whether Pan American should or should not get subsidy in 1956 was not an issue before the committee. The $1 billion figure is wildly exaggerated. A check with the proper Government office would have revealed the proper total as less than a fifth of this amount. The Government pays Pan American a subsidy for maintaining deficit air services essential to the foreign commerce, the Post Office and the national defense.

1. THE FACTS

The Appropriations Committee certainly did have before them the question of how much subsidy should go to Pan American World Airways. Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, who sponsored the increase in the subsidy appropriations, finally abandoned defending Pan American and based his case that the increase was needed for the sake of the small feeder airlines in the various States and districts. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 216, p. 7241, col. 1.) In reply it was pointed out that all the small feeder airlines in the country have subsidy claims totaling only $25 million; hence, if these lines are given priority to be paid first, as was done in the Comptroller General's letter of May 18, 1955, with respect to the 1955 appropriation which Senator DOUGLAS challenged Senator HOLLAND to do for the 1956 appropriation, obviously no increase over the $40 million figure set by the House would be required, since that sum would be more than adequate to take care of all the feeder lines in the country, providing they are given priority and are not squeezed out by Pan American. In fact, adding to the small feeder airlines, the helicopter lines and domestic trunklines, the total subsidy claims of all these lines, i. e., the total subsidy claims of all domestic airlines in the United States total only $32 million. So, again, it is obvious that the increase from the $40 million figure set by the House to the $52,500,000 figure set by the conference committee referred to in Tucker's column of June 30 is largely for the benefit of Pan American World Airways only.

Total airmail pay, including subsidies, since World War II, adds up to $1,150,000,000.

This figure excludes additional subsidies through the airport and Federal airways programs, which are estimated as almost as large as the airmail pay. No estimate of how much of the airmail pay was really a subsidy over and above the cost of services actually rendered in flying the mail is available, since no separation of the two was made until the fiscal year 1955.

TUCKER COLUMN

2. "The White House and a House Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, from Brooklyn, cut the 1956 subsidy figure proposed by the CAB from $55 million to $40 million."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

The White House had nothing to do with the proceeding. Not Representative ROONEY, of Brooklyn, but Representative PRESTON, of Georgia, is head of the subcommittee. CAB

asked for $63 million. This was cut to $40 million in the House. Fifty-five million dollars was not mentioned by the House committee, but was the figure subsequently recommended by the Senate committee, and which the CAB said was likely to require a supplemental appropriation later.

2. THE FACTS

It is erroneous to say that the White House had nothing to do with the subsidy proceedings. In the fall of 1954 the Civil Aeronautics Board sought White House approval for a request to Congress for a supplemental appropriation of $31 million, which was in effect an attempt by the Civil Aeronautics Board to get back practically all the money which Congress had cut the preceding June. The White House did not approve this request and when the Federal budget was presented to the Congress by the President on January 17, 1955, the supplemental request of CAB had been whittled down by the White House from $31 million to $18,600,000. When the official special message, House Document No. 88, was transmitted in February by the White House to the Congress, the subsidy request had been whittled down still further to $15,200,000. In the end, the Congress voted only $8,900,000 which, added to the previous amount voted, totaled only $48,900,000, or considerably less than the Congress wound up voting for the following year.

It is correct that Congressman PRESTON, of Georgia, is head of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Commerce Department and Related Agencies (including the Civil Aeronautics Board). It also is true that when the congressional program for cutting subsidies began, the ranking Democrat was Congressman ROONEY, of Brooklyn, who was head of the subcommittee which embraced not only the State Department and the Justice Department but also the Commerce Department. It is entirely correct to say, as Tucker's column of May 4, 1955, did, that the cut made by the House in the 1956 appropriation down to $40 million was made at the strong urging of Congressman ROONEY.

TUCKER COLUMN

3. "The reduction is not so important as the purpose behind it, which was to force Pan Am to adopt economies that would make it self-sustaining."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

Not a single line of the record of the proceedings supports this.

3. THE FACTS

To the contrary, the record of the proceedings actively supports the contention that Congress intended to force economies in the Pan American. House Report No. 207, by the Committee on Appropriations, March 15, 1955, stated:

"A report from the investigative staff of this committee dated December 30, 1954, contained the following:

"The survey indicates that the Civil Aeronautics Board does not have accurate facts or figures regarding Pan American operations. Most of the subsidiaries have never been properly audited and some not at all, and there has not been insistence that the operations of the entire system be treated as an entity, as required by a recent Supreme Court decision. If corrective action were taken, substantial cuts in subsidy should result.

"The committee is of the opinion that the Supreme Sourt decision, if properly adhered to, will result in a substantial reduction in the amount of subsidy, and that the amount allowed by the Committee will be sufficient to make payments during the remainder of the fiscal year to domestic lines and international carriers who are not affected by the Supreme Court offset decision."

Following adoption by the Congress of the conference committee report, House Report No. 426, on April 19, 1955, the Comptroller General stated in his interpretation of the law, May 18, 1955, in his letter to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"A review of the legislative history leaves little doubt that, notwithstanding the general terms of the appropriations statute as enacted, it was clearly intended by the Congress that the sum appropriated was not to be used in payments of subsidy to those carriers affected by the Supreme Court offset decision."

As a result of this decision, no part of the 1955 supplemental appropriation contained in Public Law 24, 84th Congress, was permitted to be paid to Pan American.

Of course, since Senator HOLLAND of Florida, did not extend the principle of the Comptroller General's decision, quoted above, to the 1956 appropriation (as Chairman HAYDEN, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee had previously applied it to the 1955 supplemental) the lid is now off on subsidy spending in the direction of Pan American.

TUCKER COLUMN

4. "Pan Am gets the lion's share of taxpayers' money allotted to airlines subsidies."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

Not true. Local-service airlines copter companies get lion's share.

4. THE FACTS

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the airline receiving the largest amount of subsidy from the Public Treasury is Pan American, slated to get $17,769,000. (Sources: Hearings of House Appropriations Committee on CAB budget for fiscal 1956, p. 365; and Senate hearings on 1956 CAB budget, pp. 286–287.) The second most heavily subsidized airline, according to the official tabulations submitted by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the two Appropriations Committees is a local-service carrier, Frontier Airlines, due to get $3,074,000. Going down the list, only 2 airlines get more than $2 million each, and the rest in amounts going down as small as $1,000. The facts indicate that it is quite true to say that Pan American gets the lion's share of the taxpayers' money allotted to airlines subsidies, and it might be added that it is a pretty hungry lion at that.

It should not be forgotten that all big airlines except Pan American are now off subsidy for both their domestic and international operations, including specifically TWA, American, Eastern, United, Northwest, National, and Capital.

There are numerous certificated airlines who receive neither service mail pay nor subsidy, and about 2,400 nonschedules or charter airlines who also get no subsidy of any kind.

TUCKER COLUMN

5. "Its great overseas rival, Trans World Airlines, has just received a special citation from Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield congratulating it for operating without subsidies. Most other lines, foreign and domestic, pay their own way."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

Pan American is also off subsidy for operations comparable to those of TWA. In the recent past, PAA has received subsidy to maintain air services over certain thin-traffic, national-interest routes, such as those to South Africa, to the door of the Iron Curtain at Finland, to Australasia, and westwardly from Hong Kong. Incidentally, the Senate Appropriations Committee requested the CAB to clarify this distinction in the future. Foreign-flag airlines are heavily subsidized—many are government owned.

5. THE FACTS

It is true that Pan American operates over thin-traffic routes to South Africa, to Finland, and to Hong Kong, but Pan American has never revealed the specific subsidy costs of these specific routes. It is doubtful if, as, and when Pan American ever submits specific figures for these 3 specific routes, if these routes could be shown to justify more than a fraction of the total of $17,769,000 which Pan American is getting.

It is true that foreign-flag airlines have been receiving subsidies. However, on the Atlantic, both TWA and Seaboard & Western fly certificated, scheduled services, facing the same foreign competition that Pan American does—and they are able to do it without a single cent of subsidy. In the Pacific, Northwest Airlines flies to the Orient and successfully struggles against foreign-flag competition without subsidy. If these other airlines can meet foreign-flag competition successfully without constant recourse to the Public Treasury, the very natural question arises: Why can't Pan American?

TUCKER COLUMN

6. "In Senate debate on this question, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, developed these facts about Pan Am's finances and its relationship with the CAB, the Treasury and the General Accounting Office."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

Unsubstantiated charges were made by Senator DOUGLAS. The other side of the debate which fully answered Senator DOUGLAS with the record facts is completely ignored by Tucker.

6. THE FACTS

Senator DOUGLAS' charges were anything but unsubstantiated. His charge that Pan American, in the most recent year for which figures are available, spent on its wholly-owned subsidiary, Intercontinental Hotels, Inc., $2,530,063 more than it received back, was substantiated by an official CAB tabulation appearing on pages 6907–6915 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1955—and his figures were never, at any point in the congressional debate, contradicted. Senator DOUGLAS' charges concerning the granting of subsidies to Pan American by the Civil Aeronautics Board to cover almost their entire Federal income tax burden was substantiated by another CAB tabulation appearing on pages 6916–6918 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, and these figures were never denied. The Senator's facts concerning the failure of the CAB yet to have implemented the Supreme Court decision was supported by a tabulation provided by Postmaster General Summerfield appearing on page 6920 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1955, and these figures were never denied, nor has Mr. Creedy, of Pan American, denied the accuracy of these substantiating figures.

TUCKER COLUMN

6. "In Senate debate on this question, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, developed these facts about Pan Am's finances and its relationship with the CAB, the Treasury, and the General Accounting Office."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

Unsubstantiated charges were made by Senator DOUGLAS. The other side of the debate which fully answered Senator DOUGLAS with the record facts is completely ignored by Tucker.

6. THE FACTS

Senator DOUGLAS' changes were anything but unsubstantiated. His charge that Pan American in the most recent year for which figures are available, spent on its wholly owned subsidiary Intercontinental Hotels, Inc. $2,530,063 more than it received back, was substantiated by an official CAB tabulation appearing on pages 6907–6915 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1955, and his figures were never, at any point in the congressional debate, contradicted. Senator DOUGLAS' charges concerning the granting of subsidies to Pan American by the Civil Aeronautics Board to cover almost their en-

tire Federal income tax burden was substantiated by another CAB tabulation appearing on pages 6916–6918 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, and these figures were never denied. The Senator's facts concerning the failure of the CAB yet to have implemented the Supreme Court decision was supported by a tabulation provided by Postmaster General Summerfield appearing on page 6920 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1955, and these figures were never denied, nor has Mr. Creedy, of Pan American, denied the accuracy of these substantiating figures.

TUCKER COLUMN

7. "Pan Am receives between $8 million and $9 million a year from the Federal Treasury in order to pay its taxes to Uncle Sam. In some years, Pan American has received more than it owed in taxes, but it has simply pocketed the windfall."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

All of an airline's revenues, including Government subsidy and everything else, go into its bank accounts. It draws on these accounts to pay all of its expenses—wages of personnel, cost of fuel and other supplies, rentals, and facilities, interest on its debt, and income tax. It is no more accurate to say that the Government subsidy pays an airline's income tax than to say, for instance, that cargo shippers alone pay it.

Tucker's reference to a windfall refers to a CAB policy, changed many years ago, which applied to all airlines.

7. TAX ALLOWANCES AND TAX WINDFALLS

The Pan American argument is easily answered in that it is obvious that the $17,769,000 of Government subsidy goes into the Pan American till and that while a particular Government check might not be endorsed over to the Internal Revenue Service by the recipient, Pan American, it is obvious that receipt of the Government check relieves Pan American of the burden experienced by the average taxpayer throughout the United States, which is of paying their own Federal income taxes out of their own pockets. Furthermore, the various rate orders issued by the CAB specifically identify specific amounts given to Pan American as "Federal income-tax allowance." The CAB figures on page 6917 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1955, which have not been denied by Pan American or anyone else, show that, for the calendar year 1953, excluding the Atlantic division (the subsidy amounts for which are still being debated at CAB) the CAB has already given to Pan American under the specific label of "allowances for Federal income taxes" the very large sum of $5,438,000, or 60 percent of the total Federal income taxes reported by Pan American to have been paid to the Treasury. A variety of proposals are being presently considered at the CAB for additional Federal income-tax allowance to be given to Pan American through its Atlantic division. The lowest of these proposals would result in the Government paying 87 percent of the total Federal income-tax burden of Pan American, and the highest of these proposals would leave the Government paying not just all of Pan American's Federal income taxes, but 102.4 percent of them. (Reference: p. 85 of CAB Order E8833 in CAB Docket 1706, Transatlantic Final Mail Rate Case, containing the recommendation that PAA should be allowed $7,958,000 as provision for Federal income taxes and exceptions taken by Postmaster General to initial decision of CAB in CAB Docket 1706, which exceptions are quoted on pp. 2204 and 2212 of Senate Appropriations Committee hearings on CAB budget for fiscal 1955, wherein it is noted that the proposal of CAB to pay the Atlantic division of Pan American $3,892,000 as Federal income-tax allowance would, when added to the $5,438,000 of Federal income-tax allowances already granted to the other three divisions of Pan American, make a total Federal income-tax allowance to Pan American World Airways, Inc., at the public expense, of $9,330,000, or 102.4 percent of the amount reported by Pan American and CAB Form 41, Accounting No. 9100. Income Taxes. Twelve months, to December 31, 1953, $9,110,000.) It is thus quite clear that the Government is paying the major part, and may wind up paying the entire amount—or even more than the entire amount—of the Federal income taxes of Pan American World Airways, Inc.

This is a fairly recent racket, beginning in a big way only with the year 1950, according to the official figures on page 6917 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1955.

The figures indicate that this is also a unique racket, not shared in by other airlines and certainly not shared in by the general public.

It is as if, dear editor, you were able to go to the United States Information Agency of the United States Government and say: "I have to pay $1,000 of income taxes this year, so please give me about $1,000 to pay them with."

I don't know how far, dear editor, you would get with this request, and, in fact, I never heard of an editor or newspaperman who had the crust to try it; but, as you may have observed, there is no lack of gall or nerve on the part of the Pan American people which may explain in part why they get away with things that most people think: "It just can't happen here."

Turning now to the matter of tax windfalls, a charge brushed off by Pan American as something which "refers to a CAB policy changed many years ago," this situation refers to another variation on the basic theme under which you, dear editor, would go to the United States Information Agency and say: "I think I will have $1,200 of income taxes to pay this year, so please give me $1,200 with which to pay them." It subsequently might turn out that you would only have to pay $1,000 worth of income taxes; but since you have already received $1,200 from another agency of the Government with which to pay the $1,000, and nobody is making a squawk about it, you simply pocket the $200 as a windfall.

Pan American says this business of windfall, "refers to a CAB policy changed many years ago." Senator KILGORE, of the Appropriations Committee, says: "If the CAB does not have a new policy regarding tax allowances, it appears that the Postmaster General of the United States has not yet heard about it." (Hearings on S. 346, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 104.) So it is questionable if the barn door is locked even now, but Pan American makes no answer whatsoever about the horses which CAB admits have already escaped from the barn.

On page 2120 of the Senate appropriations hearings on the 1955 CAB appropriation, Senator KILGORE quoted from CAB Order E4561, in which the CAB made the following extraordinary admission:

"In computing such tax allowance in previous cases, however, the basis used has in many cases resulted in making provision for a greater amount of tax than would ever be paid by the carrier."

On page 2166 of these hearings, the CAB admitted to Senator KILGORE:

"The statement you just read is unquestionably a correct statement."

On pages 2121–2126, Senator KILGORE introduced sworn affidavits that during the period of approximately 1946–47:

"The Civil Aeronautics Board has apparently allowed Pan American approximately $1 million on account of taxes that will never become due."

Despite the fact that the CAB was asked a year ago to comment as to whether this affidavit is true or false, no statement whatsoever has been received from the CAB or from Pan American. And it is certainly not answered by Mr. Creedy's rebuttal. Furthermore, the same affidavit also stated with regard to American Overseas Airlines which has since been bought by Pan American World Airways, Inc., and for which the Civil Aeronautics Board at this very moment is proposing a retroactive subsidy increase of $8,792,000 in which case the money would obviously go to the new owner, Pan American World Airways, Inc.:

"It would therefore appear that a sum well in excess of three-fourths of a million dollars has been allowed AOA on account of taxes that will never be paid."

Again, the Civil Aeronautics Board was asked by Senator KILGORE to answer this charge and again no answer has since been forthcoming in more than a year.

Since the Civil Aeronautics Board admitted that tax windfalls had occurred in many cases in the past and since a lot of the rate cases are still open or have been reopened as far back as January 1946, the Civil Aeronautics Board was asked by Senator KILGORE to provide:

"A statement of the difference between the amounts of airmail pay and/or subsidies which the CAB has awarded from 1946 to date to companies holding airmail contracts for the purpose of enabling them to pay their Federal income taxes and, on the other hand, the sums actually paid by those same companies into the United States Treasury."

The Civil Aeronautics Board replied that the Board did not have the information available in its records.

Again, a year later, the Civil Aeronautics Board was asked at the Senate hearing on May 27, 1955:

"Who got how much tax windfall in what years, and, secondly, what has been done to recover the money?"

In response, Messrs. Mulligan and Roth, of the Civil Aeronautics Board staff, stated that they did not think a precise answer was possible. However, Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman Rizley said he wanted the committee to understand that the problem of tax windfalls was wholly new to him as the new Chairman of the CAB, but he saw no reason why there could not be a full and exact answer and he promised to give it.

Unfortunately, both this question and this promise of an answer, which occurred in the presence of witnesses at the hearing of Senator HOLLAND'S Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on May 27, 1955, were stricken from the official printed hearings, under mysterious circumstances.

To date, the answer still has not been given.

I now refer to page 7230 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, 1955:

"Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have the windfalls been recaptured?

"Mr. HOLLAND. I am unable to say."

Senator HOLLAND went on to say:

"The agency of the Government to bring about recapture is the Internal Revenue Service of the Department of Justice, not CAB. That situation results from the law which Congress passed, and not from any attitude on the part of CAB."

However, this view conflicts with the view of the Comptroller General which is that the Civil Aeronautics Board has the necessary authority under present law. On May 20, 1955, the Comptroller General answered the inquiry of Senators KENNEDY and KILGORE, as to the responsibility for preventing or recovering the tax windfalls, as follows:

"The protective feature in the (Civil Aeronautics) Act, however, is the authority of the (Civil Aeronautics) Board, upon its own motion, to reopen a rate case at any time it is of the opinion that the return to the carrier is exceeding the amount which was contemplated at the time such rate was determined."

It is therefore perfectly clear: (1) that the Civil Aeronautics Board is responsible for these tax windfalls occurring in the first place and is fully empowered to recover the money under present law, and (2) the CAB has failed dismally since the problem was first raised in the Appropriations Committee a year ago, to lift a single finger to recover a single penny of the tax windfalls.

Perhaps Mr. Creedy would be glad to supply you or the Appropriations Committee with sworn affidavits in answer to the sworn affidavits of alleged tax windfalls of $1,750,000 and perhaps he would also care to supply you with an answer if tax windfalls have occurred in other years and what has been done to pay the money back to the Government.

TUCKER COLUMN

8. "Pan Am operates a chain of luxury hotels in Latin America, with fancy bars, golf courses, and swimming pools, on which it looses between $2 million and $3 million."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

Pan Am's wholly owned subsidiary, Intercontinental Hotels Corp., operates a chain of hotels, all but one of which are owned by others. They are an essential tool in the development of the tourist industry in Latin America. Tourist dollars spent at these hotels help provide Latin American countries with foreign exchange to buy goods produced by American workers. Intercontinental Hotels Corp. operated at a profit last year and continues to do so this year.

8. THE FACTS

The Pan American comment does not answer Tucker's charges. The facts reveal in 1953, the most recent year for which figures are available from the Civil Aeronautics Board, Pan American World Airways, Inc., spent on its 100-percent-owned subsidiary, Intercontinental Hotels Corp., $2,530,063 more than it received back (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1955, top p. 6913). If Intercontinental Hotels Corp. is now operating at a profit, there are no audited Government figures to show so.

If Intercontinental Hotels Corp. is now operating at a profit, that is a trend in the right direction, and it may serve ultimately to repay some of the money which has been drained off by Intercontinental Hotels Corp. from Pan American, which in turn has been draining off over $17 million from the American taxpayers in subsidies. But Intercontinental Hotels Corp. has a long way to go before the debt is paid back.

Figures on page 387 of the House appropriations hearings on the CAB budget for 1956 indicate that, accumulatively, through December 31, 1954, Pan American had spent on Intercontinental Hotels Corp. $4,539,000 more than it received back. Comment by Creedy, of Pan Am, does not indicate the size of the present profits of Intercontinental Hotels Corp., nor whether such profits exceed the $4½ million cited above.

Pan American itself owns the Hotel Grande in Belem, Brazil, which is managed by Intercontinental Hotels Corp. Intercontinental Hotels Corp. owns entirely the Hotel Reforma in Mexico City; Intercontinental Hotels Corp. leases and operates the Hotel Victoria Plaza in Montevideo, Uruguay; and until very recently also leased and operated the Princess Hotel in Bermuda; and Intercontinental Hotels Corp. manages the following other hotels: Hotel Tequendama in Bogota, Columbia; Hotel Tamanaco in Caracas, Venezuela; Hotel Del Lago in Maracaibo, Venezuela; and the Hotel Carrera in Santiago, Chile.

This gives us a chain of seven hotels involved in the operations of Pan American and/or its 100-percent-owned subsidiary, Intercontinental Hotels Corp.

Each of these seven hotels can accurately be described, as Tucker has done, as luxury hotels. A yet-unreleased Government report states, "Each of the * * * applications show the completed cost to be in the luxury type of hotel, and these simply cannot be profitably supported by a tourist trade."

For example, when asked to comment upon the need for a hotel in Mexico City, the American Embassy commented, "It should not be a luxury hotel but should cater to the middle class wherein the tourist future of Mexico undoubtedly lies."

The Hotel Reforma in Mexico City was purchased by Intercontinental Hotels Corp. for over $2 million at a time when Pan American was losing on Intercontinental Hotels Corp. and was in turn soliciting subsidies of over $17 million from American taxpayers, and does not meet the standards described by the American Embassy.

Tucker's further descriptions of the luxury hotels containing, "fancy bars, golf courses, and swimming pools," is amply borne out by a mere glance at the 15-page plush, colored pamphlet passed out to prospective customers (a few of which have also been obtained by unsuspecting taxpayers). Editors who themselves cannot afford to stay in these places and unwittingly and unwillingly contribute toward them in their income taxes may relish reading a few extracts from this pamphlet:

With regard to the Hotel Grande in Belem, Brazil, which is 100 percent owned by Pan American: "* * * spacious guest rooms reflect the magnificence of the days of the Amazon throne, yet incorporate every modern facility for comfort and repose."

For those editors thinking of visiting Bogotá, Colombia, there is (if you can afford it and bear in mind you are helping to pay for it anyway) there is the Hotel Tequendama for which United States Government credits as well as United States Government airline subsidies are involved where it is said "Take delight in the lovely terraced Monserrate Room for dining, entertainment, the informal grill and coffee shop, and the intimate Chispas Bar."

The picture for the Hotel Tamanaco in Caracas, Venezuela, features the latest type kidney-shaped swimming pool surrounded by cabanas where citizens who can afford it sip their Latin American drinks while the rest of us stay home and work to pay for the Government credits and subsidies which went into this luxury hotel.

Ignoring the advice of the American Embassy that a hotel in Mexico City should be geared to a middle-class pocketbook, the ad for the Hotel Reforma, wholly owned by Intercontinental Hotels Corp., says, "the international society that congregates at the Reforma adds a further dash of color and excitement to a thrilling visit to Mexico City."

I'm sure that American editors everywhere will be glad to help pay for a suitable gathering place for the international set.

Then there is the Hotel Victoria Plaza in Montevideo, Uruguay, managed by Pan Am's Intercontinental Hotels Corp., despite the fact that the State Department is quoted in the official Government files that "the Department has no political interest whatsoever in the Montevideo hotel project."

The Pan American Intercontinental Hotels Corp. pamphlet states that "the cocktail lounge and Sapphire Room offer Montevidean interpretations of an enchanted evening."

In our tour, we should not forget the Hotel Carrera in Santiago, Chile, where it is stated that "the Robinson Crusoe Bar and the glamorous Carrera Night Club reflect the gaiety of Santiago's scintillating society."

TUCKER COLUMN

9. "According to Senator DOUGLAS, this loss is financed by many taxpayers who cannot afford an air voyage to the luxurious hostelries."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

Wrong. No subsidy money goes into the hotel company or ever has. On the other hand, under present subsidy policy, the CAB claims in full any net income realized by Pan American from investment in any affiliated company—with consequent reduction in subsidy requirements.

9. THE FACTS

The facts indicate that in 1953, while taking in from the Government over $17 million in airline subsidies, Pan American was at the same time passing along $2,530,063 to its 100-percent owned hotel subsidiary. Mr. Creedy has not denied these facts. Commonsense indicates that the Government subsidies go into the same big kitty of Pan American that the expenditures on its hotel chain come out of.

It might be different if the CAB actually subtracted from the airline subsidies given to Pan American the amount of money which Pan American drains off into its subsidiaries, but the Comptroller General of the United States, in answer to Senator DOUGLAS' specific question as to whether or not that subtraction is being made, replied on April 27, 1955: "The answer to this question is in the negative."

No facts have yet emerged to dispute the contention by Senator DOUGLAS that "what seems to be happening is that we are subsidizing Pan American, which in turn is subsidizing its wholly-owned hotel corporation." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1955, p. 6915, column 1.)

Senator DOUGLAS gave a specific example of just how airline subsidies are being diverted to hotel activities as follows, which example was at no point in the 3 days of Senate debate challenged and which is specifically not denied by Mr. Creedy, of Pan American:

"Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I find that the same man, John S. Woodbridge, controller of Pan American, is also controller of International Hotels Corp."

INTEREST-FREE LOAN TO HOTEL SUBSIDIARY

"I think the evidence will show that on the 14th of July 1953, Pan American advanced $2 million to Intercontinental Hotels Corp. By a letter on January 21, 1954, the controller of Pan American Airways informed the Intercontinental Hotels Corp. that this $2 million advance would not bear interest. This act of generosity was accomplished by the same man, writing a letter from himself in one capacity to himself in another capacity.

"The foregoing of interest on this single advance of Pan American to its hotels amounts to $80,000 a year at 4 percent, an item which we are covering through the subsidies."

TUCKER COLUMN

10. "According to Postmaster General Summerfield, Pan Am owes millions to the Government for past overpayments it has received for carrying the mail, which is another form of subsidy. But, despite Mr. Summerfield's urging, no suit to recover has been brought by the CAB or the Department of Justice."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

This couldn't be more wrong. CAB judicial proceedings have been heard to determine whether Pan Am owes the Government or the Government owes Pan Am. Final decisions are not yet it, but upon the record, the CAB staff admits that the Government owes Pan Am, not vice versa. As in the past, the judicial proceedings protect the Government from overpayment and substantial amounts due have been withheld from PAA in the interim. Money received for carrying the mail is simple compensation for services rendered. Subsidy is separate. The Government made $7 million profit last year on the mail Pan American carried. This is the difference between the money it received from the sale of stamps less costs of handling the mail and the money it paid Pan American for the work of carrying the mail.

10. THE FACTS

On June 8, 1954, Senator KILGORE inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4234, a tabulation received by him from the Postmaster General of the United States, Arthur E. Summerfield, indicating that under the principles of the unanimous Supreme Court decision of February 1, 1954, the Post Office had made assertions that Pan American had made excess earnings in its Pacific, Latin American, and Alaskan divisions totaling $6,815,000, which could be applied as offset against the mail payments for the Atlantic division of Pan American for the period 1946–53. In effect, the Postmaster General asserted that these were overpayments which had occurred and which could now be applied against pending claims. Prior to this year's vote in the Senate, Senator KILGORE inquired of the Post Office Department what had happened about these assertions of excess earnings available for offset, or overpayments, during the past year. On May 23, 1955 the solicitor of the Post Office Department replied: "Since none of the cases listed in the tabulation has been finally determined by the Board, the Department is unable to present any final results."

It is thus evident that in well over a year, nothing has been done by the Civil Aeronautics Board to answer the Postmaster General's assertions against overpayments to Pan American.

TUCKER COLUMN

11. "Most amazingly, as several congressional investigations disclose, neither the CAB nor the Comptroller General have complied with legal requirement that they audit Pan Am's finances and operations."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

This statement is plain astonishing. The CAB has testified that over 10,000 man-hours were spent in 1954 auditing PAA's books. An additional 597 man-hours were devoted to Pan Am's hotel subsidiary.

11. THE FACTS

On June 27, 1955, the Comptroller General of the United States made the following report, which completely answers the comment by Mr. Creedy, of Pan American:

"All divisions of Pan American World Airways, Inc., have never been audited simultaneously by the Civil Aeronautics Board, but have been audited for odd periods corresponding with pending divisional mail-rate cases. In our opinion, it is extremely important for all of Pan American's divisions and main accounting office to be audited for identical periods, with simultaneous completion dates, so that the complete financial results of the system as a whole can be coordinated and reviewed.

"The Board determines service-mail rates for each of Pan American's divisions separately and the determination involves four rate proceedings by sectors of operations—transatlantic, Latin American, transpacific, and Alaska. Since 1946, there has always been an open rate case pending on one or more divisions of this carrier. One of the inherent dangers in this situation is that over $200 million of centrally controlled revenues and expenses are allocated to the divisions by Pan American's main accounting office. Not only can a small change in allocation percentages cause a shifting of substantial amounts between a division on a final mail rate to another (or others) on an open rate, but the task confronting both the Board's audit and rate staffs of validating the amounts so shifted is overwhelming.

"The Board's audit staff has never verified the revenues and expenses allocated to the divisions. * * *

"Pan American's affiliates and associates also have never been audited, except for a preliminary or exploratory survey of its wholly owned domestic subsidiary, Intercontinental Hotels Corp., made during the latter part of calendar year 1954."

TUCKER'S COLUMN

12. "Both agencies have failed to comply with a Supreme Court decision to that effect, a decision which revealed the jurists' annoyance over this untidy state of affairs."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

This is a confused reference to a Supreme Court decision of February 1, 1954, in a test case against Chicago & Southern, not Pan American, which had nothing to do with auditing. In brief, the decision required that any excess earnings from one division of a company be applied to reduce subsidy in another division. Pan American has always believed that this makes sense and is on record as opposed to attempts by other airlines to change the Civil Aeronautics Act to upset the Supreme Court decision.

12. THE FACTS

The Supreme Court decision of February 1, 1954, contains not only the offset principle (that excess earnings from one division of an airline be used to reduce subsidy claims of other divisions of that same airline) but also the entity or entirety principle which has been, and still is, ignored by the CAB and Pan American. The Supreme Court stated in its unanimous decision, February 1, 1954: "The 'need' of the carrier is measured by the entirety of its operations not by the losses of one division or department."

At the Senate appropriations hearings, May 18, 1954 (p. 2195), Senator KILGORE stated: "It appears necessary that the CAB hold a consolidated proceeding for all parts of Pan American instead of continuing to treat them separately by divisions. The CAB has not yet held such a consolidated proceeding."

The investigative staff of the House Appropriations Committee in their report dated December 30, 1954, stated: "There has not been insistence that the operations of the entire (Pan American) system be treated as an entity as required by a recent Supreme Court decision."

The House Appropriations Committee in House Report No. 207, 84th Congress, March 15, 1954, stated: "The committee is of the opinion that the Supreme Court decision, properly adhered to, will result in a substantial reduction in the amount of subsidy."

The difficulty has always been that the four different divisions of Pan American have been, and still are, processed separately in separate CAB proceedings, for separate time periods, instead of having the whole airline taken up in its entirety as required by the Court decision.

Until a consolidated proceeding is held of all parts of Pan American at the same time period there will never be an end to Pan America's old pea-and-shell game.

The hodgepodge of the present system can best be illustrated by the time periods covered in the most recent CAB mail rate decisions on the four divisions of Pan American. (Source: CAB, ext. 8089). Note that no two of the Pan American divisions cover the same time period.

1. Pan Am Pacific division: Final rate decided November 21, 1951, for period November 16, 1945–December 31, 1953. On open rate since January 1, 1954.

2. Pan Am Alaska division: Final rate decided July 20, 1953 for period October 1, 1952–December 31, 1954. On open rate since January 1, 1955.

3. Pan Am Latin American division: Final rate decided September 1, 1953 for period January 1, 1953–December 30, 1954. Calendar 1952 still open and on open rate since December 31, 1954.

4. Pan Am Atlantic division: Final rate decided June 9, 1947 for period calendar year 1945. On open rate since January 1, 1946.

Of course, it is manifestly impossible to make an accurate offset, as the Court requires, because each of the divisions is on a different time period. No offset could be any more than an approximation under this divisional approach, which the CAB and Pan American are still continuing.

Notice that this system of CAB carefully avoids matching time periods, even for a single year. This is far removed from measuring the company in its entirety.

TUCKER COLUMN

13. "Despite Senator DOUGLAS' scorching analysis, a Senate Commerce Subcommittee headed by Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida, increased the subsidy total from the House allowance of $40 million to $55 million. Although HOLLAND failed to answer the DOUGLAS indictment, the Senate voted for the larger amount by 51 to 25."

COMMENT BY MR. CREEDY, OF PAN AMERICAN

This just isn't true. Senator HOLLAND made a very full answer to the DOUGLAS charges. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 16, 1955, page 7220 and following.

13. FACTS

The comment by Mr. Creedy, of Pan American, is purely a matter of opinion, as to whether Senator HOLLAND did or did not make "a very full answer to the Douglas charges." The reader will note from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1955, pages 7222, column 3, that when pinned down by Senator DOUGLAS on the three main questions (1) the loss of $2,500,000 by Pan American on its hotel subsidiary, (2) the use by Pan American of some $8 million with which to pay their Federal income taxes, and (3) the failure of the Government yet to have collected or applied as offset the $6,800,000 asserted by the Postmaster General under the Supreme Court decision, Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, put his defense of his proposal to increase the amount of subsidies over the House figure on a personal basis. Senator HOLLAND was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee and was therefore referring a good bit to himself when he stated: "Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois * * * that he is evidencing no confidence in the CAB * * * no confidence in the committee which has gone into this question in great detail." Toward the end of the conference committee between the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on June 28, 1955, Congressman FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, in this secret session, suggested: "There surely cannot be any harm in letting me write a few words in the committee report to provide that the little fellows should come first so they will not be squeezed out by the big fellow."

Senator HOLLAND leaned across the table and whispered to Congressman PRESTON, of Georgia: "This is a personal thing with me on account of DOUGLAS." Congressman PRESTON, of Georgia, squelched his colleague by saying: "We don't want the impression to get out that we are against big airlines."

Since all big airlines except Pan American are off subsidy, it is clear what was being talked about.

It is equally clear that in putting through the raise in the subsidy appropriations for Pan American, Senator HOLLAND based it on a personal plea, a powerful factor in a courtesy-minded Senate, and not on an answer to charges of Senator DOUGLAS.

Egg Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from a constituent in North Dakota regarding the price of eggs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FESSENDEN, N. DAK., *July 10, 1955.*

Senator LANGER.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I think I have written to you a number of years ago. So I am just too happy to tell you that it is more wonderful, to come to a man like Mr. LANGER with our problems. I just like to know about the eggs, cream, and cattle, and poultry that the farmer sells, has no price, especially the egg price. I would like to see that up to at least 35 cents a dozen. Its almost impossible to buy those high-priced groceries for that small amount of egg price we get.

I would sure be pleased if you could at least set the price on eggs a little higher and leave them up to a certain price. I told our groceryman that I was going to write a letter to Mr. LANGER. Then he said, "What are you going to write?" I said, "You'll find out, it will be in the paper. But my name will not appear there." I have others that will be on my side too. I don't know what we would do without you Mr. LANGER. You really have done much for us here in North Dakota.

Your friend,

MRS. PHILIP HUBER.

Arming for the Wrong War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that many of us fought diligently against cuts in our Air Force, negligence in Air Force procurement, and unwise reductions in our conventional ground forces. Even while the bills were pending this Spring, I myself stood on the floor and urged a full-scale reappraisal of the administration's proposals before it was too late.

It is no secret that Gen. Matthew Ridgway, subject always to his subordination to higher authority, earnestly protested the cuts in our Army. He protested so earnestly that he was denied reappointment as Army Chief of Staff, but he did his duty, at least, as he saw it.

Now the magazine Nation's Business, a publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, carriers an interview on our military affairs with Dr. Vannevar Bush. Dr. Bush was Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development in World War II, he is a distinguished scientist and a deep student of military affairs. Dr. Bush suggests plainly that it is a great mistake for us to cut our ground forces and other conventional military forces so drastically that we may no longer be able to fight so-called brush-fire wars in the corners of the world.

There has been overemphasis, Dr. Bush says, on the possibility of atomic war. All of us recognize that we must be prepared to retaliate instantly against atomic attack—but what about the things we are neglecting? We must also be ready, Dr. Bush urges, "to handle those secondary wars" that may break out, and to handle them "by modern means that are not just the means of World War II dressed up a bit." These potential "secondary wars," he warns, "are not being given the attention they deserve."

It is now too late for us to remedy matters in this session. But once again I suggest that we here in this House, and particularly members of the Committee on Armed Services, have a direct obligation for a fresh reappraisal of our military needs and capacities. I hope that the second session of the 84th Congress will move swiftly to make that kind of study.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the Nations' Business interview with Dr. Vannevar Bush.

WE'RE ARMING FOR THE WRONG WAR—DR. VANNEVAR BUSH, PRESIDENT OF CARNEGIE INSTITUTION OF WASHINGTON AND WARTIME DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TELLS KIND OF MILITARY PREPAREDNESS WE NEED

(A Nation's Business interview)

What are the prospects of atomic warfare?

We are headed into what you might call an atomic stalemate. This doesn't mean that war is obsolete. Minor wars may and probably will go on by what is usually called conventional means but no nation can depend on all-out war to impose its will.

If there is not much likelihood of warfare on a major scale, how are the differences and tensions between major powers to be settled?

I hope, of course, by diplomacy and by the growth and strength of the United Nations, which might take a generation. But in Korea we already have had an instance where a difference was approached by means of war. There has since been a war in Indochina, again by conventional means. One of our primary jobs in military planning is to be simultaneously ready for the all-out war and also be ready to handle these secondary wars by modern means that are not just the means of World War II dressed up a bit.

Are we ready for these secondary wars now?

I fear they are not being given the attention they deserve. I think there has been overemphasis on atomic warfare.

Military people, who are good thinkers, have been buried in the sheer necessity of thinking through the implications of the bomb, and trying to plan in regard to it. As a result, we haven't had enough emphasis on how we handle the secondary wars and, more important, how to prevent them from breaking out by being so ready that no one wants to start one.

I cannot see how A-bombs could be used in these minor wars—even tactically—without sooner or later tripping off the main catatrophe. If we should use A-bombs tactically the next thing would be to use them against lines of supply. Inevitably, I think the thing would just grow until we began to bomb cities, both ways.

Do you feel that the Russians understand this?

I think Russians are, above all, realists and therefore I can't conceive that they would deliberately undertake total war or a movement which would be bound to lead into total war unless they felt that they could eliminate us in a single, surprise strike. If they could do that, it would be a strong temptation. But if we maintain a position so that Russia knows that if they trip this thing off, Russia will be devastated, whatever else may happen, then I think there is no danger of their deliberately tripping it off.

We should, of course, maintain enormous strength, enormous retaliatory power, no matter how pleasant or soft the Russians may become.

Is a formal agreement not to use atomic weapons likely?

I think there will be formal agreements some time. I am not optimistic that we will have any such agreements early. Russia cannot suddenly alter its entire philosophy and open up its country to an inspection that is really thorough. Russia can't suddenly abolish the Iron Curtain and still maintain its regime, so I do not expect we will have a workable agreement early. But, on the other hand, if the world comes to the conclusion generally, as I think it will, that we must prevent atomic war breaking out even by accident, then I think after a time it wouldn't make too much difference whether there was a formal agreement or not. The actual situation would, in effect, be stabilized. Agreements of various sorts could follow but I think the state of mind has to appear first.

The countries of Europe were so impressed with the dangers of poison gas in the First World War that they agreed not to use it. Could we arrive at the same kind of agreement on atomic war?

That is a good comparison. We were not parties to an agreement to abolish poison gas, although in the second war neither we nor anyone else used it. There was no formal agreement, and yet everyone abstained. It is quite parallel to the situation that we have today, where there is no formal agreement and yet there has been abstention, which I think will continue.

But let me say this: If gas warfare had been introduced in the second war, it could have been very terrible, because powerful gases were developed. Beyond that we could conceive that biological warfare could be more terrible.

Methods of biological warfare not only have never been used, but there has been no national effort to produce such methods on a broad scale that I know of. Such national effort as there has been has been primarily dictated by the thought that we must know about it; we must be alert. We have no great national program on it, nor do I think anyone else has.

I think we could say, however, that if there had never been an atom bomb we would be in about the same position today that we are now in—the means would have been different, but the situation would have been substantially the same, because what has happened has not been merely production of the weapons. What has happened is that science has become applied to warfare and has transformed it absolutely and, in my opinion, has rendered it obsolete in the long run.

Does that mean we will develop new types of warfare more thoroughly, such as economic warfare, psychological warfare, and social warfare?

Well, if you envisage an atomic stalemate, with minor wars going on by conventional means, it will undoubtedly be accompanied by all of the means of international competition that we have always had. We won't abandon those for some time.

There seems to be so much confusion about the actual effects of atomic warfare that the ordinary man really doesn't know what to expect.

I believe that the Government of the United States should be utterly frank with the American people on this subject.

We should have thoroughly authoritative and complete statements as to what would happen if an H-bomb dropped.

I'm completely out of sympathy with a situation where the public learns the facts

through wrong channels before the Government finally speaks out and tells a little bit.

Now, mind you, I believe in keeping the technical aspects of our weapons secret wherever that knowledge would be of advantage to the enemy.

But, where the Russians undoubtedly know what the situation is on fall-out, what the radioactive effects are and all the rest of it, I see no reason for secrecy.

We tell altogether too much about the details of our guided missiles, of the airplanes we build, and so on. The Russians do not need a spy system to find out what we are doing along some of these lines. All they need to do is read our magazines and newspapers.

As a country and as a people, we talk too much about such things. I see no sense in publishing military technical details but I believe that there are essential things which the American public needs to know.

I believe that when the people are told those things authoritatively and completely there will be a better attitude toward this whole affair not only in this country but throughout the world.

I think that when all peoples of the world, in Russia and everywhere else, face these facts, danger of an all-out atomic war will be greatly reduced.

Isn't the inference then that hydrogen warfare could actually destroy nations as well as cities and perhaps cause serious damage to the world as a whole for generations?

I am not the authority to give you a complete answer to that. Such an answer would require the thought of geneticists in regard to mutations caused and their effect on the population.

It would require the point of view of physicists who know what the radioactive products are and how long they would remain in the soil. It would require the point of view of physiologists who know or can find out what the effect is, for example, of the ingestion of radioactive isotopes over a considerable period.

We are now getting information but my complaint is that we are getting it in fragments.

Is it possible that massive explosions could actually affect the position of the earth itself?

There is no danger of that whatever. There is also no danger of igniting the atmosphere. The night before Alamogordo, Dr. Conant and I were out on the desert where they were working on this first test. The situation just before the bomb went off was, needless to say, very tense. While we were waiting, a physicist came up and chatted with us. He said, "You know, I am disturbed about whether this bomb might ignite the atmosphere. The conclusion, I know, is that it will not, but I still think we might perhaps have overlooked something and that when this bomb goes off, it might ignite the nitrogen in the atmosphere and eliminate all life from the earth."

That was a comforting thought at that time in the morning but there was actually no danger then and there is no danger of such a result now. The atmosphere is too big and nitrogen doesn't ignite that way. Incidentally, a single heavy thunderstorm releases more energy than very many atomic bombs.

Just the same, if all-out atomic war should come, with hydrogen bombs and all the rest, it would drive civilization back on its knees in a way that it would not recover for centuries. There is no question about that.

Is there any size limit to the bombs that can be developed by using atomic power?

Of course there is a practical limit to the size one might want to handle, but there is no theoretical limit on the size.

That makes it all the more fearsome to a layman?

I know some people have been afraid to tell the full story for fear the American people do not have the determination and moral courage to face up to very grim things. I have no such fear.

The American people do at times go down crazy, wild alleys and they get all excited about queer things, but on things that are of great moment, when they have the facts and have time to think and after they get over their first confusion of mind, they think soundly and can be depended upon.

Is it not possible that most of the facts have been given out but in fragmentary fashion?

Yes. We now have all the essential facts but there is confusion. The public doesn't know whether to believe the people who say the whole matter has been overly exaggerated or whether to believe the alarmists who say that if a few bombs went off, all life on earth would cease.

The public wants authoritative statements that it can trust: for example, the extent, from a hereditary standpoint, of the damage by radioactive fallout or from the standpoint of poisoning the population. The way to find that out is to get a group of competent scients to report on it carefully. The National Academy of Sciences is making a general study of radioactivity's effect on living organisms.

I'm glad, also, to see that the United States has proposed that the United Nations assemble and evaluate the effects of nuclear radiation from atomic tests.

Is the chief block for full information civilian or military?

I think it is both. We have a civilian-military team in this country and we have a government with civilian power supreme. I'm not placing the blame on any individual, any group or any party. Moreover, I think people in Government have been as confused as people anywhere else. They haven't fully appreciated, therefore, the necessity for getting thoroughly competent and authoritative statements spread on the record.

As far as public statements have been concerned, the development of atomic knowledge is confined pretty much to the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and possibly one or two other countries. Is there any considerable body of knowledge in the smaller countries?

Don't forget that small countries produce thoroughly capable physicists, and any person with that knowledge and experience today have enough material so that he can become an expert in the field of nucleonics, atomistics, and atomic energy. So, while the main activity has been in the three countries, which you include, and in Canada, thinking about the subject from the standpoint of the physics involved goes on all over the world and has nothing to do with national boundaries except as the flow of information is restricted by security regulations.

What would prevent an ambitious smaller country from using atomic energy for its own purpose and suddenly challenging the world with atomic bombs?

In the first place, they couldn't do such a thing suddenly. They would have to shut down their power plants if they wanted to convert the material in them into bombs. I can't imagine a small country with a few bombs challenging the world.

The same restrictions and deterrents would apply to them as to the larger countries?

Of course, and more so.

The Domestic Parity Plan for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, we have a serious wheat problem in this country. This year we had a carryover of more than 1 billion bushels. The August crop report estimates that the production this year will be 910,958,000 bushels.

It is estimated that for the marketing year July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955, total domestic consumption and exports amounted to 856 million bushels which is less than this year's crop to say nothing of the more than 1 billion bushel carryover.

ACREAGE HAS BEEN SEVERELY CUT

The surplus situation would be even more serious except for the fact that wheat acreage was cut from about 78 million acres in 1953 to 62 million acres in 1954, 55 million acres in 1955, and 55 million acres again for 1956.

Marketing quotas have been invoked and all wheat farmers who produce more than 15 acres of wheat can sell, generally speaking, without penalty only what they produce on their allotted acres. Any amount sold above that quantity must pay a penalty of 45 percent of parity, which penalty during this marketing year will be $1.13 per bushel.

PRICE SUPPORTS HAVE BEEN REDUCED

In addition, wheat price supports have been reduced from 90 percent of old parity, the rate for 1954 and preceding years, to 82½ percent of old parity in 1955 and 76 percent of transitional parity in 1956.

To state the figures in dollars and cents average price supports on wheat in 1954 were $2.24 per bushel, for 1955 they were $2.06 per bushel and for 1956 they will be $1.81 per bushel. This includes the 5 percent reduction in parity due to the shift to modernized parity. There will be another drop of 5 percent in the parity price for 1957 and an additional 5 percent drop in 1958.

With wheat stocks as high as they are at present if flexible supports are continued farmers can expect no more than 75 percent of transitional parity for 1957, which as near as can now be estimated will be $1.70 per bushel; for 1958 it will be $1.60.

Based upon the present supply situation acreage allotments will be no higher than 55 million acres in 1957 and 1958 if the present program of flexible price supports is kept in effect. In fact, the only thing which prevents a much smaller allotment is the provision of the law which says the minimum allotment shall be 55 million acres.

EFFECT OF FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS IS TO REDUCE FARMERS' INCOME

Flexible price supports have not had the effect of reducing wheat acreage or expanding wheat consumption. Such

acreage reductions as have taken place have been the result of acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The principal effect of flexible price supports has been to reduce farmers' income from wheat. Another effect has been to reduce the value of all governmental wheat stocks to the level of the reduced support price. This is compensated for to some extent by the fact that lower supports make it possible to reduce export subsidies.

FARMERS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR PRESENT SITUATION

Farmers feel, and justifiably so, that they are not responsible for the present wheat-surplus situation. During the war and up until the crop-year of 1954, farmers were urged to go all out in the production of wheat. As a matter of fact, all of our present surplus has accumulated since the harvesting of the 1952 crop. On July 1, 1952, our carryover was only 256 million bushels, which is less than a normal or desirable carryover in these times. The large 1952 crop should have resulted in the imposition of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for 1953, but the then Secretary of Agriculture did not do so. Instead he set a goal of 72 million acres of wheat which was only 6 million acres less than the goal for the preceding year of 1952. As indicated above, acreage allotments and marketing quotas have been imposed for the 1954, 1955, and 1956 crops. Farmers have cooperated well in these programs with the result that there has been a substantial reduction in the total amount of wheat produced. However, declining exports and decreased use of wheat for livestock feeding has resulted in an increase in our carryover even with these reductions in production.

WHEAT PRODUCERS SEEKING MORE ACCEPTABLE PROGRAM

Confronted by the present situation, it is no wonder that wheat producers have been desperately looking for a more acceptable program. Many of them who have studied the matter feel there is great promise in the proposal known as the domestic parity plan, which has the support of both the National Grange and the National Association of Wheat Growers.

APPLICATION OF DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN

The purpose of these remark is to discuss and explain the domestic parity plan. This plan is also known by other names, such as the certificate plan and the two-price system. The term "two-price system," however, is a misnomer as applied to the domestic parity plan, because under this plan all wheat would be sold on the market at one price, that is, the going market price. The principles of this plan are in successful operation in the field of dairy products and have been discussed in connection with other commodities.

Briefly, the plan and its operation may be described as follows:

First, all wheat would be sold without marketing quotas or restrictions of any kind.

Second, at the beginning of each marketing year the Secretary of Agriculture would make an estimate of the average going market price for that year. He would also announce the parity price of wheat for the year.

Third, the Secretary would estimate the probable amount of wheat which would go into domestic consumption for human food during the marketing year. This amount, which for many years has been approximately 500 million bushels, would then be allotted among the wheat farms of the Nation on substantially the same basis as acreage allotments are made now, except that in this case the acreage would be translated into bushels and the allotment to each farm would be in bushels. Each wheat farmer would receive a certificate stating the number of bushels constituting his share of the estimated domestic consumption of wheat for food.

This certificate would have a value in dollars and cents of the number of bushels which it represented multiplied by the difference between the going market price of wheat as estimated by the Secretary and full parity.

Let us assume for the sake of illustration that the number of bushels represented by this certificate is 1,000 and that the difference between the estimated price of wheat and full parity is 75 cents per bushel. In that event the certificate would have a value of $750.

WHERE WOULD THE MONEY COME FROM?

The next question is how would the farmer realize cash on this certificate and from whence would the money come? The answer to that question is that each miller or other processor of wheat will have to purchase certificates covering the total amount of wheat which he processes for domestic consumption as human food.

It will not be necessary for farmers to deal directly with millers because under the pending legislation the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates. Thus the Commodity Credit Corporation would act as a clearing house. Farmers would turn their certificates in to the Commodity Credit Corporation through the county agricultural stabilization committee and millers in turn would buy certificates from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The program in general would be administered by the county agricultural stabilization committees which administer other agricultural programs.

This is but a brief outline of the program and I would like to develop it further by means of questions and answers as follows:

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Question 1: Would there be acreage allotments under this program?

Answer: If times were normal it would be possible to operate without acreage allotments. Under conditions as they exist now it seems desirable to give the Secretary authority to impose acreage allotments for the following reasons:

First. It would prevent overproduction in the present and immediate future when we have such a large supply of wheat on hand.

Second. It would enable the Secretary to adjust production in line with the supply of corn and other feed grains.

Third. It would permit the Secretary to take into account world wheat supplies and prevent the production of excess supplies which could not be absorbed by the world market at fair prices.

Question 2: Without marketing quotas and penalties how could production be effectively restricted through acreage allotments?

Answer: This would be done by providing that no farm would receive a certificate unless the producer stayed within his overall wheat-acreage allotments. The value of this certificate would constitute an incentive sufficient to induce most producers to stay within their allotments. However, farmers growing wheat as a part of their crop rotation or in small quantities for feeding on the farm or who for some other reason were not interested in securing certificates would be free to exceed the current allotments without the payment of penalty. The amount of wheat involved in these cases would be small and would have little effect on market prices or total supply.

WHEAT LOANS

Question 3: Would there be wheat loans under this program?

Answer: If this program were being instituted at a time when production and carryovers were normal it would probably operate better without Government loans. However, in times like the present with large supplies of wheat and other grains on hand it seems advisable to have a low level loan to prevent the market price of wheat from going so low as to adversely affect the price of corn and other feed grains and to constitute a disturbing factor in the world market.

Under the provisions of the legislation now pending in Congress the level of these loans would be determined by the Secretary after taking the following factors into consideration:

First. The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand thereof.

Second. The economic feasibility of producing substitute crops on acreage withdrawn from the production of wheat.

Third. The price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat.

Fourth. The provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party.

Fifth. Foreign trade policies of friendly wheat-exporting countries.

Sixth. Other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

It is anticipated that most of the time such a loan program would not prevent the free movement of wheat into export channels without subsidies.

THIS PROGRAM WOULD NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE PRICE AND SUPPLY OF CORN AND OTHER FEED GRAINS

Question 4: Producers of corn and other feed grains have expressed the fear that this legislation might result in increasing the total quantity of livestock feed and have adverse effects upon the price thereof. Is there any basis for these fears?

Answer: No. It is realized by those who are sponsoring this legislation that whatever benefits accrue to wheat must not be at the expense of corn or any other crop. That is the reason for the provision in the legislation which protects corn by providing for price support on wheat at a level slightly higher than the support price on corn and in giving the Secretary the authority to impose acreage allotments. Under this authority the Secretary would be able to limit the amount of wheat which would be available for livestock feed if this was thought desirable.

However, all the evidence which is available indicates that if this program results in expanding wheat acreage it will reduce rather than increase the available supply of feed grains. This is because the feed value of the product of an average acre of wheat in this country is less than the production of the average acre if it were used for feed grains. In 1954 we produced approximately 37 percent more feed grains on the acres diverted from wheat than if they had been used for feed-wheat production.

Feed-grain production in the form of oats, barley, and grain sorghums in 1955 on land taken out of wheat will be over 50 percent greater than the feed value of the reduction in wheat production as a result of wheat marketing quotas. In addition, a part of the land diverted from wheat was used to contributed to our record crop of soybeans in prospect this year.

Based on August 1 estimates the increase in production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums in 1955 over the 10-year average 1944–53 will be 558 million bushels or 11.1 million tons, while the reduction in wheat production in the same period is only 243 million bushels or 7.3 million tons.

All of this means that shifts out of wheat acreage increase the available supply of feed grains and increases in wheat acreage decrease feed grain supplies even if all wheat produced on the increased acreage is used for livestock feed.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN WOULD NOT CONSTITUTE DUMPING

Question 5: Under the present farm program it is necessary to subsidize all wheat exports by direct payments from the Federal Treasury, thus constituting what is known as dumping and arousing resentment and antagonism from other wheat exporting and importing countries. Would the domestic parity plan constitute dumping in the export market?

Answer: It would not. Wheat going into export would move at the market price and without the benefit of a subsidy such as is being paid under our present program. The adoption of the domestic parity plan will enable us to get away from the charge of dumping. Furthermore the fact that producers would only receive the market price for wheat exported and that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to impose effective acreage allotments will prevent the production of excessive quantities of wheat which might have the effect of lowering world prices.

PLAN WOULD BENEFIT TAXPAYERS

Question 6: How will the adoption of this plan affect the taxpayers of this country?

Answer: It will benefit them in several ways. First, it will do away with the need for export subsidies which during the last 6 years have amounted to $771 million. Second, by providing a market for wheat it will reduce and eventually eliminate the tremendous sums that are being paid every year as storage charges. Third, losses on wheat placed under price-support loans will be reduced or eliminated. Fourth, administrative costs of the wheat program will be reduced as compared with the present price-support loans and marketing quota program.

COST OF BREAD WILL NOT BE INCREASED

Question 7: Will this plan increase the cost of bread to domestic consumers?

Answer: No. Under this plan wheat will cost domestic millers less than they have been paying in recent years. This is true notwithstanding the fact that under this program wheat will cost millers 100 percent of parity instead of the 90 percent of parity which was in effect until the 1955 crop came on the market. However, wheat is shifting from old parity to modernized parity which will be in effect after 1958; 100 percent of modernized parity is less than 85 percent of the old parity.

It should also be kept in mind that the amount of wheat in a loaf of broad costs about 2½ cents and has little effect on the retail price. For instance, in January 1948, the farm price of wheat reached a peak of $2.81 per bushel, and the average price of a 1 pound loaf of bread was 13.8 cents. Today the farm price of wheat has dropped to $2, yet the average price of a pound loaf of bread has increased to 17.5 cents.

Question 8: What effect will this plan have on the production of quality wheat as compared with the price support plan which is now in effect?

Answer: Because all wheat will be sold on the open market its price will be based on quality and producers of those wheats most in demand by millers will receive premiums because of this high quality. Thus this plan, unlike the present program, will directly encourage and reward high-quality production and permit the value of wheat to be determined freely in the market place instead of by Government edict.

Question 9: It is contended that the distribution of domestic parity certificates among wheat farmers based upon past production without regard to the kind of wheat they produce is unfair in that a larger percentage of some kinds of wheat is consumed for human food than others.

Answer: In this respect the program follows the present law under which price supports are the same on wheat irrespective of whether it goes into domestic consumption for food, into export, for livestock feed, or simply piles up in the elevators. If this new plan is unfair then the present plan is unfair also.

However the real answer to this question is covered by the answer to question No. 8 which points out that the types of wheat in demand will bring higher prices on the market and the total income of producers of those types of wheat will be greater than the income of producers of less desirable types, although the value of the certificates in each case will be the same.

POULTRY PRODUCERS AND DAIRYMEN WILL BENEFIT

Question 10: What about poultry producers or dairymen who desire to produce wheat for feed or to purchase the same at feed prices?

Answer: Under this program they can produce all they need for feed on their own farms and will be able to purchase wheat at market prices for their further needs.

WILL HELP EXPORT TRADE

Question 11: Will this plan increase wheat exports?

Answer: In the long run it probably will because it will make it easier for exporters to carry on business with their customers. Under the existing program a great deal of the wheat exported comes out of Government stocks and in the case of the remainder exporters can make sales only after they have made arrangements with the CCC as to the amount of the subsidy which will be paid. The red-tape, delays, Government price fixing, and other annoyances brought about by this procedure constitutes a handicap which undoubtedly results in foreign buyers going to other countries such as Canada where it is easier to do business.

Under the domestic parity program exporters would be in a position to make their own deals without government interference.

Question 12: What would the cost of this program be to the Federal Government?

Answer: Practically nothing excepting the small cost of administration.

INCOME OF WHEAT FARMERS WILL BE INCREASED

Question 13: How would the wheat farmer's income under this plan compare with his income under existing support programs?

Answer: Estimates prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress indicate that wheat producers would have received approximately the same income from their wheat under a domestic parity plan as they actually did receive in 1954 when supports were 90 percent. If an allowance is made for some increased use of wheat for feed and export there would be an income difference in favor of the domestic parity plan.

In 1955, with the support level dropped to 82½ percent of parity, producers would have received a minimum of 7 percent more income than they will realize under the current program for the wheat produced on the 55-million-acre national allotment.

In 1956, with the support level under the present program dropped even further to 76 percent of parity, the estimated minimum income advantage of the certificate plan is 9 to 10 percent.

SUMMARY

Question 14: Will you summarize the principal advantages of the domestic parity plan over the present program?

Answer: First. Returns to the farmer would be somewhat greater than under the present program, and there is a good prospect that expanded outlets might substantially increase these returns in the future. Second. Marketing quotas and marketing penalties would be eliminated and acreage controls greatly minimized and possibly eliminated in the course of time. Third. Relief to taxpayers would be afforded through an immediate substantial reduction in the costs of the present program and eventual elimination of practically all such costs. Fourth. To a large extent, it would take the Government out of the warehousing and marketing of wheat and in the end probably do away with such activities altogether. Fifth. Wheat would be produced for market instead of for Government loans and storage, thus encouraging the production of wheat with superior milling qualities. Sixth. Producers of livestock and poultry, wherever situated, would be able to produce wheat for feed or buy wheat at feed prices. Seventh. There would be some expansion of wheat exports through the elimination of redtape and other obstacles existing at present. Eighth. The plan would be a recognition of the fact that wheat is produced and used for various purposes and would furnish an effective method of moving wheat into its natural outlets and market channels. Ninth. It would return to the farmer greater freedom and control over his activities.

Mr. Dixon's Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of misunderstanding about the reason the special Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee referred the testimony of Edgar H. Dixon, of the Dixon-Yates combine, to the Department of Justice. Suggestions have even been made that opponents of the Dixon-Yates deal overreached themselves in raising questions about the consistency of Mr. Dixon's testimony.

Just to clarify matters, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried an editorial which runs the record of the remarkable inconsistencies and lapses of memory involved in testimony before the Senate subcommittee and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, the editorial is offered for the RECORD:

The Kefauver Antimonopoly Subcommittee has taken a proper course in referring Edgar H. Dixon's testimony to the Attorney General for consideration whether it warrants prosecution for perjury.

The senior partner in the Dixon-Yates power syndicate now testifies to the investigators that he became worried about the dual role of Adolphe W. Wenzell as early as February of 1954.

He talked with his attorney at that time about the possibility that conflict-of-interest charges might be brought against the First Boston Corp. first vice president under the criminal code. His lawyer advised him to consult First Boston and the Bureau of the Budget.

First Boston advised its first vice president to quit his Budget Bureau post, in which he had already created the prototype for the Dixon-Yates deal and advised on the financing of the specific contract. To keep its own skirts clear, First Boston waived its fee for the Dixon-Yates contract—a substantial sum, for it had charged $150,000 plus $20,000 expenses in handling an earlier financing job for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Ten months after Mr. Dixon had received these double indications that Mr. Wenzell might be dynamite, he testified to the Securities and Exchange Commission in its hearings on equity capital for Dixon-Yates. He was asked to name First Boston officials with whom he had talked to get money-market information. Mr. Dixon replied that he had talked "directly or indirectly" with Duncan R. Linsley, one of First Boston's 40-odd vice presidents.

That was last December. Six months later, in June, Mr. Dixon was called back to testify in SEC's hearings on Dixon-Yates borrowings for the proposed plant. He was asked the same question and again gave the same answer.

Senator KEFAUVER now confronts Mr. Dixon with the fact that Mr. Linsley was out of the country at the time, and draws from Mr. Dixon the admission that he talked with Mr. Wenzell and that Mr. Wenzell was the only First Boston official he did talk with.

Whether Mr. Dixon's earlier statements were perjury or not, they certainly were at sharp variance with the story he now tells. That is par for the course. The Dixon-Yates affair has been one long and continuous record of secretiveness and misinformation about the public's business. Some people, no doubt, would like to sweep the whole mess under the rug and forget it. The Kefauver subcommittee should refuse to be diverted. The full truth is worth establishing, even if the contract has been cancelled.

Report to the People of the Second District of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 84th Congress has now adjourned. As I view it in retrospect it is obvious that during this crucial year many issues of tremendous importance to the people of the Second New Hampshire District have been debated and resolved before this body.

By personal letters, telephone calls, telegraph messages, and personal contact, my constituents have given me the benefit of their opinions on the major issues. To each of those who offered me their valuable advice, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my most sincere appreciation.

The accomplishments of the 1st session of the 84th Congress represent congressional achievement, considering the fact that the executive and legislative branches of the Government were controlled by different political parties.

In the vital fields of foreign affairs, mutual assistance and national defense, we have experienced an unusual degree of harmony based on a genuine appreciation of the seriousness of present world and national conditions.

This, in large measure, reflects the gravity of the times and the able leadership of the President and the responsible leadership of Congress.

The major problem facing our country today is the assurance of world peace. It has long since been obvious that our best approach to this aim is the adherence to a strict and effective policy of internal strength.

In this field President Eisenhower had congressional accord, and I was privileged to support the administration in the following measures:

First. Extension of the Draft Act for 4 additional years.

Second. Authorization for the President to defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands from Communist aggression.

Third. Establishment of a Reserve program to total 2,900,000 men by 1959 and increasing the service opportunities available to our young men entering the armed services.

Fourth. Allowed the President to continue for 3 more years the reciprocal trade program to assist our allies and friends in maintaining strong economies in face of the Communist threat.

Fifth. Extended certain war powers; revised the Philippine Trade Agreements Act and supported President Eisenhower's requests for military expenditures and atomic energy.

Through effective bipartisan senatorial support, treaties of worldwide importance were entered into with the Republic of China, Austria, and the West German Republic. In addition, Members of Congress supported the President and Secretary of State in their successful efforts to reduce world tension for which the whole free world has reason to be indebted.

On the domestic front, Congress and the President were often in disagreement and most of the legislation passed was of a noncontroversial nature. It has been my feeling that the Congress failed President Eisenhower and the people in the critical fields of aid to school construction, the building of an adequate road system, and the extension of social security. Among the items passed by the House which I supported were:

First. Increased to $1 the minimum wage to assist our skilled labor in New Hampshire compete with southern cheap labor. This is by far the most important item passed to help New Hampshire.

Second. Extended high rates of taxation on liquor, tobacco, and the 52-percent-tax rate for corporations.

Third. Repealed the penalty clause against farmers under the Commodity Credit Act and reduced to 3 percent the interest on farm disaster loans and extended the act.

Fourth. Increased salaries for public servants—our Federal judges, postal employees, members of the armed services, classified Government workers as well as employees and members of the legislative branch of our Government. This is in accordance with my belief that Government today as never before needs competent people.

In January the Congress will begin its second session and I am hopeful that it will follow more closely President Eisenhower's domestic program and continue a policy of bipartisanship in our foreign affairs. This will not be easy; 1956 is an election year and the pressure of politics will be formidable, but I am hopeful that the second session will be productive and beneficial to the people of the Nation and the people of the Second New Hampshire District.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to announce that I will be holding office hours in more than 60 towns throughout the New Hampshire Second District, starting after Labor Day and continuing for several months, so that I may be better acquainted with the problems of my constituents and better able to represent them. Thank you.

The Nursing Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have written an article on the urgent need for more nurses, which will appear shortly in the Courier, the quarterly publication of the George Washington University Medical Center. Because of the great interest throughout the Nation in the nurse shortage and its effect on the health care of all people, I am inserting my article into the RECORD to make it available to all Members:

THE NURSING DILEMMA

(By the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, Congresswoman from Ohio)

There is an urgent need for more nurses. This has long been recognized by the hospital and medical professions. Although we have more nurses on active duty today than ever before, an additional 60,000 could be used to good advantage today.

The need arises from growth in population, increased longevity, improvement in standards in care of the sick, new scientific and technical advances, care of veterans, and expanding Government, State, and city institution requirements—all of which are familiar to the readers of the Courier.

The situation has become so acute that it has given rise to proposed remedial Federal legislation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recommended Federal grants for the training of more practical nurses and for scholarships for the teacher training of graduate nurses and other public-health officials. I have introduced a bill which would give traineeships only to graduate nurses, which I hope might be passed in case it should be considered that Federal grants should be confined to this more limited field.

I intend to support the nursing-aid bills proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare when they come up for hearings before the House Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce, early in the next session of the Congress.

I do not, however, believe that such Federal grants will represent an actual remedy to the nursing dilemma. As urgently as they may be needed, they remain nevertheless an attempt to alleviate a bottleneck without actually getting at the reasons for the bottleneck itself. We cannot solve the nursing situation simply by continuing to increase Federal grants as the picture becomes worse. We must get at the basic problems which cause the difficulty which Federal grants are attempting to correct.

This requires careful study of the entire nursing field: a study undertaken by an authority which is unbiased, independent, and concerned primarily not with nurses, doctors, or hospitals, but with the patient himself, who is the person vitally to be considered on behalf of the public welfare.

I believe that such a study can best be made by a commission, set up along the lines of the Hoover Commission, composed of representatives of nurses, hospital administrators, doctors, laymen, and Congressmen and Senators, reporting to the Congress of the United States.

I have, therefore, introduced into the House of Representatives a bill (H. J. Res. 171) providing for the setting up of a National Commission on Nursing Services. This bill will be considered by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House early next year, at the same time that the committee holds hearings on the nursing legislation recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. My bill has also been introduced into the Senate by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH. It is my hope that my bill will be enacted at the next session of the Congress.

WHY A COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES?

My conclusion that a Commission on Nursing Services was imperative was reached after a lifetime of interest in the profession of nursing and care of the sick, with all of the problems involved.

As a member of the board of the NOPHN, I worked arduously with the League of Nursing Education and the American Nurses Association to bring nurse training out of the apprentice method and into the education field. I have sat on hospital boards and with public-health groups where I have represented the public patient, and the patient public, over a long period of years. I have watched experimental efforts to improve the nursing situation with a growing sense of frustration; and finally, last year, decided to make a survey of my own in an attempt to gather facts which might serve as a guide to a solution.

Toward this end I sent a questionnaire to some 10,000 representative nurses and nursing associations, doctors, hospital administrators, nursing schools, educators, laymen, State governors, Federal and State health authorities, and others, to which more than 4,000 replied.

The main substance of the replies can be summed up in these two sentences: Everybody agreed that there was an urgent need for more nurses. But there was absolutely no agreement, within or among the related professional groups, as to what should be done about it.

It was because of this utter lack of agreement, this complete absence of recommendations, pointing in the main in any general direction, that I came to the decision that a constructive course of procedure could only be arrived at by submitting the entire problem for study and analysis to an impartial agency, such as a national commission.

I would like to comment briefly on the pattern of disagreement as revealed by the answers to my questionnaire.

As to the reasons for the nursing shortage, the majority said that nurses' pay was too low; but any occupational group would say that about itself. There were comments to the effect that "the private-duty nurse is pricing herself out of her profession"; some people cited state regulatory laws as the difficulty; others blamed restrictions imposed by the nurses' board; some discussed the inadequacy of nursing schools; and some said that today's opportunities in industrial and business fields proved more attractive to high-school girls than the profession of nursing. No clearcut pattern emerged.

As to nursing education, there was no agreement whatever. Some said that we need more hospital training courses; others that hospitals should not be permitted to operate schools of nursing. Some said that we need better teaching and administration in colleges and universities offering graduate nursing programs; others that we need more practical nurse education which should be handled in vocational schools and junior colleges. Some said Government should assume responsibility for training nurses; others that Government should have no part in it. Some said nursing should be taught in the high schools, etc. No clearcut pattern emerged.

On the subject of financial aid, opinions were again divided. Should such aid be administered on the national or local level; should it go to the schools or to the students; should it be directed chiefly toward better courses for highly skilled professional nurses or shorter courses for practical nurses? Again no clear-cut pattern emerged.

Perhaps this was not surprising—because as I realized, after due reflection, I was getting the views of three different groups, each of which viewed the picture, you might say, through its own particular glasses—for which they cannot in the least be blamed.

First—there are the doctors. They are professional men, operating, like any profession, on a basis of earned income. While every doctor assumes responsibility toward charity patients, the economy of the medical profession is, after all, one of pay received for services performed.

Next let us take the hospital administrators. A hospital is a tax-free and more or less public institution, with an obligation to care for charity patients from whom no pay can be expected, save as State or local welfare funds are supplied. A hospital does not operate for a profit—in fact, it usually operates at a deficit which is made up by philanthropic contributions from private individuals. This, of course, is not the case with city, State or Federal hospitals, which operate on public funds. The point I'm making is that the economy of a hospital is one of a public institution instead of a private business—whereas doctors are in the main in private business.

Now what of the nurses? Theirs is an occupation the financial rewards of which are today substantially below the average. Why therefore do young women go into the nursing profession? The answer comes back again and again from the literally thousands of nurses with whom I have corresponded; and it does one's heart good to hear it.

Most of these women are, in fact, dedicated to their profession. They have devoted their lives to the sick as a matter of choice. There is otherwise no possible explanation for their willingness to remain in the profession when in industry and Government other jobs are open at higher pay.

Small wonder that they grow weary and write: "The Florence Nightingale conception of pure altruism is a poor substitute for inadequate compensation."

Nevertheless I am convinced that a deep urge to care for the sick and make them well is the basic motivation behind the profession of nursing.

The nurses naturally are more keenly aware than any other group of the reasons contributing to the urgent need for more nurses today. Their associations, the ANA and the NLN, have done much constructive work on this problem and deserve great credit for it—far more indeed than is generally granted them. But contrast their economic status with that of the doctors and the hospitals. The nurses are employees; the doctors are in business for themselves; the hospitals are semipublic and charitable institutions. There is no common economic ground for all three professions. Therefore, all three cannot be expected to view problems in the same light.

And meanwhile the individual most concerned—namely the patient—has no spokesman; and he is after all the person primarily concerned.

I am interested in the setting up of a National Commission which will represent primarily the patient—the man who is sick—and acting in the interests of public welfare, reconcile the respective viewpoints of the nurses, the hospital administrators, and the doctors on behalf of a constructive program designed for better care of the patient.

WHAT PROBLEMS WOULD SUCH A COMMISSION CONSIDER?

The first problem might be that of defining the duties of a nurse.

It has been suggested by various students of the situation that if nurses could be relieved of nonnursing duties and thereby enabled to devote their full time to actual nursing, the problem might well be solved.

It is pointed out that in many hospitals today a nurse must devote much of her time to coordinating the work of the porter, the ambulance attendant, the messenger, the dietary aide, the plumber, the carpenter, the electrician, the painter, and the people delivering drugs, linen, food, and surgical supplies, etc., not to mention taking care of patients' visitors and flowers.

In addition, the nurse is usually required to handle the supply of a vast array of hospital instruments and utilities.

On top of that nurses are often expected today to possess, as surprising as this may seem, an accurate knowledge of the mechanical operation of a wide variety of intricate machines required for special treatments—which puts them practically in the classification of mechanical upkeep personnel. On the other hand, nurses these days are often instructed by doctors to use these machines in the care of patients—which gives nurses a responsibility almost equal to that of the doctors themselves. This presents a difficult question. Does one have to be a mechanical expert in order to administer treatments? Does this situation call for a special classification of "technician," for which as yet no particular allowance has been made in the medical and nursing profession?

Beyond that nurses are customarily expected to keep laboratory reports, housekeeping and dietary records, requisitions of repairs, equipment, supplies, records for business accounting, and personal time records, etc. In fact, it is reported that nurses spend up to one-third of their time in record work.

In view of the above, how much time do they have for actual bedside nursing? If recordkeepers, machine technicians, inventory up-keep personnel and administrative help, with no knowledge of nursing but knowledge of these particular functions could relieve the nurses of such responsibilities, would that solve the present nursing dilemma?

The second problem to be studied might be one of nursing education. Who is to educate the nurses? Hospital training schools, independent nursing schools, high schools, colleges or universities? And how is the cost to be met? Is the primary need today for more nurses with college and post-graduate work, who are professional experts, or is the primary need for more bedside nurses who can do a competent job after 2 years' training?

Another field to be investigated is that of licensing. There are various laws and regulations dealing with nursing in the various States. Who should be licensed, and on what basis? Are present restrictions in some parts of the country excluding qualified people from practising practical nursing; or are too many unqualified people allowed to practice and should legal qualifications be tightened? What should be done about the accrediting of schools of nursing by the nursing associations? Is this practice healthy by way of making certain that only competent people are admitted to the profession; or is it unhealthy because it discourages schools of nursing and makes it more difficult for girls in some parts of the country to enter the profession?

What about nurses pay? If the pay is too low to attract enough girls into the profession, what can be done about it and where is the money to come from? This latter problem raises of course the question of Federal aid; but as you can see from what I have said above, this is only one of many facets contributing to the difficulty. If a constructive pattern could be worked out for the education of nurses and the functioning of nurses, this might lead to a logical corrective course of action with respect to the compensation of nurses. None of these basic considerations are solved by the simple device of Federal grants for traineeships, or for more teaching. The latter are merely stop-gap measures, praiseworthy in object, but representing no actual solution.

WHY PUT CONGRESS IN THIS PICTURE?

It is the function of the Congress to look after the welfare of the people. In this particular case we are concerned with the welfare of the people who are sick and need hospital care.

In my many years of experience in the field of nursing I have learned that the man most concerned, namely the patient, needs a champion and a spokesman. No matter how dedicated the doctors, the hospitals, and the nurses may be to public service, they naturally look at things, as I said before, through their own glasses. Therefore, I think it is imperative that the Commission which I propose should include in its personnel Members of Congress, and that the Commission should make its report to the Congress.

The bill which I have introduced into the House of Representatives (H. J. Res. 171) provides for a Commission to be composed of 12 members as follows:

1. Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

2. Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

3. Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

Among the six members appointed from private life should be representatives of the nursing, hospital administration, and medical professions. Provision for members from the executive branch of the Government allows for adequate participation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But of particular importance, to my mind, is the provision for 2 Members from the Senate and 2 from the House of Representatives, plus the provision that the Commission, not later than 2 years from the time of its inception, shall give the Congress a report as to the reasons for the growing urgent need for nurses and recommendations as to what steps might best be taken to meet this demand.

Another reason for the participation of Members of the House and the Senate on this Commission is that under their urging it may be possible to gather together, for the benefit of the Commission, the many excellent and comprehensive studies on the nursing situation and the care of the sick that have already been made by hospital, nursing, and medical authorities in their respective fields.

Present nursing legislation, as imperative as it is—and as I said, I shall vote in favor of it—represents definitely in my opinion stopgap measures. I am a firm believer in legislation of whatever type is required to remedy the nursing dilemma on a long-term basis. But in order to determine just what type of legislation might be desirable or effective, I think we first need the findings of a Commission. That is why I have introduced House Joint Resolution 171, providing for a National Commission on Nursing Services.

Remarkable Doings on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable events we witnessed in this session was the spectacle of the official House Republican leaders begging us to kill all public housing—because, they said, that was the way to give President Eisenhower the pitifully inadequate 35,000 units per year of public housing he wanted.

The whole record of the Eisenhower administration on public housing has been hesitant, shifty, and doubtful. The President has never seemed able to make up his mind whether he believes in it. He has never advocated the full 135,000 units a year authorized in a bill sponsored by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, certainly no Socialist. But even when he advocates only 35,000 units, he gets precious little enthusiasm from his leaders in this body, and he himself seems positively apprehensive when we finally insist on giving him 45,000 units this year.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried a perceptive editorial on the Republican performance on the housing bill. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks. I offer the editorial for the RECORD:

It is always interesting to observe the maneuvers by which the Republican leadership in Congress and the Republican leadership in the White House seek to compile a record both for and against public housing. Satisfying both the real estate lobby and the proponents of federally aided low-rent housing is a tricky business, and this year the maneuvers were especially intricate.

President Eisenhower is in favor of public housing. That is to say, he is in favor of some but not very much. He asked Congress to approve 35,000 units a year for 2 years. The Senate, prodded by those malicious Democrats looking for an issue, raised the ante by passing a bill authorizing 135,000 units a year for 4 years—the original level established by the original 1949 Housing Act, of which the late Senator Robert A. Taft was coauthor.

The fancy footwork came in the House, which has always been more responsive to the real estate lobby than the Senate. First, Congressman WOLCOTT persuaded the Rules Committee to bottle up the administration bill. Then, as adjournment drew near, he persuaded the House to adopt his own substitute, which called for no public housing at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT, supported by the entire GOP leadership, argued that to send the administration bill to conference would inevitably result in a program larger than 35,000 units a year for 2 years, since the bargaining would begin at that level. The way to support the administration, he and the GOP leaders said, was to defeat the administration's bill. This remarkable appeal enabled Republican Congressmen to cast a 4-to-1 vote (151 to 36) for the Wolcott substitute, and they picked up enough southern Democrats to adopt it, the Democrats dividing about 2 to 1 (66 to 152 votes) against.

But more wonders were yet to come. The conference committee, instead of compromising at the administration figure, approved 45,000 units in 1 year and left the second year to take care of itself. Whereupon the White House began fighting the compromise, even to the point of uttering vague threats of veto and special session. Tired and more than ready to quit, both branches adopted the conference bill anyway. The veto talk promptly ended, and the President is now expected to sign.

It is not often that an administration permits its House leadership to defeat an administration bill. Not often does an administration fight a bill giving it more than it asked for. But then, as we said, this is tricky business. Meanwhile the country can be grateful that public housing has been saved for another year.

What Has Happened to the White House Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "What Has Happened to the White House Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, 6 months have elapsed since release of the White House Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. Inasmuch as this heralded document was presumed to suggest answers to problems involving the national security as well as the welfare of our people, I feel that we should wait no longer for an examination of whatever may have been accomplished in the half-year that has since expired. To remind you of the publicized importance of the group responsible for the report, let me point out that the committee's membership was made up of the Secretaries of the Department of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor, with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization serving as chairman.

Among other things, the committee expressed the opinion that coal and other energy industries "must maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary." The report also acknowledged that coal is "a great national asset." It further stated: "We recognize that serious unemployment exists in the coal industry."

Those obvious facts established and officially proclaimed, the report made a series of recommendations which, if carried out, would without question serve at least as a starting point in enabling coal to return to the position denied to it because of unfair governmental policies and practices. What I should like to know—and I feel that every Member of Congress who is familiar with the Cabinet study will be interesting in learning—is what the administration has done in the intervening 6 months to implement the report's recommendations. Take, for example, the following paragraphs:

"The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

"In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.

"The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken."

Make no mistake about it, it is not adequate restitution to merely check oil imports at the same rate or ratio at which they deluged United States markets in 1954. It is far from adequate relief for an industry that has been progressively sacrificed to a foreign product over the past 8 years. It may serve to prevent additional American workers from being unfairly separated from their jobs; it does nothing for those who have already been relegated to the ranks of the unemployed. The recommendations nevertheless did offer a modicum of hope for the industry as a whole assuming, of course, that the stipulated limit would be recognized by importers and enforced by government officials. To date, there is little evidence that this provision is being carried out. For the first 6 months of 1955 residual oil imports amounted to 78,010,900 barrels, an increase of 20 percent over the corresponding period last year. In view of the Cabinet committee's findings, plus the fact that the committee's recommendations were included by Congress in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, these statistics are a shameful reflection on the patriotism and integrity of importing companies and responsible administration officials.

I was one of the 27 Members of the Senate who, on August 1, placed in the hands of the Director of Defense Mobilization a letter asking for information on what action has been taken or is contemplated to halt the continued defiance and disrepect of Government mandate by the grasping profiteers who have been funneling an ever increasing amount of foreign residual oil into the markets upon which the American coal miner and oil worker depend for their bread and butter. In response, the Director of Defense Mobilization has indicated that he is conducting an investigation into the matter and that he expects to issue a statement within the near future. We are eagerly awaiting results of this investigation.

At this time, I should like to emphasize that paragraph 3 in the recommendations which I have quoted above specifically stipulates that appropriate action should be taken in the event that the voluntary limitation program breaks down. Since there is no interpretation of the term, appropriate action, offered by the Cabinet committee, I would assume that it refers to legislation. As such, I trust that in the future, if it is necessary to enact a law to protect our security and economy from excessive imports, the administration will accept the principle implied in the verbiage of the Cabinet report and discontinue its active opposition to the efforts of Members of Congress who have time and again attempted to remedy the situation, only to be rebuffed by the hustling and bustling members of the Cabinet who have heretofore journeyed to Capitol Hill to cry out against every effort that has been made to place a definite restriction on oil imports.

Another phase of the Cabinet committee report which merits study after the 6 months since its release, is the chapter on natural gas regulation. On this subject, the Cabinet committee recommended prohibition of sales of natural gas by interstate pipelines which drive out competing fuels because the charges are below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges. When it came time to the actual enactment of a law to provide the carrying out of this provision, the administration again took off like a wounded elephant and refused to support the position which it had advocated.

Still another paragraph in the White House report deals with coal freight rates. Lest this recommendation be entirely forgotten by the administration—and I have no evidence that it is being remembered—I quote that paragraph in its entirety:

"In order to maintain coal's vitality as an instrument of national defense by improving currently its ability to compete with other fuels, the railroads, by voluntary action, and, in the absence thereof, the Interstate Commerce Commission, by compulsory order, should adjust freight rates to the extent necessary to remove the excessive and disproportionate contribution that coal rates are making to meet the cost of other unprofitable services of the railroad industry. Train-load rates should be established to reflect the lower costs of such service."

I feel that no one, including our great coal-hauling railroads, would object to whatever adjustment is necessary to bring about an equitable transportation rate structure. What appears to be lacking, however, is leadership on the part of the Government that would start the wheels rolling on the way to a fair and balanced system of hauling charges for coal and other commodities.

A move to encourage the sales of United States coal to countries abroad was also included in the Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. At the present time, largely through the aggressive sales efforts of the industry, and supported by the encouragement of the men who mine the coal, our export program has been moving somewhat satisfactorily. I do not know whether the Government officials charged with the responsibility of carrying out the recommendations of the White House Report have had anything to do with promoting the sale of our coal abroad. I do know that the politically inspired export program, gratuitously announced by the then Director of the Foreign Operations Administration last year, burst like the bag of wind with which it had been inflated.

Then there was a recommendation relative to the Government's fuel purchasing policy. Whatever progress has been made in this direction remains intangible. Meanwhile, we who are interested in giving coal a fair opportunity to compete with other fuels in the sale of energy for use by the Government will not relent in our demands that this stated proposal by the Cabinet Committee be carried out.

As we approach the final 5 months of 1955, we trust that some action on the part of the administration will be forthcoming. Let me remind you that the bituminous coal industry is currently running at 50 to 60 million tons short of the annual production required to meet the accelerated demands of an emergency program. The deficit can be reduced if the report issued by the White House on February 26 is executed. Otherwise Congress may be forced to take the matter into its own hands immediately after the beginning of the new sessions in January of next year.

Calling Chairman Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, those who have the privilege of serving on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, as I do, have the opportunity to observe at firsthand the energy Adm. Lewis L. Strauss shows as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is reported that Admiral Strauss will be invited to testify on the now-dead Dixon-Yates deal before the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee completes its work. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this matter:

CALLING CHAIRMAN STRAUSS

Chairman Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission, who is to be summoned to testify what he knows about the Dixon-Yates power deal, will be a welcome and essential witness. The admiral will be scheduled for appearance before the Kefauver Antimonopoly Subcommittee after the recess, which it is taking for about 6 weeks.

It was Admiral Strauss who acted as, in effect, President Eisenhower's floor leader in bludgeoning AEC into acceptance of the deal over the opposition of 3 of its 5 commissioners. There is even indication that the President's directive to AEC to sign the contract had been sought by he AEC Chairman as the means of coercing his fellow Commissioners into acting against their best judgment.

It was Admiral Strauss, with a long record of unfriendliness toward TVA, who led the fight to ram the contract down that Agency's throat.

Chairman Strauss, therefore, like Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams (who has so far twice declined to testify) knows a great deal the Kefauver Antimonopoly Subcommittee would like very much to know.

It was surely of facts known to these two that Senator KEFAUVER was referring, among others, when he said: "We feel there are many parts of [the contract] and negotiations in connection with it that have not seen the light of day."

Excise-Tax Reduction Is Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would like to address the membership of the House briefly on the subject of our excise-tax structure.

At the outset I would like to reiterate my strongest condemnation of excise taxes as a means of raising Federal revenues. I would also like to state for the record that I have opposed every excise levy since I have been a Member of Congress and have consistently voted to reduce or eliminate excises at every opportunity. I believe it is a modest statement to express the view that the Dingell record on excise taxation and the Republican record on excise taxation are not in any way in agreement. The truth of the matter is they are at complete variance.

I have waged an unrelenting battle in opposition to the enactment of excise taxes and have fought for the reduction of excises with unceasing vigor. The basis for my stand in opposition to these iniquitous superduper sales taxes is that I wholeheartedly subscribe to the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. I have strenuously objected to any tax legislation which departed from this historically honored tax principle and believe that it is a demonstrable fact that excises comprise the most regressive form of taxation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently voted my convictions by opposing the imposition of excise taxes which bear their greatest burden on the middle- and low-income families in America. In this regard I would like to compare for a moment my position on excises as I have just stated it with the traditional position of the Republican Party on these onerous consumer exactions.

It can be said without contradiction that the Republican record on excise taxes is, indeed, an unsavory one. Let us examine the record of the Republican 80th Congress on this subject. At that time there were unmistakable indications and expressed intentions that the Republican Party was leaning in the direction of a Federal sales tax. A ranking Republican of the Committee on Ways and Means introduced a bill providing for a general manufacturers' sales tax. The then Republican chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means appointed a so-called special tax-study committee composed of New York bankers and Wall Street lawyers, which filed a report stating in part:

In the opinion of our committee, excise taxes should continue to form an important part of the Federal revenue system. A case can certainly be made for strengthening the excise tax structure.

It is significant to note that a ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means has again introduced legislation which would provide a general manufacturers' sales tax. This legislation having been introduced despite the knowledge that its impact would bear heaviest on the American families who are less able to bear the tax burden.

Other evidence of the Republican reliance on sales taxes as a source of Federal revenue in total disregard to the principle of ability to pay is found in the Republican record on the repeal of the so-called temporary wartime excise taxes. In the Revenue Act of 1943 provision was made for certain wartime excise tax rates. I opposed the inclusion in the legislation just as I have always opposed the imposition of any excise tax. While I was not successful in keeping these levies from being included in the bill, I did succeed in having a provision included which called for the termination of these taxes not later than 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

At the time the Committee on Ways and Means was considering the Revenue Act of 1945, I succeeded in having a provision included that called for the termination of these wartime excise taxes on June 30, 1946—1 year before they would have been terminated under the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1943. This proposal which was included in the House-passed version of the 1945 bill was deleted in the Senate; but I would point out that the then existing law still provided a termination date for these wartime excises.

The 1946 election campaign found the Republican candidates for office eagerly pledging themselves to tax reduction generally and to excise-tax reduction in particular. The then ranking minority leader of the Committee on Ways and Means, who became chairman of the committee during the Republican 80th Congress, introduced a bill to repeal the wartime excise taxes in an effort to capitalize on the public's annoyance with these excise nuisance taxes. During the 1946 election campaign, all the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means promised in a public statement downward adjustments in Federal excise taxes.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will well recall that when the Republican Party came into power in the 80th Congress one of the first major bills passed by the Republican majority was legislation to make permanent the temporary war excise-tax rates. This action was taken so that the Republicans could grant income-tax reduction to the privileged few who were fortunate enough to be in the upper-income brackets. At that time the Republican chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means blatantly announced that it was "the hope of the committee to be able to shift much of the burden that is now being carried by the income-tax group over to the excises, at least in part" and he added further:

Obviously, if we are going to extend the excise field we will have to include a great many items that are not now included.

Thus, the Republican tax philosophy of shifting the tax burden to the shoulders of the consumer and the lower income families becomes patently clear.

In the first session of the 81st Congress, the Democratic members of the

Committee on Ways and Means prepared legislation that would have granted excise tax relief of more than $1 billion. Unfortunately, the outbreak of the conflict in Korea prevented the Senate from favorably considering this legislation. The needs for financing the defense effort required by the Korean action made it necessary to temporarily defer tax reduction and to provide instead increased revenues. However, I was again successful in providing for a termination date of April 1, 1954, on the increases in the excise taxes which were enacted to finance the defense preparations required by the Korean incident. In the Republican 83d Congress the Republican Party again acted true to form by trying to enact legislation which would repeal the April 1, 1954, termination date and thereby make the Korean increases a permanent part of our excise-tax structure. However, the Democratic House Members with the threat of a motion to recommit forced the Republican Party to reluctantly provide a termination date so as to keep these excise increases from becoming permanent law. Thus, we have the Republican record of twice in recent years repudiating their campaign pledges of granting excise-tax relief and instead attempting to make excise increases that were necessary to finance defense preparations a permanent part of our Federal tax system.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to opposing excise taxes because of their regressive effect on consumers, I have also opposed them because of the adverse consequences they have had with respect to American industries and American labor. There are innumerable instances where discriminatory excise-tax rates have threatened the solvency of an entire American industry. The depressed economic conditions that have existed in industries affected by high excise-tax rates have frequently resulted in unemployment and have denied the opportunity for expansion that is so necessary to provide jobs for our growing American population.

As proof of this condition I would cite the alcoholic-beverage industry which has been the whipping boy of bigoted persons who have unfairly sought the detruction of this legal and honorable industry. The effect of the indiscretion of these people in imposing exorbitant excise taxes on this industry has resulted in a loss of Federal revenues and in the illicit trafficking in alcoholic beverages by bootleggers and moonshiners.

The motorcycle industry is another example of an American industry being virtually destroyed by high excise-tax rates. It was with a great deal of pleasure that I was able to support legislation in this Democratic Congress which removed the excise tax on motorcycles. The automobile industry is another example of an American industry that has been denied the opportunity to fully develop its expansion potentialities by reason of exorbitant excise-tax rates. Similarly the excise taxes on moderate-priced jewelry has not only depressed that industry but has also caused considerable unemployment in that area.

It is my intention during the 2d session of the 84th Congress to press for the enactment of the Dingell program for providing tax relief to the American taxpayer. I will insist that tax relief be considered in the following order of priority:

First. Excise taxes: Congress must give special attention to this category with a view to repealing all wartime excises and restoring others to their 1939 level.

Second. Individual income taxes: All taxpayers should be considered for tax reduction, but those in the lower-income brackets should be the first to have a substantial reduction made in their tax liability. In this connection action must be taken to increase exemption levels to an amount that is realistic and in conformity with today's cost of living.

Third. Corporate, normal, and surtax rates: These taxes should be restored to their levels existing prior to the Revenue Act of 1951.

It is my view that taxes must be kept at the minimum level consistent with the necessary functions of Government. But whatever tax burden that is imposed on the American public must be equitably distributed based on the ability to pay. Therefore, in granting tax relief in the forthcoming second session of the 84th Congress, it is essential that we bear in mind that the bulk of the tax relief granted during the Republican 83d Congress went to corporations and high-income individual taxpayers. This Republican program of tax relief to the privileged few which was enacted in the 83d Congress makes it imperative that the Democratic 84th Congress act to restore balance to our tax structure by granting tax relief first to our middle- and low-income taxpayers.

It was extremely gratifying to me that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JERE COOPER, has established a subcommittee to study technical and administrative problems existing in our excise-tax structure. It is my view that by making improvements in this area and by providing substantial excise tax-rate reductions, the Congress will have taken a very significant step in giving renewed life to that most fundamental of all tax concepts—taxation according to ability to pay.

A Man Who Respects TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to speak too frequently about the curious blindness of President Eisenhower toward the values of the Tennessee Valley Authority and his incapacity to comprehend the values that would be created by comparable river-valley developments in other areas.

It is worth notice, however, that many visitors from foreign lands consider the TVA one of the great achievements of the United States of America in the field of social engineering—the wise use of Government power for the benefit of the people.

In this connection, I offer a story by Donald Grant, of the staff of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who tells about the visit of Burma's Prime Minister, U Nu, to the Tennessee Valley country:

BURMA'S U NU IN TVA LAND
(By Donald Grant)

KNOXVILLE, TENN., July 16.—What does a neutralist look like? People on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are in the process of finding out: India's Prime Minister Nehru has been visiting Russia, Poland, and Yugoslavia, while his foreign policy adviser, V. K. Krishna Menon, has visited China, Britain, Canada, and the United States. Indonesia's Prime Minister, Ali Sastroamidjojo, has been seeing the sights in Peiping.

In a comfortable farm home in Hardin Valley, in the foothills of the Great Smoky Mountains, 20 miles northwest of Knoxville, 2-year-old Bill Jones awoke from his afternoon nap last Saturday to see the face of Burma's Prime Minister, U Nu, smiling down at him. Bill smiled back.

Prime Minister Nu (the U simply means Mr.) was visiting the Jones farm as a part of his tour of the Tennessee Valley, to see for himself what TVA has meant to the people there. Burma has one of the lowest per capita incomes in the world—one report puts it at about $32 a year—and Nu naturally was interested in a region where, since TVA came into being, the per capita income has risen from $163 to $1,042 a year.

The Tennessee Valley was interested in U Nu, too. In the old days, when a Democratic administration sat in Washington, important foreign visitors were pretty common—people like Nehru of India, Queen Juliana of the Netherlands, and David Ben-Gurion of Israel. Lately, Washington hasn't been encouraging such visits. Prime Minister Nu, however, insisted on seeing the TVA, along with the Empire State Building in New York, the White House in Washington, Niagara Falls, the big Ford plant outside Detroit, the Grand Canyon, and California. He was the first head of a foreign state to visit TVA since the Republicans took over.

When Nu arrived at the Knoxville airport the crowd saw a short, square-cut man with what seemed to be a dark coat of tan on his wide, smiling face. He was wearing his Burmese sarong and headdress. Nu was met by TVA Chairman Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, also smiling. They drove together to the Andrew Johnson Hotel, and the rest of the party followed, in a sort of cavalcade of cars.

One of the women in the crowd at the airport, commenting later, said it was something like a circus coming to town, what with Nu in his sarong, with Mrs. Nu and Mrs. James Barrington, wife of the Burmese Ambassador at Washington, both in sarongs of brighter colors than that worn by the Prime Minister, and both women carrying gay and dainty parasols against the sun.

That night Nu attended a girls' 4-H Club meeting, ate half a sweet muffin baked by 14-year-old Jane Kyker, Blount County 4-H Club baking champion, and delivered a lecture on the need for a return to religion, morality, and self-discipline among youth. The 4-H Club girls seemed happy, but a little puzzled. Nu might have been better understood had he given them a bit of his own history: the Prime Minister was the village drunkard in Wakema, on the Irrawaddy Delta, by the time he had reached the age of 16.

At the age of 18 he reformed; at 48 he is one of the leading lay leaders of world Buddhism.

The next morning in Knoxville, Prime Minister Nu put on a black silk western business suit and a brown straw hat and went to the TVA headquarters to see a documentary film on the development of the Tennessee Valley. Nu found it exciting—the story of flood control, power generation, river navigation and, most of all, the improved living conditions for the people. Afterward he had many questions to ask.

He learned that the valley has almost three times the number of manufacturing establishments that it had in 1933, that the number of farms using electricity has increased from 3 percent to 93 percent. He was told how malaria, formerly a serious problem in the Tennessee Valley as it still is in Burma, has been all but eliminated. He learned how floods—which still ravage the Irrawaddy Valley where Nu was born—are now controlled in the Tennessee Valley, and how the use of the river for shipping has increased nearly tenfold.

You could see U Nu's enthusiasm for TVA mounting by the minute, even before he had seen a dam. At lunch, the Prime Minister raised his water glass in a toast: "To the everlasting prosperity of the TVA."

After lunch they took him to the Jones farm, where the Burma party and the TVA people sat beneath a big maple tree in the yard, on steel camp chairs borrowed from the Hardin Valley Consolidated School. Young Bill Jones' father, W. K. Jones, told how the land had been improved with TVA fertilizer and with the help of University of Tennessee agriculture experts. U Nu took off his jacket, revealing bright blue and white suspenders. It was hot.

The party moved on to the Fort Loudoun Dam, 25 miles southwest of Knoxville. Here Nu stood fascinated by the four big electric generators, each producing some 32,000 kilowatts of electricity, driven by the force of water falling over the dam, through great turbines connected to the generators by huge steel shafts. The generators were mounted in a large, spotlessly clean, hospital-gray room; there was a humming sound in the air.

"All this," marveled Nu, "turns great waste into great utility—for the benefit of people. It is beauty itself."

Then, as if not wishing to seem to be carried away, he added, with a smile: "But some people can see beauty in the face of a bulldog."

Outside the powerhouse the party clambered into two fishing launches and entered the locks, and the TVA technicians opened sluices which lowered the level of the water by 70 feet in about 20 minutes, by allowing some 12,640,000 gallons of water to flow on downstream. Later the locks were refilled, and the launches raised to their former level.

On land again, the cavalcade moved on to visit a University of Tennessee greenhouse where fertilizers were being tested, and a university machine shop, where seeds were being treated with high-frequency electric currents, just to see what would happen.

Outside the machine shop, Nu delivered his verdict on the day:

"It has been a very valuable time spent here. I am most interested in TVA because we have similar problems in Burma. Our 3 big rivers flood every 2 or 3 years and cause great damage. We have engaged American experts to begin surveys of two of the rivers, but of course we will need foreign exchange to pay for the experts and for the equipment to harness the rivers. * * *

"But I am most impressed by the possibilities of projects such as the TVA, and especially by what it can do for the people.

"After all, is it not the duty of good government to look after the people, and to protect them as far as possible against natural calamities?

"I look upon the TVA as a successful democratic meeting of a great challenge."

The Prime Minister of Burma did not mention the Dixon-Yates affair. U Nu in his scholarly days not only translated into Burmese Karl Marx's Das Kapital—but also Dale Carnegie's How To Win Friends and Influence People.

Rev. John A. Dronzek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., concerning the Reverend John A. Dronzek, pastor of St. Michael's Parish, West Lynn, Mass., who recently died:

REV. JOHN A. DRONZEK

Death came to one of the outstanding parish priests of the archdiocese of Boston early last night as the Reverend John A. Dronzek, pastor of St. Michael's Church in West Lynn, succumbed to a long illness.

The death of the beloved priest stunned the city. For months his flock had been aware of the seriousness of his condition, and yet his passing was a signal for genuine and heartfelt expressions of sorrow not only among the Polish people he had served so well but to members of neighboring parishes who had come to look upon him as their own in the past 30 years.

Father John, as he was affectionately known throughout the city, was a young man of only 32 years of age when he arrived in Lynn as successor to the late Father Takuski back in 1925. He had been a curate for only 9 short years, but despite his short experience and youth he soon demonstrated his capabilities as a pastor and administrator.

While he sought principally to enrich the spiritual life of his parishioners, Father Dronzek believed that faith flourished amid the wholesome family surroundings provided by picnics, reunions, and other social events. With that in mind, he sponsored many events in the early days of his pastorate which succeeded in focusing the spotlight upon the parish and provided many good times for adults and youngsters alike.

He was intensely interested in the parish organizations, advising and counselling them at every step of the way. Up until his fatal illness, he was the chaplain of every men's organization in the parish.

While he never sought to establish himself as the leader of the Polish people of West Lynn, Father Dronzek couldn't escape the mantle of leadership that seemed to be his. He was dynamic and forceful, energetic and driving. Small wonder that his people came to lean heavily upon him as the years passed.

Hardly a year passed without Father Dronzek embarking upon some project. If he wasn't renovating the church or school, he was seeking to improve the convent he constructed or the rectory. Under his leadership the St. Michael's parish plant developed to the point that it was one of the most extensive of its type for a small parish in the archdiocese. Fellow pastors marveled at Father Dronzek's ability to get so many things done with such a relatively small parish.

There is hardly a member of St. Michael's parish who hasn't some fond memory with which to associate the lifetime of Father Dronzek. The oldsters remember him as a kindly young priest first reporting here in 1925. Graduates of the school remember his interest in them and their ambitions. Hundreds of married couples whom he joined in holy matrimony recall his sincere interest in their futures.

Lynn is a great loser in the death of a man of Father Dronzek's calibre. Of his 62 years on this earth, it was the city's good fortune that his most productive ones should have been spent within its limits. His deeds and accomplishments will never be forgotten.

Who Doctored the Record?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, before the subject of the now dead Dixon-Yates contract is dropped, let us recognize that some unusual efforts were made to conceal and pervert the facts regarding that deal. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch seems pertinent:

Whatever may have been the propriety of Adolphe H. Wenzell's serving on both sides of the table in the Dixon-Yates deal, his testimony before the Kefauver subcommittee makes two things very clear indeed.

First, it is clear that somebody in the Budget Bureau and in the Atomic Energy Commission undertook to conceal Mr. Wenzell's role in the Dixon-Yates negotiations.

Last August, in order to answer criticism of the contract and to fulfill President Eisenhower's directive that all facts pertaining to it be made public, these two agencies released to the press elaborate "chronologies" which purported to show the record of every conference and every document dealing with the subject.

Nowhere in these documents was Mr. Wenzell even mentioned. Nowhere was it revealed that he served as vice president of the investment firm which arranged financing for the Dixon-Yates deal, and also served as a Budget Bureau consultant who sat in on the formulation of Government politics which made the deal possible.

How did it happen that the chronologies mentioned a major conference on January 20, 1954, at which Mr. Dixon with the backing of J. Wesley McAfee of St. Louis proposed to build a power plant at West Memphis—but did not mention that Mr. Wenzell and another First Boston executive were present? How did it happen that one important conference which Mr. Wenzell attended with 8 or 10 others at the AEC, as well as a personal conference he held with AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, were omitted from the record altogether?

To suppose that these omissions were pure coincidence strains credulity too much. Obviously, the allegedly complete record was not complete until Senator KEFAUVER's committee dug out the facts. Obviously, somebody in the administration edited the record before it was published.

Why? If Mr. Wenzell's role was proper—indeed yes, as the President said at his press

conference this week, why was the record of it covered up?

The second fact which Mr. Wenzell's testimony makes clear is that somebody in the administration has been guilty of shockingly misinforming the President. At his news conference June 29, the President said "Mr. Wenzell never was called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract." Mr. Wenzell's own testimony now shows this to have been untrue. The President's flat statement can be explained only on the assumption that his advisers on this matter failed to inform him completely, just as they failed inform the public completely.

Who edited the public record?

Who told the President only half the story?

The Kefauver subcommittee should press its inquiry until those questions are answered. And President Eisenhower, it seems to us, ought to be conducting his own inquiry into the same questions.

Appeasement of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOE MCCARTHY

Recently on the Senate floor, I was challenged by a Republican Senator to cite an instance in which the Eisenhower administration had appeased communism. I had been making the general argument that on this score the Eisenhower record was hardly better than that of the Democrats, and my challenger arose to demand chapter and verse. I replied: "Korea, Indochina, and the Tachen Islands." Since the Senate that day was debating a specific issue, that of whether it should risk expressing its views about Eastern Europe, I did not think the time appropriate for pressing the general charge I was making. But I realized then that we Republicans could not continue to encourage the notion that the appeasement business is a Democrat monopoly without doing great injury to the anti-Communist cause.

The record of the Eisenhower administration is one that I take no particular pleasure in documenting. I do not, however, see that it is possible for this country to get back on course until the American people realize fully the extent to which administration policies have steered us away from our objective of defeating communism.

COMMUNISTS ARE ASIA-FIRSTERS

The Eisenhower administration's record of knuckling under to communism has been enacted, for the most part, in the Far East—and this for the not too surprising reason that the Far East is the area in which the Communists have made serious efforts to beat us down.

Communist strategists, historically, have historically, have viewed the conquest of viewed the conquest of Europe as posterior to the conquest of Asia. Lenin stated very early in the game that, after Russia had been secured communism must seek to engulf Asia, and, as the first step toward this goal, China. Of course, if circumstances seemed to promise a cheap local victory in Europe—as they did in Eastern Europe during and immediately after the Second World War—the Communists would exploit their opportunities. But in the main, the battle in Europe would be a holding action, pending domination of Asia.

The Far East has always been, in Communist eyes, the free world's line of least resistance. In the Far East, there have been no strong national armies—except, before the war, the Japanese—that could destroy the armed forces the Communists planned to recruit from the native populations. In the Far East, resentment against the West, characterized by European imperialism and colonialism, has been running high for over a century. In the Far East, nationalistic sentiments have lately become articulate and militant, and the Communists have recognized the opportunity to shape Asiatic nationalism into their own mold. Moreover, after World War II, the Communists knew that real opposition would come, if it came at all, only from the United States—that while the Soviet Union would probably be confronted with a united anti-Communist front in Europe, the Western European countries would have no stomach for collective action in the Far East. For such reasons, the Communists have heeded Lenin's advice, and trained their sights on Asia.

Members of the Republican Party's right wing, so-called, have often been accused by our Europe-oriented press of being Asia-Firsters. The obvious answer here is that the Communists are Asia-Firsters, too.

THE DEMOCRAT LEGACY

Messrs. Truman, Acheson, and Marshall, in their day, advertised themselves as tough anti-Communists. But their policies, insofar as they were anti-Communist, affected only Europe where the risks were minimal. The Communists' main drive was in Asia, and the Democrats responded by attempting to build up Europe's defenses. The single exception was the Korean intervention; but in this case, too, the Democrat administration showed its stripes by backing down at precisely the point in history where we might have delivered world communism a serious setback.

The responsibility of Democrat administrations for the overthrow of Free China is second only to that of the Communists themselves. The Roosevelt administration betrayed China at Yalta by handing over to the Soviet Union strategic Chinese ports, and by inviting the Soviet armies to occupy Manchuria, China's richest industrial province. Under Truman, General Marshall attempted to force on China a coalition government with the Communists, and when that failed, the Truman administration deliberately denied to the Nationalist Government the military support that would have enabled Chiang Kai-shek to defeat the Communists on the battlefield.

Moreover, the Truman administration deliberately prevented the United States from defeating the Communists in Korea. Gen. Douglas MacArthur was relieved of his far eastern commands because he insisted on telling the American people that political considerations were denying our forces a military victory. The Truman administration established a privileged sanctuary across the Manchurian border from which Red Chinese aircraft could attack American troops and return with impunity. It further obliged the Communists by removing the Nationalist threat to the Red Army's rear. On June 27, 1950, President Truman announced, "I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The 7th Fleet will see that this is done."

The American Navy was thus ordered to protect an enemy that was engaged in a life and death struggle with the American Army.

But even with these handicaps, United States forces could have won in Korea had the Truman administration not forbidden further land advances in the spring of 1951. Why was our offensive stopped just short of victory? Because the Communists asked for a truce. The Communists knew that the American Army, if permited to do so, could break through their lines. A truce was requested on the theory that once hostilities had stopped, the United States would never resume the war, and would in time withdraw its forces from Korea. The Communists would thus have an opportunity to reestablish their military position in Korea; and meanwhile, the Communists reasoned, they would be free to turn primary attention southward, toward Indochina.

Such was the situation inherited by the Eisenhower administration. With the Communists asking for a truce to gain time in Korea and to facilitate a new aggression in Indochina, and with the American Armed Forces in a position to smash the Communist armies if they were permitted to do so, the disastrous Truman regime bowed out.

Now, the question that should be kept in mind as we proceed is, Did the Eisenhower administration, after it took the reins of Government, deal with Communist aggression in some way different from the Truman administration's way of dealing with it, or did it perpetuate its appeasement legacy? I contend that the record of the past 2½ years shows that the Eisenhower administration, at the beginning of every crisis, took a strong position, but eventually fell back in the face of Communist pressure, and settled into the old appeasement groove.

THE EISENHOWER APPEASEMENT: KOREA

We should look first at the handling of the Korean situation, since that was the first test of whether the Eisenhower administration was prepared to adopt new policies. As we have seen, the overriding question with respect to Korea was whether the Communists would be permitted to get out of a bad military situation there, and move on to a new and more promising aggression in the south. On April 16, 1953, President Eisenhower called attention to the danger and strongly indicated that his administration would not play the Communist game. A Korean armistice, the President said, "should mean no less importantly an end to the direct and indirect attacks upon the security of Indochina and Malaya. For any armistice in Korea that merely released aggressive armies to attack elsewhere would be a fraud."

But since any armistice that left the Communist armies intact would release Red Chinese forces for an attack against Indochina, the President's remarks implied there would be no armistice until we had won a military victory and had moved our lines forward to the Yalu.

And let us remember that from a military standpoint, we had a clear-cut victory within our grasp. Last year the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security conducted an investigation of the conduct of the Korean war, and that subcommittee's report, unanimously adopted, settles, as conclusively as it can ever be settled, the question of whether the United States could have won that war. After it had heard the testimony of the field commanders in the Korean war theater, Gen. Mark Clark, Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, and Adm. Charles Turner Joy, the subcommittee reported these conclusions:

1. The senior military commanders in the Korean war theater who appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary believed that victory in Korea was possible and desirable.

2. The senior military commanders in the Korean war theater who appeared before

the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary believed that the action required to achieve victory would not have resulted in World War III.

3. The senior military commanders in the Korean war theater who appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary believed that political considerations were permitted to overrule military necessity.

But even though we could have won the war, the new Eisenhower policy of firmness never got beyond the talking stage. The President did not change Truman's orders to our field commanders, and did not authorize a resumption of the march to the Yalu. Instead, the new administration gave the Communists their armistice.

The result has been precisely as expected. The Communists have proceeded to build up their military establishment in Korea while ours has progressively deteriorated. They have repeatedly violated the armistice agreement with no retaliation from us. The most tragic of these violations, in human terms, is the continued imprisonment of American servicemen. At the time of cessation of hostilities, in the summer of 1951, there were 941 Americans who, in the words of our Department of Defense, "there is reason to believe were at one time in Communist custody but for whom no accounting has yet been made." By the latest authoritative accounting, 465 American servicemen are still alive and are still in Communist prisons. Fifteen airmen, so far, have been released. The rest are held, as the 15 were held, as hostages, and are apparently to be used in bargaining with the free world for territorial concessions.

Finally, the Korean armistice permitted the Communists to concentrate military forces, and their attention, elsewhere—to move into Indochina, and to prepare an attack against Nationalist bastions in the Formosa Straits.

To oblige the Communists by granting them a truce when we were strong was appeasement where it was least justified. We held all of the military and political advantages, but for the sake of an illusory peace, proceeded to hand them over to our enemy.

THE EISENHOWER APPEASEMENT: INDOCHINA

Let us turn now to Indochina, and see how the Communists made the most of our generosity. By the spring of 1954, a crisis had developed there that was the direct consequence of appeasement in Korea. For 8 years the war between the Vietnam and the Viet Minh had been stalemated. By themselves, the Viet Minh had been unable to win a decisive victory. But after Chiang Kai-shek had been driven from the Chinese mainland, and the Korean war had ended, the Chinese Communists were in a position to intervene and thus to tip the scales in the Viet Minh's favor. Chinese volunteers and war materials poured into Indochina in decisive volume. As a result, French and Vietnam forces faced a crushing defeat at Dienbienphu, and a catastrophe on the Hanoi Peninsula.

The administration's reaction to this new Communist threat was, at first, encouraging. I think it is well to recall the statements of various American leaders as the crisis developed, for then we can see how fast and how far the administration retreated in the face of Communist pressure.

President Eisenhower, on August 4, 1953, explained that if Indonesia fell, "the peninsula, the last little bit of land hanging on down there, would be scarcely defensible." "All India," he continued, "would be outflanked," and "Burma would be in no position for defense." On April 7, 1954, the President was still warning that if Indochina fell, all of southeast Asia would collapse like "falling dominoes." The President said, that as the last domino in the line falls inevitably from the toppling of the first, the loss of Indochina would lead to the loss of Burma, of Thailand, and Indonesia, and a threat to Australia and New Zealand.

On March 29, 1954, before the Overseas Press Club of America, Secretary of State Dulles made his then-famous promise of collective defense of Indochina. "Under the conditions of today," Mr. Dulles warned, "the imposition on southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally, by whatever means, would be a grave threat to the whole free community. The United States feels that that possibility should not be passively accepted but should be met by united action. This might have serious risks, but these risks are far less than would face us a few years from now if we dare not be resolute today."

On April 15, 1954, Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—who was known at that time to be advising, privately, military opposition to the Communists at Dienbienphu—said this publicly: "The free nations cannot afford to permit a further extension of the power of militant communism in Asia. In the interests of preventing aggression full advantage should be taken of the fact that non-Communist Asia has a considerable potential for development of defensive military forces. * * * Indochina's loss would be the prelude to the loss of all southeast Asia and a threat to a far wider area."

The next day, on April 16, Vice President NIXON urged that American troops be used, if necessary to prevent Indochina from falling to the Communists. The Vice President took a stand squarely opposed to the sort of deal that the administration eventually agreed to. The following are excerpts from a digest of the Vice President's off-the-record speech, as it appeared in the New York Times:

"Negotiations with the Communists to divide the territory or in any form would result in Communist domination of a vital new area. * * * The United States as a leader of the free world cannot afford further retreat in Asia. It is hoped that the United States will not have to send troops there, but if this Government cannot avoid it, the administration must face up to the situation and dispach forces. * * * French pressure will be exerted at the conference (beginning April 26 at Geneva) for negotiation and the end of the fighting. The British will take a similar position, because of mounting Labor Party pressure and defections in the Conservative ranks. The British do not want to antagonize Red China, which they have recognized. This country is the only nation politically strong enough at home to take a position that will save Asia. Therefore the United States must go to Geneva and take a positive stand for united action by the free world."

These, of course, were heartening words; it seemed that the United States had at long last decided to face up courageously and realistically to Communist aggression. But in 10 short days everything had changed. On April 26, the Geneva Conference opened, and on that very day President Eisenhower announced that the United States was no longer prepared to hold the line against Communist aggression but was seeking a modus vivendi in Indochina. The British and French took the President's line, and repudiated Mr. Dulles' policy of united action. With electrifying swiftness, our strong position had been reduced to shambles, and the Western Powers abjectly agreed to hand over northern Indochina and 12 million human beings to the Communists.

On the 12th of May, 1954, Secretary Dulles weakly explained to his press conference that Indochina had not been so important after all.

EISENHOWER APPEASEMENT: THE FORMOSA STRAITS

Let us turn now to the growing crisis in the Formosa Straits, and our policy toward the Nationalist Government of China. To keep our China policy in proper perspective, we must remember that when it took office the Eisenhower administration was firmly committed to the view that the Nationalist Government in Formosa was the rightful Government of China, and that the Chinese Communists were criminal usurpers whose claim to rule the mainland was legally and morally fraudulent. Moreover, the Republican Party was officially on record against a passive policy toward China. The Republican platform of 1952 contained a solemn promise to seek the liberation of captive nations—the most conspicuous of which was, of course, China.

In its early days, the Eisenhower administration took steps to implement the Republican platform. In his first state of the Union message, the President revoked the Truman order directing the 7th Fleet to protect Communist China from attack by the Nationalists. Here is what the President said:

"[T]here is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists. This permitted those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers and those of our United Nations allies, in Korea.

"I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China."

This was the famous policy of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek. The President disavowed any aggressive intent on our part, but his message was interpreted as a go-ahead sign to Free China—an encouragement to make preparations for eventual liberation of the mainland. Meanwhile, the administration appeared determined that Free China should not lose any territories it then held. In September 1953 the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously recommended that the United States defend Quemoy and the Matsus. Aside from the fact that these islands were advance bases from which liberation forces could be launched, the Joint Chiefs recognized that they were vital to the defense of Formosa itself. The United States thereupon sent new equipment and technical personnel to Chiang Kai-shek, and the Nationalist Government was urged to fortify and garrison the offshore islands against the possibility of Communist attack. This the Nationalist Government did. Fifty thousand men were sent to Quemoy and twelve thousand to Matsu, and three airfields were built on Quemoy. Nationalist preparations continued throughout 1954.

Perhaps we should ask at this point why the administration was maintaining a strong position in the Formosa Straits, while it was giving ground in Korea and Indochina. The answer here is quite simple: The offshore islands were the third step on the Communist timetable. The Communists did not begin to exert serious pressures in this area until, first, they had been let off the hook in Korea, and, second, had won the Indochina war. But as soon as the Communists had achieved these objectives and turned their sights toward Formosa, the American position began to buckle. It is a familiar characteristic of appeasement that firm stands are taken when the enemy is momentarily inactive, only to be abandoned as soon as he shows signs of meaning business.

After their Indochina victory in the late spring of 1954, the Communists began to concentrate troops along the eastern coast of China, opposite Formosa and the offshore islands. This military buildup, especially the construction of airfields, would take some time; but the administration knew the Peiping regime was preparing an assault across the straits. Meanwhile, Communist aircraft began to batter the Tachens, Quemoy, and the Matsus.

In January of 1955, in the face of mounting Communist pressures, the administration began a new retreat. The first signs, as usual, were deceptive. The President ap-

pealed to Congress for blanket authority to use American Armed Forces in the Formosa area—a request that clearly suggested the American Government meant business about resisting further Communist aggression. But it shortly developed that the bellicose Formosa resolution was but a guise for concealing a policy of appeasement and retreat. The resolution was interpreted to give the President power to defend Formosa and the adjacent areas; but it was so worded as to give the President authority not to defend the Formosa area—which is what the administration proceeded to do. The Congress was thus deceived and maneuvered into a position where it could only look on resentfully as the new appeasement unfolded.

First, the administration ordered the Nationalist Government to hand over the Tachen Islands to the Communists. It is no longer a secret that Chiang Kai-shek came very close to disobeying this order, for his government saw the Tachen surrender as the first in a series of steps leading to total disintegration of the Nationalist position. But Chiang finally agreed to evacuate the islands because he was given to understand on no less authority than the President of the United States that if the Nationalists behaved in the Tachens, the United States would defend Quemoy and the Matsus.

The next blow fell on March 2, 1955. When asked at a press conference whether the United States would support an attempt by Chiang to liberate the mainland, President Eisenhower gave the astonishing answer: "The United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war." Thus, in 2 short years, a war of liberation had become, in administration terminology, an "aggressive war."

Simultaneously, the State Department suggested a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. Now, to add to their woes, the specter of Munich arose to haunt the Nationalists: Chiang feared that the American Government was preparing to deal directly with the Communists about a cease-fire and was thus ready to sell free China down the river. But on March 3 Secretary Dulles temporarily assuaged this particular fear. In a statement that was interpreted around the world as a solemn undertaking by the American Government, Mr. Dulles said: "The United States will not enter into any negotiations dealing with the territories or rights of the Republic of China except in cooperation with the Republic of China."

In April, the Communists appeared to be ready, at last, to attack Quemoy and the Matsus. For several tense weeks, America's position was in doubt. Although a clear statement from President Eisenhower that we would defend the islands would probably have caused the Communists to change their minds, and although the Joint Chiefs had recommended that the islands be defended, the President remained ominously silent. Finally, in May, the administration said the United States would defend Quemoy and the Matsus only if they were attacked in conjunction with an attack on Formosa itself. This meant, of course, that Quemoy and the Matsus would not be defended, since it would be foolhardy for the Communists to attack simultaneously the offshore islands and Formosa.

The Communist attack on Quemoy and the Matsus did not materialize as soon as anticipated. The Peiping regime apparently realized the chances were good that the Eisenhower administration could be talked into giving them the islands without a fight. But the Communists would not wait forever.

It is reliably reported that on his recent visit to the United States, Krishna Menon, India's goodwill ambassador, conveyed to President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles a Chinese Communist ultimatum to the effect that unless the United States agreed to a conference dealing with Quemoy and the Matsus, those islands would be attacked immediately following the Big Four Conference. It is an educated guess that the Soviet leaders repeated this threat to President Eisenhower at Geneva.

At any rate, on August 1, just a week after the close of the Big Four Conference, the administration did what it had promised 5 months previously it never would do: It entered into direct negotiations with the Chinese Communists about questions that vitally affect the rights, territories, and interests of the Republic of China—without the participation of the Republic of China. Mr. Dulles announced that at the conference the United States would seek a cease-fire in the Formosa straits.

It thus appears that the administration will force Chiang to hand over Quemoy and the Matsus if it can obtain, in return, a Communist agreement to a cease-fire.

Now, let us be very clear about why a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits cannot possibly benefit the free world and is just another instance of appeasing communism. In Communist eyes, cease-fire agreements are made to be broken when it is advantageous to do so. From our point of view, such agreements are presumably made with the purpose of keeping them. Thus, in ordering Chiang Kai-shek to observe a cease-fire arrangement in the Formosa Straits, the administration restores precisely the situation that existed when President Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet to protect Communist China against Nationalist attack: The Communist regime is protected by the American Government. If such an agreement is signed, the Communists will be free to move their forces in any direction they choose—possibly to the south for another crack at the Malay Peninsula, possibly to the north for a renewal of the attack on South Korea, and possibly they will keep their main strength right where it is in preparation for a later attack against Formosa when the Communists feel they can move against the main Nationalist position without incurring American military opposition.

Moreover, a cease-fire will deal the forces of Chiang Kai-shek a mortal blow. Not only will free China lose—assuming Quemoy and the Matsus are thrown in as part of the deal—its advance bases for an attack upon the mainland; the Nationalists will be hard put to mount an effective defense against Communist attack. Chiang Kai-shek has always insisted—and who is to disagree with him?—that the moment his forces lose hope of returning to the mainland, the will to defend against Communist attacks will no longer exist.

Such is the record of the Eisenhower administration in its first 2½ years of office—a record of giving ground in every instance in which the Communists exerted heavy pressures against free world positions. It is a record of appeasement, retreat, and surrender in the pattern of the Truman administration—and it shows not the slightest sign of abating.

LIBERATION VERSUS AGGRESSIVE WAR

I think the best measure of the administration's appeasement policy is a comparison of the Republican Party platform in 1952—which presumably represented the original administration view of our objectives—with certain statements made by Secretary Dulles on July 26, 1955. The relevant plank of the Republican platform is as follows:

"We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. That program will give the Voice of America a real function. It will mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of containment which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism, which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction."

Those were the Republican views on liberation 3 years ago. Now let us listen to Mr. Dulles' discussion of the subject in 1955:

"There is no doubt that North Korea is a part of Korea, but the security treaty which we made with the Republic of Korea makes clear that the United States will not extend its protection other than to areas which we recognize as having been lawfully brought under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Korea and we do not believe that aggressive force is such a lawful means.

"There is no doubt but that North Vietnam is part of Vietnam, but we stated in connection with the Indochina armistice that we were opposed to any renewal of aggression to bring about the unification of Vietnam.

"Both the Republic of China and the Chinese People's Republic claim that the area held by the other is part of China. But in connection with the mutual security treaty which the United States made with the Republic of China, it was agreed that the Republic of China would not use force except as a matter of joint agreement."

In other words, attempts by the free peoples of Asia to recover their homelands are now defined by the Government of the United States—just as the Communists themselves define them—as "aggressive wars." What a mammoth betrayal of our fighting allies. What a monstrous perversion of international morality.

Let us test the administration's definition of aggressive war by some events of the past. The administration is saying that any attempt to achieve a rightful objective by force is aggressive and therefore wicked. But is not the American Revolution condemned by this definition of aggression? Our revolution was a resort to force in order to drive out tyrants and establish a free government. The reasoning of the Eisenhower administration would have prevented George Washington from undertaking offensive operations.

Or take the Civil War. Here is an even closer analogy to the Far Eastern situation. In 1861, the South seceded from the Union, and the question for the North was whether to resort to force in order to reunify the country, or permit permanent dissolution of the Union. As we compare that situation with the Korean problem today, let us note that in 1861 the cards were stacked in favor of the administration definition; for the moral position of the South was much stronger than that of the Communists in North Korea. The South had accomplished its secession peacefully and there was obviously no danger of the South attacking the North. And yet Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles seem to be saying that Abraham Lincoln committed an act of aggression when he employed force to keep the Union together. If the administration is prepared to stick by its present definition of aggressive war, then I am afraid our history books need an extensive job of rewriting.

Or take our position vis a vis occupied Europe during the Second World War. Is the Eisenhower administration now saying that the armies led by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower embarked on a war of aggression against Nazi Germany when they landed in Normandy in 1944? Probably not, but how is that situation distinguished from the one in the Far East today? The Nazis had conquered various countries by force, and the exiled leaders of those countries proposed, with American and British aid, to recapture their homelands by force. If the present administration position is the correct one, we should have desisted from forcible liberation. And let us not be put off by the argument that because an armistice has been signed in Korea and Indochina, the situation now is different. For France and Germany, in 1940, also concluded an armistice. Yet we left no stone unturned to persuade the

French people to resume hostilities and help us liberate their country. And there was very little talk emanating from General Eisenhower's headquarters about the United States being a "party to an aggressive war."

No, this talk about "aggressive war" in behalf of restoring freedom to captive Asiatic countries will not wash. Characterizing such liberation efforts as "aggressive wars" is simply an attempt to rationalize a weak, cowardly, and immoral American foreign policy.

UNITED STATES MUST PERMIT AND SUPPORT FREE ASIATIC OFFENSIVE OPERATIONS

One year or two years from now, it may be too late to liberate Asia. By that time the will and the capacity of the free Indochinese, the free Koreans, and the free Chinese to undertake serious military operations may no longer exist. Today, however, those nations have under arms a million and a half men ready and eager to attempt to liberate their homelands. Perhaps, they will be unsuccessful. But if there is a chance of success, it is morally and practically indefensible for our Government to prevent these nations from making the attempt.

At the present time the free Asiatic nations are in a position to launch a huge, three-pronged pincers movement against Communist China. It should be the policy of the United States to encourage the launching of such an attack. South Vietnam should be encouraged to attack North Vietnam; Free China, to cross the Formosa straits; and South Korea to move north from the 38th parallel. The free Asiatic countries should receive at least material and technical assistance from the United States.

There is every reason to believe that once the armies of free China have landed on the mainland, they will be joined by great numbers of the Chinese people. If the Korean war is a good precedent, desertions from the Red Army itself will occur in substantial volume. During the Korean war, over 90 percent of the Chinese soldiers who ended up in allied prison camps were deserters—men who chose freedom, at great personal risk, in preference to continuing to serve the Communist regime.

I am convinced that such a policy is the only alternative to an appeasement policy. In an ideological struggle of this sort, a static situation is impossible. This is a dynamic struggle in which we move either backward or forward. We can continue to give ground—to appease, to retreat and to surrender—as the Eisenhower administration has done, and the Truman administration before it; or we can start to gain ground. There is no middle course. Either the Communists will win or we will.

As I say, there is no guaranty that Asian wars of liberation will succeed. But the United States, in my judgment, cannot afford to miss what may be our last opportunity to defeat communism without the total commitment of American Armed Forces. The free Asiatic peoples want to fight. In justice to them, and in justice to the millions of American boys who will otherwise be called upon to sacrifice their lives in a total war against communism, we must permit and help our allies to carry the fight to the enemy.

Guilt by Association With Umbrellas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the ways to find out what people are really thinking is to read the newspaper columns carrying letters to the editor.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently carried a letter to the editor commenting on the amusing incident when, it is alleged, our distinguished Vice President made the President and Mrs. Eisenhower stand in the rain at the Washington airport upon their return from Geneva. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I insert the letter in the RECORD:

NO WONDER

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

To determine why Vice President NIXON banned umbrellas at the Washington Airport, because they might be regarded as a symbol of appeasement, let us apply the guilt-by-association techniques of the Eisenhower administration.

V. M. Molotov says that if he were an American he would join the Republican Party. President Eisenhower is a Republican. So, by association, Molly and Ike think alike?

More than 2 years ago, Adlai E. Stevenson advocated nonaggression pacts with Russia, and more conferences, to relieve world tensions. He was violently attacked by several members of the Eisenhower team and called soft on communism. Last week, at Geneva, President Eisenhower advocated, among other things, nonaggression pacts with Russia and more conferences to relieve world tensions. If Adlai was soft on communism, what does that make Ike?

In the 1954 congressional campaign, the Republican policy committee employed a faked recording in which a voice with a Russion accent said, "Vote Democratic—Moscow orders this." Now Ike reveals that Premier Bulganin, of Russia, has begged Ike to run for reelection. If, in 1954, a Moscow endorsement was bad, and the Republican policy committee wanted to vote against a candidate chosen by Moscow, how will you vote in 1956?

No wonder NIXON is nervous.

Mrs. JOHN B. CURRIE.
GREAT BARRINGTON, MASS.

A Review of the Social Security Amendments of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has termed the old-age and survivors insuranse system of the Social Security Act "the cornerstone of the Government's program to promote the economic security of the individual." Since the inception of the social-security program in 1935, the Congress of the United States has enacted six bills making major amendments to the social-security system. The most recent of these was the social security amendments of 1954, Public Law 761 of the 83d Congress, which, in my view, made the most sweeping improvements in the program since its original enactment. One of the most gratifying experiences of my congressional career was to be the author of the social security amendments of 1954 and to serve as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means at the time this legislation was being considered by the Congress.

It will soon be 1 year ago that the 1954 amendments to our social-security law were approved by the President. It is appropriate, therefore, that we should briefly review the broad scope of those amendments, consider their impact on the social-security program, and the contribution these amendments have made to the welfare of our people.

The principal provisions of the social-security amendments of 1954 may be enumerated as follows:

First. Old-age and survivors insurance coverage was extended to approximately 10 million persons who work during the course of the year in jobs previously excluded from the program. The result is that approximately 9 out of 10 jobs in paid civilian employment are now covered under social security.

Second. Social-security benefits were increased for persons on the benefit rolls, for persons who will retire in the future, and their survivors. The range of increases in primary insurance amounts was from $5 to $23.50 per month with comparable adjustments in survivors and dependency benefits.

Third. In computing average monthly wage, the total earnings on which benefits are computed and on which contributions are made was raised from $3,600 to $4,200. It was also provided that up to 5 years in which earnings were lowest or nonexistent could be dropped from the computation.

Fourth. The limitation on earnings of beneficiaries—the so-called work clause—was liberalized to permit a beneficiary to earn as much as $1,200 a year without any loss of benefit, and the age at which the retirement test would not be applicable was reduced from 75 years to 72 years.

Fifth. Under the disability freeze provision, the benefit rights and entitlement of an individual were preserved for the period of disability.

Sixth. An adjustment was provided in the schedule of contribution rates so as to insure continued actuarial soundness of the system.

Seventh. The temporary increase in Federal payments to States for public assistance was extended for 2 years through September 30, 1956, so that the benefit amounts of persons receiving public assistance would not have to be reduced.

Since the enactment of these amendments, I have received countless communications from farmers and other persons expressing approval of the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to farm families and of the other improvements made in the system by the Social Security Amendments of 1954. These amendments eliminated many of the basic causes of instances of low benefits, so that an individual's benefit level will more realistically reflect the individual's earnings on which he customarily depends for his support. The important improvements made in the old-age and survivors insurance system by the 1954 amendments have done much to remove inequities that were existing in the system and to make the program more adequately serve its intended purpose.

A review of comparable statistics for May 1954 and May 1955 indicates the tremendous growth in the social-security program that has occurred since the enactment of the 1954 amendments. In excess of one million new beneficiaries have been added to the benefit rolls in that short time. In May 1954 there were 6.4 million persons receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits; in May 1955 the number of beneficiaries had increased to 7.4 million persons. Monthly benefit payments have increased from $275 million in May 1954 to $377 million for a comparable period in 1955. The average primary insurance benefit received by a retired worker has increased from $51.72 per month to $60.85 per month. The number of people covered by old-age and survivors insurance working in a particular week has increased from 45.7 million persons in 1954 to an estimated 54 million persons in 1955. Despite increased benefit payments, the assets of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund has increased from $19.6 billion in 1954 to $20.7 billion in 1955.

These statistics clearly reveal the increasing importance of the old-age and survivors insurance program in protecting our American citizens in their old age and upon the untimely death of the principal family provider.

I have taken the time of the membership of the House to set forth the recent gains that have been made in our social-security program because I realize the tremendous interest there is in this program on the part of the people of our Nation. It is my hope that with careful study and prudent planning we can accomplish further improvements in our social-security program.

The Los Angeles County Senior Citizens Service Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the establishment of the Los Angeles County senior citizens service center.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, there is now pending in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a bill, S. 693, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER] and a great many other Senators, to establish the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged.

I was honored to be asked to be one of the authors of this measure. I feel rather confident that the proposal to establish such a Commission will receive favorable consideration when the Congress returns next January.

Such a Commission, in my opinion, will perform a magnificent service to our country and to our society through focusing enlightened attention on the problems of our older citizens and on programs for the solution of those problems. In this connection, I am happy to report that one of the great communities of my State, the county of Los Angeles, has recently taken a great new forward step of its own in this very field. I refer to the establishment of a senior citizens service center, where older people of the community may seek and obtain information and counseling in a single place on the various problems which come up in their personal lives.

Ten years ago, in order to assist several hundred thousand veterans returning from World War II to reestablish themselves in civilian life, the county established a veterans' service center. This continues to service the day-to-day problems that inevitably occur in so large a group.

In a county of 5 million people, the group described as "senior citizens" is also of considerable size. Many of these citizens are alone. Occasions arise when they need to seek advice, information and assistance. The county board of supervisors felt that if these older citizens could turn to one central place, it would lighten their problems by the very fact that they would be simplified.

The senior citizens service center will be under the direction of the man who has directed the veterans' service center since it was founded, Mr. Arthur Tryon. The cost will be small. A small staff will be augmented by volunteers, older people themselves whose active minds necessitate their keeping busy at something useful and helpful.

The plan is set forth in a letter from Mr. Arthur J. Will, the chief administrative officer of Los Angeles County, to the board of supervisors, as follows:

"The proposal closely parallels the veterans' service center, instituted some 10 years ago to provide a central information, counseling and referral service for war veterans in the Los Angeles area. The outstanding contribution of the veterans' service center has merited nationwide acclaim. It is now proposed that the same concept be established for the needs, guidance and counseling of the aged, as well as those community organizations devoted to the same purpose.

"The senior citizens service center would be under the general direction of Mr. Tryon, chairman of that committee, who is in the position of old-age counselor, without compensation (bureau of public assistance). Adequate quarters are available in the presently leased space at 306 West Third Street, on the floor immediately below the veterans' service center. This would permit the use of the receptionist and the telephone services already available in the veterans' service center, and more particularly, the benefit of experience resulting from the continuous supervision of Mr. Tryon, who also serves as executive director of the veterans' service center.

"The proposal offers one of the most promising and tangible ideas yet advanced for assisting the aged, and for integrating, coordinating, and providing a central clearing house for all community agencies participating directly or indirectly in the same problem. It is proposed that the program be initiated on a modest scale so as to permit a flexible operation capable of adjustment as the needs arise. The following gives some idea of how the program will develop:

"1. The superintendent of charities, who is directly concerned with the aged and their employability, will immediately assign a nucleus of approximately six positions, thereby permitting concentration of such departmental activities in a logical and central place.

"2. The California Department of Employment will assign personnel for assisting in the placement of aged persons.

"3. The A. F. of L. and CIO will maintain representatives.

"4. The city and county recreation departments can from time to time provide recreation counseling and advice for community agencies and for aged clubs and groups who are developing recreation programs geared to this segment of our population.

"5. The Legal Aid Foundation will provide services.

"6. The schools can participate in offering advice and counseling on adult education programs suitable for the aged. The county superintendent of schools will assign one person to the center.

"The program will be developed through the full use of cooperating agencies and personnel. Conferences have been held with a few carefully chosen community leaders and officials of community agencies. All have endorsed the plan of the senior citizens service center and have pledged their enthusiastic support to such an activity. Many have volunteered the statement that the proposed center appeared to be the most economical and down-to-earth approach to meeting the problems of the aging, which service was desperately needed in Los Angeles County."

Record of the 1st Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the people of Idaho, and particularly those of the First Congressional District, I would like to sum up the record of the 1st session of the 84th Congress and my part in it.

A Democratic Congress worked in comparative harmony with a Republican President—in sharp contradiction to the political cold war that was forecast. The legislative record shows that in most instances Democrats supported the President's foreign policy to a greater extent than did the members of his own party. On domestic issues, Democrats supplied the winning roll-call votes in almost every case where the Eisenhower program was enacted. Two of the President's major legislative requests—his trade and public housing programs—were passed only because the Democrats came to his rescue. A majority of House Republicans voted to kill both of them.

We Democrats sincerely tried to give the President's requests fair, just, and reasonable consideration. I know that I approached every piece of legislation recommended with a "What's best for the people?" and a "What's best for Idaho?" attitude. Our job—my job—was made easier, I must confess, by the fact that much of the Eisenhower foreign policy and part of his domestic policy has been taken lock, stock, and barrel from Democratic programs.

On the other hand, the Democrats maintained a responsible, constructive opposition. We vigorously opposed

those moves and measures which ignored the common good. We successfully fought the infamous Dixon-Yates giveaway—and I predict we will fight the Hells Canyon giveaway to an equally successful finish. And although we increased the President's budget requests in a number of instances—for medical research on cancer and arthritis, and for school lunches as examples—we proved a good friend to the taxpayer by cutting the President's over-all budget requests on unnecessary items by $1.8 billion—a substantial savings.

IN THE PEOPLE'S INTEREST

I believe we Democrats demonstrated again this session that we are the party of the people—of the workingman and woman, of the farmer, of the small-business man.

First. Social security: Democratic-sponsored amendments to the Social Security Act passed by the House will benefit over a million deserving women by allowing them to draw old-age and survivors benefits at 62 instead of 65. Other amendments allow disabled workers to draw benefits at 50, continue disabled dependent children's benefits after they are 18, and extend coverage under old-age insurance programs to certain professional groups. The Senate will consider the amendments next session.

Second. Taxes: We Democrats tried to reduce taxes for the smaller income groups. A $20 reduction was passed by the House but administration disapproval killed it in the Senate.

Third. Minimum wage: Over the opposition of the administration, the minimum wage was increased from 75 cents to $1. The administration held out for only 90 cents. Employers who hire less than six people are exempt.

Fourth. Farm legislation:

With dairy and other farm income down for the third year in a row, I supported the bill passed by the House and opposed by the administration, to restore high, rigid price supports for all basic commodities. The Senate did not act on this bill. I am seriously concerned about the deepening farm recession.

This session also passed a bill to place a ceiling on disaster-loan interest rates at 3 percent instead of the 5 percent set by Secretary Benson. Legislation was enacted to increase farmer ownership of the farm-credit system, and to modernize the REA loan allocation system. I am also glad to report that a bill was passed to prevent speculation in onions, one of Idaho's important crops.

Fifth. Small business: This session of Congress extended the Small Business Administration for 2 years, and increased its revolving fund. The SBA has approved more than 1,700 loans to small business in the gross amount of $87 million. A bill was also passed by the House to curb the influence of bank holding companies.

GOOD SESSION FOR THE WEST

This has been a relatively good session for the West. I had an opportunity to serve Idaho and other Western States as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This is a particularly valuable assignment for an Idahoan, since public lands comprise almost 68 percent of the State. This session my subcommittee considered 64 bills and reported 23. Sixteen were passed by both the House and the Senate.

First. Sugar: I was one of the sponsors of the bill the House passed to change sugar quotas. Under this measure, Idaho sugar beet farmers—and all American sugar producers—will be able to plant a reasonable acreage of the crop so essential to their operations. I regret that the bill was stalled in the Senate.

Second. Mining: I also authored a bill to extend scheduled termination dates of the domestic minerals purchase program for tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores, which would have stabilized the industry for some time. Because of positive assurance of a Presidential veto, I reluctantly settled for a compromise which Administration spokesmen led us to believe the President would sign. The compromise bill merely increased quotas, but kept scheduled termination dates. The bill passed both Houses, but when it reached the White House it was vetoed.

Third. Hells Canyon:

As the principal sponsor of the Hells Canyon bill in the House, it was a red-letter day for me when hearings were opened in the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, of which I am a member. A number of Idahoans came East at their own expense to testify. In spite of heavy lobbying by the Idaho Power and other power companies, the bill was favorably reported by the subcommittee shortly before adjournment, and on a straight party vote—Democrats for, and Republicans against. A Senate subcommittee took similar action

The bill was therefore ready for full House and Senate committee consideration when Congress reconvenes in January. Hells Canyon legislation had never been so far along toward passage before. Yet the Federal Power Commission with ruthless haste awarded the Idaho Power Co. a license to build three low, single-purpose dams in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River. The fight for the high dam is far from over, however. We who believe in the full development of our natural resources for the benefit of all of the people are not giving up. In the end the people's interest will prevail.

Fourth. Public works: Starts on a large number of projects not requested by the administration were written into the public-works appropriation bill by the Democratic Congress. A million-dollar start was authorized for Ice Harbor. This is the first Federal dam on the lower or middle Snake River. Among other projects on which long-delayed work can now begin are the Yellowtail Dam in Montana, and the Hills Creek Dam and Coos Bay projects in Oregon.

IMPORTANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This Congress passed a number of other bills which will give assistance to those who need and deserve it.

First. Veterans and servicemen: The direct VA loan program was extended for 2 years, and broadened to include home improvements. The same benefits were extended to GI farmers. Disabled veterans were given until October 1956 to apply for the purchase of special automobiles, and this privilege was extended to veterans of the Korean conflict. Legislation was enacted to permit men and women in the service on January 31, 1955, to continue to build up GI school benefits.

Second. Pay adjustments: We Democrats were successful in winning a fairer pay increase for both Federal and postal employees than was recommended by the administration. As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I was in the middle of both pay raise fights—on the side of the employee. I voted against any increase in my own salary, however.

Third. Retirement: Bills were enacted to liberalize benefits to railmen's wives and widows, and to give a cost-of-living increase to Federal retirees and survivors. Both were well deserved.

Fourth. Conservation: Conservationists do not have as much to cheer about as I had hoped they would, but this session of Congress passed a bill releasing $13½ million of earmarked wildlife funds that had been tied up in the Treasury for 10 years, and also increased by 10 percent the appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, and the Soil Conservation Service.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

Much yet remains to be done in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. A satisfactory way must be found, for example, to finance the highway program. The President suggested a special bond issue which would have cost the taxpayers $11 billion in interest. A bill was brought to the floor of the House which called for financing the highway program by pay-as-you-use taxes, but it was defeated. We seriously need more and better highways, particularly in the West, so I hope a satisfactory highway bill can be worked out early next session.

Our schools must also have help. For the first time in history a school construction bill cleared a committee of the Congress this session. The bill provides for a 4-year program of grants to help States meet the crucial classroom shortage. Idaho would receive $1¾ million a year, or $7 million over the 4-year period. An attempt will be made to bring the bill up for action as soon as the new session convenes.

A bill should be passed to move agricultural surpluses out of warehouses and on to meager American dinner tables. It doesn't make sense to have food wasting in warehouses while many Americans suffer from a substandard diet.

There are many other problems—taxes remain high, the cost of living remains high, and farm income is down approximately 30 percent. We Democrats will continue to give careful consideration to any remedies the administration offers for any of our problems—and to offer remedies of our own. We will support the President when we believe his pro-

posals are in the people's interest, and vigorously oppose those proposals which would benefit only the privileged few.

We have demonstrated we are not blinded by partisanship. We are not giving our enemies an opportunity to say that a Republican President and a Democratic Congress have divided and weakened America. We know that the President's program cannot be successful without the Democratic Party.

Whether the world has moved toward peace in the past few months—only time will tell. We all pray that the apparent change of heart and the willingness of the Soviet leaders to negotiate is sincere. But we must not pin all of our faith in these developments. We must continue to take every practical step to keep the free world strong—we must not be lulled into a false sense of security.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the results of one business leader in the fight for fair trade.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently the Senate Small Business Committee took official notice in its weekly staff report of the activities of one of the leaders in the fight for fair trade. Those who believe the repeal of fair trade would deliver a hard blow to the small retailer should be encouraged by the results of the Sheaffer Pen Co.'s drive to enforce fair-trade merchandising of its products. The pen company's experience seems to show that a national brand manufacturer can prevent illegal price cutting of its products without losing sales volume.

Last year the Iowa company intensified its efforts to enforce resale price maintenance of its products and declared all-out war on price cutters of Sheaffer pens. Detective agencies and shopping services were retained to check retailers suspected of bootlegging pens and pen products and all dealers throughout the country were warned that retail discounting of Sheaffer merchandise would not be permitted.

In the past 18 months, this company has cut off 650 retail outlets for price cutting, has started legal action against 397 discounters, has obtained fair-trade injunctions against 54 and fair-trade agreements from 230 retailers otherwise faced with legal action. Thus, fair-trade violations have been reduced to a trickle," the company said.

The pen company has spent nearly $1,500,000 in a year and a half in its fair-trade drive. In that time sales have risen steadily. Net sales for the fiscal year ended February 28, 1955, were $27,072,821, an increase of 7.6 percent over the preceding year. Some of the gain is attributed by the company to the increased support of retailers in appreciation of the Sheaffer fight for fair trade.

This successful experience of one company should be heartening to the many thousands of small, independent retail stores throughout the Nation who still refrain from joining in vicious price-cutting practices, which, in the end, are competitively harmful to everybody, even the discounter himself.

Help the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 220 to establish a select seven-man committee of the House to study the problems of consumers. It is my belief that such a study is absolutely necessary. The study I propose would include consideration of all the problems confronting consumers today. The committee would give particular attention to advertising methods, the effectiveness of the Federal Trade Commission and the need for a permanent Federal agency for consumers.

As we all know, the Government maintains vast departments devoted to labor, agriculture, and business. Nowhere, however, is there any comparable agency which is concerned with the consumers' welfare. Who is there to speak on behalf of all the consumers when Congress considers legislation affecting their interest? Who speaks up for the consumer at Presidential Cabinet meetings? No one. Which agency of the Government provides information and assistance to consumers? None. What Federal efforts are being made to protect, inform, and help the consumer? Very few, I am sorry to say.

Not only is there no adequate governmental service available to consumers, but the lack of it is highlighted by the vast Federal agencies devoted to all the other major economic groups found in American society.

Let us consider only one field where such a Federal agency could be of service. Here in Congress in the necessary course of all legislative proposals, each bill, following its introduction, is referred to a committee. There it remains unless the Member who introduced it contacts the chairman of the committee and requests that the usual reports from the interested administrative agencies be obtained. This is an absolutely essential step in order to obtain any sort of consideration for the measure. The committee then requests the reports. Nowhere in the Federal Government can any congressional committee obtain a report as to the effect of a bill on the consumers or secure an administrative opinion on the needs of the consumers. Where can we go to get some plain information on the consumers' interest? I submit that there is no Federal agency in existence at this time which is in a position to supply this data and information. I do not mean that critically. No agency is charged with that responsibility directly, although the Federal Trade Commission does have a bureau where members of the public can go when they have been sufficiently aroused to file a complaint.

We have recently held extensive hearings on a subject of vital concern to the consumers: Federal regulation of natural gas producers. Many witnesses appeared and testified that the consumers need continued Federal control and protection. Has any agency of the Federal Government reported to the committee that this is the case? Has any agency of the Federal Government testified to that well-established fact? I think not.

As further indication of the present compelling need for the establishment of a consumers' department we need only look at any edition of a newspaper or tune in certain radio and television commercials to find an abundance of misleading bait advertising.

Would you like an aluminum combination storm and screen window, triple section, heavy gage, satin finished, and made of all extruded aluminum? A Philadelphia newspaper carried an advertisement for such a window priced at $9.95. New York newspapers, television, and radio advertisements have offered such windows for as little as $7.50. Baltimore and Boston have also been plagued by similar bait advertisements.

I challenge anyone to buy this window. An attempt to do so will be met by a fast-talking salesman's spiel that "there is a 3 months' factory delay for this window, installation charges, and special carpentry will be over $10 for each window; no guaranty goes with this window and it needs to be scrubbed with steel wool weekly; it will rust and corrode; but this other window, selling for $32.50, is available immediately and with a guaranty, not for years, not for a lifetime, but forever." The fact that the company offering the window has been in business only 6 months is not mentioned.

Perhaps it is uranium stock you would like. Offers abound in public advertisements. Each company is, of course, actually producing and the stock sells for only 5 cents a share. Sure the company is producing. It is producing profits for the promoters. Even the New York Stock Exchange is alarmed by the rash of these fake promotions.

Have you ever been in the unfortunate position of having to answer the advertisement for a funeral complete for $100? Yes; it is "complete." There are only a few extras, such as cards, potted palms, chairs, pallbearers, plot, lowering charge, and several other incidentals which bring the cost up to $500; and for this fee you do not get much more than the simplest pine box.

Are the bereaved even able to think about these incidentals so casually mentioned? Certainly they cannot. Not until payment is demanded—and then, it's much too late.

The housewife is confronted with her usual multitude of problems, but generally overlooked is the poultry inspection situation. Most meat is inspected and stamped by United States inspectors, but not poultry. Only about 20 percent of

commercially slaughtered poultry is inspected under voluntary arrangements. The other 80 percent may be in any condition from fairly clean to disease-ridden, tubercular birds, slaughtered under filthy, unsanitary conditions.

A recent advertisement in the cautious New York Times points up the extremes to which bait advertising and gimmick selling have gone. According to this advertisement you can now purchase for only $17.85, a special phonograph record brush which "operates on an extremely simple nuclear principle." This is the atomic age and the high pressure sales promotions are part of it.

The Nation is being deluged by outright phony and fraudulent offers to sell just about anything. Scandals have been uncovered in garden seedling sales and in sewing machines, stocks and bonds.

Automation, wtih adequate planning, can create more goods for a better life. But the innocent consumer will still have to figure out which is the legitimate offer and which the baited trap.

Local district attorneys, States' attorneys, and the better business bureaus are doing an outstanding, but unfortunately inadequate job in this field. The better business bureau can point out the evils. The county district attorney has his hands full with increasing crime. The States' attorneys are equally burdened by the tremendously growing case loads and the same size staff.

As an indication of the extensive bait advertising uncovered by the better business bureau, this pointed statement, contained in the May issue of the New York City bureau's Monthly Memo, is most succinct:

> Unfortunately, we still have some advertising appearing in newspapers and on radio and TV offering aluminum storm windows installed for less than $8, reupholstery of living-room furniture for $59, vacuum cleaners for $12, and electric sewing machines for $23. Everybody loves a bargain, but when the facts reveal that these low-priced items cost the advertiser more than the advertised price and can only be sold at a loss, it takes no mental giant to conclude that these highly ballyhooed offers are insincere and are made solely for the purpose of getting leads to sell much higher-priced models of the same kind of product.

It is time for all the facts to be exposed, prices and monopolistic practices vitally affecting consumers are mounting. In many fields the consumers' interest is entirely overlooked. Distribution practices and the quality of basic foods constitutes such an area. The poultry situation has already been mentioned. In addition, the cost of milk to the consumer remains virtually static while the return of the farmer goes down. Where does the difference go?

A great many more examples could be cited. However, the need for the proposed study is clear, I believe. The knowledge and information to be gained is sorely needed. The increase in public information would be most helpful. The consumers are entitled to know where their dollars go. I respectfully urge the adoption of my resolution.

Accomplishments of the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously granted, I present for printing in the RECORD a statement of the work accomplished by the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits during the present session.

As chairman of the committee, I am proud of the record which has been made, and I desire to express my appreciation to all of the members of the committee whose cooperation has made this record possible. In addition, I would like to express the committee's appreciation to the several Government agencies who have cooperated consistently with the committee, and the veterans' organizations who likewise have demonstrated a spirit of cooperation with the committee and a genuine desire to be helpful.

On June 28, 1955, our committee reported to the House, H. R. 7089. House Report No. 993, 84th Congress, 1st session, accompanied this legislation.

The committee's report in considerable detail comments on the many provisions of the commmittee's bill. It will not be my purpose, in this summary for the RECORD, to attempt to paraphrase the committee's report, but rather to highlight again certain provisions of the committee's bill that demonstrate its fiber and tenor.

The work of the select committee was begun in the 2d session of the 83d Congress. Because of time limitations the job could not be completed, but under the able leadership of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], a firm foundation was laid for the activities of the committee that was recreated by the present Congress.

The purpose of the committee was to attempt to bring some order to the present confused survivor benefits picture. The combination of laws today represents a hodge-podge which in practical application results in many cases of actual hardship and in serious inequities which offend the sense of justice.

At the present time there are seven standing committees of the House that have jurisdiction in the field of survivor benefits for Armed Forces and former Armed Forces personnel. This select committee, by its resolution, having been authorized to report legislation, has attempted to bring into focus all existing survivor benefits, and by consolidation and coordination make of the present hodge-podge an orderly package of survivor benefits which is equitable in its practical application.

The five major survivor benefits which exist today are:

First. Six months' death gratuity.

Second. Servicemen's indemnity of $10,000.

Third. Veterans' Administration compensation.

Fourth. Social security.

Fifth. Federal employee's compensation.

In the committee's bill the 6 month's death gratuity is continued. At the present time where this payment is based on 6 months' basic pay, plus special and incentive pays, the survivors of enlisted men are receiving a minimum payment of $468, while survivors of high ranking officers are eligible to receive a maximum of $7,656. The committee's bill provides that the minimum payment in the future will be $800 and the maximum payment $3,000. This will provide for larger benefits for the lower enlisted grades, and will curtail somewhat the excessive payments in the higher ranks.

The servicemen's indemnity of $10,000 is currently paid at the rate of $92.90 per month for a period of 10 years and then abruptly ceases. The committee proposes that this be discontinued and these payments in the future be replaced by higher VA compensation. In so doing one of the five existing programs would be eliminated.

At the present time VA compensation rates are set at a fixed dollar amount for certain classes of beneficiaries, with income limitations considered for some, but not all, and rate differentials for deaths occuring in peacetime and wartime.

The committee's bill proposes that for widows the compensation be a base of $112 per month plus 12 percent of the basic pay of the serviceman. Under this formula the minimum payment to a widow would be $122 per month and the maximum payment $242 per month. At the present time, under VA compensation, the monthly payment for a wartime death is $87 and $69.60 for a peacetime death. The committee's bill provides for certain upward adjustments in compensation payments to children only and dependent parents.

With regard to dependent parents, there is currently an income limitation which if exceeded precludes the parents from receiving any VA compensation. If the income of the parent is slightly less than this statutory maximum the full benefit is receivable. The committee in attempting to overcome this "all or nothing" philosophy provided a sliding scale of benefits. Under this provision, as the parents' income increases, VA compensation decreases. Thus, a parent could receive in income an amount greater than the present statutory limitation and continue to receive some VA compensation on a reduced basis.

At the present time all men in the Armed Forces are being provided with a constructive social-security wage credit of $160 per month. This gratuitous wage credit has been retroactively granted since September 15, 1940, and is currently in effect. There have been no contributions to the OASI trust fund for these credits, but the Federal Government has a moral, if not legal, obliga-

tion to the trust fund for reimbursement of benefits expended by virtue of this $160 wage credit. To date no funds have been appropriated as reimbursements to the OASI trust fund. The present amount accrued will approximate three-quarters of a billion dollars.

The committee did not deem it appropriate or financially sound to continue indefinitely the granting of gratuitous wage credits to Armed Forces personnel.

In its bill the committee recommends that all Armed Forces personnel be placed under social security on a contributory basis.

Under existing law, survivors of certain reservists have the right of election to receive either Federal Employees' Compensation Act benefits or VA compensation. Only survivors of reservists have this right of election. Since 1949, when FECA benefits were significantly increased, the survivors of thousands of reservists have elected the benefits under FECA, which were considerably in excess of benefits to which they would have been entitled under VA compensation.

This disparity in treatment of Armed Forces survivors offends one's sense of equity.

The committee's bill provides that extension of FECA benefits to certain Armed Forces personnel be terminated.

There are other provisions of the committee's bill which we feel do much to remove certain inequities and to provide a more uniform and concise survivor benefit package for Armed Forces personnel than exists today.

Under the provisions of the committee's bill no person today receiving compensation payments from any source will experience a reduction in his present survivor benefits. Those on the rolls today will have the right of election to the higher benefits provided under the committee's bill.

As to cost, the proposed legislation for the first 8 or 10 years, by providing the right of election, may prove to be somewhat more costly than existing legislation. However, by placing all Armed Forces personnel under social security on a contributory basis, where the serviceman himself as an employee will make a monthly contribution, it is projected that within 8 or 10 years the cost to the Federal Government of the proposed survivor benefit bill will be less than the cost of legislation on the books today.

There are today approximately 465,000 cases on the various death compensation rolls. The annual expenditure required of the Federal Government approximates a half billion dollars.

In closing, I would like to emphasize the thoroughness with which the committee considered the legislation which was reported. In the present session the committee met 57 times, holding 29 public hearings and 28 executive sessions or hearings. I am of the opinion that the committee's bill represents a composite of the thinking of the best available talent on the subject of survivor benefits both within and without the Government.

My colleagues, Mr. KILDAY and Mr. BATES, with me are members of the Armed Services Committee and we have long been interested in the subject of survivor benefits for Armed Forces personnel. Certain inequities which exist have been a source of concern to us. Therefore, it was gratifying to me to have an opportunity to serve with them on a select committee created exclusively to deal with this subject.

As chairman of the select committee I felt extremely fortunate to have as members, in addition to Mr. BATES and Mr. KILDAY, our very able and distinguished colleagues, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. TEAGUE, currently chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, brought us his wide experience in the field of veterans' legislation, and Mr. KEAN, a ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, added his vast store of knowledge on the subject of social security.

The task assigned the committee was an extremely difficult one, but I feel that the committee has accomplished its assignment. The committee's bill passed the House on July 13 and is currently pending before the Senate Finance Committee. It is our hope that favorable action will be taken by the other body of the Congress early in the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's Ordeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included into the RECORD the following editorials from the Denver Post entitled "Ezra Benson's Ordeal," in four installments.

The Post's discussion of the farm problem is a complete one and presents very ably the Eisenhower administration's new farm program:

EZRA BENSON'S ORDEAL—I

Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture and a man of courage and principle, is marked for political obliteration.

Mr. Benson is being zeroed in for the attack of 1956. The Democrats and their allies, from the National Farmers Union to the CIO, are mounting an assault on the Eisenhower farm program. The objective will be the Presidency, of course. The tactics will revolve about an appeal to the discontented and fearful noncommercial farmer, who will be described as a human sacrifice to corporate agriculture.

The weapons in this campaign against Mr. Benson and his policies will be statistics:

"Prices received by farmers have dropped 22 percent since their high point in 1951. * * *

"The net income of farmers has dropped 13 percent in the past 2 years.

"Farmers alone are no better off than they were before World War II.

"The Republican Party, the author of flexible price supports, is forcing farmers into an agricultural depression.

"Benson's real (though secret) objective is to wipe out all price supports, after having obtained 'full flexibility'."

The Secretary's enemies are already charging him with the "failure" of his "2-year experiment with the sliding scale theory of price supports." They are indicting him for bankruptcies in the dairy industry, for increases in the farm mortgage debt, for incurring unnecessary losses to the Government on price support operations.

Just this week an adviser to Mr. Benson told a Massachusetts farm audience that the postwar decline in farm income was an emergence from "a dream world, and no one expected it would last." A Democratic Senator, JOE O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, seized on that as an issue which may "turn the scales in 1956."

Critics of the present administration acknowledge that "Eisenhower prosperity" is a modern phenomenon. But, they say, "In this pleasant sea of well-being, agriculture is an island of pessimism, hardship, and general discontent. For farmers, 1955 is a year of real depression."

So Mr. Benson and his farm policies are the handles on the otherwise less-than-vulnerable Eisenhower administration. And it is with those handles that the Democrats hope they may dislodge Republicans—if not Ike himself, then lesser candidates for State and National offices.

Ezra Benson himself has shown no inclination to run, to equivocate or to trim his sails. He survived the elections of 1954 amid rumbling threats to restore high and rigid price supports (threats that did not materialize). For Mr. Benson believes that the other side of the debate on farm policy, his side, will stand the test of public scrutiny.

What is the "other side"? What is the "whole story"? We'll discuss that tomorrow.

EZRA BENSON'S ORDEAL—II

Those who are trying to pin responsibility on Secretary of Agriculture Benson for a 22-percent drop in farm prices since 1951 conveniently neglected to mention 2 facts. The first is that the so-called high of 1951 coincided with the Korean war—a war which, since that time, has been mercifully brought to a halt. The second calculated omission is this: Almost two-thirds of the drop in farm prices took place between 1951 and January 1953—the year that Mr. Eisenhower (and Mr. Benson) took office.

The parity ratio, which describes prices received by farmers against those paid for goods and services, dropped from 113 in February 1951 to 94 in January 1953. Right now it stands at 84. In the last year that ratio has hovered within a range of 84 to 87, suggesting the first stability since 1951.

Does this drop in farm prices, plus an alleged 13 percent decline in the net income of farm people, foretell an economic collapse throughout the country? That would depend, it seems to us, on other important factors. For example:

Total agricultural production this year may break all records. While prices will average below those of 1954, that loss may be entirely offset by increased marketings and lower costs of production.

As to the charge that farmers' take-home pay has slumped to pre-World War II levels, that is nonsense. Per capita net income of farm people was $930 in 1952, $904 in 1953 and $907 in 1954. (The estimates for 1955 are not yet available.

During the 5-year period just before World War II, per capita income of farm people was one-fourth to one-third of today's levels, or from $200 to $300 a year; and that difference, even when adjusted in terms of present inflation, hardly confirms the claim that the farmer is the abused class in American life.

Figures other than those picked out to illustrate upcoming calamity suggest that American agriculture is not likely to sink into ruin tomorrow. Farm real-estate valu-

ations jumped by 2 percent from 1954 to 1955. Farm debts are only 11 percent of farm assets, as compared with 19 percent in 1940 and 21 percent in 1930. The average equity of farm families (meaning total assets minus debts) is fixed at $22,000, or about $5,000 higher than the comparable figure for nonfarm families.

Finally, it should be recalled and repeated that the major factor in the reduction of agriculture's total income has been the decline in farm prices—two-thirds of which took place before flexible support prices came into effect, and before the present administration moved into Washington.

How, then, can the so-called agricultural depression complained of be attributed to the present administration's policy of forcing farm prices down? Obviously, it cannot.

It is Mr. Benson's contention that the accumulated weight of some $7.5 billion worth of farm commodities, owned outright by the Government under price support, forced down farm prices in the United States. Those surpluses, consisting largely of wheat, corn, and cotton, were amassed under a program of rigid supports at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. Benson insisted in 1954, and holds to the position now, that "the program which got us into this mess would never get us out." The record proves, in our opinion, that he is right.

What about this rigid versus flexible price-support fight? Is the present administration actually "father" of the idea? We'll discuss that tomorrow.

EZRA BENSON'S ORDEAL—III

The high priests of high and rigid farm price supports who preach that the evil plan of flexibility was a creation of the Republican 80th Congress, are gambling that the miserable memory of the American people will remain that way—unremedied. But, for the record—

We had flexible price supports before World War II. They ranged between 52 and 75 percent of parity. Wheat was supported at 52 percent of parity in 1938, 56 percent in 1939, and 57 percent in 1940.

In 1948 the platforms of both parties endorsed flexible price supports. Mr. Harry S. Truman in fact recommended flexible price supports to that same "worst" 80th Congress which approved it. And Mr. Truman said at that time:

"Now we must look ahead to a farm price-support policy geared to our improved farm economy. Many shifts in production will have to be made, and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly manner. * * *"

The leaders of all farm groups favored flexible supports in 1948. Congress approved the act of that year, but postponed use of the flexible-support provisions for 2 years. (Subsequently the date when such supports were to become effective was extended to 1955.)

There has not been a Secretary of Agriculture for 20 years who did not, at one time or another, favor flexible supports. They include Henry Wallace and Clinton Anderson (who still favor such supports, by the way); Claude Wickard and Charles Brannan.

So why this great cry of anguish over the sudden imposition of flexible price supports, that hideous device to squeeze the profits from little farmers and force them into vassalage of the corporate farming system?

It was not until this year that Mr. Benson had any authority to reduce supports at all, and especially on the basic crops. When he did belatedly receive that authority, he fixed support on cotton, peanuts, and tobacco at 90 percent, corn at 87, rice at 85, and wheat at 82½.

And what happened to the dairy industry after Mr. Benson dropped support prices on milk and butterfat to 75 percent of parity in the spring of 1954? Critics of the Benson program complain that "dairy farmers received 8 percent less cash in 1954 than the year before—for 3½ percent more milk." And, they complain, sales of butter for consumption increased by $42 million over 1953, but reduced prices cost dairy farmers 10 times that much.

But Ezra Benson can justify the application of the sliding scale theory in dairying, without hesitation or apology. Per capita consumption of butter climbed 6 percent in 1954–55, reversing a trend the other way. The consumption of cheese climbed 10 percent.

Since the end of July, last year, the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of dairy products were reduced by 50 percent; and CCC purchases of butter during October–July were 56 percent below those of the same period the previous year.

It is confidently expected that by the close of the 1955–56 marketing year, the holdings of butter, nonfat dry milk and cheese will be modest. And in the all-important matter of the "milk-feed price ratio—the relationship of milk prices to feed prices," the July 1955 crop report of the USDA said: "In July the milk-feed ratio was 3 percent above average, 9 percent above a year earlier, and as favorable as any for July in the last decade."

Today the USDA insists that the farmers have culled their low-producing cows; that there are fewer cows in dairy herds than a year ago and the herds are producing more milk per cow. The result has been that more people are using more dairy products; and the dairy industry is less dependent upon the accumulation of mountains of stored dairy products in costly Government and leased warehouses for its solvency and future prosperity.

What is the genesis and the goal of the get-Benson campaign and why? Discussion of that will conclude this editorial series on the subject in the Sunday Roundup editorial section.

EZRA BENSON'S ORDEAL—IV

Ezra Taft Benson's heroic efforts to shrink the Government's holdings of farm products and to modify the role of Government in managed agriculture are piling up fancied political demerits for the Eisenhower administration.

The Eisenhower farm program is under attack by those who are trying to make quick political capital of adjustments from a wartime to a peacetime economy. That adjustment has been painful in some segments of agriculture. It has been accompanied by some decline in farm prices and net farm income. And it has coincided with a continuing population trend from farm to city and a revolution in farming techniques—from automation to enlargement of the family-size farm.

But Mr. Benson is fighting back, with the firm support of President Eisenhower and the concurrence of a large part of United States agriculture. The Secretary's problem is complicated, however, by forces and influences quite beyond his control; and those are precisely what Mr. Benson's enemies are converting to their own purposes. For example:

There is a vast and constantly changing difference in the size, output, and general efficiency of United States farms. The trend from farm to city, which has been going on for 200 years, today finds only 13.5 percent of our total population living on farms. That is 22.1 million persons in a total of 165 million.

That broad and changing variation has created conditions under which a price that represents parity or equality for one producer may spell bankruptcy for another, and a bonanza for still another.

Now, about 2 million of the 5.5 million units classed as farms in the United States produce 85 percent of the farm products which go to market annually. They are known as the commercial or family-size farms, operated by the farmer, his family, and some seasonal hired help.

The income of the 2 million commercial farmers compares favorably with that of nonfarm people of similar capabilities and with similar investments. If that were the group from which farm statistics were obtained, and with which government were primarily concerned, the so-called farm problem could be discussed, at least, in simpler, more understandable terms.

But there are 3.5 million farm operators who sell only 15 percent of the food and fiber that go to market. Within that group there are 1.5 million farm operators at the lower end of the scale who have less than $1,000 income a year. They are part-time or underemployed farmers. Their marketings are so meager that they benefit little, if any, from price-support programs.

The averages for the three groups mentioned, when set forth as farm statistics, are misleading. And any plan that attempts to endow all with parity or equality—or which purports to guarantee them something simply because they call themselves farmers—can hardly be harmonized with the real interests of American agriculture as such.

So there are really two problems here: That of the commercial farmers and of the low-income farmers. The latter need rural-development programs and assistance in the development of new jobs in areas where they are concentrated. They need low interest and liberal credit to expand their operations and to buy machinery. Their children need vocational training. But for many of those people the solution to their problem does not lie in the land at all.

When Secretary Benson discusses the farm problem in such realistic terms, however, there are always critics around to accuse him of playing toady to the "rich fatcats of the Farm Bureau." And those same dissenters go on to parlay that unwarranted class distinction into political opposition to the present administration. The genesis of that opposition is partisan politics in the main, proceeding from indefensible economic and social doctrines. The goal: Defeat of the present administration with its philosophical approach to managed agriculture and the substitution of a gigantic and undiscriminating system of subsidy, at the taxpayers' expense.

Ezra Taft Benson and the Eisenhower administration are undertaking great and basic reform in agricultural policy. The dire consequences of that reform have not come to pass, except as their enemies—by gross distortion of history and current fact—misread the indexes of farm welfare and deliberately pass that misinformation on to the uneasy public. We hope Mr. Benson remains on the course he is pursuing. It is the right way for Americans.

Termination of Rapid Amortization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1953, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, requesting that the Treasury Department make recommendations for the termination of

the rapid amortization authority granted under the Internal Revenue Code. I took this action because of my belief that the need for tax incentives for capital investment in the defense program had largely been eliminated and, as I stated in my letter to the Secretary, "the accelerated depreciation—rapid amortization—is undoubtedly costing the Federal Government many hundreds of millions of dollars in the way of revenue."

Two years later that same Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, has apparently come to my point of view. He has recently recommended that the granting of authorizations for rapid amortization be either terminated or greatly restricted. Between the date of my letter to the Secretary and the time of his recommendation, several additional billion dollars of capital investment have been certified for rapid tax amortization with the result that the Federal revenues have sustained very substantial losses.

Members of the House will recall that present law provides that a business wishing to take a rapid tax writeoff on a capital investment for defense-facility construction can arrange to do so by obtaining a certificate of necessity covering the facility involved. This certificate permits the writeoff of the investment in a 5-year period instead of over the normal lifetime of the asset as required under normal depreciation procedures. The law requires that the certification relate to the defense effort.

At the inception of the national-defense program instituted in connection with the Korean conflict, the rapid amortization provision of the Internal Revenue Code provided a necessary incentive for defense-plant expansion.

It is my view that the administration of this program providing for the issuance of certificates of necessity has exceeded the original intent of Congress. In conducting the program the administrators have certified high percentages of the construction cost without taking proper account of the fact that in most instances those plants would have obvious production uses in peacetime, and in some cases a certificate has been granted where only a very tenuous defense relationship existed.

The accelerated amortization program does not constitute a cash grant or subsidy of a defense plant by the Federal Government. However, its end result is similar in that it brings about reductions in Federal income taxes during the acceleration period, it makes more cash available to the taxpayer, it helps to finance the cost of new facilities, and it has the nature of an interest-free loan of funds that would be otherwise available to the Federal Government. The resulting reduction in Federal income-tax collections resulting from tax amortization occurs at a time when tax rates and interest rates are high. These facts magnify the gain to business and the loss to Government from the amortization privilege.

To date over 20,000 certificates of necessity have been issued under the present program at an average certificate rate of 60 percent with the result that over $18 billion of plant investments has been certified for rapid tax writeoff. At the present time there are 900 applications pending for the issuance of a certificate of necessity covering approximately $5 billion in plant investment. The action of the Secretary of the Treasury in asking for the termination of this program more than 2 years after I first expressed concern over the problem to the Secretary comes in my opinion rather late.

The effect of the delay by the Eisenhower administration is that the Federal Government has had to borrow money and pay interest charges thereon to make up for the deficit in receipts caused by the tax postponement occurring under rapid tax amortization.

The ordinary taxpayer has had to pay in several ways for the cost of the tax amortization program. He has had to pay in higher cost of Government purchases because a company with a certificate of necessity is allowed to use the additional amortization as a cost factor to get higher prices from the Government. He has had to pay interest on the portion of the Federal deficit that resulted from the loss of tax revenues through rapid amortization. He has also had to bear in higher taxes the distortion in the distribution in the tax burden that occurred under the rapid amortization.

It is a matter of great concern to me that the Eisenhower administration did not act more promptly to either restrict or terminate this practice of granting rapid tax amortization. In the early days of the armament buildup that attended the Korean defense effort, speed in the allocation of defense contracts was essential. However, Secretary Humphrey and other responsible officials of the administration have had long months since my letter to make the necessary review of the program. That they have failed to do so more promptly will cost the American taxpayer several billions of dollars in added taxes and interest charges.

The Future of Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, it has now been a few days since highway legislation was defeated in the House. It would seem well, therefore, to discuss the situation which this has brought about and the possibilities of future legislation for better highways for our poople.

At the Governors' Conference at Lake George, N. Y., on July 12, 1954, more than 1 year ago, President Eisenhower, speaking through Vice President NIXON, launched a drive for a greatly expanded highway program.

Few proposals were ever advanced with such attendant publicity. Meetings supporting it were held throughout the country, and those in Washington were widely publicized. Editorial writers, commentators, columnists, and many public speakers joined in the chorus that a great system of modern highways was a vital necessity for our country's future. It was described by some Republicans as a key proposal in what was termed the dynamic program of the Republican administration.

As a result of the impetus that was being given an expanded highway-construction program the President appointed a committee to make a report to him as to the desirability of such a program and the ways and means of realizing it. This committee became known as the Clay committee because of its chairmanship by Gen. Lucius Clay. Subsequently this committee made its report.

The recommendations of the Clay committee, which in effect were adopted by the administration, involved major expenditures, especially by the States and the Federal Government. They concerned not only the 40,000 miles comprising the interstate highway system but the entire more than 3 million miles of roadways in our country and were generally characterized as a $101 billion program, a fairly large portion of which was to be contributed by agencies of Government other than the Federal Government. Particular emphasis, however was placed on the reconstruction of the interstate system, which was held by the Clay committee to be a primary obligation of the Federal Government. It had been estimated by the highway departments of the States that the reconstruction of the interestate system would cost $27 billion, of which the Federal Government's share, as recommended by the committee, would have been approximately $25 billion.

The Clay committee further recommended that Congress accept the thesis that the interstate system be reconstructed to modern standards; that the construction be accomplished in a fixed number of years; that the funds for its construction be allocated yearly according to its needs within the various States instead of by the traditional formula heretofore used in Federal aid; and, that these funds be raised through a new Federal corporation which would issue and sell bonds, the last of which would mature in 1987.

The Fallon highway bill, which was reported by the Committee on Public Works and finally rejected by the House last week, accepted the principle of every recommendation by the Clay committee except that pertaining to the creation of a Federal corporation to finance the reconstruction of the interstate system by the issuance of long-term bonds and one other provision concerning toll roads which, by common consent of both Democrats and Republicans, had been dropped. Since it was obvious that the Republicans would have supported the Fallon bill almost unanimously had it contained the Clay committee financing provision, and since it is possible that this same difficulty may be encountered if we are to have highway legislation in the next session of Congress, it might be well to first dis-

cuss in some detail the worthiness of the Federal corporation idea as applied to highway legislation.

Just what would the Federal corporation have done, as planned by the Clay committee? It would have issued $21 billion in bonds, with which to partially finance the construction of the Interstate System. The interest on these bonds would have been $11,500,000,000, or 55 percent of the principal of the bonds. These bonds finally would have been paid in 1987. By General Clay's testimony the interest on the bonds would have been substantially higher than if they had been issued by the Treasury. He estimated that the additional interest required to be paid in order to have them issued outside the Government would be from $475 million to $1,900,000,000. This high interest rate would have resulted from the fact that the bill incorporating the Clay committee financing provision specifically stated that the bonds of the Federal Corporation would not be a debt of the Federal Government. General Clay testified that while not a debt of the Federal Government they would be a moral obligation of the Government and would, of course, have to be paid by the Government.

By this arrangement, the Clay committee was seeking to capitalize the 2-cent gas tax now levied by the Federal Government as a general revenue tax, which it said would be sufficient to pay off the bonds by 1987, and provide $622 million yearly in Federal aid through that date. Such calculations wholly disregarded the fact that $622 million is insufficient Federal aid today—it actually is $700 million at present—and would be a mere yearly pittance long before that distant day in 1987 on which the bonds finally would have been paid, and, at which time we will have twice the number of vehicles and almost three times the ton-miles of traffic we have on the highways today. In freezing the 2-cent gas tax returns for 32 years, it also wholly disregarded the finding of the Bureau of Public Roads that even though the Interstate System is constructed by 1965 there will have to be additional construction thereon between 1965 and 1985 of $9,700,000,000. All these great, additional outlays would come at a time, under the Clay committee bond financing provision, when the taxpayers of our country also would be paying the $11,500,000,000 interest on only $21 billion of the Federal Corporation bonds.

Up to the present every dollar expended by the Federal Government on roads has been subject to authorizing legislation by Congress, full budgetary control, complete appropriation procedure, and has been paid out of general revenue and accounted for within the statutory debt limit. It would be a revolutionary departure from fiscal fundamentals and long recognized governmental principles to adopt the Federal corporation idea in financing highway construction. If we begin, in effect, capitalizing taxes out of general revenue for highway construction it could and would be adopted for other purposes and would finally result in the complete destruction of the authority of Congress over the appropriation of public funds. If we pile up debts for which succeeding generations must pay, the least we should do is to leave them an honest set of books in order that they will know the sum total of obligations bequeathed to them.

While the administration bill, which included the Federal corporation device, specifically provided that the bonds of the Federal corporation would not be a debt of the Government, it also included a provision that gave the Government the authority to accept these bonds as security for all fiduciary trust and public funds, including that of social security. It is completely contradictory to say in one section that the corporation bonds would not be a debt of the Government and then declare in another that they are eligible for Government trust-fund investment. And, it is unthinkable that Congress would ever pass legislation which would permit bonds not guaranteed by the Government to be sold to its trust funds. This alone should have resulted in the rejection of the Federal corporation idea from any highway legislation.

Our committee, as well as this House, had a great amount of other evidence on the validity of the Clay committee financing provision. On March 30, 1953, President Eisenhower, in a message to Congress, said:

> In the state of the Union message I expressed my deep concern for the well-being of all our citizens and the attainment of equality of opportunity for all. I further stated that our social rights are a most important part of our heritage and must be guarded and defended with all of our strength. I firmly believe that the primary way of accomplishing this is to recommend the creation of a commission to study the means of achieving a sounder relationship between Federal, State, and local governments.

Pursuant to the above statement by the President he created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and directed it to examine the role of the National Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions. On this Commission were many of the country's ablest citizens. This Commission rendered its report in June 1955 after more than 2 years of the most exhaustive study. In reaching its decision it had before it the report of the Clay committee to which it had given long and careful consideration. In the chapter in its report on the financing of highways, it had the following to say:

> The Commission recommends that the expanded highway program be financed substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose, primarily from increased motor fuel taxes.
>
> The effect of the Commission's recommendation on highway aids will be to increase Federal expenditures. An increase in taxes is preferable to deficit financing as a means of supporting larger highway outlays by the National Government. The latter method would result in high interest charges and would shift the burden to citizens of a future generation, who will have continuing highway and other governmental responsibilities of their own to finance.

It must have weighed very heavily with the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to find that his Clay committee's Federal corporation bond proposal was without merit. Yet, that was the effect of their very forceful and logical recommendation quoted above and released in June at the very crux of the controversy over highway legislation. But that was not all. The Honorable Joseph Campbell, a 1954 appointee of President Eisenhower as Comptroller General, appeared before both the Senate and House Committees on Public Works while these committees were considering highway legislation. On each occasion he strongly disapproved the recommendation of the Clay committee that a Federal corporation be organized outside the regular channels of the Government in order to sell bonds in the deficit financing of a highway program. Among other things, Comptroller General Campbell stated:

> Insofar as we are aware, such a financial arrangement for a Federal expenditure program of the scale and magnitude contemplated for the proposed Federal Highway Corporation has never been used by the Federal Government.
>
> The corporate form of government activity is objectionable because, for the most part, it is free from the normal safeguards set up by the Congress to maintain adequate control over the conduct of public business and the expenditure of public funds.

In passing on the validity of the Federal corporation idea it is well to remember that before final action in the House last week on the highway bill, and even before action thereon in our House Committee on Public Works, the Senate had passed a highway bill in which not only the Federal corporation proposal but all other major recommendations of the President and the Clay committee were rejected. The final vote in the Senate on the Gore highway bill was 60 to 31. After a long and thorough Senate debate 13 of the 47 Republican Senators had joined with the Democrats in opposition to the main points of the President's program, including the Federal corporation device.

The President's Secretary of the Treasury was a witness before the House Public Works Committee during the consideration of highway legislation. While expressing a preference for the Clay committee recommendation concerning financing of highway construction, as would be expected from a member of the President's own Cabinet, Secretary Humphrey definitely did not disapprove the financial provision of the Fallon bill reported by your committee. In fact, he stated that neither he nor any other Secretary of the Treasury would ever object to a pay-as-you-go program. He also testified that the credit program as recommended by the Clay committee would be inflationary and that the pay-as-you-go program of the Fallon bill would not. And, he affirmatively confirmed that from $475,000,000 to $1,900,000,000 interest which would be paid on the bonds under the Federal Corporation plan would result from the higher interest rate occasioned solely by their being issued by the Federal corporation instead of by the Treasury.

It can also be said to the credit of the Fallon highway bill that the one Presi-

dential recommendation which the Public Works Committee did not accept had received substantial criticism from numerous other citizens of repute throughout our country. Many public figures had pointed out the obvious fact that it was nothing more or less than deficit financing. In addition to the 13 Republican Members of the Senate, the President's own Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and his own Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, it had been denounced by Senator BYRD, considered by almost everyone as the Senate's outstanding financial authority. Among many other things, Senator BYRD had stated that it amounted to an attempt to deceive the American people as to the amount of their Federal debt.

Just how did this financial provision get into the report of the Clay committee? This seemingly is answered by a statement made in January of this year by General Clay himself. Speaking on his committee's recommendation, the General said:

> We want to avoid a higher debt limit, further taxes, or greater deficit.

These were highly laudable ambitions but in its proposal to expend $21 billion under the limitations of this statement, the Clay committee left itself no fiscally responsible course of action. The political situation being what it always is in Washington, it is not difficult to understand why this Presidentially appointed committee would necessarily accept assignment to the committee in the knowledge that it would not be advisable to advocate either the raising of taxes, increasing the public debt or doing deficit financing. But, it is somewhat amazing that the Clay committee felt it had found a way by which Congress could authorize the borrowing of $21 billion, pay almost $12 billion interest on it, and still evade each of these political liabilities. Certainly only a severely strained interpretation would admit of any such claim.

The hurdle supposedly was accomplished by simply saying in the act of authorization of the Federal corporation that its bonds would not be a debt of the Federal Government. Congress was thereby being asked to authorize obligations against the people of our country but declaring at the same time that they were not debts. Yet they would have to pay them. And, General Clay himself testified as much. If any hurdle remained it was to be eliminated by having the Federal corporation keep its books separate and apart from the Treasury Department. Even accepting this slight-of-hand way of evading the charge of raising the national debt and making necessary an increase by Congress of our debt limit, it still is more than difficult to understand the assertions of the Clay committee that no deficit financing was involved. Borrowing $21 billion in any manner by which the taxpayers must repay it, along with $12 billion interest, would seem to be deficit financing with a vengeance.

This Federal highway corporation idea is represented as an easy way. It is the painless solution. It deludes the people into believing that somehow they are to get something for nothing. It holds out the promise that if the Federal corporation is set up as another bond-selling deficit financing agency, somewhat outside the Government but with the Government and the taxpayers still morally but not legally responsible for its acts and obligations, your highway problem is solved. What a snare and delusion. All such a gimmick would do would be to widen and deepen our Government's financial jungle, and with our taxpayers right in the bottom of the pit. What could be more vicious in its evil potentialities for a government's fiscal soundness than this financial device? It could be the beginning of a chain of Federal corporations, each one nibbling away a portion of the Government's general revenue which, during the boom time of the last few years, still has been insufficient to pay our yearly expenses and prevent deficit financing. This is illustrated by the fact that a paper with the integrity and repute of the Christian Science Monitor seriously suggested in a front page article a few days after the Clay financing plan was publicized that the schoolroom shortage problem could also be solved in like manner by the organization of a Federal school corporation and assigning to it part of the revenue of the Treasury for long-term capitalization. It is worth noting that no one has suggested what will happen to the present manifold obligations of the Treasury when all its revenues are assigned to newly organized Federal corporations in order to secure entirely new services and benfits not now enjoyed. It must be admitted that its possibilities are tremendous. It would seem charitable to say, as did Senator Byrd, that this provision would have evaded fiscal responsibility by legerdemain and public debt by definition.

In desperately trying to reach an easy solution of a problem incapable of any such solution, the Clay committee violated basic principles of fiscal responsibility. The more reasonable and more logical appraisal of the President's own Comptroller General, the President's own Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the considerable number of the President's own party members in the Senate, and of Senator Byrd and many others, must be accepted as to the undesirability of the financing provision recommended by the Clay committee and rejected by your Committee on Public Works in the Fallon bill which we reported to you.

It is worthy of note that while this political juggling act in high finance was taking place a few months ago, our known Federal debt was $278 billion and we were still extending our record of constantly recurring yearly deficits. Not only was that true but the Secretary of Defense had just announced that defense expenditures could be expected to remain at or above the then present level for a considerable number of years. No one has been sufficiently bold to predict that so-called normal expenses of Government will ever again be reduced. Unless there is a decided change in the political climate, they will continue to increase.

Now, with this record before us your Public Works Committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted 22 to 9 to favorably report the Fallon bill which contained all major recommendations of the Clay committee except the Federal corporation device. Yet, when it came to a final vote on the Fallon bill in the House last week only 29 of more than 200 Republicans voted for it. Even though only 4 of the 15 Republican Members on the Public Works Committee voted against favorably reporting the Fallon bill to the House, 9 of the 15 finally voted against it. Remember, too, that at the time the vote was taken in the House all other possible highway legislation had already been eliminated. It was the Fallon bill or nothing. After having espoused a campaign of many months for highway legislation, after having wrung every possible political benefit from it, after a Democratic controlled committee had cooperated in reporting a bill that generally followed Clay committee recommendations except in the one highly questionable particular of a $21 billion high-interest bond issue, they disowned their own child and voted against better highways for our country.

It is true that many of the Democrats had opposed the administration recommendations from the beginning. Some were not convinced that a sum such as was recommended should be expended within the proposed number of years. Some felt that the Fallon bill, in making the administration recommendations fiscally responsible by substituting user-taxes for the dangerous Federal corporation bond proposal, had assumed a political liability for their party. Other Democrats who were inclined to vote for it did not do so when it became obvious that the Republicans, with practical unanimity, were voting to kill their own baby. Still, almost half the Democrats voted for the Fallon bill and better highways for the American people.

Even in defeat there were some great virtues in the highway measure on which your Public Works Committee had labored for many months. While it was known as a 13-year bill, actually the construction under it, and the payments for such construction, would have covered a period of almost 16 years, commencing immediately upon its enactment. Under the total authorization of $24 billion provided therein, it meant a Federal expenditure of $1.5 billion per year, instead of $2.5 billion per year as it was considered by the general public when first proposed as a 10-year program. The construction period recommended by the Clay committee was extended to make certain that sufficient time was allowed to guarantee that every possible economy; would be effected in construction contracts. This money would have been expended wholly within our own country, which, while not a complete novelty, certainly should have commended it. All costs for labor would have gone into the pockets of American workers and all materials would have been purchased from American business. The $24 billion would have been expended for something we not only greatly need now, but for which the need will be desperate long before the termination of the 16-year period in which it could have been realized under

the proposed legislation. It could not have been other than of great value in advancing our economy and, if highway authorities are correct, it would have paid for itself. Stated differently, now that highway legislation has been rejected, we will be paying for a great highway system in loss of time, human life, and destruction to property, but we won't be getting the highways. Although it is true that many motorists might not greatly use the limited mileage of the Interstate System, the Fallon bill, by also providing for the accelerated construction of the remainder of the Federal-aid system, would have guaranteed good highways for everyone. Finally, the enactment of the bill not only would have avoided inflation, not only would not have greatly increased our national debt, it would have been an example of sound fiscal policy at its very best.

It can be taken for granted that our Republican friends really would have liked the great highway system they had proclaimed to the world that they wanted, provided, of course, every "t" was crossed and every "i" dotted with respect to the Federal corporation device. But, that would have made the American taxpayers pay an extra almost $12 billion in interest, a possible almost $2 billion of which would have been necessary only to give some little appearance of validity to the claim that we were not raising our public debt. If your Public Works Committee had been willing to report such a financial provision, the Fallon bill would have gotten some 200 Republican votes instead of 29 and we would have had highway legislation. But if there was to be full fiscal responsibility in connection with the building of highways, if equitable user-taxes were to be imposed on those who would profit greatly by their direct use of the new highways and thereby prevent raising the public debt and destroying the peoples' earnings through needless inflation, then their desire for highways was lost and the legislation could not be realized. In the final interment of the Fallon bill it sometimes seemed that our Republican friends might be more interested in the issuance of many billions in bonds carrying high interest rates than they were in securing highway legislation that would provide a greatly expanded highway system for the people of our country.

We are told that the Republicans are saying in defense of their votes on highway legislation that they had promised not to raise taxes. If they were not willing to have the highway user pay for finer highways—highways which will make him money and which he even now is paying for even though he is not getting them—then why all the tremendous campaign and publicity regarding the vital necessity of a greatly expanded modern highway system? If it is remembered correctly, the Republicans also promised not to permit further deficit financing. In adopting the Clay committee financing provision they were embracing deficit financing not only to its fullest but in a manner highly dangerous to sound fiscal policy. And, by accepting the Clay deficit-financing program they not only were just delaying the imposition of additional taxes, they were also making it absolutely certain that the taxes, when levied, would be at least $12 billion more than if levied at the present time, this sum representing the amount of interest which the Clay committee deficit-financing plan entailed.

It now seems that the trucking industry is receiving plaudits for killing highway legislation. It is being said that the big tractor-trailer commercial highway operators induced a 100,000-telegram barrage of Washington in opposition to the Fallon bill and that this secured the votes for its defeat. Even if true, one might wonder whether this is all gain and no loss for the trucking industry. The 600,000 heavy commercial trucks operating on our highways, comprising only 1 percent of our motor vehicles but monopolizing a great share of our country's roads, not only congest the highways and make motoring an onerous burden for the other 57 million motorists, they are the vehicles which contribute so disproportionately to the destruction of our roadways. To a very great extent the operation of freight trains on the highways had made necessary the highway legislation which the commercial truckers are given credit for having defeated.

It is very true that a motor-fuel tax alone is a highly inadequate measure of road use for the heavy vehicle. The owners of the 48 million automobiles of our country which weigh between 1 and 2 tons as compared to the heavy trucks' weight of 36 tons, and which travel an average of only 9,000 miles yearly as compared to the heavy trucks' approximately 50,000 miles, would seem to have a particularly great interest in the user taxes to be imposed provided the Federal Government is to furnish substantial funds for highway construction. And, if there is to be an imposition of a Federal gas tax of 3 cents, certainly the disparity such a levy creates as between the automobile and small-truck owners on one side and the commercial-truck owners on the other should be equalized in some manner. It should be remembered in this connection that the Federal Government has provided less than $7.5 billion for highways during the entire 40-year life of the Bureau of Public Roads. If it is to furnish more than 3 times as much in 1 piece of legislation—and it would seem that it should—it certainly is only right and proper that equitable user taxes be imposed with which to pay at least a substantial portion of it.

It can be said for the Fallon bill that it not only represented fiscal responsibility, its user tax approximated equity as between user groups. If there was injustice in the tax provision, it was against the 57 million automobile and small-truck owners and not against the big, commercial tractor-trailer operator. The 40,000 to 80,000 pound trucks have never paid a tax commensurate with their use of the highways, their damage to the highways, the congestion they create on the highways, and the great inconvenience their relatively small numbers necessarily cause to the general motoring public. As they continue to multiply, and especially if they become higher, wider, longer, and heavier, for all of which their lobby continually applies increasing pressure, they will finish the job of making nervous wrecks of America's motorists. It is only natural to object to taxes, regardless of the advantages they may bring, provided it is felt that others may be made to pay them or should pay them. But there seems little doubt that the trucking industry might have paid their portion of the taxes imposed by the Fallon bill and still have made more profits than it will realize from the continued use of our present greatly congested, time-consuming, and highly inadequate arterial highways. In an address in New York City after the plan was unfolded to reconstruct the 40,000 miles of interstate system and there had been time to study it, Karl Richards, head of the Motor Truck Division of the American Manufacturer's Association and secretary of the highway policy committee of that association, said that the trucking industry alone would save $1½ billion yearly on just labor and accident costs by such reconstruction. That would amount to a saving for the trucking industry alone of $23 billion in the 16-year construction period or twice the amount of the proposed additional taxes against not just the trucking industry, but the entire motorcar industry. It would seem conclusive that Mr. Richards, who is an honorable, able man and, by reason of his employment, greatly interested in the trucking industry, can be relied upon for the facts concerning this situation. It would also seem conclusive from the carefully prepared presentation of this national authority that the trucking industry was getting a bargain in the Fallon highway bill.

The big trucker has flaunted the entreaties of the highway administrators of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the 48 States with reference to the axle weights and gross weights which the highways can reasonably withstand. With powerful lobbies he has pressured State legislatures into increasing the weight of his load and the size of his truck even when highway administrators were pleading that his action could only result in inordinate damage to the Nation's highways, which they were trying to protect in order to serve him. He has maintained this action without ceasing through the years. While this was going on, records in many courthouses throughout our country were being made which attest the fact that he did not always abide by the laws which he could not change by the pressure of his lobby. Naturally his violations of weight limitations were causing highway destruction and needless economic loss to the other 57 million motorists and to our country generally.

So, while there is reveling in the applause which the big commercial truckers are now receiving for their contribution in defeating a fine highway sytem for our people, while an unjust tax situation is being continued in behalf of the large vehicle combinations at the expense

of the general motoring public, I just wonder if the final reaction to this wrecking operation is going to be as rosy as it now appears on the morning after. While the many telegrams reaching Washington were quite formidable, they will not build a highway system and, in the end, they may serve to remind our people not only of what caused the present condition of our highways but also of what prevented us from getting the kind of highways we need and must have.

Now it is being said on all sides that we ought to pass a highway bill. Some are suggesting the calling of a special session and the President himself has mentioned such a possibility. Others are saying that there should be a compromise on highway legislation. The Fallon bill was a compromise and a considerable compromise at that. There would now seem to be nothing left on which compromise should be made. Had the Democratic members of your Committee on Public Works agreed to report the Gore Senate bill, which was sponsored by Senate Democrats and a strong minority of Senate Republicans, a bill that rejected all the President's recommendations, it would have passed. Had that happened, the President would have been placed in a very trying and very embarrassing position.

Having reported a bill which followed every Presidential recommendation except one—a bill in which the only rejected provision was one condemned by the President's own appointed Comptroller General, by his own Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and by a substantial number of his own Republican Senators—there seems reason to wonder not only as to whether there is anything on which to comprise but especially as to whether there is any highway legislation for which the Republicans might vote, except, of course, that which would provide for a bond issue and a great increase in the people's debt. Since the President's own Secretary of the Treasury testified that the substituted financing section was fiscally responsible, uninflationary, and unobjectionable to him, what else could be asked? The substituted tax provision, while possibly not equitable to the 57 million automobile and small truck owners, was at least a step in that direction.

Your Committee on Public Works was given, and it accepted as a duty, the assignment of writing a tax provision in highway legislation. In reporting the Fallon bill, it felt that it had acted responsibly and that it had presented an excellent measure to the House. In view of the great need for better highways and the enormous losses being suffered by the traveling public in the use of the present ones, it is somewhat difficult to understand the House vote on this measure. An expenditure of $24 billion in 16 years for better highways and the promotion of our economy is a large one but it is relatively small when it is considered that, if there is no change in the present rate of expenditure, we shall spend in the same 16-year period $650 billion on defense, $55 billion on foreign aid, and more than $67 billion on public works. It might be added that a portion of the public works program, justly or unjustly, is oftentimes referred to as pork-barrel. As finally presented to the House after it had been amended, no such criticism of the Fallon bill would have been merited.

Therefore, if and when the House determines to again consider highway legislation, might it not be well for us to seriously ask ourselves the question as to whether that consideration should not be given to the very proposal which we recently rejected so hastily? If we are to act responsibly, if taxes are to be imposed equitably as between the groups of motorists which should mainly pay for highways, it is difficult to conceive of legislation that would more fairly accomplish that purpose. In the interest of our country and its people the Republicans ought to be willing to forego the unwise investment bankers high interest multibillion dollar bond issue and the Democrats should forget, if such influenced them, that the administration originally recommended the highway program. The sole issue should be whether our motorists need better roads and whether they can afford the user-taxes that will build them. The answer seems to be that they do need them and that they actually will be saving money when they pay the taxes necessary to secure them. To act in the obvious interest of the people, the duty of Congress seems quite clear.

A Tribute to Oveta Culp Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the terms of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, the Nation's 10th Cabinet post was created by law on April 11, 1953. That new Cabinet office was the position of Secretary of the newly created Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

To become the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the history of our great Nation the President selected an outstanding citizen who had a distinguished record of public service prior to assuming the new Cabinet post. The Honorable Oveta Culp Hobby, as the Nation's first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, further distinguished herself by her performance of duty in her new position.

In his message to Congress of March 12, 1953, pertaining to the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President of the United States in outlining the need for the new executive department and defining its purposes stated as follows:

> But good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their success upon efficient, responsible administration.

Secretary Hobby provided in full measure both efficient and responsible administration. In addition to those attributes, she demonstrated an organizational genius and an understanding of public needs to the end that the vital functions performed by the multifold agencies under her supervision attained outstanding achievements in the field of public service during her tenure in office.

Under the guidance of Secretary Hobby expanded Federal-State programs were developed to provide better schools, improved medical facilities, more realistic care for the disabled and the aged, liberalized child welfare services, and accelerated medical research. She instituted a program of vocational rehabilitation and education that in the years to come will find increasing numbers of our disabled again becoming productive, self-sufficient citizens.

Secretary Hobby must share in the credit for the improvements that were made in our social security program by the Social Security Amendments of 1954. Her department worked in close cooperation with the Committee on Ways and Means to prepare this important legislation which provided liberalized benefits, expanded coverage, and improvements in the retirement test.

It is not possible to detail Mrs. Hobby's many accomplishments as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Suffice it to say that every American citizen will realize enduring benefits from her capable and selfless performance of duty.

Mrs. Hobby has recently found compelling personal reasons that have necessitated her return to private life. Her absence from public office will be sorely felt by those who were privileged to work with her and, indeed, by all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is reported that one of her Cabinet colleagues once referred to Mrs. Hobby as "the best darn man in the Cabinet." I would like to join in that remark and observe also that she is one of the most gracious ladies I have ever met.

Mrs. Secretary, you have performed your task well and have the grateful thanks of your fellow citizens.

Synthetic Fuels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, I recommended to the Congress that it consider the feasibility of diverting into a synthetic-fuels project some of the vast Federal expenditures that are now being earmarked for the development of commercial atomic energy. Since then I have inquired further into the possibilities of a synthesis-fuels industry, and I have also attempted to pursue the multitudinous reports on atomic energy that have originated in this country and abroad. I believe that it is

now time to take another look at the situation.

Many of the statements issued from Geneva during the conference on atoms for peace have tended to give the impression that commercial application of atomic power on a universal scale is just around the corner. The general public has been led to believe that electricity produced by nuclear fission will soon be marketable at prices far less than the cost involved in the use of conventional fuels. On closer examination, however, we discover that cheap electric power from the atom is still confined to the realm of theory; there are no definite assurances, in fact, that reactors will ever be able to produce the lowest-cost electricity, particularly in areas within close proximity of the coal areas of our country.

There are too many factors involved for us to go all out in the direction of atomic power to the exclusion of coal and other fuels. If the Government is going to subsidize construction of the reactors and other necessary facilities, if the Government is going to undertake to insure property and personnel against damage that could be inflicted in the event of an accident in an atomic plant, if the Government is going to underwrite commercial operations against losses incurred in developmental programs—then there may be a basis for the assertion that nuclear fission will become a principal source of electric power. I would imagine that it can be authoritatively stated that electricity at TVA rates can be made available in various areas of the country if the Federal Government is willing to pour sufficient funds into the atomic energy program.

The hazard problem alone would add considerable expense to overall operational costs of a commercial atomic energy plant unless—as has been suggested by some of the ready spenders of Federal funds—the Government is willing to accept insurance risk. Harold L. Price, Director of the Division of Civilian Application, United States Atomic Energy Commission, has stated that the hazard catastrophe potential is more serious than anything now known in the insurance industry. Mr. Price states that the possibility of a serious catastrophe seems very remote, but he nevertheless raised a question which is of maximum importance in the promotion of nuclear fission on a commercial basis.

In our enthusiasm for this new type of power, let us try to be realistic and attempt to determine just how much it would be practical for our Government to invest in the program. Fuel experts are of the opinion that, even if the most optimistic predictions on atomic power come true, this method of generation will provide only about 10 percent of the electricity to be consumed by the United States in 1975. The fact is that coal, which has always been the principal source of electric power, will be consumed in constantly increasing quantities by the utilities within the next 20 years. Coal will get a rising share of newly developed electric capacity; it will also supplant oil and gas under boilers as the reserves of those short-term fuels gradually become depleted. According to the United States Geological Survey there are upward of 1 trillion 200 billion tons of recoverable coal in the United States—enough to produce more than a billion tons a year for a thousand years. Because of this abundance of coal, America can face the future with full confidence that there will be ample supplies of liquid and gaseous fuels irrespective of the duration of our petroleum and natural gas resources. These fuels will come from coal through synthesis.

The Bureau of Mines has informed me that, according to the consensus of experts in the field, the fuels synthesis process will eventually furnish the bulk of our requirements of liquid fuels. The Bureau of Mines further states:

> The switch from petroleum and natural gas to coal in the long run is understandable when one considers that more than 80 percent of our mineral fuels (exclusive of radioactive materials) is coal—enough to last for centuries.

Both Japan and Germany manufactured important amounts of synthetic gasoline and oil during World War II. In the Union of South Africa, a new synthetic-fuels plant is expected to produce annually a total of 55 million gallons of gasoline, 7 million gallons of oil, and 15 million gallons of chemicals.

One of the methods for producing fuels and chemicals from coal is the hydrogenation process. The Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Co., which at Institute, W. Va., in 1952 pioneered the first commercial plant to produce chemicals directly from raw coal, has isolated and identified more than 100 different chemicals in its short history. Some of these chemicals have interesting possibilities as medicines, new fabrics, paints, plastics, and insecticides. Whereas it took nerly an hour to process coal by German methods, Carbide's new process does it in about 4 minutes.

The research which eventually led to the establishment of the Carbide hydrogenation plant was actually undertaken because the company was concerned about the future supplies of petroleum and natural gas, and it was decided to explore the possibilities of a synthesis fuels plant in this country. While the need for manufacturing gasoline and oil from coal has not yet materialized, there is no question about the ability of the Carbide plant to produce them. Dr. J. George Davidson, president of the company, said at the time of the plant's opening:

> Carbide & Carbon has no intention of making any gasoline at Institute if we can help it, but we would have to be pretty dull if after running the plant for a few years we didn't know how to make gasoline.

Certainly it would not be fair to a progressive organization such as the Carbide Co. if the United States Government were to subsidize construction of a plant to be operated in competition with this firm, and I want it understood that I am making no such recommendation. I am convinced, however, that it would be to the distinct advantage of this Nation—from the standpoint of security as well as to protect fuel supplies for use over the long range—if some of the money which is going into the development of atomic power for commercial use would be diverted into one or more synthesis plants. The time has arrived for at least the consideration of such a program.

With billions of dollars being invested each year in the Nation's defense structure, the future need for synthetic fuels cannot be questioned. Should the United States be forced into another world conflict, there is definite danger that we would be prevented from bringing any foreign oil whatsoever into our ports. Under these circumstances our industrial and military machines would place such a sudden demand upon the petroleum and natural gas industries of this country that a supplementary supply by synthesis might be the only deterrent to a fuels shortage. What better investment, then, could be made at this time that a potential stockpile of gasoline and oil in the form of a coal hydrogenation plant?

Despite the fact that there has been some upturn in the production of coal during the first 8 months of this year, as compared with 1954 output, there is heavy unemployment in some of the coal-mining communities of America. Here is a laboring force eager to participate in the construction of a synthetic-fuels plant. By providing employment for these men the Government would encourage them to remain in coal areas and thus be available for mining work when demands for coal increase. In my district we have the men, and we have adequate coal and water resources for the operation of such a plan. The citizenry of my area are most enthusiastic about the possibility of having the Government give some attention to the idea.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps during the second session of this Congress it would be advisable to review the progress that has been made thus far in synthetic fuels and to look into their potentials and the expected time that they will become a necessary part of the overall energy program. Congress should solicit the views of fuel experts connected with the petroleum, natural-gas, and coal industries, as well as with Union Carbide and other firms which have ventured in some way or another into synthetic-fuels research. Let us ascertain whether or not it would be to the general interest if we were to earmark some funds for the building of coal, oil, and gas plants that would be available for conversion into commercial enterprises.

No doubt we will also hear from those factions whose objection to such a program is that synthesis fuels cannot compete with other sources of energy on a price basis. I say to you that neither can atomic energy compete. Let me quote for your perusal the following two paragraphs of a news story from Geneva that appeared in the Wall Street Journal:

> Now turn to America. The United States, with abundant cheap coal and oil, really has no urgent need for atom power. Officials of the companies which make reactors say frankly that most of their utility company customers have no early expectation of cutting costs by building atom plants; their primary motive is to stake this out as an area of private rather than public power.

At this time, I quote from an editorial that appeared in the United States Press Association's Commentary on National Affairs. This editorial material is used widely in newspapers throughout the country and I recommend it to you because it raises a question which has too often been overlooked in the headlong drive toward a utopia powered by atomic energy:

PEACEFUL POLLUTION

It is a long time since anyone has believed in a gas saver so miraculous that the car owner is required to stop now and then to bail out the tank * * * but the topflight physicists of the United States, Britain, France, and the U. S. S. R. now know how to get power out of the atom and create, at the same time, more atomic fuel than they burned in the first place.

In their Geneva confab, the scientific wizards have revealed their innermost, hitherto top secrets—on the peaceful uses of atomic energy—including the last remaining secret of the neutron which forever banishes the fear of running out of what it takes to stoke the atomic furnace.

There is obvious emphasis in the enthusiastic reports from this latest Geneva Conference that the discussions have nothing to do with the earlier and more homicidal use of the atom. It is all a part, of course, of the furious effort to distract the world's attention from further progress at annihilation. Yet it is difficult for the unscientific mind to grasp the fact that these dissectors of protons and neutrons can share their innermost secrets, yet reveal nothing of military significance.

But discussion of a study of the earth, air, and water around the vast plutonium plant at Hanford, Wash., revealed something of a hazard that has been kept pretty quiet since the early days of atomic tinkering. In spite of elaborate protective measures, the plant is leaking radioactivity which is showing up in fishes in the Columbia River, in birds and even in jackrabbits. The concentration (or radiophosphorus) was found to be over 100,000 times normal in small fish and 5 times as great in some birds, yet the biologists considered this well below the dangerous levels. They admitted, however, that if the concentration in the Columbia River were to reach the allowable maximum for drinking water, the fish could not be eaten.

This, together with earlier discussions of the problem of disposing of radioactive trash from atomic plants, suggests that when atomic energy comes into general use, ash removal will be far more costly than fuel.

You can't fill in swamps with it. And you can't kick it around till it gets lost. That takes thousands of years.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the day is not too far away when there will have been developed a safe and efficient method of using the atom to generate electricity and for other peacetime purposes. But, meanwhile, it should be remembered that the United States cannot afford to invest indiscriminately in a project whose practicability has not yet been established. Coal is a proved source of heat and power and of gaseous and liquid fuels. Under the circumstances, is it not logical to consider investing in a number of synthetic-fuels plants rather than to continue to spend vast amounts in the belief that the dollar sign will eventually efface the question mark that hovers over commercial atomic power?

Results of the Republican Tax Program of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my opinion that our free-enterprise system operates best when there is the minimum amount of governmental restriction and regulation that is consistent with the protection of the public interest. When American initiative and ingenuity are permitted to go forward without artificial restraints imposed by needless barriers in our tax structure and without other unnecessary governmental restraints, it can be expected that our American economy will prosper and expand. I have seen this happen time and time again with agriculture, labor, and business sharing in the resulting benefits because of the built-in incentives contained in our free-enterprise economy.

It is for that reason that I now view with great interest the healthy condition of our economy and the effect of the tax reduction program carried out in the Republican 83d Congress. It will be recalled that in 1954 the greatest tax reduction program in the history of our Nation was carried out with total annual tax relief of $7.4 billion being granted to our American taxpayers. At that time individual income taxes were reduced $3 billion; excise taxes were slashed $1 billion; the expiration of the excess-profits tax reduced the tax burden by another $2 billion; and $1.4 billion in tax savings resulted from the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The tax reduction that resulted from the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was only an incidental effect of this monumental legislation. Principally, this legislation was designed to provide a just and equitable tax law and a sound tax structure that would be conducive to the dynamic development of our American economy.

Recent economic statistics released by the Department of Commerce indicate that this program of tax reduction and tax revision has acted to stimulate our economy and provide unprecedented prosperity in our Nation.

Calendar year 1953 was the peak year for our Nation's economy as a whole previous to 1955. This new high in the level of economic activity has been achieved despite drastically reduced Federal expenditures. Statistics for 1955 indicate that the current year will substantially exceed in terms of production, employment, and income any other comparable period in our history. For example, our gross national product in 1953 was $364.5 billion; the annual rate in the second quarter of 1955 is $385 billion. Personal income in 1953 was $286 billion; the annual rate in July 1955 was $301 billion. The industrial production index—1947 to 1949 equals 100—for 1953 averaged 134; for July 1955 the index stood at 140. Average weekly earnings in manufacturing for 1953 was $71.69; a comparable figure for July 1955 stood at $75.76. Employment in 1953 averaged 62.2 million persons; in July 1955 a comparable figure was 64.9 million persons.

Thus, it is apparent that by creating an economic environment that is favorable to development and growth we have achieved a prosperity never before attained in our history. It is a prosperity in which our citizens from every segment of our economy have shared.

Under the able leadership of our President and the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury and with sound legislation enacted by the Congress, our country today can view with confidence new economic and social goals to be obtained in the foreseeable future. But continuing to act with prudence and courage, we can look forward to sustained national progress and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me, as it must be to all the Members in the House of Representatives, to review the salutary advantages that have been derived from the tax program enacted during the Republican 83d Congress.

How the Settlement of Kansas Affected Our National Life—The Struggle Between Freedom and Slavery Still Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago William Colfax Markham endowed the Markham lecture course to be delivered at Baker University in Baldwin, Kans.

Dr. Markham is a widely known publisher, a great poet, and true statesman. He has done as much or more for the development of our public highways and country roads as any other one man in this country. He is a philanthropist who has served his God, his country, and his fellow man well.

To my surprise and gratification, I was invited to deliver the Markham lecture at Baker University on May 30, 1954. Because I have had many requests for copies of that address I include it under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

President Horn, friends of Baker University, citizens of the great State of Kansas and my fellow Americans, the history of Kansas is long, rugged, challenging, thrilling, and romantic. As far back as 1541 Francisco De Coronado traveled over the plains of what is now Kansas and for the two centuries following, fur traders from Louisiana and Spanish explorers came into what is now your great State. Those explorations and surveys were followed by expeditions by men like Lewis and Clark in 1804 and later by Col. John C. Fremont.

From about 1830 to 1854 Kansas was an Indian territory settled by many different Indian tribes, many of whom had been

driven from the east and southeast of this great State. White men who dared settle the Indian territory during those years, particularly since Missouri became a State in 1821 until 1854 when Kansas became an organized territory, did so at great risk and great peril. Those pioneer men and women who marched westward to carve out of the wilderness a mighty empire were men and women who prized liberty, who sought new and larger freedoms and who through their fortitude and patience and perseverance, through hardships and sacrifices and endurances helped build this great commonwealth in the center of our great Nation.

Kansas is in the heart of America which your great United States Senator John J. Ingalls once characteristically said was the "navel of the Nation." And the activities and incidents attendant to the forming of an organized territory and the carving out of a State here in the heart of America led the great historian George Bancroft to say that "Kansas was the miracle of the ages."

I hope that we have not forgotten completely those brave men and women who marched westward in covered wagons, who lived in dugouts, and houses; who burned buffalo chips for fuel, who lived on buffalo and antelope and deer and prairie chicken and wild game until they could carve out homesteads, cultivate the soil, build them crude huts, to make Kansas one of the leading States of our Union.

I want to say now, President Horn, that I consider it a rare privilege, a great pleasure and a distinct honor to be invited to come back to this memorable institution of learning, my beloved alma mater, Baker University, at its 96th commencement. And especially being a Missourian I am flattered and more than honored, just a wee bit surprised, that I would be invited to speak on this particular day in the history of Kansas celebrating the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Kansas-Nebraska bill that repealed the Missouri Compromise. I am much aware of the events that took place from 1854, 100 years ago today when Franklin Pierce as President signed this bill, down to January 29, 1861, 7 years later. I am reminded of all the tumult and turmoil and strife and conflict and the highway robbery and the arson and the murders that were committed between the people of Missouri and Kansas back and forth across the line that separated them. So I am just a bit surprised and I am much aware that the events that took place during those years of 1854 to 1861 while Kansas was a Territory, would hardly encourage a warm welcome to any neighbor from Missouri.

Nevertheless I am glad to be here. And lest I forget it I want to point out that in spite of the fact that Quantril a little later with 400 men marched into Lawrence and sacked it killing ruthlessly 150 helpless citizens and burned the town, some of you Jayhawkers got what was given by you to my fellow Missourians in the days gone by because of the retaliatory power you possessed in inflicting punishment upon the Missouri maurauders.

Not all Missourians were cutthroats and assassins, though we can boast of our share of the men who stole elections in those days. It hasn't completely died out. You know there is a little machine that operates in Kansas City, that still operates effectively, because it goes back a long time. They still vote people who have been dead for 20 years by taking the names off the tombstone and can when they ask to see ballots they have written, destroy or burn those ballots. Pendergastism can still do a more effective job than was done back in Kansas when it was a Territory. But not all of the Missourians even in those days of the 1850's were bad people and not all of them were against the views entertained by many of the early settlers of Kansas who came from New England and Pennsylvania and in whose breasts fiercely burned the love of freedom.

It might interest you to know that my own grandfather who came from the hills of east Tennessee in 1849 on his way to California, when he hit the Ozarks in southwest Missouri said, "This is as near heaven as I ever hope or want to get" so he settled there. And though he came from Roane County, east Tennessee, which happens to be the county of our former great Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, he believed in the Union and he fought for the Union and he fought the bushwackers in Stone County of southwest Missouri north of the Arkansas line at the same time John Brown and Jim Lane and Charley Robinson and some others were fighting them over on the Kansas side of the Missouri line.

Not all of the Kansans agreed in those terrible years. Kansas became a Territory in 1854 and until she was admitted to the Union, in 1861, LeCompton, Leavenworth, and Atchison were proslavery. But you have old Wakarusa, Lawrence, and Topeka that believed in free soil and free men and free State. So the conflict was intense first between the white settlers who had fought the native Indian tribes, later on between the white men themselves, who so violently disagreed in their views on the matter of slavery.

My friends, Baker University here at Baldwin is really a most suitable place to commemorate the signing of the Kansas-Nebraska Act of a century ago because Baldwin is the first stopping place along the Old Santa Fe Trail. The Federal Government had established it in 1853 and 40 days after Franklin Pierce had signed the Kansas-Nebraska bill allowing them to decide whether or not they wanted to be freemen or slaves. Within 40 days after he signed the bill, Bishop Ames sent a preacher on horseback into the territory of Kansas whose job it was to spy out the land and see what contributions the church could make in helping to improve and encourage educational and cultural development of the lives of this new prospective State. So it came to pass that the first sermon to white settlers in Kansas was preached by the Reverend William H. Goode on July 9, 1854, in the Kibbee cabin just north of Baldwin.

Here at this place on the Santa Fe Trail in this particularly sacred spot steeped in history, we gather on this anniversary so meaningful in the history of this great State. My, what a change. Today this rectangle, 210 miles stretching from Nebraska on the north to Oklahoma on the south, 410 miles from Missouri on the east to Colorado on the west, with 2 million people, rich in oil, coal, lead, and zinc, is the breadbasket of America, the greatest wheat-producing State in the Nation and in the world, with the great oil refineries, with your flour mills, with your cattle raising and livestock, and meatpacking industry.

Kansas had only 100,000 people at the beginning of the Civil War. After Horace Greeley and Abraham Lincoln had come out to the Territory and made speeches against the extension of slavery, Kansas showed her appreciation and loyalty to the cause of the North and against slavery by sending more than 20,000 troops, President Horn, out of approximately 100,000 population. And in every conflict in which we have been engaged since as a Nation, the loyal sons and citizens of Kansas who believe in freedom have always shown a willingness if not an eagerness to contribute their part in order to bring about victory and to extend the blessings of liberty which we ourselves enjoy to others less fortunate.

This legislation signed by the President and passed by the Congress in 1854 making Kansas a Territory naturally had a massive and almost terrible impact. A violent situation arose between proslavery and antislavery factions. Fraudulent elections were held, conflicting constitutions were written, rival slates of candidates were elected. There was bitterness and strife and bloodshed so that Kansas was referred to in the days of John Brown as "bleeding Kansas." It resulted in the historic Lincoln-Douglas debate, through which it helped prepare the way for Lincoln to enter the White House. It triggered the Civil War; it laid the base for the great Republican Party. This great act permitted the people in Kansas and Nebraska to determine whether each State should come into the Union as free or slave.

The impact of the settlement of Kansas upon our national life was momentous and far reaching. It determined the future destiny of our country, when the repeal of the Missouri Compromise aroused men as they had never been aroused before. How mightily the course of the history of the United States was changed by raising this one great question, whether this great State of Kansas should be settled by homesteaders or by planters with servants? This by the way brought forth a new party, the Republican Party, dedicated to free soil, to free labor, to free speech, and to free men.

Thus it is that Kansas stands as a symbol in our Nation of the eternal struggle between freedom and slavery. Today 100 years later after the signing of the Kansas-Nebraska Act which evolved from the issue of slavery a fight for men's minds again envelopes the world. Again Kansas has a central role in this crusade. This time she provides, instead of the issue as 100 years ago, the man. She provides a Kansan to lead the crusade for freedom. I asked President Eisenhower 3 or 4 weeks ago saying I would like a statement from him to read to the Jayhawkers out here in the heart of America on this particular occasion. Though he happened more or less accidently to have been born in Texas he said he spent the impressionable years of his young life here in Kansas on the rolling prairies of your sublime and ostentatious climate where you can have heat and cold and everything between. If you don't like the weather just wait 15 minutes and you will get a different brand. I want to read to you, President Horn, this letter sent as a greeting to you through me from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 28, 1954.

The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DEWEY: I wish I could be present when you deliver the Markham lecture at Baker University. I know how vivid and absorbing will be your treatment of the effect of the settlement of Kansas on our national life.

In this great event and the closely related settlement of Nebraska were embedded many issues that loom important in the history of our country. A symbol of westward expansion, the settlement of the Kansas territory characterized the Nation's growth during the 19th century. Strongly influenced at birth by the terrible intellectual and physical struggle involving slavery in this country, Kansas visually symbolized the tension and the strife that finally burst into the War Between the States. In many ways these events of a century ago was the genesis of the Republican Party.

It is fitting, therefore, that during this centennial year—a year in which slavery and freedom on a global scale are in deadly contest for supremacy—Americans everywhere should give recognition to this deeply meaningful anniversary.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

My only regret about this occasion this afternoon is that your dear friend and my dear friend, one of the greatest boosters Baker University ever had, a fraternity

brother of mine, and perhaps that is the only reason I was invited to deliver this lecture, is not present. Although he knows that while I was born and lived all my life in the Ozarks in southwest Missouri that I am more or less a Kansan by adoption because I did graduate from Baker University and taught for 4 happy years down at Southwestern at Winfield under a great Baker alumnus, Dr. Albert Emanuel Kirk, whom I am happy to see is present this afternoon with his son-in-law, Harold Case, whom I am going to stay over to hear tomorrow. I refer to Billy Markham. We call him Dad Markham down in the Delta House.

I have this letter from Dad Markham. As you know he is a great publisher, poet, and statesman, who has done as much for the development of our national highways and Federal roads as any other one man in this country. He now lives at Swarthmore, Pa., but I have written to him 3 or 4 times and on May the 10th Dad Markham wrote me:

"DEAR DEWEY: In reference to your receiving a message from President Eisenhower for you to include in your address at Baldwin I would like to suggest that I presume that this will be addressed to you and I want to request that having incorporated it in your address you turn it over to President Horn with the suggestion that I shall be very glad to have the message framed and hung up on the Old Castle Museum.

"Fraternally,

"W. C. MARKHAM."

And I turn it over to you now, President Horn.

On an occasion like this naturally it is a great temptation to reminisce. I have reviewed and brought out altogether too inadequately and too briefly the romantic challenging and interesting history of the territory of the State of Kansas. But for the few minutes remaining I would like for us to turn our thought about to this great conflict between freedom and slavery that is still raging throughout the world.

Lincoln said shortly after Kansas became a State, that this Republic could not remain half slave and half free. I don't think that this world can forever remain half slave and half free. Twice in our generation we have fought and won two world wars but have lost the peace in both instances. In addition we have been engaged in a sort of so-called police action over in Korea that has cost us over 145,000 casualties and more than $15 billion. Fortunately the spilling of blood has ceased. The shooting has been stopped, but no one can rest assured that there is any peace in the Far East or anywhere else in the world in this tragic and sad hour.

It's an uneasy truce under which we live, I have had my fingers crossed ever since negotiations began at Panmunjom. My fears question whether there can be any permanent peace or economic stability in the Far East or throughout the world with a divided Korea. You cannot arbitrarily draw an artificial line across a country dividing it in two, separating 30 millions of people of the same origin, who speak the same language, have the same ideals and aspirations and hopes to remain at peace, anymore than you could divide the people of the United States east and west of the Mississippi River.

There is no peace in the world today and I fear there will be none in our time because unfortunately after winning two World Wars and becoming bogged down in a Korean stalemate the world today is divided into two armed camps between East and West, between free men and slaves. And unfortunately since V–E and V–J Days in 1945, less than a decade since, our so-called ally has reached out and drawn within her orbit nearly 800 million of peoples or nearly one-third of the total of the world's population. The western countries that believe in God, believe in the Christian religion are alined against a country that is dogmatic and aethistic that considers all religions an opiate of the people. Wonderful nations that believe in the democratic processes of free men, in government of and by and for the people stand against other nations behind the Iron Curtain that believe in totalitarian powers of government under a ruthless dictatorship. These wonderful nations that believe in the fundamental economic philosophy of private enterprise and individual initiative face another group of nations that believe in everything owned and controlled by the state, and the individual a helpless cog in a grinding wheel. There are two contrasting philosophies of life, two hostile, irreconcilable ideologies of politics, religion and economics. The world which the President referred to is separated between slaves and free men in the fight that is going on today.

Now then whether you like it or not, or whether I like it, we have got to put forth every effort in our power to live decently with men, to achieve a just and a lasting peace because the world is so small. It is closer from Baldwin, Kans., to Leningrad than it was from Baldwin to Kansas City in the Civil War. The remotest spot on this earth is only a few hours from Baldwin. Coming back from Australia after visiting the Far East and Korea, this was several years ago, I spoke to the Chamber of Commerce at Honolulu at its noon luncheon and had dinner with my family the next evening in Washington, D. C. The year following, coming back from the Near East, I had breakfast in Bermuda, lunch in my office, spent 3 hours in Washington and that evening had dinner with my folks down in southwest Missouri near the Kansas-Oklahoma line. And I was traveling in an ox cart, a C–54. The other day two of our boys flew from Los Angeles to New York in 3 hours and 45 minutes.

We are going to have to do our best to get along with other people but we also know this, enigmatic as the Russian people are they are bent on world domination and as long as you have 14 mad dogs in the Kremlin, as long as this hungry Russian bear reaches out with her hungry paws and pulls in all of the countries in eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Balkans, as long as she takes over all of Manchuria, the south half of Sakhalin and the north half of Korea, and now is backing the aggression in Indochina and threatening all southeast Asia, we must remain practical and be realistic and fortify ourselves against any eventuality. In sheer self-protection and for our own survival in this global conflict between slavery and freedom today we must build up and maintain our military might, our economic strength, and our spiritual power. We must build up and maintain our military might and remain invincible on land, sea, and in the air. We must live within our means, preserve the value of the dollar, expand a healthy economy, and fortify our religious faith. There is no easy way out of our dilemma.

A day or two after his confirmation by the United States Senate, Secretary of Defense Wilson came into my office and paid me a courtesy call and I said, "Mr. Secretary, I feel flattered and honored that you called on me. We are going to have to work together as a team. I think the President and the American people are most fortunate to persuade a man with your long and successful business experience to dispose of your stock and to accept one of the most responsible positions in our Government, a job that forced one man to leap out of the window and another man to resign. I think we are lucky to have you, Mr. Wilson, who as head of General Motors employed 486,000 people doing a $7 billion volume of business each year. Agreed, Mr. Secretary, that is peanuts to what you have now. Instead of employing fewer than a half million people you have 5 million working for you, 3½ million in uniform, 1,280,000 civilians, and instead of doing a volume of $7 billion a year, in 1 year we spent over $52 billion on our national defense, twice as much money as our total national debt at the end of World War I which was 26 billion."

We can't forever go on with all our wealth and resources, our inventive, scientific genius carrying such an onerous load. Heavy as our taxes are, great as the sacrifices made, it's much cheaper to have adequate national defense than to suffer defeat. And anyone who has traveled through the Third Reich or Japan since the close of World War II will realize that without an argument. We must build up and maintain our strength on land, sea, and in the air, but we must also realize that the same time we cannot have military might without economic strength. So America must be strong not only militarily but economically because the battlefront can never be stronger than the homefront. We want security, but we have to secure it with solvency. The two are wed. Whenever you divorce them you destroy both. Lenin once wrote that America, like every capitalistic country, would spend herself into bankruptcy.

The hope of Stalin and Molotov is that we will knock ourselves out by our own profligacy. They know that a bankrupt nation never licked anybody and never will. If they can syphon off our wealth in economic and military aid to foreign nations all over the world, if they can engage us in sideline wars on the vast periphery of the Soviet Union, Korea yesterday, Indochina today, Iran tomorrow, if Russia can drain our resources and bleed us white, then she can win the cold war and she can win this conflict between freedom and slavery without ever firing a shot or losing a man. She has been doing a pretty good job of it.

I don't want us to become bogged down in another jungle war. If we must fight I want us to choose the place and the time on grounds to our advantage. Should we become involved in another global conflict I think I can assure you there will be no sanctuary behind any line of demarcation.

America must remain strong in these trying and troublesome times. During these days of tumult and terror, of toil and trouble, we have got to remain strong not only in military strength, but also in an economic sense because after all every military man with whom I have talked, be he admiral or general, will quickly confess to you that after all, the thing that won World War II for the allies over the axis power was not only the men in uniform in our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and Air Force, it was also the men and women who toiled on our farms, in our mines and forests and factories, that produced the food and the weapons and the sinews of war to feed, clothe, and equip 12 million men and women in our own Armed Forces, and millions of our allies, to save the battle of Stalingrad and the battle of Britain.

But there is one other way in which I think we have got to be strong. Not only must we build up and maintain our military might against this threat facing us, not only preserve our economic strength without which you cannot build up strong military forces, but folks, most important of all is to have a moral resurgence, a spiritual revival in this country where men and women will realize that no nation or people can be stronger than the intelligence and character of its citizens.

We must realize that we are engaged in a global war for the hearts and minds and souls of men. We are not going to win the global conflict between slavery and freedom with guns and tanks and planes and bombs alone. As I tried to tell my fraternity brothers down at the Delta House last night, this is an ideological war in which we are engaged. It is a war between ideals and philosophies

and the only way to overcome a bad philosophy is with a good one.

An idea can be the most dangerous weapon on earth. You can't shoot it with a rifle, you can't stab it with a bayonet, you can't destroy it with an atomic bomb. Truth, though crushed to the earth, will rise again; murder, though it hath no tongue, will speak with most miraculous organ. —

Let us go forth from this commencement at Baker University, whose history has been side by side with the history of Kansas, this institution of learning that realizes the importance and the value of religious training in vocations of spiritual idealism, this college to which Abraham Lincoln contributed at its beginning and which has proved its worth over almost a century of time. Because of the magnificent contribution which Baker has given not only to the physical development and material growth, but to the spiritual enlightenment and the moral advancement of this great State and Nation, let us go forth from this commencement resolved in our hearts and in our wills that we will put forth every effort to keep America strong, not only to build up and maintain military might, not only to preserve our economic strength, but to extend good will and to teach a gospel of love, a fellowship, and cooperation with men everywhere in order that we can end this age-old conflict between slavery on the one hand and freedom on the other and bring about a just and lasting peace among ourselves and all men.

The Distinguished Leadership of Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 2, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of the 14th Congressional District of Massachusetts, deserves the praise and appreciation of the Nation for his outstanding leadership in the House of Representatives and as an influential leader in our national affairs.

Since 1939 the beloved gentleman from Massachusetts has served as either Speaker or minority leader of the House of Representatives. Previous to that time he had served in a succession of important positions in the House of Representatives since first coming to Congress in 1925.

It has been my cherished privilege to claim JOE MARTIN as a friend and colleague during his entire term of service in the United States Congress. In war and in peace, in adversity and in prosperity, the example and wisdom of this sturdy New Englander have lent courage and forthrightness to all who have served with him. His perception and understanding embody the steadfastness of the past, the reality of the present, and the hope of the future. The leadership qualities of JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., put him foremost as the guardian of the rights and liberties of men and of nations.

The counsel and guidance of our admired minority leader have served to ease the legislative burdens that each of us must bear. Regardless of seniority in the House or tenure in office, each Member of this distinguished body has done his assigned tasks better because of the able leadership of our esteemed colleague. JOE MARTIN'S knowledge of the problems confronting all geographical areas of our Nation and his awareness of the needs of each segment of our economy have made his judgment on national matters respected by all.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to express the view that our American ideals and our way of life will long endure under the able leadership of our beloved minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ENTITLED "SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES" (S. REPT. NO. 1306)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of August 1, 1955,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, on August 10, 1955, submitted a report of that commitee entitled "Summary of Activities," which was ordered to be printed.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

APPOINTMENTS BY THE SPEAKER SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, 84th Congress, and the order of the House of August 2, 1955, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on August 25, 1955, appoint as members of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of New York; STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Republican, of New York.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE SPEAKER SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 372, 84th Congress, and the order of the House of August 2, 1955, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on August 25, 1955, appoint as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts; EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York; PAUL F. SCHENCK, Republican, of Ohio.